Howard L. Snider
Louis G. Snyder
Richard L. Spreitzer
Cleo P. Stapleton, Jr.
Alfred E. Stark
Willard M. Stephens
William K. Stratford
William G. Swigert
Charles E. Thompson
William J. Tiernan
Jan P. Vandersluis
Donald L. Waldvogel
Edwin G. Weatherford
Robert D. White
Willis E. Wilson, Jr.
Robert C. Wise
Robert J. Woeckener
Fitz W. Woodrow
Peter Yadlowsky
John R. Yates, Jr.
Hans A. Zander
Charles L. Zangas
James R. Ziemann

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant:

Thomas A. Bailey
John M. Ballard
Ivan M. Behel
Harold W. Biesemeier, Jr.
James S. Bloxom
Denham W. Bowman
Ronald D. Bussey
George E. Carpenter
Robert H. Dobrow
Gene L. Dowell
Carl W. Fredericksen
James R. Frisbie
Lawrence E. Garcia
Gregory K. Gordon
Arlo D. Gravseth
William H. Hamilton
Harold L. Inabinet
Joseph J. Jannik, Jr.
James H. King, Jr.
Harry C. Leeper, Jr.
Joseph X. McCormack III
Hugh M. McIlroy, Jr.
Maurice G. Michaud
Frederick J. Moon
Charles R. Rivenbark
Gregg Roberts
Stanley C. Schlegel
James S. Shi
Richard Y. Shintani
Paul D. Skinner
David M. Thomas
John B. Ullman
Leroy D. Vansciver
James H. Walker
Richard W. Walker
Thomas A. Walsh
John H. Whitney
Hensley C. Williams

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OTTO TELLER: A TROUT'S BEST FRIEND

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Otto Teller, the new president of Trout Unlimited, knows how to explain to men some of the problems fish have, which are also mankind's problems of perceiving and remedying environmental damage.

Recently, State Editor Dale A. Burk of the Missoulian interviewed Mr. Teller, who resides during part of the year—the best fishing season—in my native Ravalli County. Mr. Teller's philosophy and insights are good and useful reading to anyone, fisherman or not. I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in the Missoulian of September 26, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OTTO TELLER: A TROUT'S BEST FRIEND

(By Dale A. Burk)

"A trout can tell you many things, not only about himself but the stream he lives in and the land around it," the fisherman said as he released the pound and a half brown trout and watched it swim slowly back into the current of the Bitterroot River south of Hamilton.

"Take this one, for instance," Otto Teller said. "He's sluggish from the cold water, and tired from his upstream run to spawn. He's feeding but he's not very scrappy."

But the trout was alive and free again, resting in the cold current under a clear Bitteroot sky one cold morning just a week ago. The fish had no way of knowing it, but it had been caught and released by a man who only a few days earlier had been chosen by other fishermen to speak out for trout like this from coast to coast.

NEW TU PRESIDENT

Otto Teller, a resident of Hamilton in the summer months and a member of the West Slope Chapter of Trout Unlimited in Missoula, is the new president of the national fishing-conservation organization, Trout Unlimited. As such, he heads an organization that is dedicated not only to protecting trout, but to protecting the watershed that provides them their home.

Teller was elected president of Trout Unlimited at a time when, under its imaginative and dynamic executive director, R. P. Van Gytenbeek, the group is intensifying its conservation programs. That is as Otto Teller says he wants it. This is a time when fishermen must fight for trout water or there will be no water that will support them.

"If we don't have water we can't have trout," Teller said in an exclusive Missoulian interview at his cabin on the Bitterroot River "but we can't simply concern ourselves with the water that is in a stream. We also have to consider the watersheds that produce the water for those streams."

THE COUNTRY'S LIFEBLOOD

Teller said he believes water to be the lifeblood of the country and the fact that trout live in it is only incidental.

"TU's greatest concern is the management of our watersheds," Teller said. "If the water is depleted by mismanagement of our forests or other bad land management practices, we are in serious trouble."

He said that if watersheds are properly managed there will always be trout, and water for man's use. Teller pointed out that it generally is after water has passed through trout habitat that it becomes of the greatest use to mankind in the downstream portions of a stream.

Teller said that trout are a good indication of the quality of a stream.

"If you have trout in a stream, you are sure of two things," Teller said. "One, that there is enough water to support trout life and two, that if trout live in it, the water can be used for almost any other use."

He said that Trout Unlimited considers its mission to be the protection of water and to find instances of bad forestry, farming, mining, road construction or damming practices, and to report those findings.

CHANGE BAD LAWS

"I also believe it is a primary mission of TU to seek out bad water laws and work to change them," Teller said. He cited as an example a Colorado law that states that water must be removed from a stream to be of any beneficial use to man.

Teller said that because of its membership make-up, Trout Unlimited often is one of the first conservation groups to become aware of problems involving resource management.

"Our people fish the headwaters of most of our great streams," Teller said. "They often see changes in stream ecology before anybody else."

Teller credits his fishing with arousing his own concern for conservation, and says that two Montana streams are responsible for his involvement in watershed conservation—the Gallatin and Bitterroot Rivers.

SILT IN GALLATIN

"About 25 years ago I fished the Gallatin River quite a bit," Teller said, "and one day I noticed they were starting to build a road up the Gallatin to Gallatin Gateway. They had to get into the stream and disrupt it, but they told us they had to get the logs out of the mountains."

Teller said that in subsequent years, the Gallatin silted up whenever it rained.

Throughout the last 30 years, Teller has also fished the Bitterroot extensively but it wasn't until 1965 that he bought a ranch on the river upstream from Hamilton.

"Since I was in the area more then, I began to go up into the mountains and viewed the timbering operations," Teller said. "I was absolutely appalled at what I saw."

He spoke of finding huge clearcuts, one involving a trip where he measured seven consecutive miles on a speedometer with clearcuts on both sides of the roads.

"I've since checked many of the technical questions involved," Teller said, "but then as now my major concern was what this was doing to the naturally regulated waterflow we get from the watershed in the Bitterroot."

NOT NATURAL

He said that one of the most serious effects of Forest Service management in the area through its widespread use of clearcutting and terraced planting has been that much of the Bitterroot no longer is a naturally regulated watershed.

"I picked up a Forest Service brochure in Hamilton one day that stated that the source of our nation's water is a snowflake falling on a wooded slope," Teller said. "I began to wonder how they could justify clearcutting such huge areas in the high lodgepole pine area and still expect to provide a naturally regulated waterflow."

Teller said that in subsequent years he found that in 1943 the Forest Service itself had conducted a detailed survey in the Bitterroot in which most of the high altitude areas which are now being cut was recommended to never be logged.

SURVEY IGNORED

"The study said these high areas greatest use was watershed and wildlife." Teller said, "and in 1971 the Forest Service is clearcutting these areas to the ground."

Teller says that concern for the streams must originate at the headquarters, pointing out that most of the nation's great streams have their headwaters in the Rocky Mountains and two of them in particular—the Columbia and the Missouri—in Montana.

"If we can't protect our watersheds at the Continental Divide, we can't protect them anywhere," Teller said. He added that keeping a stream clean in its upstream portions means improved habitat and water downstream.

"I think that because we've taken a stand on the upper watersheds we hope to benefit all the downstream fishermen, too," Teller said, "and that includes the bass fisherman, the estuary fisherman and even the ocean fisherman."

ORGANIZATION CHANGING

He said that TU, once a fly fisherman's organization, is no longer simply for those who use artificial flies.

"I like to fish with a fly because it is the biggest challenge," Teller said, "but I've also fished for steelhead with bait. My basic philosophy on this point is that fishermen should use whatever they enjoy most as long as they can release most of the fish they catch."

On the latter point, Teller said that fishing has changed in the last few years.

"Fishing has become a contemplative sport rather than something to fill the icebox," he said.

LIMIT KILL

He said that in keeping with this, TU has pursued a philosophy based on the motto "Limit your kill rather than kill your limit."

Teller says, however, that modern-day fishermen can't afford to isolate themselves from

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the problems involved with watershed conservation.

"All this talk about what sort of equipment you use is really only philosophical," Teller said. "We've got to consider the basics first. If there aren't some fish in the stream, it doesn't matter much what sort of equipment you use."

He said he will follow this basic philosophy as he leads TU over the next year in pursuit of the organization's two-fold objectives of habitat protection and improvement, and sound trout, steelhead and salmon fisheries management.

"Trout are very comparable to the canary in the mine," Teller said. "A healthy trout fishery is one sign of a well-managed watershed which is well suited for people seeking a quality environment."

TRIBUTE TO "TEX" TALBERT

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 3, 1971, a testimonial dinner will be given in Beverly Hills for my friend Paul "Tex" Talbert, a Los Angeles businessman, civic leader, and long-time Republican Party activist.

Born in Fort Worth, Tex., a graduate of Stanford University, a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery Reserve, and former national president of the Organized Reserve Corps of the Field Artillery, Tex has lived in the Beverly Hills area since 1938 and has had offices there since he founded and became president of the Paul H. Talbert Co., specializing in oil well insurance, 27 years ago.

For almost a third of a century Tex Talbert has been a leader in the community life of the city of Beverly Hills. He has served as director of the Beverly Hills Chamber of Commerce membership committee and as a director of the Beverly Hills Men's Club and Beverly Hills Rotary Club. He has been active in the junior chamber of commerce, in the community chest, and in virtually every other local organization or project in which the indispensible ingredient has been service to others.

In 1938 Tex helped organize the Boys Club of Hollywood, an affiliate of the Boy's Clubs of America, and has unselfishly donated his time to that organization as president, as director, as finance chairman, for more than 30 years. In Republican politics the number of party leadership positions he has held and the number of political careers he has helped get started are beyond estimation.

In Washington and in Sacramento today, and for many years in the past, there are and have been elected Republican officeholders, making important contributions to the State and Nation, who would not be in public life at all if it were not for the encouragement and sponsorship which Tex Talbert has provided.

Tex Talbert believes deeply in, and talks a great deal about, the free enterprise system in the United States of America. In his very successful business career he demonstrates the potential of free enterprise initiative. But most important of all, through generosity and through service, he makes the system work.

And for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it is with special pleasure that I call attention to the program honoring Tex Talbert on October 3 and to note that I will be joining his many Los Angeles friends in the Crystal Room of the Beverly Hills Hotel on that evening to try to show him something of our profound admiration, gratitude, and respect.

IRS THREAT TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the National Council of Churches and various other church organizations continue to lobby actively for legislation of which they approve—I am sure you find their activities reflected in your mail as they are in mine—and when openly avowed revolutionaries such as Jerry Rubin are allowed to use tax-exempt foundations to evade payment of taxes on the profits from the sale of their inflammatory publications, it is disturbingly significant to find the Internal Revenue Service carrying on its 5-year effort to deny tax-exempt status to the Christian Echoes National Ministry—Christian Crusade. Despite a ruling by a Federal district judge in favor of the Christian Crusade, the IRS is carrying its campaign to the Supreme Court, which apparently will be asked to authorize the IRS to decide whether or not particular Christian churches may be built and particular Christian ministers granted the usual tax status for those of their calling.

Therefore, I am taking this opportunity to call your particular attention to the following statement by the head of Christian Crusade, describing the IRS actions and the findings of the U.S. district judge in this case. The issue here transcends any one particular individual's or organization's tax problems, raising the prospect of fundamental infringements on religious liberty in this country.

STATEMENT BY BILLY JAMES HARGIS CONCERNING FURTHER HARASSMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE AGAINST HIS ORGANIZATION

On Thursday, June 24, Judge Allen E. Barrow of the U.S. District Court in Tulsa, decided in favor of Christian Echoes National Ministry (Christian Crusade) and against the Internal Revenue Service. In issuing his decision, he stated that the Internal Revenue Service's revocation of our tax-exempt status in 1966 was unconstitutional and illegal and had, in fact, denied us our rights under the First Amendment, Fifth Amendment and even our due process of law. Judge Barrow specifically stated that Christian Crusade had been singled out for persecution by the Internal Revenue Service because of its fundamental and conservative theology.

We had hope at the time of Judge Barrow's decision that this would be the end of coercion and harassment of this organization by the Internal Revenue Service. We should have known better. After nine years of constant investigation and harassment, the Internal Revenue Service has signified that it will not accept the decision of Judge Allen E. Barrow and will continue its vendetta against Christian Crusade and Billy James Hargis by appealing this decision and assessing unfair taxes against us.

In a series of three events, the Internal Revenue Service has for one thing assessed Christian Crusade $218,481.09 in back income taxes for 1964, 1965 and 1966. It is interesting to note that the income taxes that the Internal Revenue Service is trying to collect for these years are on the contributions that were made by our supporters across America to build the Cathedral of the Christian Crusade, 2808 South Sheridan Road in Tulsa. The IRS now seeks to make us pay income taxes on tithes and offerings that were collected to build a church house in Tulsa, Oklahoma. This particular assessment, showing the desperate desire of the IRS to eradicate this ministry, came on June 25, the day following Judge Barrow's favorable decision to Christian Crusade and against the IRS.

Furthermore, since the June 24 decision, the Internal Revenue Service has assessed me personally for back income taxes, contending that I did not qualify for deductions allowed all ministers of the Gospel. They are now resorting to two approaches, harassing me as an individual and the organization which I head, attempting to discourage the continuation of my ministry of Christian evangelism.

Now, on Friday, July 23, we have been notified that the Internal Revenue Service will appeal Judge Barrow's decision to the United States Supreme Court. Apparently they feel that their agency of the government has the constitutional right to determine what is and what is not religious. Since Judge Barrow's decision questions the constitutionality of the Internal Revenue Service's defining religion, they are resorting to the United States Supreme Court to establish their right to define religion. The Internal Revenue Service, by this action, would attempt to set aside the provisions of the First Amendment, guaranteeing an individual the freedom to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience and his understanding of the Word of God.

In the case of Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade, the Internal Revenue Service would deny us the right to worship God and preach the Gospel of Christ as we understand it, since it is apparently contrary to the opinions of the many "powers that be" in the Internal Revenue Service offices in Washington.

As stated in the Internal Revenue Service letter, assessing Christian Crusade $25,151.60 for 1964; $108,338.94 for 1965; $84,990.55 for 1966; or a total of $218,481.09 for the three years; we have 90 days in which to file a petition in the United States tax court. Otherwise, the taxes must be paid. *We most certainly will file a petition.*

Of course, with the June 24 favorable decision from Judge Barrow and the U.S. District Court, we are not about to pay $218,481.09 in income taxes, since a favorable decision for Christian Crusade removes any liability for payment of income taxes.

It is difficult for me to understand why President Richard Nixon allows the Internal Revenue Service in Washington, D.C., which is under his jurisdiction, to carry on this wicked vendetta against Christian Crusade which started under the administration of President Kennedy and was carried on under the administration of President Johnson.

We are calling upon Christian friends around the United States to ask the President of the United States and members of Congress to look into this harassment and coercion of one Christian organization by the Internal Revenue Service. We have all learned the effect the American people have on Congress and the President, whenever they make known their will. The only way in the

world that this long-running harassment of Christian Crusade by the Internal Revenue Service will ever be stopped is for the people to react, in the name of fair play and justice, and *demand a congressional investigation of the Internal Revenue Service and their actions toward Billy James Hargis and Christian Crusade.*

If necessary, we will fight the Internal Revenue Service before United States Supreme Court. We will certainly appeal these assessments against Christian Crusade and me personally. We are sick and tired of being persecuted by an agency of the government that is being used too often to reward its friends and persecute its opponents.

Considering Christian Crusade's traditional stand for Christ and for America, we cannot understand why we have been the subject of such persecution from the Internal Revenue Service. Rather than discouraging us, the IRS, by its un-American actions, has made us more determined than ever to fight unfair and dictatorial acts.

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the present vacancies on the Supreme Court occasioned by the retirement of Associate Justices Hugo Black and John M. Harlan present an unparalleled opportunity for the President to demonstrate to Americans that the Supreme Court is, indeed, the Nation's highest tribunal for all the people and that 51 percent of the population is not foreclosed from membership by reason of their female sex.

The Constitution, and the Supreme Court that interprets it, must be open to all citizens, not just those who hold a particular judicial or political philosophy. Nothing in the Constitution requires, or even suggests, that Supreme Court appointments must, or should, be made solely in the image of the President. This is particularly apparent when the seat to be filled is that of Justice Hugo Black, a jurist whose judicial philosophy was apparently unacceptable to Mr. Nixon. Diversity has been the hallmark of this Nation and it has been the hallmark of the membership of the Supreme Court—it is the taproot of both.

To say that qualified women cannot be found to fill the Supreme Court vacancies is to ignore the facts. The White House has been given the names of at least 10 highly qualified, distinguished women lawyers and jurists—the choice of any one of whom would be a credit to the Court and the country. These women include Federal judges, law school professors, Members of Congress, and prominent women lawyers in private practice and public service. While any one of these women would individually constitute an outstanding appointment, the inequities of the past and the realities of the present require that women who have been historically excluded from the process of government by accident of birth must be afforded this opportunity to participate in the decisions which will affect their lives. I urge the appointment of a woman to the position of Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as the shortened Apollo program nears its end, the question arises about the future of America's space program. One of the main features of the next stage of development is to be the creation of a space shuttle system whereby space vehicles would be reusable and thereby reduce some of the high costs of the program to date. The State Journal of Lansing, Mich., in an editorial appearing September 26, 1971, presents a strong case for moving ahead in this area and concludes:

The plain fact is that the United States cannot afford to abandon its tremendous investment in space research just as it has reached the threshold of making it pay off.

I commend the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

U.S. SPACE SHUTTLE A VITAL NEXT STEP

In the decade of the sixties the world witnessed the marvel of men leaving the confines of earth and landing on the moon. It was a thrilling experience not only for Americans but for millions throughout the world.

In the aftermath, however, questions were soon being raised about what comes next. As the Apollo program progressed with successive manned landings on the moon there was growing criticism about the cost and what really could be accomplished by carrying out a long series of such ventures to a barren planet.

Congress got the message and soon started to chop the NASA budget from a peak of $5.9 billion to the current level of $3.5 billion. This resulted in sharp curtailment of the Apollo program and the layoff of thousands in the aerospace industry.

As the struggle went on there was even stronger pressure in some quarters for more cuts in the NASA program with some critics proposing that the United States get out of the space exploration business entirely and concentrate all of its resources on resolving the domestic problems of the nation.

Still others pushed for bigger and better space spectaculars such as a manned flight to Mars and probes into deep space.

Between these two extremes we believe there is a better answer and there is encouraging evidence that Congress, which controls the purse strings, is moving in that direction.

It involves the practical matter of finding a way to reduce the immense cost of building the space vehicles, launching them into space and then abandoning them after a mission because there is no way to return them to earth.

The encouraging factor is that Congress has authorized continuation of research and development of the so-called space-shuttle, space vehicles which can be launched into orbit, link up with an orbiting scientific space research station and then fly back to earth like a conventional aircraft. They would be used over and over.

NASA officials believe the shuttle could become operable within the next six or seven years. This change in thinking, we believe, is the logical one needed to keep America in the vital field of space research.

Extensive exploration of the moon and the setting up of manned scientific laboratories on that near earth neighbor may come later. But the immediate goal as stressed by Sen. Howard W. Cannon, D-Nev., is to expand the new knowledge we have gained during the space program to date. The real potential, he notes, has barely been touched. Cannon is a member of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The use of orbiting space stations serviced by returnable space craft would make it possible for trained scientists, for the first time, to carry out research in space regarding such things as world weather forecasting, development of better communications systems, agriculture research and pinpointing pollution dangers on earth, to name a few.

While reducing immense costs of present space efforts, such a program also could lead to far greater development of the aerospace industries, provide more jobs and spin-off industries—certainly a key element in current domestic problems.

Such a program does not envisage the commitment of a massive share of the national budget to space research. It can, in fact, be done with a relatively modest amount.

The plain fact is that the United States cannot afford to abandon its tremendous investment in space research just as it has reached the threshold of making it pay off.

Another hopeful development involves reports that Soviet space scientists are now showing increasing willingness to cooperate with U.S. space research teams in joint projects involving space stations.

As Sen. Cannon said recently:

"Logic dictates that we should move ahead with the shuttle program. Experience tells us that the aerospace industry can respond to even seemingly impossible challenges—and that nations that reject major challenges of their times do not remain major powers.

"And a hard fact of international economics is that the United States can remain prosperous in this world only by maintaining and utilizing its advanced technology."

INFLATION—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 29, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on inflation. I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON INFLATION

As the tabulation of your opinion poll questionnaires proceeds, it is obvious that citizens of the Sixth District consider inflation to be the number one problem facing the nation.

So, I thought today we'd talk about inflation—what it is, its causes, its effects, how we got in this mess, and what measures the country should take to curb inflation.

According to *Webster's Dictionary,* "inflation is an increase in the volume of money and credit relative to available goods resulting in a substantial and continuing rise in the general price level". Remember the definition of inflation for we will return to it later in this discussion.

As Americans experience ever-rising increases in the cost of living—groceries, clothes, rent—they are voicing concern and demanding action. Most Americans no longer accept promises of massive expenditures of additional funds and new give away programs as answers because all share the wealth programs have failed and the people, except for higher taxes and the wealthy getting richer, have only suffered faster inflation which is the cruelest of all taxes. More people are becoming harder to fool because

more people are getting hurt in the pocketbook.

Rising prices on commodities and costs of services such as medical and dental care are not the causes of inflation as the people are being repeatedly told to believe. Such a myth is the equivalent of saying that wet streets and sidewalks are the cause of rain. A rise in the price level is a result of a consequence of inflation. The price rise according to the definition is caused by an excess of money relative to available goods for sale. So any action which would add more money to an already excess of money in circulation over the goods available would be inflationary.

Excessive federal spending for welfare and in other non-productive areas which add more purchasing power but nothing to the economy in the way of available goods is inflationary just as is the action of raising wages by a percentage considerably higher than the percentage increase in productivity. I certainly want to see the wages and the standard of living of our working people improve, but only in the same proportion as the increase in productivity. To increase wages at a much higher rate than the rate of increase of productivity must add to the inflationary spiral. The employer passes the raise on to the consumer, prices soar, and the workers would see their wage increases soon eaten up by increases in the cost of living. In 1965, the average worker earned $5,710. By 1971, that average had risen to $8,000. In terms of buying, however, the $8,000 would be equivalent to $6,235 in 1965 dollars. In other words, over 75% of the increase was eaten away by inflation. And other non-union segments as well as retired people on fixed income suffer with little chance of recovery.

The rapid increase of crime and lawlessness has reached such a magnitude that it cannot be overlooked as a factor contributing to inflation. The many bank robbers and burglaries of businesses and homes give the culprits purchasing power but adds nothing in the way of goods and services to the economy. Likewise, insurance premiums must increase and claim payments must add buying power. Businesses destroyed through bombings, fires, or vandalism throughout America have simply closed shop. Other businessmen who had plans for expansion and would have increased production of goods are cancelling such plans because of the fear of lawlessness.

Another major cause of inflation is deficit spending by the government. Candidate Nixon in 1968 advocated fiscal responsibility and a balanced budget. Once in office he declared that he was a disciple of John Maynard Keynes, a Fabian socialist who promoted the idea that "the more money you owe, the richer you are." The U.S. Treasury has admitted a deficit of $26 billion; yes, I said billions not millions, for the fiscal year just past ending June 30. The President and Congress through fiscal irresponsibility have added fuel to the fire of inflation causing the flames to go higher and higher. I consistently voted against the exorbitant and wasteful give-away money bills of the LBJ Administration and now the Nixon Administration, primarily because they are improper functions of government in most instances, but also because I realized that such reckless spending in excess of income relative to production would cause inflation—the most cruel tax of all.

Inflation does not affect everyone equally. Speculators, especially those privy to contemplated government spending plans and awarding of big contracts are able to benefit from inflation. The hardest hit by inflation are retired people on a fixed income—the retired worker from the railroad, Esso, Ethyl, or other plants; the retired teacher, retired public servant, the retired person living off social security, the widow trying to make ends meet on ever shrinking income from pensions, social security, or interest on savings.

Also, the value of savings—such as savings bank accounts or Building and Loan accounts, life insurance, and bonds are reduced by inflation—interest on deposits hasn't kept pace with loss from inflation. Inflation discourages thrift and encourages extravagance and speculation. "Spend your money now before it becomes worth less", is a common trend of thinking.

Prior to a few decades ago, this country operated under a sound money system where paper money was redeemable in gold or silver and prices were set in a free competitive market with government intervening only to protect the public from monopolists and other unethical business practices designed to fix prices. During this span of time, periods of inflation and deflation of short duration occurred but the country returned to normal business within a short period of time.

When inflation continues over a long period of time and is not curbed it can but lead to financial chaos and bring on oppressive government control of wages, prices, and use of property, as we are witnessing today. The threat of price and wage fixing feared by big business is now welcomed by big government as a solution to the problem it created.

President Nixon proclaimed on TV in June of last year: "Now here is what I will not do. I will not take this nation down the road of wage and price controls, however politically expedient that may seem." Then about three months ago, the President stated that wage and price controls would be too costly to impose, and would be grossly unfair to the great majority. Yet, on Sunday, August 15th, he changed his mind as has become his custom and declared: "I am today ordering a freeze on all prices and wages throughout the United States for a period of 90 days."

Many persons in desperation felt that wage and price controls were long overdue. They reason: "The way to stop inflation is easy—simply set price controls and prohibit prices from rising." Price controls, however, without other controls will keep prices stable only for a very short time. Controls merely repress the symptoms of inflation temporarily. History has proved over and over again that price controls have never worked. As more and more citizens complain of violations, the government must hire more and more bureaucratic price supervisors who receive taxpayers' money and produce nothing useful and thereby add to the inflationary spiral.

History proves that whenever a government intervenes with price control laws, production goes down, because such action by government destroys initiative and the competitive spirit. However, all we need to do to realize this is to look at the economic status of people in socialist controlled countries like Cuba and Russia. When shortages exist, then government rationing is the next step—and that, I predict will be another control bound to come if the wage-price freeze continues past the 90-day period.

And if the controls are not removed, the confusion and injustice which they will engender can be seized upon by the Administration for imposing almost complete dictatorial controls without Congressional approval over transportation, labor, communications, education, and all other phases of American life. The President gave himself this power when in his recent proclamation Number 4074 of August 15, he proclaimed a national emergency which gives him and his top executive aides the de facto authority to effectuate Executive Order 11490, assigning emergency preparedness functions to federal departments and agencies.

And this administrative dictatorship takeover could well be accomplished in the name of domestic peace unless Congress moves to prevent it. The nation has been divided into ten regions for control—ten regional divisions which simply override and ignore States and State boundaries in the administering of federal laws by all departments and agencies except the Treasury, Agriculture, and the Veterans Administration. For the benefit of listeners who may not be aware of this highly unconstitutional trampling on the rightful domain of the sovereign States which formed the federal government, we in Louisiana are now a part of Region 6 with our new regional capital in Dallas, Texas. It's high time the sovereign States call a halt to the violations by Congress of the U.S. Constitution at the expense of State sovereignty. If the people through their State legislatures and Governors do not take action to challenge the unconstitutional regional government action of the Federal Government, then the states are by omission approving the actions of the Federal Government.

Let us look again at the definition of inflation: Inflation is an increase in the volume of money and credit relative to available goods resulting in a substantial and continuing rise in the general price level.

Rising prices are the result and wage and price controls or even rationing attack the result and not the cause. There are two basic elements which constitute the cause—volume of money and credit available and availability of goods.

When a free competitive market is allowed to operate, the common sense of people and the profit motive will see that supply and demand of goods are kept more or less in balance. But what about the money supply? I will discuss this important element of inflation in a following telecast.

STOKES, CAUCUS GAINING POWER

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, September 28, 1971, in Cleveland, Ohio, the Nation received a crash course in the new black politics.

While the newspapers, the large business organizations, and the local Democratic Party leadership vied among themselves in favor of one or the other of the two Democratic candidates in the primary, the 21st Congressional District caucus was mobilizing votes for the primary candidate of its choice, James M. Carney. The suburbs were surprised, the city fathers were shocked, but the black community knew what was going to happen.

Black communities are organizing along political lines. Black people are becoming increasingly aware of the power to be had with the vote and of the fact that black men and women can be elected to Government positions at all levels.

In November, Democratic candidate Carney will meet Independent candidate Arnold Pinkney. It is no secret that Mr. Pinkney is favored by the 21st Congressional District caucus and by the black community as a whole. And considering the recent primary contest, it should come as no surprise to anyone when Arnold Pinkney becomes mayor of Cleveland in November.

Until now, the two major parties have been slow to recognize the realities of black politics. Hopefully, after the les-

son of Cleveland, and by the time of the national conventions, both parties will be prepared to rise to the yet unmet challenge of trying to represent all of the people. They have no other choice.

On September 30, an editorial about the 21st District caucus victory appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

STOKES, CAUCUS GAINING POWER

Mayor Carl B. Stokes and his 21st Congressional District Caucus won a momentous victory in Tuesday's primary elections.

It is they who capsized the Democratic organization and nominated James M. Carney for mayor. They got out a near unanimous bloc vote for him in the biggest surprise in Cleveland's political history.

But also they were invincible in every Council contest they got into. They plowed Democratic regulars under. Examples: Warren Gilliam, in midtown, Mrs. Mary E. Yates in Glenville, Clarence R. Thompson out near Lee-Seville. They either won or put into the November runoffs their entire slate, including a former foe, Ceasar Moss, and others brought into line and then approved.

Thus the Stokes-21st District Caucus party humbled the Democratic party. Mayor Stokes and his group showed up the party's weakness. They taught Democrats, political prophets, newspapermen and poll takers some lessons in political strategy.

This makes Carl Stokes look like the master urban politician, the wizard of confrontation, the shrewdest tactician in the use of black power.

The 21st District Caucus considered Carney the opportune candidate to vote for in the primary. They certainly consider him expendable in the Nov. 2 final, when they will have the independent Negro, Arnold R. Pinkney, to vote for. Pinkney is Stokes' choice to succeed him.

In City Council the Stokes group seems sure to control a much firmer block of votes, at least 11, possibly 14. All will owe more now to the Stokes-21st District Caucus, which hand-picked and then backed them.

This makes the Stokes-Caucus group into the real opposition party, the only real second party in Council. It could control 40% of Council in challenges to the bare 17-vote majority which the Democrats will manage to muster.

Anyone who calls the upsets of Tuesday's primaries a fluke or a mere trick is refuted by the ward-by-ward vote on the East Side. It took long, deep, thorough work to produce big, solid votes for caucus candidates in wards which, to complicate things further, had just been redistricted by the Democratic organization.

The party led by Mayor Stokes and the 21st District Caucus has proved what an important force it is in city politics, and what a wide base it has among the city's most politically conscious residents.

CHATTANOOGA COMMUNITY CONTINUES PIONEERING SPIRIT

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, we live in an era in which the welfare check has nearly replaced the paycheck in some of our Nation's largest cities. It is a sad note when we realize welfare recipients in America's biggest metropolis now number over 1 million. One out of every eight New York City residents is supported at public expense.

In this age of the big government handout it is heartwarming to note there are still communities in which the American traditions of hard work, pride, and individual initiative still flourish.

I am proud to commend one such community in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee. The citizens of the St. Elmo area of Chattanooga, Tenn., my hometown, are proving the individual still counts. Forming a neighborhood improvement league to beautify the area, these public-spirited residents have set about helping themselves—without the intervention of a government "Santa Claus."

It gives me special pleasure to point to progress being made in St. Elmo, because this is the area of Chattanooga in which I grew up. I still attend church here and maintain close ties with the community. St. Elmo, once a separate city, is the oldest community incorporated into the city of Chattanooga. Rich in historical heritage, it lies at the foot of famous Lookout Mountain, on whose summit and sides the "Battle Above the Clouds" of Civil War fame was fought.

In recent years, St. Elmo has faced problems of aging which plague older areas of many cities. But its citizens are meeting the problems in their own way and looking toward the future with confidence.

Several years ago, homeowners in this community were practically offered Federal grants from $1,500 to $8,000 to improve their property. These proud people rejected the Government money, preferring to accomplish needed changes gradually, on their own, rather than crawling to the Federal trough.

These citizens have answered the perennial question, "What can I do as an individual citizen?" with concrete action.

Under the leadership of the St. Elmo Improvement League, the community is getting a facelift. The taxpayers of Tennessee are not footing the bill. The changes are slow, but they are steady. Improvements have not been dramatic, but they are marked.

In joining forces to create a better community, the citizens of St. Elmo have rejected the "something for nothing" philosophy. They know progress cannot be made overnight. But it can and is being made in St. Elmo.

The Chattanooga Times, in its September 24 issue, saluted the St. Elmo community with a forward-looking editorial entitled "There's More To Come." I join in its praise. It is this kind of pioneering self-sufficiency which has built America's great cities, opened up our Western frontier. This same spirit is now conquering man's last horizons—our atmosphere and oceans and the far reaches of the solar system. As long as Americans display the kind of spirit shown by the Nelms, Ryans, the McDonoughs, and all the other fine residents of St. Elmo, we will remain a great nation.

The editorial outlining the community's specific accomplishments follows:

THERE IS MORE TO COME

It's symbolic, perhaps, that the most dramatic phase in the thrust of St. Elmo's determination to clean up and beautify is the painting of the underpass at 37th Street and Tennessee Ave. It bridges the chasm between indifference and achievement, brings together the merchants directly concerned with that heavily traveled stretch of businesses and the residents of the proud neighborhood who patronize them.

But the painting of the underpass is only part of the improvements steadily being made in the area of the St. Elmo Improvement League under the presidency of Roy Nelms and chairmanship of Mrs. Conroy Ryan. It is not an overnight transformation but during the past few months a large field adjacent to the railroad has been cleared, the area next to the Incline Drug has been made more attractive for visitors and incline-riders, lawns have been neatly edged and members of the Masonic Lodge have quietly volunteered their services to make repairs for those needing help with house improvements.

"Would you believe that we took out 20 truckloads of brush from that field," remarked Martin McDonough Sr., who with his son operates the drug store. "And three loads of that was just tin cans." And there are plans for the future like beautification of the new traffic triangle where Tennessee joins Broad, a fountain for the small park area across the street from the foot of the incline and even eventual removal of the unsightly hump of chert behind those businesses.

Improvements come slowly, perhaps—the painting of the underpass is being done by a group called The Neighborhood whose identities are kept anonymous by choice and they have to work when traffic is light—but in St. Elmo they are coming steadily.

Other neighborhoods would do well to chat with Mr. Nelms, Mrs. Ryan, Mr. McDonough and the others out in that part of town to find out how the magic is performed, and then go and do likewise.

THE AMBASSADORS OF SONG, U.S.A.

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1972, the Frankford High School a cappella choir will make its fifth goodwill singing tour of Europe. Frankford High is located in my northeast Philadelphia congressional district.

The group is known as the Ambassadors of Song, U.S.A., a name bestowed upon it by the State Department after its first highly successful tour in 1964.

On its coming trip, the choir, led by Mr. David M. King, will appear in Germany and Italy. The young people have a repertoire that includes the sounds and rhythms of American music as well as a wide selection of the music of the countries they visit.

The choir is made up of some of our finest young people. It represents America with honor wherever it goes and it is an independent organization.

The members and their parents are currently working to raise the $60,000 necessary to meet the group's expenses on the forthcoming trip.

In order to help them reach this goal, a booster organization called Twenty Thousand Americans has been formed. Its purpose is to find 20,000 Americans willing to contribute $1 and thereby share in this wonderful experience and

cultural exchange. It is my privilege to appear on their list of honorary chairmen.

The Ambassadors of Song consists of 80 members, all working for a better relationship between the United States and Europe through song—one of the best ways of expressing a friendship.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL MAP

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, as the present administration has woven its way into our daily newspapers—and our daily lives—we have become increasingly aware of its inadequacies and inconsistencies. All of us have spent more time than we should have, trying to figure out just what Mr. Nixon and his loyal entourage stand for, where they are going, and why.

However, as far as the administration's position concerning the black and the poor, we now have all the answers we need. The President has done us the favor of presenting us with a map, both geographical and political. I suggest that we do him the favor of looking at it.

Let us begin with Washington, D.C., where the President postponed a meeting with the congressional black caucus for over 2 years. When he finally consented to a meeting, the Congressmen-at-large for over 25 million Americans presented him with 60 suggestions for improving the lives of all our citizens. His response was his own document, which cost the taxpayers a fortune to prepare, and which said absolutely nothing.

We should now proceed to Madrid, Spain. It was there, following his trip to Africa, that the Vice President denounced all American black leaders for their so-called constant recriminations.

Now let us make a brief stop in Pontiac, Mich., or any of the other cities across the country where local officials are trying desperately to comply with the Supreme Court ruling on busing while the President tells them not to bother.

This is a good place to pause and attempt to make some sense of the statements and events we have recalled as we looked at the President's map. This is an administration that does not have time to listen to the leaders of 13 percent of the American population. And it is a President who feels he can flaunt our highest Court, if that Court makes a decision not to his liking.

But if we are still unsure about the Chief Executive and his motives, I invite you to scan the map from San Quentin to Attica. We all know what happened in both places. We now know that George Jackson was shot in the back. This information came out with the release of a corrected autopsy. The coroner "decided," following consultation with ballistics experts, that George Jackson was not shot in the head, as was originally reported. And we know that 42 people were slaughtered from four directions at Attica on the basis of a rumor that turned out to be false. The President's only statement concerning either of these tragic incidents was a wholehearted expression of support for Governor Rockefeller's action which resulted in the senseless massacre of 42 human beings.

On September 22, 1971, an incisive and intelligent analysis of this administration appeared in the New York Times. It was prepared by Mr. Joseph Rhodes, a graduate student at Harvard and formerly a member of the Scranton Commission. It is Mr. Rhodes' thesis that our administration does not value all human life equally, that black life is somehow cheaper than white life, that the life of a man in prison is worth less than that of a man who is not in jail.

I agree with Mr. Rhodes' analysis, and invite my colleagues to study it:

THE ADMINISTRATION'S VISION OF THE WORLD

(By Joseph Rhodes, Jr.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—Ever since Vice President Agnew asked President Nixon to remove me from the Scranton Commission, I have followed the statements and actions of Mr. Agnew in a perhaps hopeless attempt to understand what vision of the world motivates this Administration. Because Mr. Agnew speaks more frankly than Mr. Nixon, I had thought that his views might reveal the deeper philosophies that underlie the policies and directions of the President. No statement of the Vice President's has more troubled and confused me than his recent denouncement of the leadership of black America during his trip to Africa last summer. Since that extraordinary condemnation of our black leadership, I have waited for some evidence that might explain this bitter attack by the Vice President.

The article that Mr. Agnew wrote for the Op-Ed Page last week on the "root causes of Attica" provides such an explanation. It offers an insight into this Administration's approach to the problems and injustices that poor Americans and poor black Americans in particular suffer. The vision of America that Mr. Agnew projects is a revealing one if only because of its detachment from the reality that is the common experience of millions of impoverished and helpless Americans.

If I understand the Vice President's point of view correctly, he feels deeply outraged that some black leaders in America have attributed the Attica tragedy to the basic conditions that reign in our nation, the most severe such condition being the powerlessness of poor black people. He cites statments by "heretofore responsible Negro" leaders as an unreasonable allegiance to the "radical ideological premise of original sin which holds every outbreak of violence in our society to be further evidence of the intrinsic evil of the system."

Nothing infuriates our Vice President more than all the fuss over the deaths of the black prisoners: "To compare the loss of life by those who violate the society's law with a loss of life of those whose job it is to uphold it—represents not simply an assault on human sensibility, but an insult to reason." In his mind the Attica tragedy happened because of an expression of "criminal arrogance fed by the long-time accommodation of moderate spokesmen, white and black alike, to the extremism of word and deed practiced by black power militants." Incredibly, Mr. Agnew holds the black leadership of America responsible for the violence at Attica.

I have only one question for Mr. Agnew. Why, sir, do you think there is such a high proportion of black people in American prisons? Why are 80 per cent of the men at Attica black men and nearly all the dead prisoners of Attica, dead black men? There are only two possible reasons for this: either black men have a natural proclivity for crime, which is a racist point of view, or something about the American system tends to disproportionately produce black criminals and black convicts. Mr. Agnew, if the latter is the case, then there exists a serious inequity in the actual conditions of life for black Americans and not simply an excess of inflammatory rhetoric by black leaders.

Is it possible, Mr. Vice President, that so many black people end up in prison because of the economic and social conditions that black Americans endure? You referred to the nurturing of the "roots of violence such as occurred at Attica and, not long before, at San Quentin." But did you bother to check on the actual circumstances that led to the ten-year imprisonment of George Jackson? As a lawyer, you could only agree that if a white middle-class youth in California had committed Jackson's "crime," he would never have spent ten years of his life in California maximum-security prisons.

Just because a black man ends up in a prison does not remove him from the role of humanity. I wish you could open your eyes and realize that thousands of black people sit in prisons because they are black and because they are poor. Thousands more live in conditions only slightly better than those of Attica.

When our Vice President refers to the "previous confrontations between society's authority and antisocial force" he probably has Kent State and Jackson State in mind. The great threat facing our society is not that the cries of the suffering will provide "the violent-prone" with a "civilized rationale for their psychopathic proclivities." Some of these "violent-prone" people wear the uniform of the Ohio National Guard and the New York State police. To have waited a few more days before unleashing these armed men on Attica would not have amounted to an "acquiescence to the demands of the criminal element." It might have saved a few lives, human lives, convict or otherwise.

If our society comes to the point where it regards criminals as nonhumans and deserving of any punishment that they get, we will have advanced tragically closer to the Fascist society Mr. Agnew so desperately wants to avoid. The "storm troopers" were not criminals in prisons; they were officers of the law and carried out their horror under the "civilized rationale" of upholding law and order.

KANSAS CITY JAZZ REVISITED

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the recent Monterey, Calif., Jazz Festival included a musical salute to Kansas City of the 1930's which is reported in the following story by Melvin D. Lewis in the Kansas City Star of September 19:

KANSAS CITY JAZZ REVISITED

(By Melvin D. Lewis)

MONTEREY, CALIF.—The setting was the Monterey County Fair Grounds, but the sounds were from an era 35 years ago and more than 2,000 miles away as the 14th annual Monterey Jazz Festival paid tribute to jazz, Kansas City style, featuring some of the great musicians who played in Kansas City in the 1930s and 1940s.

Among them were Mary Lou Williams, pianist with Andy Kirk for many years; Jay McShann, pianist; Big Joe Turner, blues singer; Jimmy Witherspoon, blues singer; Harry (Sweets) Edison, trumpet, and the Jesse Price blues band.

Price opened the session with up-tempo blues featuring some outstanding tenor saxophone work by Jimmy Forrest in the earthy style of Sonny Stitt.

Big Joe Turner joined the group and among the blues he sang was an old favorite, "Everyday." Turner is remembered by many Kansas Citians for his down-to-earth rendition of "Piney Brown Blues."

Moving center stage next was Mary Lou Williams, who recently came out of retirement, backed by Bill Hadnot on bass and Louis Bellson on drums. That she was well remembered was evident in the round of applause she received when she walked on stage. Retirement had not hurt Mary Lou. Her left hand maintained that steady bass roll that made her a standout with Kirk's Clouds of Joy, while her right hand carried the melody with clean and incisive notes.

Her opening number was an Afro-Cuban rhythm piece well supported by Edison and Hadnot. The number evolved into a straight jazz number reminiscent of the days when she was playing such numbers as "Roll 'em," with Kirk.

Mary Lou then played a swinging version of "Caravan," and the trio was joined by Roger Glenn on flute. Roger is the son of Tyree Glenn, trombonist with Cab Calloway for many years, displaying a musical heritage handed down from his father.

McShann, leader of one of the last big bands in Kansas City, took over the stage with Hadnot and Paul Gunther, drums. The trio revived many old-time Kansas City favorites—"My Chile," "Confessin' the Blues," "After Hours" and "Vine Street Boogie."

As the session moved on the trio was joined by Clark Terry, trumpet; Herman Bell, tenor sax and guitar, and Claude Williams on the violin.

During the McShann stint on stage, the music became so exciting that throughout the sell-out crowd of almost 7,500, people began dancing in the main arena and grandstands.

The wrapup of yesterday's musical offerings featured Al Hibbler, blind vocalist who sang with Duke Ellington from 1943 to 1951.

Hibbler sang two of his best known numbers, "Until the Real Thing Comes Along" and "Do Nothing Til You Hear From Me."

The day's activities ended with a flourish. A singing blues jam session featured Hibbler, Witherspoon and Turner. Their trading of choruses had the audience standing on its feet and calling for more as the curtains were drawn marking the end of yesterday's "Kansas City Revisited."

The entire afternoon was typically Kansas City style with soloists riding high above a background of solid 4–4 beat and riffs originated in Kansas City by persons such as Count Basie, McShann and others who laid the foundation of what is known today as Kansas City jazz.

THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the Military Order of the World Wars is an organization composed of individuals who have held commissions in the service of their Nation during the time of war.

Established in 1920, the order had as its first national commander in chief, general of the armies, John J. Pershing. Since that time it has had many illustrious leaders, including Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Recently the order, during its 1971 national convention passed a resolution expressing its concern about the continuing deterioration of our Armed Forces. The resolution was then forwarded to President Nixon at the White House.

The letter and resolution follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 26, 1971.

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

DEAR MISTER PRESIDENT: The Military Order of the World Wars is seriously concerned about the continuing deterioration of our Armed Forces and, perhaps even more important, about the apparent unconcern of Americans generally in this problem. We feel that our survival as a free nation is seriously jeopardized—today—by our Nation's second best military capability when compared to that of Russia.

The Order has expressed its concern and set the tone of its 1971 National Convention by passing the enclosed First Day Resolution. We request that you take appropriate action to awaken this Nation to the deadly peril confronting it. Our National concerns and priorities must be re-ordered. What can be more important than our National survival.

Sincerely,

A. R. BROWNFIELD,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Retired,
Chief of Staff.

FIRST DAY RESOLUTION

Whereas, no other organization in America more sincerely desires to have and to continue to have full and complete confidence in our Chief Executive and national administration; and

Whereas, through our observation of the obvious and appalling progressive deterioration of our military establishment and national spirit, we have had our confidence severely shaken and most sorely tried; and

Whereas, the future foreseeable to us holds little hold of a rapid change in the nature of the world to a benign utopia wherein our nation would be certain of never again needing the ability to defend itself; and

Whereas, the past has shown us full well the folly and tragedy of unpreparedness; and

Whereas, we believe the unpreparedness of the United States at the present time, in terms of morale, military hardware, trained and ready active forces and reserves, and above all, the will to fight if necessary, represents a reckless and shortsighted policy of extreme danger to our nation, leading inevitably to national suicide if not soon altered;

Be it hereby resolved, that we, The Military Order of the World Wars, in national convention assembled, do hereby call upon President Richard M. Nixon to recognize and relieve the great and growing concern, not only of The Military Order of the World Wars, but of all citizens who love the United States and hope to see it survive as a free nation, by clearly re-stating the national goals of the United States in the inspiring terms of the great principles and moral values upon which the nation was founded. We call upon him further to forcefully assert and demonstrate his constitutional powers and his authority and responsibility as our national leader, by commencing and carrying out a vigorous and fully adequate program of strong military preparedness and national defense, starting with the rebuilding of national morale, pride and patriotism, and continuing with the immediate building of whatever modern military equipment and trained forces are required to positively assure this nation of a secure future in the world.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution shall be printed in the "World War Officer Review" and be sent forthwith, under the personal letter of our Chief of Staff, to the President, all members of the United States Senate, all members of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary, National Security Council, and all radio and television networks and news wire services.

THE URGENCY OF PRISON REFORM

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times there is a very fine article by former Attorney General Ramsey Clark concerning the need for a major national effort to reform our medieval penal system so that its emphasis will truly be on correction not corruption.

The recent tragic events at Attica simply underscore our failure until now to develop a truly humane and workable correction system. For this our society is paying a fearful price. All but a tiny fraction of the inmates of our prisons will eventually return to the outside community. They should be returned as truly rehabilitated individuals and not embittered, hardened, dehumanized enemies of society.

The text of Mr. Clark's article follows:

A NICKEL FOR REHABILITATION

(By Ramsey Clark)

WASHINGTON.—Attica reminds us how quickly America resorts to violence and how little we revere life. We created the "Big House," knew of the inhumanity there and waited for the recurrence of death and destruction that was bound to come. When the crisis arose we accepted, perhaps wanted, official violence to smash the prisoners we hated and feared.

The same qualities of character that call for shooting looters, that condone police killing Black Panthers, and support the National Guard when it fires high-powered rifles and takes the lives of unarmed students justify the avoidable slaughter of prisoners and guards. Attica can only remind prisoners throughout America of the value we place on human life—theirs and the men who guard them. Attica shows again America's reliance on violence as a problem solver.

Can society be expected to make a significant effort for people whose humanity it denies, whose lives it holds of such small value it will sacrifice them on the alter of order? If we are to begin to make sense with our treatment of offenders, we must first recognize our common humanity and want them to live at peace with themselves and others. Until then, whatever we say or do or spend will fail.

The Congress and state legislatures could quickly double national expenditures for corrections. We spend less than two billion dollars a year in all correctional activities, Federal, state and local. Sixty per cent of the expenditures are by state governments. We employ about 150,000 people. Our ability to train and beneficially employ additional personnel provided by such increases in a short period of time seems clear.

Ninety-five cents of every dollar spent in penology is for custody, pure custody. Five cents is for services essential to rehabilitation and crime reduction. Approximately 80 per cent of corrections budgets supports prisons and jails while 20 per cent is used in community activities. Prisons place the prisoner in the starkest possible segregation from the community to which he must return. We

should not spend more than 20 per cent of our resources on prisons and jails. No funds should be invested in prisons or jails housing more than 100 inmates. Those in existence should be dismantled as soon as possible.

A mere increase in expenditures for corrections will be inadequate, even dangerous. We do not need more of the same. We require essentially different qualities in corrections activity. Priorities should include the following:

First, a philosophy of avoiding detention wherever possible through prevention efforts, community treatment and probation supervision.

Second, recognition that the needs of each individual are different. Corrections programs should be carefully tailored to individual needs.

Third, the creation of new substantive rights of persons convicted of crime that would impose duties on governments to fulfill basic human needs:

Health—full social-medical services for the care and cure of alcoholism and addiction; adequate psychiatric and psychologist treatment and counseling for all in need; mental health services; prohibition of unhealthy or overcrowded quarters; provision of good food and diet.

Safety—freedom from assault by guards or other prisoners, forced homosexuality, corporal punishment and solitary confinement.

Communications—free access to family, friends, advisers, attorneys and the press. Freedom to write letters, articles and literary works.

Education and Vocational Training—immediate placement in an academic program with remedial help as needed; vocational training, with special programs for the handicapped and retarded.

Job Placement—in highest skills for which qualified at the earliest feasible time on work-release basis where partial confinement is necessary; programs for on-the-job training to teach higher skills.

Fourth, the creation of new procedural rights of prisoners, including due-process standards, the right to see and hear all evidence, to confront witnesses, to an impartial trier of fact and to counsel on issues such as program, institution transfer, denial of privileges, release on parole.

Fifth, an intensive effort to move offenders to the community where they will live. Funding for full probation and parole services can make these techniques an effective tool of corrections. Work-release, pre-release guidance and halfway houses are but beginnings. The need is for small, unmarkd community facilities with skillful community service personnel to help assure the individual social stability as he continues schooling or vocational training, works at a job, adjusts with family counseling to return home.

If these priorities seem radical, it is because radical solutions are needed. We have tinkered long enough and tortured ourselves with antisocial conduct.

KEATING WADES IN TO SAVE THE "DELTA QUEEN"

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am joining with my distinguished colleague, Mr. McCULLOCH, in introducing a bill to permanently exempt the sternwheeler *Delta Queen* from the 1966 safety at sea law.

This bill is designed to save America's last overnight paddlewheel steamboat from destruction.

As many of my colleagues know on three occasions, in 1966, 1968, and 1970, the House and Senate have voted unanimously to grant the *Delta Queen* a stay of execution from the Safety at Sea Act.

The safety at sea law provides, among other things, that U.S.-flag vessels with overnight accommodations for 50 or more passengers, must be constructed entirely of fire retardant materials. Therefore, because the *Delta Queen* is an American-flag vessel constructed partly of wood, it is condemned under the law.

By definition and intent of Congress and by my interpretation, the *Delta Queen* should have not been included in the Safety at Sea Act to begin with.

Last winter, the *Delta Queen* was upgraded and refurbished at the Avondale Shipyard in New Orleans at the cost of $500,000. The total investment in the *Delta Queen* during the last 4 years totals $1 million.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the *Delta Queen* has its home port in Cincinnati and is a traditional landmark for Queen City.

We are proud of her and consider it a permanent Queen City institution equal with the Cincinnati Reds, bratwurst sausage, the opera in the park, and the Tyler-Davidson fountain.

Under the present temporary legislation, the *Delta Queen* is exempt under law until November of 1973.

Supporters of the paddlewheel ship contend that it must have permanent exemption.

The law which threatens the destruction of the *Delta Queen*, nevertheless, permits a foreign vessel built with wood to continue to carry U.S. passengers from U.S. ports.

The law obviously discriminates against the *Delta Queen*. It also does not recognize the vast difference between the deep-draft ocean vessel and a paddlewheel river boat.

The operation of *Delta Queen* is limited entirely to inland rivers. It is only a short distance from shore and never encounters the hazards of the open sea.

Safety improvements to the *Delta Queen* during the past 4 years include the removing of 45 years' accumulation of oil-base paint on the exterior. The bulkheads and overheads are treated with three coats of fire-retardant and fire-resistant paint. The interior of all staterooms are similarly treated.

The *Delta Queen* owners have met U.S. Coast Guard requirements during annual and quarterly inspections.

The owners of the *Delta Queen* also installed a new diesel electric generator and electrical pumps to make sure that the ship's main and auxiliary fire sprinkler system would function in case of a power failure.

I am impressed with the good faith shown by the owners of the *Delta Queen* in making these improvements and I believe they have fulfilled the trust the 91st Congress placed in them by granting last year's 3-year exemption.

I submit to my colleagues that the *Delta Queen* represents a nostalgic part of American tradition.

As it plys the Ohio River between Pittsburgh and Cairo, Ill., and into the majestic Mississippi River to the port of New Orleans, thousands of Americans in some 16 States take certain comfort in hearing the churning of the huge paddlewheel and lonesome wail of its steam whistle.

We should not deprive our citizens of this part of America's tradition.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 21, sufficient signatures were gathered on discharge petition 1 to order the Judiciary Committee to discharge from its consideration House Joint Resolution 191 entitled "A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings." Because this extremely important resolution will now be brought to the House for a vote with virtually no consideration by the committee this year, I would like to take this opportunity to review the history of the prayer amendment and remind my colleagues of the controversy which has surrounded it since its conception in 1963.

In 1962 and 1963, the Supreme Court handed down a series of ruling regarding prayer and Bible reading in our public schools which, in effect, reinforced each individual's freedom of religion and prevented public officials, including teachers, from directing prayers in the classrooms. As a result of these decisions, the first prayer amendment was introduced in the 88th Congress on January 9, 1963, by Congressman Frank J. Becker of New York. Floods of mail protesting the Supreme Court decisions concerning prayers and Bible reading in public schools placed great pressure on Congress to act during the 88th Congress.

As of September 1963 a total of 151 measures relating to prayers in the public schools had been introduced in the House with another 14 having been introduced in the Senate. Mail from individual constituents was overwhelmingly in favor of these measures in contrast to to bulk of religious organizations which were generally in opposition to such an idea.

Though Chairman CELLER was opposed to the proposed constitutional amendments, he agreed to call hearings when the discharge petition which had been filed was successful in getting 167 of the 218 names needed to release the measure from committee.

Hearings on 150 pending resolutions to amend the Constitution with respect to school prayers, Bible reading, and other related matters were begun by the House Judiciary Committee on April 22, 1964. Testimony on the 35 different forms of amendment to the Constitution which had been proposed was heard from distinguished church leaders, as well as

experts in the fields of constitutional law, theology, and education during the 18 days of hearings which followed.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee in 1964, I was among those who repeatedly heard witnesses testify regarding the dangers inherent in the practice of devotions within our public schools. It was the consensus of the witnesses that the first amendment of the Constitution in its present wording has minimized tension and conflict among religious interests and has for nearly 200 years provided the framework within which responsible citizens and our courts have been able to afford maximum protection for the religious liberty of all citizens. The first amendment, by removing the coercive forces of government from among those that play upon the theological convictions of the people, has served well to protect the freedom of belief of Americans.

It was the belief of the witnesses, as it is my belief, that we should not depend upon Government in any way to give a status or a protection to a particular religion. We should instead hold to the basic protection that we have all been afforded by the first amendment.

I believe the Judiciary Committee gave exhaustive consideration to the prayer amendment in 1964 because of what seemed to be substantial support for its enactment. But by the end of the committee's deliberations there was no substantial support for the amendment and a majority of the committee was opposed to making any changes in the first amendment.

In 1967 the Senate was also successful in defeating the enactment of a similar amendment but the dogged supporters of the issues have refused to let it die and have resorted to emotionalism in bringing new life to the issue in 1971.

Unfortunately the supporters of this amendment have sought to strengthen their forces by equating opposition with this amendment to opposition with religion, by equating opposition with Bible reading in the public schools with opposition to the Bible. This is not the case. The first amendment was constructed in two parts; the first says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion and the other says there can be no law prohibiting its free exercise. The first amendment is based on the premise that the separation of the church and state is best for the church and best for the state and secures freedom for both. It is not the function of the state to undertake the responsibility which is that of the parent to determine when or in what manner the children shall pray or read the Bible. For nearly two centuries this assumption has proved valid. Religion today enjoys in the United States the highest degree of esteem, reverence, and influence anywhere in the world. It was the first amendment which brought this about with its guarantees securing rights to the individual and restricting the state. Should the Wylie amendment, House Joint Resolution 191, be adopted it would be the first time in nearly two centuries that the Bill of Rights as adopted by the fathers of our Constitution will ever have been amended.

I am opposed to the Wylie amendment and believe that by rejecting it, we will be protecting from challenge the basic liberies that promise freedom for all. For this reason, I would like to encourage my colleagues to carefully study the testimony of the 1964 hearings which is available from the Judiciary Committee as well as the statements of religious leaders, educators and constitutional law authorities which I will be inserting in the RECORD daily until this issue is brought before the House for a vote.

ADVISORY COUNCIL APPOINTEE

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I call to the attention of the House of Representatives a recent appointment made by President Nixon to the National Highway Safety Advisory Council.

Dr. Ruth E. Winkler, an outstanding optometrist who is actively engaged in practice in Tulsa, Okla., was appointed to the Advisory Council by President Nixon on September 13. I commend the President for his wise and careful choice of a highly qualified individual to fill the vacancy created by expiration of one of the 3-year terms on the 35-member Council.

Dr. Winkler has been closely identified with, and exceptionally active in highway safety programs at the local, State, and national levels, making her an ideal choice for this position. As we are well aware, good vision is a vital factor in highway safety. Dr. Winkler's expertise in the preservation and enhancement of functional vision and her experience in applying that knowledge to highway safety will combine to make her a valuable contributor to the deliberations and recommendations of the National Highway Safety Advisory Council.

A graduate of the Northern Illinois College of Optometry, Dr. Winkler first entered practice in partnership with her father, the late Dr. Thomas Winkler in Tulsa in 1950. She has been a driving force in making the entire community more safety conscious, through participation in various civic and service organizations.

To list all of the groups which have benefited from Dr. Winkler's dedication to improving the safety of our streets and highways would require considerably more space than might be proper here. However, I would like to call your attention to just a few of her past and present affiliations and activities. She is currently serving as national secretary of the National Association of Women's Highway Safety Leaders and president of that group's Oklahoma section; chairman of the Tulsa Mayor's Safety Coordinating Committee; and a member of the executive committee of the Oklahoma Safety Council.

Over the years, Dr. Winkler has brought the highway safety message to the Tulsa Business and Professional Womens' Clubs; the Illuminating Engineering Society; the Northwestern Traffic Institute on Vision and Traffic Safety, and various parent-teacher organizations.

In addition to these activities, Dr. Ruth Winkler has also served her own chosen profession of optometry as chairman of the Oklahoma Optometric Association Committee on Motorists' Vision and Highway Safety, and for 3 years as a member of the American Optometric Association Motorists' Vision and Highway Safety Committee.

All who are concerned with the improvement of safe driving practices owe a debt of gratitude to this fine lady who has now been provided a further opportunity to serve the Nation and its citizens through the use of her special skills and dedication to solving one of America's most difficult problems.

I know I speak for everyone in my district and the State of Oklahoma when I offer my most sincere congratulations to Dr. Ruth Winkler on her appointment to the National Highway Safety Advisory Council.

THE FIRST LADY OF NORTH ATTLEBORO

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an eloquent example of the role of a woman in modern society is movingly presented in a tribute appearing in the Attleboro Sun Chronicle of September 14, expressing the deep respect and community affection in which Mrs. Alice Agnew is held. It is a pleasure for me to incorporate the column of tribute in my remarks.

The many diverse and rich contributions of Mrs. Alice Agnew to the improvement of social ills, and the betterment of community life, would require many, many pages to elaborate with justice to Mrs. Agnew. Known popularly as "Mrs. United Fund," and "The First Lady of North Attleboro," for many years she has been an active and dynamic force in educational and civic programs within North Attleboro. Mrs. Agnew, who served my distinguished predecessor in his personal affairs coincident with the expansion of North Attleboro, as the first woman to ever serve as a vice president of the North Attleboro United Fund, a marked reflection of her competence and reputation, inasmuch as this was in 1955. In 1967, 11 years later, she was chosen through election as chairman of the fund's executive committee. Mrs. Agnew is the first woman to be entrusted with an executive position in the North Attleboro Chamber of Commerce, just as she was the first woman to serve on the Joseph W. Martin, Jr., school building committee. Mrs. Agnew has also served as a member of the North Attleboro school committee,

and served as the first president of the Quota Club of Attleboro, which undertakes highly commendable endeavors in women's circles. Perhaps a revealing insight into the true worth and sincerity of purpose of this remarkable woman is the special meaning that her position on the vestry of Grace Episcopal Church holds for her. For Mrs. Agnew is the first woman to ever hold such a position.

The creditable life's work of this extraordinary woman richly deserves recognition, and her achievements reflect well upon the promise of all women, with aspirations to serve their community and State as she has done.

The article follows:

NORTH ATTLEBORO'S ALICE AGNEW LEADING BUSY CIVIC LIFE

(By Marjorie Ashworth Dix)

NORTH ATTLEBORO.—In common with the nation and the state, this town has a first lady, but it is not a courtesy title. It was earned by Mrs. Alice Agnew because of her exceptional executive ability. And because of this ability and her willingness to use it for the betterment of the town, she has been appointed the "first woman ever to serve" on a long list of the town's important boards, committees and commissions.

Miss Alice Wharmby came from Pawtucket to North Attleboro in 1930 to work for the Holbrook Insurance Company, and she stayed with this organization for 11 years. But by that time she was no longer Miss Wharmby but Mrs. James Agnew and she and her husband, whose business was located in Pawtucket, were thinking of building a home in that city, when Joseph W. Martin Jr., owner of the A. T. Parker Insurance Co., offered Mrs. Agnew a position in his office. This, of course, made it necessary for the Agnews to make some radical changes in their plans, which they did. They built their new home on Anawan Road.

UNITED FUND ACTIVITY

In 1955 she became vice president of the town's United Fund, a position which up to this date, had always been held by a man. She served in this capacity for 11 years. In 1967 she was elected chairman of the fund's executive committee and in 1969 she was appointed head of the special gifts division and this year she is chairman of the committee that requests donations from clubs and organizations. On a bronze plaque awarded her for her long and tireless service, in addition to noting the various positions she has held in this organization, there is a line which refers to her as "Mrs. United Fund."

CHAMBER

Mrs. Agnew is the first woman to hold an executive position in the North Attleboro Chamber of Commerce. For a number of years she served as its vice president and is presently a member of the board of directors. She is also the first woman to be honored by this body with a testimonial dinner held at the Gerald E. Riley chalet which was not only largely attended by her local business associates but by state dignitaries as well.

Another 'first' was added to the list when she was appointed the only woman to serve on the Joseph W. Martin Jr. School Building Committee. She served this board as secretary.

But of all the outstanding positions she has held, there is one she treasures above all others. She is the first woman ever to hold a seat on the vestry of Grace Episcopal Church. This is a group that handles the business affairs of the parish, and up until Mrs. Agnew's appointment it had always been composed of male members.

QUOTA CLUB

There is another field in which Mrs. Agnew played an important role. She was elected the first president of the Quota Club of the Attleboros when that women's service club was chartered in May 1954. Later she became lieutenant governor of the 15th district of Quota International of which the local chapter is a member, and was in line to become governor of the district if ill health had not prevented her accepting the post.

This completes the list of firsts' that have been bestowed upon Alice W. Agnew, but there is an important position which, although she isn't the first woman to hold it, she did an outstanding job while in office. In 1958 she was elected to the North Attleboro School Committee. And it was through her efforts during her term that the members of the local high school honor society were first entertained at breakfast by the Chamber of Commerce, a practice that has become an annual May event.

Alice Agnew not only served as office manager for Speaker Martin's insurance agency but attended to his personal affairs during most of the years he was in Washington. She continued with the agency for about a year after Mr. Martin's death. Then she retired to care for her husband who, after a lingering illness of several months, passed away.

KEEPS BUSY

It was then that she discovered the importance of keeping busy. So rather than dwell upon her loss, she delved into serving the town with renewed vigor. At the present time she is secretary of the North Attleboro Industrial Commission. This commission is engaged in planning to turn town lands into an industrial park. The land, mostly forest, lays off Toner Boulevard and when cleared will provide excellent sites for factory buildings. Mrs. Agnew is also a volunteer worker for the bloodmobile and she attends to sending cards and flowers from the Episcopal church to members of the parish who are in hospital or have suffered a loss of some member of the family.

How she manages to handle the many duties she takes on is a mystery to her friends and associates. Probably it's just because Alice Wharmby Agnew is blessed with those qualities which make a First Lady.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL ROGERS DEMOCRAT, OF FLORIDA NATIONAL HEALTH LEADER

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the country has indicated its firm resolve to reorder its priorities and make serious attempts to remedy the myriad social and economic problems facing us at home, an unusually dedicated and capable leader has emerged in the field of health care. I speak, of course, of our colleague, PAUL ROGERS of Florida. This year PAUL assumed the chairmanship of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

The subcommittee has acted on major health manpower legislation including the Nurse Training Act and the Comprehensive Health Manpower Act. Both of these measures are now in conference. Urgent action was also taken on the administration's proposal to eliminate the public health service hospitals and clinics. A resolution expressing congressional opposition to the President's proposal is also in conference.

And this week the Rogers subcommittee continues its extensive hearings on proposals to increase cancer research.

The list of accomplishment speaks for itself. The subcommittee, under PAUL'S direction, has taken a major leadership role.

The chairman's unique position added an important dimension to his recent experience in a Chicago hotel. I call to the attention of our colleagues an article from the Miami Herald of September 10, 1971, regarding that experience:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Sept. 10, 1971]

PAUL ROGERS' SORE THROAT COULD IMPROVE YOUR HEALTH

(By Judith Randal)

WASHINGTON.—On his way back from a recent trip to Asia, a man named Paul Rogers checked into a Chicago hotel to write a speech he was to make the next day.

His throat was sore and he had a fever, so he called the front desk for help. To shorten a long story, he found that the days of the hotel physician are over and that if you are a stranger in the headquarters city of American medicine—both the American Hospital Association and the American Medical Association are Chicago-based—you will be hard put to find a doctor at night.

Were it not for the fact that this particular Paul Rogers is the Democratic representative from Florida who heads the House subcommittee on public health and environment, this would be just another story which a traveler to almost any American city could recount. The difference between this traveler and others is that Rogers is in a better position to do something about health care in this country and seemingly intends to try.

After years in which health has been a secondary issue on the House side of Capitol Hill, Rogers in the last few months has had intensive and extensive hearings on medical manpower, probed the attempts of the Nixon administration to divest the government of its network of Public Health Service hospitals and clinics, and kept its feet to the fire on the agonizing intricacies of drug abuse both in this country and abroad.

When Congress returned from its summer recess yesterday, he started right in with more of the same. This week alone, his subcommittee is having pharmaceutical company executives in to discuss pooling their firms' research efforts to develop an agent to block the effects of heroin that—unlike methadone—would be non-addictive, and is looking into the safety of foods, including the botulism situation and the recent chemical contamination of fresh eggs.

Before Christmas, he also plans to hold hearings on legislation he has sponsored to give the Food and Drug Administration the authority to regulate medical devices and on the whole question of "Health Maintenance Organizations," the recently coined term for what used to be called prepaid group practice. Rogers' purpose in holding the hearings will be to discern how deeply the Nixon administration actually is committed to the HMO concept, which emphasizes preventive medicine and comprehensive care for a fee agreed on in advance.

Also in the Florida Democrat's thinking are a national health insurance proposal and legislation that would create a separate Department of Health. Before taking up either of these matters, however, he and his subcommittee will have a long, hard look at what probably is the most burning health topic of the year—whether or not it is in the public interest to separate the National Cancer Institute from the National Institutes of Health and give it semi-independent status. Three weeks of hearings will begin September 15.

No one disputes that cancer merits more research money. The additional $100 million requested for this purpose by the President already has been voted by Congress. Rather,

the question is whether the bureaucratic strategy really makes any sense.

Like Gaylord Nelson, the Wisconsin Democrat who was the only senator to vote against the measure, Rogers feels that the clumsy arrangement it would create might retard, rather than speed, the conquest of cancer and threaten the effectiveness of the NIH as a whole. Before the House makes its decision, the Rogers subcommittee will explore every aspect of the matter and the weakness of government-sponsored medical research in general. If the hearing record it compiles can convince Rep. Harley Staggers (D., W. Va.), the chairman of the parent Commerce Committee, wisdom instead of political expediency may yet prevail.

Rogers is, in some ways, a curious man to have chosen the role of health advocate. Elected in 1955 to fill his father's West Palm Beach seat, he has been conservative on most issues from busing to the war. Yet the deeper he has delved into health and environment issues, the more committed he has become to the need for a greater governmental role, and his constituency apparently is behind him.

He does not always see eye to eye with his opposite number in the Senate, Edward M. Kennedy (D., Mass.). Indeed, he and Kennedy differ somewhat on their approach to health manpower and hold opposing views on the cancer authority. Yet there is a suggestion here that, just as Lister Hill of Alabama and the late John Fogarty of Rhode Island were the "Messrs. Health" of the Senate and House respectively during the '40s, '50s and early '60s, Rogers and Kennedy may be headed for the same sort of teamwork now.

MUNICIPAL SERVICES—THE WEAKEST LINK IN INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN ARKANSAS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the death of a small town continues to be one of the most tragic sagas in America today. This disappearance of small towns and communities in the hinterlands of this Nation cannot be allowed to persist if we as a nation are to reach the goals we have set for ourselves.

There is still time to save the backbone of America—the small towns. We in Congress, and we as a people, must be willing to redirect the resources needed to achieve the community development required for this task.

Because of the awareness currently being exhibited in the Congress, I believe my colleagues will be interested in testimony presented at my hearings on community development needs. The first hearing was held at Brinkley, Ark., on August 30. I would like to share with you the thoughtful statement given at that time by Mayor Adrian White of Pocahontas, president of the Arkansas Municipal League.

Mr. White's statement follows:

MUNICIPAL SERVICES—THE WEAKEST LINK IN INDUSTRIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN ARKANSAS

INTRODUCTION

I am Adrian White, Mayor of Pocahontas, Arkansas, and President of the Arkansas Municipal League. The population of Pocahontas in 1970 was 4,544. Pocahontas is the 48th largest city in Arkansas; 399 towns and cities in Arkansas are smaller than my city.

423 towns and cities in Arkansas have less than 10,000 population, 301 Arkansas cities and towns have less than 1,000 population. I speak for the people in Arkansas' small towns and rural areas—unless we receive help—*help in the form of massive financial assistance*—our small towns will die and their people will leave Arkansas to find employment in large cities elsewhere.

A. Recent History of Arkansas

A few years ago the vast majority of Arkansas people were earning their livelihood in agriculture, timber and mining. We all know how these areas of employment have become mechanized and fewer and fewer employees are needed on the farm, in the forest and in the mines.

We in Arkansas have been trying to bring industry to our cities in order to provide jobs for the people who are being displaced by the mechanization of agriculture, timber and mining.

The total population of the 146 cities over 1,000 population is today over one million people; in 1930 it was only 488,945. These 146 cities over 1,000 population have more than doubled their population since 1930.

The industries in our cities and towns provide job opportunities for hundreds of thousands of Arkansas people who live in the rural areas of our state. In some cities 80% of the employees in the factories live outside the city.

But very few of the 301 towns and cities under 1,000 population have been able to attract an industry to their community because they have not been unable to provide the city services to a new industry and they cannot present a picture of a neat and clean municipality providing adequate municipal services to their own citizens much less being able to provide municipal services to a new industry. Unless these small towns can provide job opportunities for their people; the people wil leave Arkansas for job opportunities elsewhere and these communities will wither and die.

In 1940 Arkansas had a total population of almost 2 million out of a national population of 130 million. Today, we still have less than 2 milion people while the national population is over 200 million. Hundreds of thousands of Arkansas people have had to leave our state because our towns and cities were not attractive enough to industry to provide the job opportunities for our own people.

B. History of Municipal Financial Problem or Why is Arkansas 50th in the Nation in Municipal Revenues Needed to Perform Vital Municipal Services

1. *Antiquated State Constitution—Property Tax Inadequate.* Our present State Constitution was adopted in 1874, during a period of extreme conservatism and reaction following the abuses of the reconstruction period after the Civil War. This 97-year-old Constitution limits our towns and cities in 1971 to a 5-mill property tax to operate all the municipal government.

Art. 16, Sec. 5 of the Ark. Const. provides:

"All the property subject to taxation shall be taxed according to its value, *that value to be ascertained in such manner as the General Assembly shall direct,* making the same equal and uniform throughout the State."

This leaves to the *Arkansas General Assembly* to determine the percentage of true value which property should be assessed and the General Assembly has the power to provide for a 100% assessment if it thinks property should bear a greater percentage of the load of financing local government.

Prior to the great depression property was assessed at 50% of its value. As late as 1932 general property taxes amounted to 67% of the revenues of cities and towns in Arkansas. With the bottom dropping out of values during the depression, and with many people losing their homes because they couldn't pay their taxes, our elected assessors naturally let the assessment ratio fall until it was only 5 to 10% of true value. For the past 16 years we have been trying to raise it to 20% of value.

Today the 5-mill tax on 20% of value amounts to less than $5 million to all the cities and towns in Arkansas. It will not even operate one department of city government. Cities and towns receive very little of the property tax. Arkansas people paid over $100 million in property taxes in 1967; cities and towns received only $11 million or 11% for all purposes including bond issues. If you doubled assessments in Arkansas you would raise property taxes over $100 million but only increase city general funds by $5 million; this is approximately $4.35 per person on the average. The property tax provides only about 10% of the operating funds of our towns and cities.

The first reason Arkansas cities and towns are financially bankrupt is the almost complete erosion of the property tax base in financing municipal services.

2. The Arkansas Legislature has not permitted municipalities to levy non-property type taxes in sufficient number or amount to finance municipal services!

In many states, cities and towns levy all types and kinds of local taxes. All of these types of taxes would be helpful but the municipal problem is now so great that the only local non-property taxes that will really help is broad based taxes.

There are only two broad based taxes—they are sales taxes and income taxes. Over 6,000 cities and towns in the United States levy local sales taxes; many cities levy local income or payroll taxes; of course, these should be collected by the state and returned to the cities after deducting a collection charge.

The 1971 Legislature passed a statutory Home Rule Act applying to cities of the first class.

This will be of absolutely no assistance to 336 towns and cities under 1,500 population and very little assistance to the 87 cities between 1,500 and 10,000 population.

3. The State of Arkansas has not returned to Arkansas Towns and Cities an equitable share of state collected taxes!

The State of Arkansas is in almost every field of taxation and returns to towns and cities only about 2% of the over $250 Million General Revenues collected.

4. *Arkansas Constitution is very restrictive as to funds for Municipal Capitol Improvements.*

Amendment No. 13 to the Arkansas Constitution permits Ad Valorem Bond Issues for capitol improvements for a specific list of public improvements. Bonds cannot be issued for longer than 35 years and cannot bear interest at the rate of more than 6% per annum.

With high interest rates and the federal threat to tax municipal bonds, very few cities have issued Municipal Bonds under Amendment No. 13 in the last three years.

Cities are limited to a total of 5 mills (on 20% assessment) for all capitol improvements; with an additional 5 mills for water and light plants only. Once a city makes a capitol improvement and pledges its 5 mills for 20 or 30 years then it cannot make another capitol improvement until these bonds are paid off.

C. Importance of municipal services

Eleven years ago a group of Arkansas businessmen formed a Business Executives Research Committee which was jointly sponsored by the Arkansas State Chamber of Commerce and the Industrial Research Ex-

tension Center of the University of Arkansas College of Business Administration.

The Research Coordinator for this report was Dr. Ralph Gray and the Coordination Committee was composed of Frank Cantrell of the State Chamber of Commerce, Dean Paul Milam of the University of Arkansas, and Dr. John M. Peterson.

They published a report in March, 1960 entitled, "The Problems of Financing Urban Growth in Arkansas: A Challenge to Arkansas Leadership", which said the following:

Summary of findings and recommendations:

"Since the close of World War II, Arkansas cities have encountered increasing difficulty in responding to the demands of a dynamic, growing population. City growth has brought a host of new pressures, each of which has grown into a serious problem for the cities, simply because they have found themselves not equipped financially or administratively to deal effectively with new challenges as they arise.

"Long-standing millage limits, inflation in league with lagging assessments, and preemption of revenue sources by the state have rendered the cities unable to expand revenues as rapidly as population growth and demands for more and better services have added to the municipal responsibilities. As a result, Arkansas cities spend far less per person for municipal services than their neighbors or their northern competitors."

The Importance of Municipal Services:

"The growth of Arkansas' economy depends, for the most part, upon the growth of industrial employment. For Arkansas to be attractive to potential outside investors, it should be able to boast of well-managed attractive cities which render the quality of services to which officials and skilled employees of industrial plants have long been accustomed. This generally means higher expenditure levels and higher taxes, and thus raises the question 'Can Arkansas afford better government service?' The committee finds that the relationship between acceptable municipal performance and attractiveness to potential industry, and therefore to income growth, is so clear that Arkansans cannot afford not to raise municipal service levels. Accordingly, the committee urges that citizens' groups be formed to promote local and state action toward making possible more and better services."

Let me repeat the question and the answer: "Can Arkansas afford better government service?" *The committee finds that the relationship between acceptable municipal performance and attractiveness to potential industry, and therefore to income growth, is so clear that Arkansans cannot afford not to raise municipal service levels.*

D. Arkansas towns and cities 50th in Nation in municipal taxes

The Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, has recently completed the 1967 Census of Governments.

In its publication, "Finances of Municipalities and Township Governments", issued July, 1969 we find the following:

The average per person municipal taxes for the U. S. is $89.61.

The average per person municipal taxes for the 17 southern and border states is $59.24.

Guess what the average is for Arkansas and where we rank?

You guessed it, we are 50th with an average per person tax of $16.52.

This is less than a nickel per day per person in municipal taxes—all municipal taxes for all municipal purposes.

This $16.52 municipal tax rate is the major reason that Arkansas is *50th* in the nation in state and local taxes, ($200 per capita—National Average $330) and the municipal tax is only 8¼% of total state and local taxes.

Also, you can see that the national average is 5 times as much as Arkansas. The southern average is 3½ times that of Arkansas.

The 49th state, West Virginia, (with $29.28 per person) is almost double Arkansas. In other words, Arkansas cities and towns are in such a dead last position in local municipal taxes we would have to double our local taxes to raise to 49th.

E. What a community needs to attract industry

The most important needs of a community are public water supply, sewer system, good streets, police and fire protection and health and sanitation.

1. Small and medium size towns and cities need massive financial assistance to improve their water systems to provide services for industrial development. The present administration has been especially cruel to small communities in cutting off Federal Grants for water and sewer projects.

2. The cost of sewer treatment and especially the treatment of industrial sewage is very expensive and the Federal Government must make a major commitment to aid small and medium size cities in the drive to clean up the environment.

3. Our towns and cities are using their street turnbacks to improve their street systems.

4. The Federal and State Governments must give financial assistance to help pay for the sanitary disposal of solid waste.

5. One of the greatest areas of need in our towns and cities is better police and fire protection. These services cannot be financed on a fee basis.

A beginning has been made in assistance to local police departments but this must continue.

Police protection is very expensive. It must be furnished 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. All of our merchants, businessmen and even home owners are seeing their burglary insurance rates going up and many are finding it hard to buy at any price. So we pay for adequate police protection even if we don't have it.

To have one policeman on duty at all times on basis of a 40-hour week takes five policemen on the payroll. Using a cost of $5,000 per policeman it costs the city $25,000 a year to keep one man on duty around the clock.

The people of our cities—the people of Arkansas—simply must have law and order! They must have police protection. This is the No. 1 duty of government. Yet, Arkansas is failing in this regard more than in any other area.

According to a recent publication of the U.S. Bureau of Census, the one area of expenditures where Arkansas was 51st in the nation (yes, 51st because they counted the District of Columbia as a state) was in the area of police protection.

We were not last in education, in local schools, higher education, highways, public welfare, health and hospitals, local fire protection but, we are *dead* last in police protection. Is it any wonder that our burglary insurance is going up?

The area of city government closest to my heart, and for which I don't mind spending city money, is fire protection.

Every dollar we spend on fire protection is an investment. An investment in saving lives, preventing injuries caused by fire, saving our businesses, our factories and our homes.

Also, we are saving money for the people living in our cities. We will cost our constituents money when we fail to increase taxes and fail to improve our fire departments.

Fire protection is very expensive but the lack of fire protection is even more expensive. Even working 72 hours a week it takes three firemen on the payroll to have one on duty around the clock. For the cities to have a 56-hour week, it would take four firemen on payroll to have one on duty.

We are dealing with people's lives, their homes, their businesses, the place where they work—when we talk of police and fire protection: How much are the lives of your people worth? What kind of society can we have without adequate police and fire protection? *A society not worth living in.*

With adequate water and sewer service, sanitary disposal of solid waste, and police and fire protection we cannot only protect the lives and property of our people; we can make our communities attractive to industry.

Let's remember two things: First, small towns and cities have no way to raise revenues. We have no unlimited millages the people could vote; we have no local authority to raise revenues. *Second,* by making our small towns attractive to industry we can stop the exodus to large ghettos of the north and make taxpayers of many of our citizens who are now on public welfare.

This is the second insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other material which I have gathered during my search for answers to the need for community development in sparsely populated areas and those areas threatened by population losses. Other material on this subject appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22 on pages 32740 and 32741.

BUSING SCHOOLCHILDREN ACCORDING TO RACE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 651, a constitutional amendment introduced by Congressman FLETCHER THOMPSON, which I have cosponsored along with 12 other Congressmen, states simply that "no public school student shall, because of his race, creed, or color, be assigned to or required to attend a particular school."

This is exactly what the antiracists long and loudly insisted—until lately—that they were trying to achieve. Yet now House Joint Resolution 651 rests unmoving in the House Judiciary Committee, and we have to seek signatures on a discharge petition, an unusual and difficult maneuver required to force a bill out of committee. For most of the antiracists have stopped pretending that a color-blind, equal-opportunity society is their goal. Rather, they are openly advocating a reorganized society run by them as social engineers—a society in which children will be assigned to schools according to race, but as the social engineers, not their parents, may choose.

Thus racism appears in a new form, as a vital aspect of an intolerant, totalitarian elitism which moves other people's children around vast metropolitan areas like pawns on a chessboard, to obtain the sociological mix most satisfying to the dominant academic and bureaucratic cliques of the moment. That is the real meaning and importance of the nationwide controversy over busing schoolchildren according to race, now flaring

with new fury as another school year begins.

In its decision last April in the case of Swann et al. against Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, the U.S. Supreme Court, tragically unanimous in error, not only read into the Constitution a power for a single Federal district court judge to set school attendance rules for an entire city—a power which could not by the remotest stretch of the imagination be conceived as having been in the minds of the Founding Fathers when they drafted the Constitution—but overturned the explicit language of their own historic Brown against Board of Education decision which said that new school attendance areas should be "compact units." When the Supreme Court begins to override not only laws passed by Congress, not only long-established legal precedents, but even its own recent and best-known rulings to advance its sociological objectives, it is heading straight for tyranny or chaos.

On September 13 I introduced H.R. 10614 which would deprive all Federal courts of jurisdiction over cases involving the assignment of schoolchildren to attend particular schools on the basis of race. A bill of this kind has the advantage over a constitutional amendment in that it requires only a simple majority vote for passage, rather than two-thirds. But it now rests in the same House Judiciary Committee which has bottled up every bill to check in any way the enormous abuses of Federal court power.

However, it may still be possible—at least in some areas of the country—to turn the Supreme Court's own twisted logic against itself. The Swann decision appeared to say that busing on the basis of race was being authorized only in those States which once had a dual school system segregated by law. It did not uphold—yet—the growing number of lower court decisions requiring busing in States such as California where any past or present racial "imbalance" in schools resulted solely from neighborhood housing patterns. Therefore no school outside the South is yet under Supreme Court mandate to bus for racial integration. Until such a decision is forthcoming from the Supreme Court, no local school board outside the South is compelled to take this action and even lower court order requiring it may and should be appealed.

If enough public support builds up for House Joint Resolution 651 and H.R. 10614 to curb the power of the courts in these cases, the Supreme Court might finally be willing to listen to reason on this issue.

PERKINS STUDENTS IN WESTWOOD

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a rather touching article appeared in the Quincy Patriot Ledger Monday relating the visit of a group of 10 teenagers to the two nature trails specially designed for the benefit and pleasure of the unsighted in Westwood, which is located within my 10th Congressional District. Until June of this year, the Cedar Ridge trail offered the sole trails for the unsighted in New England. Similar trails have been opened at the Cape Cod National Seashore. These fine and high-minded teenagers, students at the famed Perkins School for the Blind in Boston, found their visit to the Hale Reservation a most rewarding and enjoyable one, in great part, I am sure, due to the Braille markers which have been placed along the reservation for the enjoyment of the visually handicapped.

It is a pleasure for me to present the full article, and I do hope that it will serve as a stimulus to other communities to adopt such a worthwhile and laudable program.

The article follows:

TEN GIRLS GET "TOUCH" OF NATURE

WESTWOOD.—Ten teenage girls who camped out at Hale Reservation over the weekend were like any other campers except that they were the first visually handicapped to spend a night there.

RARITY

Accompanied by an instructor, Miss Ingrid Watkins, and instructors in training, the youths, all students at the Perkins School for the Blind in Boston, chose Hale because of its specially-designed nature trails which have Braille markers.

Laughter and good-natured remarks about one another came easy for these girls who for the most part considered their stay Friday night and Saturday morning a special treat.

The rarity of camping accounts for them being more appreciative of people taking the time and effort to explain what camp life is all about, Miss Watkins said.

They felt particularly welcome at Hale because of the two nature trails designed for the blind.

The 1100-foot Cedar Ridge trail has 26 markers and the Spruce Hill trail, 13. They were the first trails for the blind in New England until June when others opened at the Cape Code National Seashore.

MARKERS

All of the markers describe the vegetation, animal life, ecology, and geology of each spot in terms of the sense of touch.

The printed markers were made by the Massachusetts Association for the Blind, and Braille zinc markers were made by the Perkins School.

Funds for the markers were provided by the Massachusetts Federation of Women's Clubs junior membership and the Westwood Lions Club.

CONGRESSMAN McFALL SPEAKS ON HEALTH CARE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, while reviewing materials available on various aspects of health care as they may pertain to the work of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, it was my good fortune to obtain a copy of a brief address presented by our esteemed colleague from the 15th District of California, Mr. JOHN J. McFALL.

I believe Representative McFALL's comments presented to the San Joaquin Optometric Society contain food for thought for all of us who must consider, deal with, and vote intelligently upon health legislation. With this in mind, I insert Mr. McFALL's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that more concerned citizens, both in and outside the Congress, may share the benefit of his cogent thoughts on the subject of health care:

SPEECH BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN J. McFALL

I want to thank my friends in optometry for this opportunity to discuss with them and others in the community one of the most vital as well as controversial problems that faces the Americans and in turn their Representatives in the Congress—that of health care and how and at what cost to provide it to the American people. And while we are on the subject I will include some comments on specific legislation of interest to the members of the optometric profession.

Most Americans are beginning to believe that good health care like a good education ought to be a fundamental right of American citizenship. This represents a rapid shift in public opinion because it was just in 1965 that we were able to obtain passage of medicare and medicaid after a twenty year struggle that met with bitter resistance and smothering cries of socialism.

Programs to provide this care are receiving broad support among members of congress and are variously backed by labor unions, chambers of commerce, hospital administrators, insurance executives and the American medical association.

It's been said that what lies behind this shift in national attitude is widespread frustration, especially in the middle class—over higher taxes for ever more costly governmental health programs, the failure of private health insurance to control soaring medical costs and the inability of millions to get health service when and where they want it.

The biggest question mark has been posed by a social security administration study of health care costs released earlier this month. How do Americans want to pay for their health care and how much and who do they want to handle the cash-private insurers (including some companies that would make a profit) or the lower overhead federal government (a choice that would virtually abolish the private health care system and, also, make the government bigger).

Part of the discussion necessary to reach a solution that will be acceptable to the American people must be between the legislative and professional sector of our society. Optometry, which has been waging a battle to win the recognition it deserves as primary health care provider, is a vital and necessary participant in that discussion because your profession has repeatedly demonstrated how self regulation can set guidelines for the welfare of the citizens it serves and provide the foundation for incorporation of this needed service in government administered programs.

The nature of America's health care problems can be identified primarily in three areas.

First, we are confronted with immense increases in the cost of health care.

Secondly, there are acute shortages of thousands of qualified practitioners of the healing arts.

And, thirdly, there seems to be a lack in present-day health care for a policy of preventive medicine, backed by vigorous medical programming.

The cost of goods and services has precipitated a situation where personal financial ruin can be the result of serious illness. Notwithstanding, other legislative bills have been introduced in Congress, and a number would provide for Federal assistance for an illness defined as catastrophic. Under these plans, the Government would assume all the expenses associated with an individual's illness after they exceed, for example, $4,000. Nevertheless, ordinary supportive services, such as diagnostic tests, X-rays, and blood tests are beyond the reach of far too many of our citizens.

Medical personnel shortages are graphically evident. Last year alone, more than 5,000 highly qualified students could not gain acceptance to medical schools in the United States. These potential physicians must now either select other fields of endeavor or delay their studies or study abroad. Those who select to study abroad find, upon returning to the United States, that they face an additional two years of study to gain recognition from professional organizations.

Medical research provides us with machines and organs to assist or replace our hearts and kidneys, but people continue to die needlessly, because we lack effective preventive medicine. Prohibitive costs and limited production have made those advance available to only a small number of our citizens.

A simple illness can become serious because of the lack of early treatment. Earl detection and treatment can in many cases eliminate or reduce the possibility of serious consequences at a later date.

As insurmountable as the national health care problems appear in the areas of rising costs, shortages of medical practitioners and thrust of preventive medicine, Congress is taking positive action to arrive at responsible and working solutions.

During the beginning of this Congress, the House and Senate have taken the initiative in finding a legislative avenue to prevent the present deterioration of health care services and ensure the availability of good health medical treatment for our people.

So this evening I would like to bring you up to date on some of the major health care proposals pending before the Congress, and outline where optometry is included in them.

The proposals cover a wide spectrum from the national health insurance plan advocated by Senator Kennedy and Congresswoman Griffiths which would provide individuals with all of those health needs whether major or minor and including a corrective lenses and the professional services of optometrists, to the more conservative proposals which provide only for services which are currently available under health insurance plans, such as the "medicredit" proposals which are primarily fostered as such by Congressman Fulton of Tennessee and Dr. Hall of Missouri.

Permeating any discussion of health care programs on a national scale are the basic questions of how Americans wish to pay for their health care and whether they wish to handle the funding through private insurers which of course include companies who keep some of the money in profits or the lower overhead Federal Government. The latter probably would lead to the end of the private health insurance system, as we know it, and also increase the size of the government.

To shed additional light on the subject and put the matter into perspective, I would like to cite a few pertinent statistics from an analysis recently made by the Social Security Administration and issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The study shows that the costs of health care are rising at an astronomical 12½% per year, and it appears certain such costs will be $105.4 billion in the 1974 fiscal year beginning July 1, 1973. This would compare with the previous fiscal year's cost of $67.2 billion. The staggering growth of health care costs will be reached even if no new Federal level health plan at all is passed and if we just continue today's piecemeal methods of paying for medical care.

At the present time we now pay for our care in many bits, including doctor bills, insurance premiums, dozens of taxes and hard cash if hospital emergency room treatment is required.

Of the various plans proposed, the Kennedy-Griffiths program represents the most drastic departure from the traditional and fragmented health care system we have had in this country. Nevertheless, the Kennedy-Griffiths plan has picked up significant support.

The Kennedy-Griffiths program would have the Government pay for almost everything and this would cost some $113.8 billion in fiscal 1974. Some proponents of the Kennedy-Griffiths plan would describe this difference "as a bargain."

The program would require the taxpayer to spend an estimated $97.9 billion in taxes but his direct out of pocket cash spending for health care would drop to $11.2 billion.

The plan would have private insurers handling only $1.9 billion of the annual health care bill for the Kennedy Plan would not pay for all psychiatric care, or prescription drugs, or non-prescription drugs, long-term nursing home care, or adult dentistry. It is not a cradle-to-the-grave free medical care program, as some have said, and it does not appear that any such program is likely to happen in this country in the foreseeable future.

In contrast to the Kennedy-Griffiths plan is the administration's proposal which would more or less stick to the present methods of paying for health care through expanding employer-employee payments for private or commercial insurance.

Under the administration's proposal, the Nation's total health bill would jump to $107.2 billion which would cost only 5½% less than the Kennedy plan. Under the Nixon proposal the total fiscal 1974 costs to the taxpayers at all levels would be an estimated $44.6 billion and their cash out of pocket direct payments, not including insurance premiums, would be $28.3 billion.

Private insurers under the Nixon plan would handle $30.4 billion as compared to the scant $1.9 billion as provided under the Kennedy-Griffiths program. The administration's proposal would provide for eye examinations for children up to age 12 subject to deductibles and co-insurance.

Another comprehensive health care plan has been advocated by Senator Javits of New York. The Javits proposal would amend the Social Security Act to extend medical care to all age groups, utilizing a step-by-step method. Initially, the Javits program would provide complete health benefits, including yearly visual examinations, to those persons 65 years of age or older, and after several years, children under the age of 19 would be included. Eventually, the Javits plan would provide for the entire population and would increase the cost of medical care in fiscal 1974 by $7.6 billion including a $4.6 billion increase in Federal taxes.

The American Medical Association's plan to encourage purchase of private health insurance via a tax credit system would increase the cost of health care in 1974 by about $4.1 billion and increase Federal taxes some $6.3 billion.

The American Hospital Association's plan would require all employers to furnish private health insurance. The increase during fiscal 1974 would be $9.5 billion and call for a $4.9 billion Federal tax increase.

Congressman John Dingell of Michigan has proposed a Government health insurance plan which would increase the costs in 1974 by $11.4 billion and provide for a $61.3 billion Federal tax increase.

Less extensive is Senator Russell B. Long's proposal which would provide Government insurance to cover catastrophic illness and this would increase national health insurance costs in 1974 by an additional $1.1 billion and require $3.1 billion in Federal taxes.

It must be emphasized that regardless of the plan which ultimately evolves from the legislative process, I believe it absolutely inherent that the traditional and valuable doctor-patient relationship be preserved. This sacred relationship is a cornerstone to any sound medical system and it cannot and should not be eroded under any program, or in the name of efficiency, which would provide assembly line medicine.

Although the delivery of vision care and general health care under the new, emerging proposals are of great concern to practitioners, there are many other federally funded programs in which vision care is an important element.

The Congress is well aware of the need for continuing support of optometric teaching institutions as well as those of the other primary health professions.

There is no doubt that schools and colleges of optometry could not have made the tremendous strides they have, except for the financial assistance provided by the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act, or title 7 of the Public Health Service Act. This legislation provides authorization for construction grants for new schools; construction grants are available for remodeling and expansion of existing physical facilities; institutional grants for basic support for the teaching program; special project grants for innovative programs and special situations; and the student loan scholarship programs which are so important to those students who require financial aid.

As the act presently operates, schools of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, pharmacy, podiatry, veterinary medicine and optometry are all provided for. The act was due to expire July, 1971. Several changes have been urged by various groups during the hearings on this legislation. Optometry's major problem, however, is that the administration's bill would do away with practically all of the continuation of construction and institutional grants that have previously been extended for your schools and colleges, although it still allows optometry students to get loan money. The major health professions educational assistance proposals before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Health Subcommittee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee, however, *would* include optometry schools in re-authorizing legislation and *would* authorize more money to our schools and colleges and our students.

This conflict between the administration's proposals and those that would include optometry has precipitated a heated debate in the Congress over the Health Professional Educational Assistance Act. I recognize that this program is really the lifeblood of the schools and colleges of optometry. I believe optometry schools must be retained and treated equitably.

Another subject which has held the interest of your profession for some time is legislation to obtain equitable treatment for military optometry officers, with respect to special pay and other career incentives.

After a number of unsuccessful attempts to bring the special pay issue before the House Armed Services Committee, the matter was resolved during the present session of Congress, when special pay was made a part of legislation to extend the Military Selective Service Act. As you know, extension of the draft has been a very difficult and emotionally charged issue, but the House has passed the bill and it is now awaiting final action by the Senate. The House version, and the bill approved by the Senate Armed Services Committee *do* include the special pay provision for optometrists in the military services. Assuming the Military Selective

Service Act is extended, it appears that special pay for optometrists will be an accomplished fact.

Professional visual care for veterans has been a matter of serious concern to your National Association and to the Congress. There is legislation under consideration now which proposes expansion of eye care for veterans, and creation of a new position of chief optometry officer within the VA Department of Medicine and Surgery. This new position would be consistent with the continuing efforts of Congress to provide our veterans with truly comprehensive health care services when they have completed their military service. At present, optometrists perform eye care services on an outpatient basis. While the current practice is better than no care at all, it leaves a great deal to be desired in terms of well-organized, comprehensive health care services which take the visual aspect into account. Under the proposed amendments to the veterans administration legislation, optometry would be accorded its rightful place within the framework of the health care team, just as dentistry and nursing have enjoyed and made major contributions for many years.

One final area of specific legislation I know to be of interest to you is that dealing with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and the Blind Vending Stand Act.

In 1967 provision was made in the vocational Rehabilitation Act for optometrists to aid handicapped persons under the vocational rehabilitation program, especially in the area of orthoptics. However, although Federal law makes adequate provision for optometry in this regard, it is known that vocational rehabilitation people who actually administer the program at the State level do not accept an optometrist's certification of eligibility for vocational rehabilitation. So long as this situation exists, optometry is effectively excluded even though Federal law provides for inclusion. Vocational rehabilitation amendments before the 92nd Congress would accomplish two goals: First, an optometrist's statement would be accepted as a certificate of eligibility for vocational rehabilitation; and secondly, optometrists would be authorized to certify blindness under vocational rehabilitation.

In addition, there is a program operating under vocational rehabilitation known as the Blind Vending Stand Act which allows those persons who are considered blind to operate vending stands on Federal installations. This legislation, first enacted in 1934, provides that blindness, for purposes of the act, can only be certified by a duly licensed opthalmologist. Several bills to update this law were introduced in the 91st Congress, and they redefined blindness as 20/200 acuity (with correction) but they were silent as to who could certify.

A freedom of choice provision in the definition section of the Blind Vending Stand Act has been proposed. The Senate has passed that bill, providing that blindness could be certified for the purposes of the act by either a physician skilled in the diseases of the eye, or by an optometrist.

WHAT IS RIGHT WITH AMERICA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is common at this time to hear a great deal about what is wrong with America. Our country, of course, has many problems. It is, after all, a society of men—and men, being finite, have not yet achieved perfection—either in moral, social, economic, or political spheres. Much criticism is, in fact, a criticism of the human condition itself, and not of the American society in particular. I join those who wish men were less selfish and more altruistic, less parochial and more willing to open their minds and hearts to truth, and to other men. It seems, however, that human nature is constant, and is very much the same as it was a thousand years ago. Most likely it will be the same a thousand years from now.

Given the fact that man is what he is, it is only fair when judging any society that it be compared with other societies and not with utopian constructs in the minds of dreamers. By a utopian standard even the best and most humane society would appear barbaric and unjust.

Our American society, when compared with other societies in the world today, does not appear nearly as negative as many of our critics would lead us to believe. Recently Andrew W. Nickle, the outstanding senior man at Hillsdale College in Hillsdale, Mich., expressed a viewpoint which is very different from that of many students who have been in the news in recent years.

Mr. Nickle asked us to look for a moment at some of the things that are right about America. To those who attack our system of capitalism and free enterprise, he replies:

It has been so successful that if we wanted to put ourselves on the same level as our nearest competitor, the Soviet Union, we would have to: Destroy two thirds of our rail mileage; destroy about 60 per cent of our houses; destroy 60 per cent of our steel mills; destroy nine out of every 10 telephones; move about 60 million people back to the farms; and reduce our standard of living by a full 60 per cent.

To those who speak of the race question, Mr. Nickle points out that—

Today there are more blacks in college in America than there are English in college in England or French in college in France. ¶To those who speak of our crisis in education he provides the reminder that—¶ More Americans have completed high school than any other people. No other nation comes close to matching 6.5 million students now enrolled in our colleges and universities.

These facts should not make us less firm in our commitment to solve the problems which remain and which are within our ability to influence and correct. We should, however, understand our country as it really is, and not permit those who have distorted history and present reality to dominate the intellectual scene and become arbiters in the marketplace of ideas.

I wish to share Mr. Nickle's thoughtful statement with my colleagues, and insert excerpts of his address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time:

A STUDENT SPEAKS

Andrew W. Nickle, "Outstanding Senior Man" at Hillsdale College (Hillsdale, Mich.), recently expressed a viewpoint very different from that of many students in the news in recent years. Excerpts of his address at the college's commencement follow.

Currently, it is fashionable to be a critic of our society and it is "out" to be a supporter, especially within my generation. While I believe there is certainly room for valid criticisms of various aspects of our society, I also believe that by overstating their cases, critics and reformers have led many of us to accept a pessimistic attitude about our nation's future.

The strength of this country lies in the physical, moral, and spiritual strength of her people—people who have a sense of what is right and what is wrong. The strengths we possess individually we possess collectively as a nation. All these strengths have led us to create the healthiest, wealthiest, most generous nation in the history of the world.

Under attack today is our free enterprise system. Some claim it is failing and others see it as repressive. However, I say it is more than a coincidence that it has produced more goods and services for more people than any other system. The record of our free enterprise system speaks for itself and needs no defense.

It has been so successful that if we wanted to put ourselves on the same level as our nearest competitor, the Soviet Union, we would have to:

Destroy two-thirds of our rail mileage; destroy about 60 per cent of our houses; destroy 60 per cent of our steel mills; destroy nine out of every 10 telephones; move about 60 million people back to the farms; and reduce our standard of living by a full 60 per cent.

Economically we are the strongest nation the world has ever seen, and we have shared our wealth as no nation has ever done. In foreign aid and assistance, we have given more than 200 billion dollars to other nations.

Despite our unequaled economic standing, we constantly read and hear of poverty in America. Once again, the critics are overstating their case. It is true that there are many Americans whose standard of living should be raised. However, to state this is a nation plagued with poverty is nothing short of an asinine remark.

In this country, we view any income below $5,000 as a poverty case. But do you know that less than one per cent of the people in the world earn $5,000. Much of the world views our "poor people" as kings and queens as our poverty cases enjoy shelter, plumbing, clothes, food, televisions, cars, and education opportunities. The fact is, we don't know what real poverty is.

Many say we should not dwell on America's material accomplishments, but we should worry about the problems of people. However, because America is strong and rich, because America is so productive, we are able to do things about our problems.

Of course there is the problem of race relations. In this area there are many black pages in our history. However, the past 20 years have been marked by unprecedented progress. While we still have a long way to go, and I don't believe we can move fast enough, new opportunities are continually opening up for minority group Americans. Today there are more blacks in college in America than there are English in college in England or French in college in France. There are also more black millionaires in America than in the rest of the world combined.

Another current crisis is that of unemployment. We are constantly told we are in a recession and unemployment has reached frightening proportions. But the facts show that our current rate of six per cent is about par, and is nothing near the 25 per cent unemployed in the 30's. Even the Kennedy years saw unemployment surpass the seven per cent mark.

We also hear of the education crisis in America. However, Americans today are the best educated people the world has known. More Americans have completed high school than any other people. No other nation comes close to matching the 6.5 million stu-

dents now enrolled in our colleges and universities.

Then there are those who tell us that we are unfeeling and uncaring about other people. Yet the facts show that last year alone, Americans donated more than 14 billion dollars to charitable causes.

Of all the good things in America, the best of all is her people. If we lose faith in ourselves, we will become what our critics say we are. Our challenges are too great and at the same time our potential is so unlimited that we cannot afford to listen to the preachers of disasters.

We should all love America. But let us love her not because she is rich, not because she is strong, but because America is a good country and we are going to make her better.

FARM CREDIT

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great interest that I read the speech of the Secretary of Agriculture, delivered at Jackson Hole, Wyo., before the National Conference of Farm Credit Directors, September 21, 1971.

In this speech, Secretary Hardin comments on the barriers erected by the Common Market to U.S. farm products:

The United States is continuing to press the Community to modify those aspects of its policy that are unfairly harmful. We favor European integration, but we don't believe that American farmers should be forced to pay unduly for the unification of the European Economic Community.

Having seen these walls repeatedly threaten American agricultural products over the years, I certainly want to commend the Secretary and urge his Department to persevere in this area for the benefit of all our farmers.

I also was interested to note the Secretary's comments in support of the Farm Credit Act of 1971. We share the Secretary's view that the bill will enable the cooperative farm credit system "to meet the growing credit needs of farmers in years to come."

Secretary Hardin says he looks forward to "favorable House action in the near future" on the farm credit bill. In that this bill has been passed by the Senate and hearings have been completed by the House Agriculture Committee, I too hope that we can move this bill to the House floor for action as soon as possible. There is great support in most of rural America for the main provisions, and I believe that this bill merits our earliest attention.

The fact that this bill will require no Federal tax dollars, no Government loan subsidies or special guarantees of any kind, commends it as one measure which will not add to the burdens of the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Hardin's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The speech follows:

FARM CREDIT

I am delighted to see so many good friends and to meet with this leadership group, from all parts of the country, whose members are concerned on a day-to-day basis with that vital ingredient of agricultural progress, reliable credit.

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep personal interest and satisfaction in the painstaking search that you have been making over the last two years for better ways of making dependable credit sources available to farmers. You are to be complimented on performing a truly monumental task—looking far ahead, anticipating changes in agriculture and changes in farmers' credit needs, and developing feasible means of updating lenders' services.

What you really have been doing is looking at agriculture the way it likely will be 10 years from now—and how you might best serve it. You have decided to make your System more flexible and more responsive in order to keep up with the changes in agriculture.

This is something all of us should do. We should be alert to the emerging situation with our three kinds of farmers—commercial farmers, small farmers, and part-time farmers. Each requires special help tailored to meet his particular needs as he fits into the kinds of farming, and kinds of rural communities, that we will have in the decade ahead. We should be willing to change, and ready to change, so that we can be responsive. And we should judge our efforts by how well they deliver useful services to the farmers and rural residents of this Nation.

The farmers of America are doing a tremendous job, and we of the Administration are well aware of that fact. Farmers have been a bulwark against inflation; they have strengthened our balance of payments; they have fed this Nation well; and all too often they have gotten far too little for it. Many of their achievements have been directly aided by the pioneering and performance of the farmer-owned Farm Credit System in the area of agricultural financing.

President Nixon recently observed that "If private lenders and the Farm Credit System continue to expand their credit assistance to the same rate as during the 1960's, there should be adequate credit available to meet the needs of commercial agriculture during the 1970's."

The President also demonstrated his concern for those farmers whose circumstances prevent them from obtaining loans from private lenders. "I pledge," the President said, "that my Administration will continue to be responsive to the needs of those farmers who are unable to qualify for private credit."

His pledge was significant. It was important not only to operators of small family farms, important not only to the fundamental health of our agricultural economy, but potentially important to the future of the Farm Credit System. Many of the programs of the Farmers Home Administration aim to be of particular benefit to young farmers who, in due course, will reach the point where they can participate in the organizations you represent. And you, too, are putting new emphasis on credit for young farmers.

Today's young farmers who have the managerial talent to make the most of their resources, and who use credit as a true tool of production, will have a significant and, I am confident, a rewarding part to take in the agriculture of tomorrow. Nothing that we can do will pay higher dividends than helping our young people.

Even though there's talk about the dwindling number of farms and farmers, agriculture is truly a dynamic growth industry—a $57 billion gross industry from farm production—one that has grown 24 percent from 5 years ago and 48 percent from 10 years ago. And I have faith that in the years ahead, farming is going to be a better business—and a better life—than it has ever been before.

As you are well aware, the soaring costs of equipment and production inputs during the middle and late Sixties offset much of the gains farmers might have realized from their rising gross sales. You know, and I know, of many farmers who have been producing more, selling more, but are earning little more—or even less—net income because of the cost-price squeeze and inflation. Inflation has been hard on the farm business and on farm family living. We are committed to do something about that.

Farmers have good reason to feel encouraged by the fact that we are winding down the Vietnam war and have come to grips with inflation. If the effects of the wage-price freeze extend well beyond the current 90-day period, as we intend they shall, the outlook for farmers ought to improve.

Costs of production will be more stabilized, while no lid was put on the prices of raw farm products. This gives farmers the chance to realize more from efficiency and specialization. Also, the President's new policy is designed to stimulate business activity, create jobs, and boost exports. The result of more people working and earning should mean stronger markets for farmers, and farmers will benefit from strengthened export markets.

Tax reductions and investment credits, which will be another direct assist to farmers as well as to industry, assuming Congress acts favorably on the President's proposals, will encourage greater investment in new productive equipment. Again, the net effect should be to strengthen and enlarge the markets for farm products.

To the extent that interest rates drop as a result of less inflationary pressure, this will be of help to farmers and the total economy. Inflation and the expectation of rising prices tends to drive rates to levels higher than normal. But now that pressure is subsiding interest rates have declined some.

Meanwhile, related parts of the President's new economic policy are aimed at improving America's foreign trade position. This is obviously a matter of great importance to farmers in light of the fact that in fiscal 1971, more than half of all America's production of wheat, soybeans, and rice went to foreign markets—and total farm exports were record high.

The release of the dollar from its gold price peg should bring about a realignment of world currencies, better reflecting their true value. This may take time. As it happens, it will improve the competitive position of U.S. farm products and tend to stimulate their sale abroad.

I believe it is reasonable to assume that the long-term benefits of reform of the international monetary system, increased economic growth among all nations, and adjustments in the flow of international commerce to meet true market needs, will be even more beneficial than the short-term effects of the new economic policy.

Some people may ask, for example, what the prospects will be for a continued high level of exports to Japan in light of the present situation. My answer would be that the prospects are good. The Japanese economy continues to grow. Their farm imports continue to rise. We expect to continue to supply our share of that market, which in the last fiscal year was worth $1.2 billion to American farmers.

The United States is Japan's biggest customer; and Japan is America's best offshore customer. A sign of this healthy and mutually valuable trading partnership is the straight-forward manner in which they and we have been discussing our mutual problems, none of which are unsolvable. I have said before that Japan will be our first $2 billion agricultural customer. I see no reason to amend that statement.

Looking toward Europe, we must contend

with the obstacles posed by the protective Common Agricultural Policy and its variable levy system. The variable levy automatically adjusts the price of wheat and feed grains in the European Community. For this reason the prices of U.S. feed grains on EC markets are not likely to change substantially in the wake of the currency provisions of the President's new policy.

Over several years, the Common Agricultural Policy has curtailed access to European markets for many American farm products. Last year was exceptional in that our exports to Europe reached an all-time high of $1.8 billion, owing largely to short European crops and lowered stocks. This year the Community is harvesting record grain crops.

As and when the United Kingdom joins the Community, our problems could become more complicated. The possibility exists that an American export market worth nearly $400 million will be put behind the protective walls of the Common Agricultural Policy. The greatest impact would probably be on our exports of tobacco and grains; rice, lard, fruits and nuts could also be adversely affected.

The United States is continuing to press the Community to modify those aspects of its policy that are unfairly harmful. We favor European integration, but we don't believe that American farmers should be forced to pay unduly for the unification of the European Economic Community.

In spite of the difficulties that exist, I am convinced that the goal of $10 billion in exports sales of agricultural products is attainable during the decade of the 1970's. The market potential is there. Population is on the increase. Economies are growing. Buying power is rising in most countries—and as it rises, people demand more and better food.

Of course, world agricultural productivity is also rising, and this means increasing competition. However, thanks in substantial measure to the credit you have provided for farmers over the years, American agriculture has an unmatched productive capacity and efficiency in a wide range of commodities. It has the ability to capitalize on the numerous opportunities that are developing. The sharp increase in world demand for livestock products, for example, creates a significant opportunity for the American farmer. He is second to none in the efficient production of the grains and protein meals needed for meat production.

Just when the $10 billion export breakthrough will occur is not predictable. Farm exports over the past decade show gains, losses, and plateaus from year to year. But the overall trend has been up. As you know, it reached a record high point of $7.8 billion last fiscal year.

The ups and downs of the export curve reflect weather, insects, disease, domestic and foreign farm policies, and many other factors. Not the least of these are the all-too-frequent shipping tie-ups brought on by labor disputants who are not deterred by how badly farmers and other of their fellow Americans get hurt in the process.

We have the markets in sight. We have the productive power. If we have the will to compete—as I am confident we do—and if we can gain the cooperation of dock workers and others who handle our shipments, the time will come when America's farmers will get their $10 billion share of the world market.

But for agriculture to accomplish that, and at the same time continue providing our home population with an abundance of wholesome food, farmers will have to keep themselves geared to the task. Essential to the gearing up process will be readily available, flexible means of financing. This is why modernization and expansion of the Farm Credit System will come as a timely and highly constructive step.

Members of your Federal Board and Governor Jaenke have provided me with insights into the Farm Credit Act of 1971. I am impressed by the intensive efforts that have gone into the preparation of a measure that represents the best thinking, not only of people in the Farm Credit System, but of leaders of the agricultural and financial communities generally.

In line with the Department of Agriculture's missions to improve farm income, strengthen the rural economy, and help achieve balanced national growth, a number of the bill's provisions are of special interest.

I realize some honest differences of opinion have come out in discussions of the bill; yet I see no real reason why they cannot be resolved in your minds and in the thinking of the thousands of member-owners of your System.

It is my opinion that the new act will broaden your horizons and enable you to meet the growing credit needs of farmers in years to come. I am pleased that the bill has been approved by the Senate, and look forward to favorable House action in the near future.

This new legislation, when you get down to essentials, bears out a philosophy of the Farm Credit System that offers an important guide to all who are engaged in agriculture. It gives new emphasis to self-reliance, to a man's management ability, and his character. These are the factors, over and above collateral security, that really count—and your System of Banks and local associations has been uniquely designed to nurture these qualities among the farmers of America.

So I salute you for the work you are doing, and I wish you success as you enter a new era of service in agricultural credit. There is no question that farmers, ranchers, cooperatives, and rural Americans will benefit. And so will the rest of the Nation.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD a statement of the Honorable HENRY REUSS, chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee on Conservation and Natural Resources. The statement was presented by Mr. REUSS to the House Public Works Committee relative to water pollution control legislation. I am pleased to associate myself with this excellent statement:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HENRY S. REUSS OF WISCONSIN BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS ON PENDING WATER POLLUTION CONTROL LEGISLATION AND THE REFUSE ACT OF 1899, SEPTEMBER 24, 1971

I appreciate this opportunity to testify today in support of an effective water pollution control effort on the part of the Federal Govment.

My purpose in coming before you today is to urge that, in your deliberations over the contents of a new water pollution control bill, the Refuse Act of 1899 not be impaired.

The Refuse Act is a clear and concise statute. It simply states that no one may discharge or deposit his polluting wastes into a navigable waterway or its tributaries, except with a permit from the Corps of Engineers. oBth civil and criminal remedies are available to enforce this requirement.

Some 18 months ago the House Committee on Government Operations, in a report (H. Rept. 91–917) entitled: "Our Waters and Wetlands: How the Corps of Engineers Can Help Prevent Their Destruction and Pollution," said that vigorous enforcement of the 1899 Refuse Act "can substantially help to prevent pollution of our Nation's waters."

Since then, President Nixon issued, last December 23, Executive Order 11574 directing the Corps of Engineers to establish under the 1899 law an effective permit program as of July 1 of this year. The Executive Order also gave the Environmental Protection Agency a dominant role, from a water quality standpoint, in determining whether or not permits can be issued and, if issued, what conditions to protect water quality should be included. The program has been well integrated with EPA's water quality standards program.

Last February, Senator Hart's Subcommittee and my Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee held extensive joint hearings on the new permit program. At those hearings, the Administration witnesses emphasized, and we agreed, that the one significant deficiency in the program was the lack of authority for EPA to require and approve States' water quality standards for intra-state waterways.

The water pollution amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act now pending before the Congress would cure this deficiency. I understand that the Senate Public Works Committee has included provisions for such standards in the bill it is now considering. I strongly urge that this committee do the same.

I would not be here today but for the fact that in recent days witnesses for both the National Association of Manufacturers and the Administration testified before this committee and recommended amendments to the 1899 Refuse Act.

The NAM witness, Dr. William Haun, recommended on September 13 that the Refuse Act be amended "so as to limit it to consideration of anchorage and navigation" only.

If the NAM amendment were to be adopted, the Refuse Act would be "gutted" as an effective anti-pollution tool. Not even an empty shell would be left.

The NAM amendment would take away an effective tool for citizen participation. The Refuse Act has become widely known, mainly because of its provision that an informer who gives information which "leads to a conviction" is entitled to one-half the fine. I myself have used this law to inform U.S. Attorneys in Wisconsin of scores of cases of polluting discharges by industry into our waterways. I have collected half the fine in several of the cases prosecuted thus far, and I have donated my share of the fines to help municipalities cure their municipal water pollution.

Other citizens have also helped U.S. Attorneys throughout the Nation in providing information on polluting discharges. Under the permit program they will be able to review permit applications and make their views known on them to the Corps and EPA at public hearings. When a discharger fails to file an application, the citizen can inform the U.S. Attorney who, according to a very recent report, is on the Corps' "backs every day" anxious to file actions against such dischargers. If a permit is issued, the citizen can monitor compliance and inform the Government of any violation.

Thus, the Refuse Act is a law that has stirred citizen interest and participation. It has also stirred the ire of many polluters. They are feeling the pinch of this simple one-paragraph law. One State witness who complained about its use recently said that "invoking of the 1899 Refuse Act . . . overnight, placed the Federal Government with boots and helmets in the front office of nearly every waste-discharging industry in the nation".

I for one cannot think of a better place for the Federal Government to be if we are to halt the degradation of our waters. It is time—indeed, long overdue—that the industrial polluters of this nation felt the hot breath of the Government's army of enforcers, meek as they are.

The NAM recommendation would also result in abandoning the "No Polluting Discharge" standard of the 1899 law. The old "assimilative" capacity theory under which our waters are simply private sewers of the polluters would then continue to reign supreme.

Only three days after the NAM urged this gutting amendment, the Administration, following the NAM line, also testified before this Committee. The Administration witness began by extolling the virtues of the 1899 law and ended up by urging that it be emasculated.

He urged that Congress (a) "integrate" the Refuse Act into the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, (b) provide for a "transfer of the permit authority" to the Environmental Protection Agency, and (c) provide for "delegation of the permit-issuing authority" to the States.

The Administration would thus transform a simple, easily enforceable, one-paragraph anti-pollution law into a lengthy, cumbersome, and fragmented law of dubious value.

The Administration's proposal that the Refuse Act he "integrated" into the Federal Water Pollution Control Act has an enticing sound, until we remember that the Refuse Act permit program established by the President last December has, as I have said, already "integrated" the two acts.

I only hope that EPA will exercise this responsibility effectively. A July 15, 1971, memorandum by EPA's General Counsel to its regional offices raises many doubts in my mind whether EPA will do so. The memorandum clearly suggests that many applications for permits will receive only a cursory review by EPA.

Certainly, we do not need a new and more complicated permit statute to carry out the President's Executive Order. If EPA cannot act responsively under this simple one-paragraph law, I shudder at what would be the result under a lengthy and more complicated one.

The notion that the permit program should be transferred to the States borders on the ridiculous.

One very clear conclusion Senator Hart and I drew from those joint hearings last February was that the States could not effectively handle such a program.

Eight States have no standards for intrastate waters and, in almost half the states, the standards are inadequate.

A November 1970 EPA staff report states that it is "questionable whether all interstate systems have been included in the water quality standards" program under the FWPC Act, and that at least "34 States have unilaterally extended their implementation schedules for various communities and industries."

Many States are not even ready today to process applications for State certifications under section 21 (b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. That section was enacted nearly 18 months ago.

Also, let's not forget that Chairman Train said last week that "shortcomings in State permit and enforcement programs" caused the Administration to initiate the Refuse Act permit program last December, in the first place. I would be interested in learning how the States have succeded in curing these "shortcomings" in just 10 months.

A permit program run by 50 different governments will become an environmental nightmare. It will encourage industries that dislike the tough permit administration of one State to shop around to locate in a less progressive State. The result will be economic hardship to the State which effectively enforces its anti-pollution laws, and loss of jobs to its citizens.

The Refuse Act permit program is a Federal program established under a Federal law and pursuant to President Nixon's Executive Order. It should be run effectively by a Federal agency, not by the States. The States have a proper role in certifying, under section 21(b), that applicants will not violate state water quality standards. But that role should not be expanded into destroying the proper Federal role under the Refuse Act.

The Administration's suggestion that the Refuse Act permit program be transferred to EPA may perhaps be appropriate at some later date. But not now.

The permit program was just begun last February. Industry has filed with the Corps, as of September 13, some 18,000 applications covering over 32,000 discharge points. The Corps has already asked EPA to review over 6,000 of them. Three permits have been issued.

EPA lacks the funds and personnel to do this job. It is still in the throes of reorganization. Congress has appropriated funds to enable the Corps to carry it out. The Corps has the personnel and the machinery to do the job with advice from EPA on water quality, Interior on the effects on fish and wildlife, and from HEW on health effects of each discharge.

Let's not change the rules again. Transferring this program now would cause grave delay and additional chaos. We need action to protect our waters with the most effective tools, not bureaucratic paper shuffling and musical chairs.

The Administration's approach sounds a great deal like that proposed in a committee print prepared by the staff of the Senate Committee on Public Works which was widely circulated last June as a "devil's advocate type discussion paper". The Senate Committee, to its great credit, has since discarded that approach in favor of one that retains the Refuse Act intact, while strengthening the FWPC Act and the water quality standards program, and harmonizing them with the Refuse Act program.

I applaud the Senate Committee for that decision. I believe it is the right one. I urge that this committee and the full House follow suit.

Let's listen, not just to industry-oriented spokesmen, but to the public. I detect no great clamor from the public that the Refuse Act be amended or repealed, or that the Refuse Act permit program be transferred to the States. On the contrary, there is widespread public support for this law as it is because it is effective.

The League of Women Voters testified before this Committee on September 16 that the "Refuse Act permit system . . . be used to its fullest to help curb the sources of pollution".

The Izaak Walton League of America also testified before this Committee on that same day, urging "retention of the Refuse Act permit system now in effect".

The Friends of the Earth also testified last August that it would "consider any language in new legislation unacceptable which relinquishes Federal authority for water pollution control under the 1899 Refuse Act to the States", and urged that Congress "not mitigate in whole or in part" the 1899 permit program.

Unlike the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, which has never been tested in court, the Refuse Act has been widely reviewed and interpreted by many courts. These judicial interpretations, including those of the Supreme Court, have enhanced its effectiveness as an anti-pollution tool. The courts have upheld injunctions to compel a polluter to stop polluting and to remove the wastes discharged, and judgments compelling the polluter to reimburse the United States for its expenses in removing refuse deposited by the polluter.

No one urges that the judicial interpretations are wrong. Yes, I have heard it said, by some lawyers representing industrial polluters, that the Refuse Act "was not intended by Congress to function as a pollution control device", but only to protect navigation because in 1899 "every municipality and industry dumped its raw wastes into the nearest stream". I marvel at the hindsight of these lawyers and their knowledge of the intent of Congress in 1899.

Every first year law student knows that legislative history has a bearing on the intent and meaning of a law only when the law itself is ambiguous. But the Refuse Act of 1899 is far from being ambiguous. Certainly, the courts have had no difficulty in this regard. They have uniformly held that the 1899 law applies to the polluting discharges of today.

Since this is so, I cannot perceive any reason to repeal or amend the law, except to achieve the negative objective of the NAM to cripple the law.

Instead, Congress should applaud the Administration for adopting after much prodding, the unanimous recommendations of the House Committee on Government Operations for vigorous enforcement of the 1899 law.

Without the Refuse Act, the Administration would still be bogged down in lengthy procedures under the FWPC Act trying to stop the 10 mercury polluters from discharging that toxic material into our waterways. Similarly, the Justice Department would not have had an effective enforcement tool to halt the discharge of cyanide by the Armco Company into the Houston Ship Channel, or to control thermal heat discharges planned by a Florida power company into Biscayne Bay. In the latter case, the Government asserted that such discharges would have turned this national monument established by Congress into a "biological desert".

In summary, I urge that this committee reject the suggestions to repeal or amend the 1899 Refuse Act, to transfer its administration to EPA at this time, and to delegate the permit program to the States.

I urge that the committee hold the line and insist that this venerable statute be left unscathed.

I also want to add my voice to that of Congressman Vander Jagt and the Izaak Walton League and other public interest groups in strong support for two very important features of the Senate committee's bill.

The first provides that waste treatment systems which recycle pollutants and reclaim water, such as the land disposal approach of the Muskegon project in Michigan, be given a first priority in providing Federal grants to finance such systems, and that a second priority be given for those that provide "the best available treatment" of pollutants. Such a priority system does not exclude the more conventional treatment systems if the same results can be achieved at less cost. But it does encourage systems which deal with the question of ultimate disposal of the wastes. I believe this is needed. Moreover, it will help to upgrade the goals of the Administration from one of secondary treatment to the drinking water concept. Secondary treatment, in the case of most of our waters, guarantees a continuing decline in water quality.

Second, I support the need for a strong citizen suits provision in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Michigan, Minnesota, and Massachusetts have adopted such a provision. The Clean Air Act also has one. Citizen participation under the Refuse Act has stirred the Government into action. Such a provision in the water pollution control law is the real guarantee that the law will work.

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEXITIES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article entitled "Military-Industrial Complexities," appeared in the February 1971 edition of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

The author of this piece, Charles Wolf Jr., makes an examination of the aspects of the military-industrial complex, supposedly unique and responsible to a large degree for what are assumed to be inflated defense budgets, and finds that these characteristics are not peculiar to the field of military preparedness but in fact exist to an even greater extent within the health care and educational complex.

For an enlightening comparison between the military-industrial complex and the health care and educational complex this article is recommended.

The article follows:

MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEXITIES

(By Charles Wolf, Jr.)

How can one approach the question of the role of the Military-Industrial Complex in American life? What is its degree of influence? Charles Wolf, Jr., who discusses the problem is head of the Economics Department at the Rand Corporation. The views he expresses here, however, are his own and should not be interpreted as reflecting those of Rand or the official opinion or policy of any of its governmental or private research sponsors.

"Do we buy more defense than we 'need'?" Those who, like General David Shoup, view the "new American militarism" as having an insidiously controlling grip throughout society, answer with a resounding affirmative. Others, like Dean Acheson, who feel that the military-industrial complex (MIC) is at most a "marginal" problem, are inclined to answer in the negative. How can one usefully approach this question, as well as account for the widely divergent answers that people give to it?

The answer to the initial question depends on whether one thinks the national decisionmaking process trends to misestimate one or more of three variables.

The first variable concerns the threat, and whether the decision process operates to bias threat estimates. If one believes the threat tends to be overestimated, the answer to the initial question is biased upward. Accordingly, if the assumption previously underlying U.S. planning for general-purpose forces was to prepare for 2-plus simultaneous major contingencies, a better assumption should be 1-plus simultaneous contingencies, or something similar, instead. The composition of threat estimates is, of course, as important as their total size. For instance, the strategic threat may be underestimated while the conventional threat is overestimated. The result is not one good estimate, but two bad ones. Thus, the U.S. military both overestimated and underestimated the Viet Cong: including tanks and anti-tank weaponry in the equipment of U.S. divisions in Vietnam reflected an error of the first type; the heavy casualties repeatedly incurred by U.S. troops on large-unit actions, due to booby traps and land mines, were a consequence of the second type of error.

Lying behind the proper threat estimate are a number of basic, and usually unexamined, premises. For example, what premise does one adopt about the interdependencies of the estimate, the decisions we make based on it, and the actions of others, both allies and adversaries? (Are these actions compensating, or are they largely independent of our own actions? Over what time period?) What estimate is proper also depends on how willing one is to bear the risks of underestimating rather than overestimating.

The more one views the Soviet Union or the Chinese People's Republic as implacably hostile (or simply disposed to exploit any opportunity for advantage against us or our allies), the higher one tends to assess the threat and the number of contingencies we should be prepared for; hence, the more defense we need. On the other hand, the more one views potential adversaries as behaving in compensatory ways—responding to whatever we do in offsetting ways—and the more one feels disposed to bear risks, the less defense we need.

A second variable is the social opportunity costs associated with other public (as well as private) resource claims—that is, the benefits foregone from other possible uses to which military resources would be put if not expended on defense. To the extent that people believe that military activities take resources away from other national programs (especially those at home), and to the extent that they assess the other needs as more compelling than national security needs, to this extent people feel that we buy more defense than we need or can afford. In principle, these costs depend on the output resulting from using resources for other purposes. When someone says that resources should, from the standpoint of national goals, be devoted to poverty rather than defense, he is implying something about the consequences of devoting more resources to the poverty problem. All too frequently, however, he stops with the foregone inputs, and avoids the crucial question of what the output would be.

The third variable concerns the efficiency of defense production. In this case, we take as given the need or demand for military activities. We then ask whether there are characteristics of the MIC that inflate the costs of producing defense services—for example, in the weapons acquisition process, in the way we man and operate bases, perhaps in the way we tend to fight unconventional wars in a conventional manner? (If demand is relatively inelastic, higher unit costs will increase the amount expended on defense.)

In other words, while the first variable concerns whether, and to what extent, the armed services, the Congress, defense industry, and the defense research community tend to inflate demand (in relation to other national needs), the third variable concerns the effect of the MIC in inflating the cost of meeting any given demand. Underestimates of social opportunity costs can affect both demand and supply.

MIC CHARACTERISTICS

Next, consider characteristics of the MIC which people have in mind when they contend that some of these variables tend to be misestimated, and hence that we buy more defense than we need or can afford. These characteristics are presumed to be unique to the MIC, or to differ in substantial degree from those which are associated with other industrial complexes (OICs).

What are these characteristics and how do they affect the variables of the model?

1. Secrecy is one such characteristic. The demand for defense is exaggerated, it is argued, because those with access to secret information are part of the MIC and so are biased on the side of higher threat estimates. Unavailability of classified information also protects inefficiency in the production and operation of forces and systems, and prevents careful comparison of the returns from defense with those from other public sector activities.

2. The complexity of weapons systems makes it additionally difficult for the outsider to judge whether a system is being produced or employed efficiently, or whether a proposed system is needed at all.

3. Supported by secrecy and complexity is the supposed absence of countervailing forces to oppose or control the MIC. As a result, exaggerated estimates of the threat and inflated production costs are insufficiently challenged, and nondefense uses or resources get inadequately represented as competing claimants for defense resources.

4. Related to the absence or weakness of countervailing forces is the contention that the MIC is riddled with conflicts of interest. Those who determine the demand (e.g., the military services, the Armed Services Committees, defense intellectuals) are in, or at a later time acquire, a position also to benefit from higher costs in meeting that demand. Both demand and supply can be biased upward as a result.

5. The appeal which can be made to patriotism and national tradition is another characteristic that putatively strengthens the MIC's hand in overestimating threats, inflating production costs and underestimating social costs. Consider the familiar belief that we can "afford" whatever national security expenditures we "need"; that "nothing is too good for our fighting men."

6. The scale of defense spending is also a relevant characteristic. Since the magnitudes involved are so huge, additions to them may be more easily obscured. And when defense expenditures are increased in wartime, the urgency of the circumstances and the pace at which the additions occur are often so pressing that circumspection and independent review may go by the board.

7. Institutional rigidity is advanced as a final perverse characteristic of the military. The "go-by-the-manual" syndrome tends to impede innovation and adaptation. Substantial inefficiencies and increased costs are likely to result.

AN EVALUATION

Let us consider these characteristics in turn to see how each bears on the original question. Most of the seven attributes are not unique to the MIC. They apply equally, or with greater force, to other complexes, especially health care and education—the two from which I will draw most of my examples. But in part the argument is intended simply to establish a benchmark. If, as is sometimes suggested, the defense budget is "out-of-control," we need to know whether that is because these characteristics apply to the MIC uniquely, or to an egregious extent. If they don't, then we can't use this benchmark as the explanation, or else we have to accept an equal presumption that OICs are out of control too.

Secrecy is one characteristic that applies uniquely to defense questions. Even here, however, the extent to which this characteristic prevents scrutiny and control may be exaggerated. Anyone who invests a modest amount of time in reviewing the Defense Secretary's annual posture statement has access to a great deal of relevant information on which to base judgments about strategy and weapons systems choices. To some extent, classification is an impediment to full disclosure. But the extent to which this restricts discussion is much exaggerated. Much of the relevant information on threats and systems, and on the uncertainties surrounding them, is openly available (as suggested by the recent public debate on the SS–9). Nonetheless, I would agree that more information should be made available to raise the level of public understanding and discussion, and that the communications media, as well as other institutions, can do a far better job of presenting the available information than they have in the past. (Incidentally, secrecy can lead to un-

derestimates, as well as overestimates, or threats. Consider the United Kingdom before World War II, or the United States before Pearl Harbor.)

The complexity of defense matters poses a further obstacle to intelligent and public judgments. But is this obstacle any greater than what we confront in education? For example, the Coleman report suggested some of these complexities when it pointed out that expenditures' schools and on teachers' salaries, or on changes in class size, or on changing student-teacher ratios, did not seem to affect educational performance (U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics, 1966). Notwithstanding various criticisms directed against the study, Coleman's major results, by and large, have stood up remarkably well. Billions of dollars and words are expended on programs and arguments in this field without a clear understanding of what inputs are likely to be effective in raising educational performance. Are these issues really any less complex, or better understood than, for example, those that relate to the vulnerability of land-based or sea-based missiles, or to the case for (or against) providing a "thin" ABM but not a "thick" one?

Next, consider the contention about a lack of countervailing forces to check the MIC. In fact, there are numerous and strong countervalences. For example, analytical countervalences (systems analysis, planning-programming-and-budgeting systems, and other means of analyzing costs in relation to effectiveness) have been much more extensively and effectively applied in the military sector than in any other public activity. There has been nothing in health and education approaching the application of these techniques to the defense sector. Without slighting the technical difficulties involved in such new applications, and without exaggerating the results already attained in defense, it is fair to say that political and organizational oppositions to applying these techniques of budget control and resource management has been much more severe in health and education than in defense.

The same applies when one looks at other countervalences. Groups and individuals in Congress, in the media, in the academy, and in public life that dispute and control military expenditures are powerful, active and visible. Opponents of the American Medical Association and the teachers' unions, with the knowledge and organization to argue effectively for cost reduction, for improvements in quality, and for institutional and technological innovation, are rare and their arguments usually shortlived—in Congress or among the public generally.

Concerning conflict-of-interest problems within the MIC (for example, in connection with the 2,000 retired military officers who are employed in executive positions in defense industry), one should note the existence of a similar problem in the health-care industry. For example, the National Institutes of Health have often been hard-pressed to find panel members to decide on research allocations in a particular field who would not themselves be in a position to benefit, or to have their institutions, students or colleagues benefit, from such allocations. Paneling does in fact often come close to conflicts of interest, with attempts made to relieve the problems by such unsatisfactory devices as having a panel member leave the room when a grant to his institution is considered, or using foreign panel members.

Now consider the notion I discussed in connection with patriotism and nationalism that "nothing is too good for our men." In the health-care industry, conventional wisdom tends to justify increased costs in much the same way that inefficiencies are protected in defense matters. Again, "nothing is too good." Drastically escalating costs, with quite ambiguous effects on the quality of output, tend to result. Indeed, both health and education have been such sacred cows, with the purposes they serve so highly valued, that even raising the question of inefficiency is regarded as crass and unfeeling.

Consider next the point about institutional rigidity in the military tending to inflate costs through inefficiency. By way of comparison, the educational system has always operated so as to prevent or impede differentiation of teachers' salaries according to market value. Thus, the costs of getting better mathematics and science teachers in high school are enormously inflated, because salary levels that would enable the schools to compete for these skills have to be extended to teachers of physical education, home economics and history as well. (Incidentally, although the point is not "secret," is it well known to the public?) More particularly, this costly institutional rigidity results from the inertia of school administrators, as well as the political power of teachers' unions. As a barrier to innovation in health care, the institutional rigidity of the American Medical Association is no less a force to be reckoned with (for example, in its opposition to large-scale expansion of group practice, prepaid comprehensive medical care programs like the Kaiser Foundation, or the substitution of paramedical for medical personnel) than is the professional military in its insistence that war be played by the (last) book, almost irrespective of changed circumstances, as in Vietnam.

Or consider the effect of institutional inertia on the introduction of new technology. Here the education industry is at the opposite pole from the military services: technological innovations (such as computer assisted instruction, or automated record-keeping and information retrieval systems) have been painfully slow in developing, in sharp contrast to the military services, which sometimes latch onto the newest technology almost regardless of its effectiveness. In both cases the effect is increased costs. Moreover, this malpractice cannot be extenuated in education by one of the serious impediments to efficiency in the military: the fact that reliable testing procedures for new systems can only be provided in war time.

Turning finally to scale, the budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is nearly $65 billion for fiscal year 1971 ($23 billion is for health and education). The defense budget is larger ($72 billion), although this figure has come down by $7 billion in two years (and considerably more than that in real terms due to price inflation). In fact, as a proportion of federal expenditures (36 per cent), and as a proportion of GNP (seven per cent), defense expenditures are now at their lowest shares in 20 years.

Of course, defense is still awfully large. Yet if one adds state and local expenditures in health and education (another $40 billion) to the federal figures mentioned above, the total amount exceeds the defense budget. Expenditures on health care alone run to about $50 billion annually of which more than 30 per cent is public expenditure. The education industry entails annual outlays of about $60 billion, three-quarters of which is public expenditures. In their extensive interactions with the public sector at all levels, both of these complex industries are highly organized, politicized, and influential. While their efforts are not as centralized at the federal level, particularly in the case of education, as those of the MICs, this difference entails disadvantages, as well as advantages, from the standpoint of public awareness and control.

So the military is huge, and demanding of public scrutiny and control. But the scale problem is not fundamentally different from that of the OICs.

One of the numerous complexities about the MIC is that it is surely not the sole offender nor, probably, the worst. And if the answer to the question of whether we spend too much on defense remains elusive, the facts are that these expenditures are controlled relatively severely and that the totals are already sharply reduced and will probably be more so.

BICENTENNIAL MEDAL COMPETITION

HON. JOHN WARE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. WARE. Mr. Speaker, the Franklin Mint, world's largest private mint, which is located in my congressional district, has recently announced an outstanding competition for the designing of bicentennial commemorative medals in all 50 States, with prizes totaling $500,000. This announcement was made in August by Joseph M. Segel, president of the company at the New York City premiere of the new documentary film "Of Art and Mining."

BICENTENNIAL MEDAL COMPETITION

Artists in each state will be invited to design a Bicentennial medal commemorating their state's contributions to the heritage of the nation. There will be $10,000 in prize money for each state competition: first prize—$5,000, second prize—$2,500, third prize—$1,500, fourth prize—$1,000. The total prize fund of $500,000 is the largest amount ever offered in an art competition in the United States.

Actually, the investment in the program by the Franklin Mint will be at least one million dollars. In a telephone interview with *USA–200,* Segel said the company has budgeted an additional $500,000 for nationwide promotion and advertising in support of the 50 contests.

State Bicentennial Commissions have been invited to co-sponsor the competition in each state, and judging of the design entries will be done by state panels in cooperation with a national advisory panel of distinguished artists and art experts. In states which elect to cosponsor the program, the Franklin Mint will defer to the Governor or State Bicentennial Commission in appointing a panel of judges.

Under varying plans on endorsement of co-sponsorship, Segel told *USA–200,* it will be possible for the individual state to receive royalties of 10 to 50 per cent generated by the public sale of the medals, for use in supporting other state Bicentennial programs. A conservative estimate of the royalties likely to be generated for distribution among participating State Bicentennial Commissions, Segel said, would be one million dollars, with the potential being considerably higher.

The fifty state competitions, to run concurrently, are scheduled to open in January 1972 and close on March 31, 1972. Segel said he anticipated that first edition proofs of the complete 50-medal set would be available by the end of September 1972. There would be later mint editions and possibly other editions sponsored by various states.

The unique opportunity afforded artists, the commemorative value of the completed medals and the prospect of substantial royalties for use in other bicentennial activities, makes this a significant act of support and commitment to the bicentennial which I feel should be of interest to other Members of Congress.

EAST PAKISTANI REFUGEES

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a very important and significant statement made by the 25 Roman Catholic bishops who make up the administrative board of the U.S. Catholic Conference.

On September 15, 1971, this group of prelates called upon the President and Congress to "take the leadership" in promoting a massive international relief program for East Pakistani refugees by pledging at least $300 million to that effort.

The statement of the governing board of the U.S. Catholic Conference follows:

BISHOPS' BOARD URGES MASSIVE RELIEF EFFORT FOR PAKISTAN REFUGEES

WASHINGTON, Sept. 15.—The Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference today (September 15) called on the President and Congress to "take the leadership" in promoting a massive international relief program for East Pakistani refugees.

The board, composed of 25 Roman Catholic bishops from around the country, said the U.S. government should ask the United Nations and other foreign governments to mount a relief effort totaling at least $1 billion.

It urged the U.S. to "set an example" by pledging at least $300 million to the effort.

The U.S. Catholic Conference is the national-level action agency of the Catholic Church in this country. Following is the statement of the Administrative Board, which met here this week:

"STATEMENT

"In an age that has witnessed more than its share of tragedies that have darkened the lives of thousands upon thousands of people, there is probably none more tragic than the plight of the millions of refugees from East Pakistan who have fled into India to save, if possible, the lives of themselves and their families. No one can offer an exact figure on the number of refugees who have already fled, but it is now being variously estimated at between seven to ten million, and there is no end to the exodus. It is said that even at this moment, 25 to 40 thousand refugees cross the border each day. In its concern for the East Pakistani refugees, the world must not lose sight of the fact also that many thousands of their fellow countrymen are still suffering from the cyclone which devastated their land late last year. Efforts to come to their assistance, more particularly to provide for their rehabilitation, were more or less suspended at the outset of the present tragedy and it is only recently that they have been partially resumed.

"It is almost impossible for the news media to adequately portray the plight of the refugees. Having arrived with barely the clothes on their backs, without food or shelter, they have found their way into hundreds of refugee camps. The Indian Government, with funds from a number of other governments, including our own United States, and the assistance of international and national governmental and private agencies, is feeding some hundreds of thousands on a minimum sustaining diet and is providing them with at least make-shift shelter from the heat and rain. Nevertheless, there are literally thousands, who because of lack of transportation facilities and the relative scarcity of supplies, for whom death seems to be the only escape from their suffering. One relief worker, when asked what they needed most, replied without hesitation, 'Crematoria.' It seems almost miraculous that a plague has not already destroyed hundreds of thousands of others.

"It is agreed amongst all who represent the agencies which are struggling to meet this situation that, unless a relief effort is mounted on a gigantic scale than that which is presently going on, no hope whatever can be held out for hundreds of thousands of those who are already suffering so tragically.

"The Bishops who comprise the Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference, conscious of the gravity of the situation through the relief program of Catholics in the U.S. which is carried on under the auspices of their Catholic Relief Services, are keenly aware and deeply disturbed by the gravity of the situation. Meeting this week in our nation's capitol, they urge our President, the Administrative branch of our government and our Congress to take the leadership in promoting a much broader international relief program.

"Our government should ask the United Nations and the more favored nations of the world to mount a program of relief, to be administered by the United Nations, that would have a value of at least one billion dollars to which the United States would set an example by pledging at least $300 million. These monies would be added to those already pledged by the United States Government and others to make available the ships and airplanes needed to get food and medical supplies to those parts of India where refugees are temporarily settled and to East Pakistan. Nothing should be spared and no political considerations should stand in the way of getting aid to both of these groups.

"An international approach of this type would not only provide the immediate needs for the refugees, but could cope with their long term needs and their rehabilitation as distinct from the immediate need for survival. There is plentiful evidence pointing to the certainty of widespread famine in East Pakistan by October. Food must be supplied on a massive scale directly to the rural areas of East Pakistan on a politically neutral basis. This should be accomplished through a greatly augmented United Nations staff with a specific mandate and adequate facilities for effective action. In order to facilitate this massive movement of food and supplies, we urge the Government of Pakistan and the leaders of the Bangla Dash movement to cooperate fully with this emengency humanitarian program.

"The Administrative Board of the United States Catholic Conference appeals to the Bishops of the countries of western Europe in particular to use their influence as religious leaders to have their governments join in this kind of an international project."

A TRIBUTE TO J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few years the United States will observe the 200th anniversary of its founding. I suppose that we as a nation have experienced no more troubled era than that through which we have passed in this century. It is sobering to reflect that the public career of J. Edgar Hoover has coincided with some of the most challenging decades in our history, years of trial and of triumph. Through them all, he has been a tower of strength, a man of fierce integrity, sheer leadership has recreated the Federal Bureau of Investigation to win for it universal respect.

Deeply committed to the ideals which have made America great, relentless in his opposition to every alien ideology, J. Edgar Hoover has come to symbolize something fundamental in our national life. His abilities, his unshakable loyalty, his selfless dedication, and the sterling example of his personal and public life have been a continuing inspiration to millions in the ongoing war against organized crime and subversion. As a result of his diligent efforts and his intelligent application of his professional arts in the service of crime detection and crime prevention, all our people are able to sleep with a greater degree of safety. The freedoms which we cherish can only be maintained by ceaseless vigilance, a truth which he has always understood. In honoring him, we are honoring a priceless part of our common American heritage, a heritage which he has served and, with God's help will continue to serve faithfully and well.

WHAT U.S. MONEY AND THE "NEW" HUMANISM HAVE BOUGHT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the IMF, our international beggars, have now used our money and intellectual leadership to become destroyers. They now brazenly meet like a flock of vultures preying over the carcass to tell their benefactors, that is, the American people, how we must run our monetary affairs.

But, seemingly, possibly since we do not have enough gold to pay off our IOU's, the IMF bankers are talking themselves into another substitute for gold called paper gold or SDR's.

Since the international bankers all profess that gold is an archaic symbol of the past and no longer has any significance to wealth nor is a desired object in the international field, then there remains no reason to prohibit Americans from owning and possessing gold.

Since the IMF people have progressed beyond gold, then there is no longer any reason for a law by this Congress to prohibit those private Americans who have not yet attained the intelligence level to the IMF crowd from owning gold, if for no other reason than a keepsake.

Before coming to Congress I had long felt that it was wrong to deny Americans the right to own gold; and since being in Congress, I have repeatedly introduced legislation in every term to give Americans this right.

I include a related news clipping and the text of my gold ownership bill, H.R. 353 and my bill H.R. 352, and urge their immediate consideration and adoption.

The material follows:

PROMPT SETTLEMENT OF CRISIS DEMANDED BY IMF DIRECTORS

(By Lee M. Cohn)

A resolution demanding prompt settlement of the monetary and trade crisis, plus

movement toward long-range reform of the world's financial system, has been approved at the International Monetary Fund meeting.

Although the resolution—approved unanimously by the organization's executive directors yesterday—pins down no details and resolves no issues of substance, it is stronger and more specific than usual for the IMF.

Sources at the meeting predicted the resolution's tone of urgency will push the United States and the other major powers into negotiating compromises to end the crisis, which the executive directors warned "contains the dangers of instability and disorder."

Beyond the immediate crisis, a consensus appeared to be emerging for a new monetary system downgrading the role of the dollar.

SHIFT FROM DOLLAR SEEN

Finance ministers of leading nations, in speeches yesterday, proposed a gradual shift away from reliance on dollars as monetary reserves to the use of special drawing rights—artificial reserves issued by the IMF—for that purpose.

The most detailed proposals were presented by Anthony Barber, Britain's chancellor of the exchequer. He was supported in varying degrees by many of the other speakers, including the finance ministers of France, Italy, Japan and Canada. No one spoke in opposition.

U.S. officials reacted favorably to the thrust of these proposals although they did not commit themselves.

The executive directors who approved the resolution on negotiations are the permanent representatives of the member nations at the IMF. Formal adoption of the resolution by the IMF governors—finance ministers and central bankers of the 118 members—is certain at Friday's concluding session of the organization's annual joint meeting with the World Bank.

To settle the immediate crisis, the resolution calls on members to "collaborate . . . as promptly as possible" to establish new currency values and to reduce "restrictive trade and exchange practices."

BROAD LANGUAGE

It also urges "a reversal of the tendency in present circumstances to maintain and extend restrictive trade and (currency) exchange practices," and "satisfactory arrangements for the settlement of international transactions"—a reference to convertibility of currencies.

The language is broad enough to cover the negotiating positions of the United States and leading foreign countries.

U.S. officials want the others to raise the value of their currencies to give American goods a competitive advantage in world trade. In addition, the United States wants a reduction of foreign trade barriers and increased foreign contributions to mutual defense costs.

Only then does the United States intend to remove the 10 percent import-surcharge—additional tariff—imposed on imports by President Nixon.

DEVALUATION ASKED

The other countries want the United States to remove the surcharge as soon as agreement is reached on new currency values, leaving the issues of trade barriers and defense costs for later negotiation. They also insist that the United States join in the realignment of currencies by directly devaluing the dollar through an increase in the $35-an-ounce official price of gold.

There is no reference in the resolution to defense costs, because this is outside the IMF's jurisdiction. All the other issues are placed on the negotiating table by the resolution.

The references to restrictive trade practices, for example, can be interpreted to cover the U.S. import surcharge, or foreign trade barriers against American goods, or both.

A U.S. official said the resolution's "studied ambiguity protects our position," as well as the positions of other countries. He said it gives the negotiators a free hand, while setting the general direction and demanding that they work out a solution promptly.

NEGOTIATIONS SCHEDULED

Deputy finance ministers of the 10 leading non-Communist nations are scheduled to begin substantive negotiations in mid-October. If they progress, the finance ministers will meet in November, with the hope of settling the crisis by year-end.

U.S. and foreign officials agreed that the gloom and acrimony of last week have been alleviated by the formal speeches and private discussions during the IMF meeting. But they cautioned that hard bargaining lies ahead.

Beyond the immediate crisis, the resolution calls for accelerated studies on basic reform of the monetary system, a subject that has dragged on for years. The crisis has convinced most countries that the system must be overhauled to prevent a breakdown of world trade, investment and aid.

The resolution asks the executive directors to recommend reforms "without delay," presumably so that the IMF charter can be amended at next year's meeting, or perhaps to allow interim changes of the rules even sooner.

DETAILS OF STUDY

The reform study is to include "all aspects of the international monetary system, including the role of reserve currencies, gold and special drawing rights, convertibility, the provisions of the (IMF charter) with respect to exchange rates and the problems caused by destabilizing capital movements."

Speakers yesterday outlined the probable direction of reform, with their proposals for a shift from dollars to special drawing rights as monetary reserves.

The IMF began to issue special drawing rights (SDR) in 1969 to supplement dollars and gold in monetary reserves. Countries need reserves to settle balance of payments deficits and to support the value of their currencies.

SDR A MAIN ASSET

As discussed by Barber and the others, the new system would greatly enlarge the role of SDRs, which have been nicknamed paper gold. The role of the dollar would be limited primarily to commercial transactions and use for government intervention in currency markets.

This curtailed role for the dollar would reduce the dominance of the United States in the world economy, and would enforce discipline on the U.S. balance of payments. It no longer would be so easy to spend and invest more abroad than could be earned from foreign sources, because other countries would not need to accumulate so many dollars in their reserves.

However, there might not be much effect on the economic situation of average Americans.

"The SDR could become the main asset in which countries hold their reserves," Barber said. "Eventually—it would no doubt take time—the SDR could become the major element, with currency holdings largely confined to working balances."

Barber implied that the IMF could evolve into a world central bank. He said the SDR system would require "the controlled creation of adequate but not excessive world liquidity (money and credit) without reliance on the deficit position of one or more countries.

ROLE OF RESERVE BOARD

The Federal Reserve Board in the United States and central banks in other countries have as their main responsibility just such control of money and credit, to influence domestic economies.

Barber's reference to reducing reliance on the deficits of particular countries was an allusion to the present system, in which U.S. balance of payments deficits provide dollars for the reserves of other nations.

There now is agreement that chronic U.S. deficits have flooded the world with too many dollars, and must be reduced. This has led to the search for new reserves that could be controlled cooperatively, so the world economy would not be so susceptible to U.S. policies.

If the system is shifted from dollars to SDRs, Barber said, a procedure will be needed to retire existing dollars reserves.

He suggested creation of an SDR account in the IMF. Dollars would be deposited in the IMF in exchange for issuance of SDRs.

PAR DENOMINATOR

The SDR also would serve as the denominator for par values of currencies, Barber said. That is, the British pound, the German mark, the U.S. dollar and other currencies would be defined as so many SDR's or some fraction of an SDR.

The dollar has served as the denominator for par values, and the dollar in turn has been linked to gold through the U.S. offer to buy and sell gold at the fixed price of $35 an ounce. This system has broken down because President Nixon has halted gold sales, and most major currency values now are fluctuating—or floating—in market trading.

If SDRs served as the denominator, Barber said, the United States would be able to change the dollar's par value in the same way as other countries change the parities of their currencies.

The prospective new role for SDRs has been used as an argument for the United States to raise the price of gold. SDRs are denominated in terms of gold, so maintenance of the present gold price would reduce their value relative to currencies other than the dollar if these currencies were revalued upward.

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 deparment, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to any foreign government which is indebted to the United States.

H.R. 353

A bill to permit American citizens to hold gold in the event of the removal of the requirement that gold reserves be held against currency in circulation, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. At any time when reserves in gold or gold certificates are not required by law to be held against currency in circulation—

(1) the Secretary of the Treasury shall sell any gold held by the United States to any citizen of the United States on demand at a price equal to that then being charged foreign governments, banks, firms, or individuals for gold purchased from the United States Treasury.

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury may purchase from any citizen of the United States any gold tendered at a price equal to that then being paid to foreign governments,

banks, firms, and individuals for gold being purchased by the United States Treasury.

(3) no prohibition in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 or any other law, and no prohibition in any regulation, shall be effective to prohibit or restrict the acquisition, holdings, or disposition of gold by any citizen of the United States.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GUN CERTIFICATION ACT OF 1971

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since 1963 when I introduced my first mail order gun bill I have been calling for stiffer gun controls. Along with the late Senator Dodd of Connecticut, I suffered the abuse of the gun lobby and those in Congress who have been hoodwinked by the Nation's gun runners. Most of our successes in getting laws passed came in the wake of some shocking and senseless killing: The students killed by a sniper from the Texas Tower; the assassination of Senator Robert Kennedy and Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

And so it went. People were gunned down by snipers, lunatics, thugs, madmen, relatives, neighbors, and a few of us in Congress kept saying simply that if guns were made less accessible to those who should not have them, fewer people would be shot and murdered. And while little changed, there was some progress.

In 1967 we saw the "age of the sniper" appear. Not on some far-off battlefield, but in cities across the United States. And Congress began to awaken to the need for new gun legislation.

In 1968, the "Year of the Assassin," Congress finally passed legislation outlawing importation of most foreign guns, mail order gun sales, and out of State sales over the counter. New York City also passed a tough gun control act requiring the registration of buyers of rifles. New Jersey also passed a tough gun control measure.

But as I have said so often in the past, the answer to gun violence will not be found by passing piecemeal legislation, State by State, city by city. For as long as there is no national policy controlling the ownership of firearms then anyone will be able to buy a gun by simply going someplace where gun control laws are lax or nonexistent.

One promising step toward effective national regulation of guns will be the passage of my bill to ban the sale of cheap, small caliber handguns, often called "Saturday night specials." These guns account for a large percentage of the gunshot murders and assaults not only in New York City, but in every American city.

It is unfortunate that it takes a series of tragedies such as the killing of New York policemen, or a President, or a Senator, to focus attention on the Nation's failure to bring about domestic arms control. It is a tragedy that makes me wonder how many more policemen, public officials, and citizens will be shot to death before we finally take action to get the guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 was a good gun bill that was long overdue. The act marked the first time in America's history that effective controls were put on the interstate traffic in firearms.

But now we need to augment that good law with a law that will enable us to find out who owns the existing millions of guns.

In introducing the Gun Certification Act of 1971, I point out to Members that this is part of my continuing effort to increase the overall effectiveness of the Federal firearms laws in the United States. The 1968 act applied mainly to all new sales of weapons and the law has been tremendously effective in this area. Arrests of criminals and others prohibited from purchasing firearms rose over 400 percent in the first 2 years of the act's existence.

I welcome the Johnny-come-latelys to the legislative gun fray who have only recently joined me in my efforts to close a loophole in the 1968 law. This oversight has allowed the domestic production of 2½ million cheap Saturday-night-special handguns, a large number of which are used in crime. It seems to be the fashion of late to be "against" these terrible killers what with the administration and a host of Senators and Congressmen after many, many months joining me in denouncing these lethal, American-made manstoppers.

But what about the more expensive guns and the guns that are already possessed by assassins, robbers, maniacs, and habitual drunks, those who kill and maim? We must control these weapons if the firearms problem in this country is to be fully met.

The Gun Control Act of 1968 was a good beginning.

I cannot be content, however, to let the matter rest only half done. The problem of firearms abuse in the United States increases with each passing day and the lives of innocent Americans are snuffed out wantonly by the gun killer who now account for 65 percent of our Nation's murders.

As of today, an American is killed or wounded by gunfire in the United States every 2 minutes.

The legislation that I introduce today provides for a Federal certificate of eligibility to possess any firearm.

Just as one would establish his credentials in seeking to purchase narcotic or prescription drugs, I propose that current and prospective gun owners establish their status as responsible, noncriminal citizens before being allowed to possess a gun.

Briefly, this act will require that persons who possess firearms on the effective date of this firearms act obtain from the Secretary of the Treasury a certificate which would evidence their eligibility to possess firearms.

In applying for a certificate, an applicant would submit identifying information on himself and the firearms that he possessed.

A certificate would not be granted to felons, fugitives, mental incompetents, or citizens who renounce their citizenship.

In addition, juveniles under 18 years of age could not obtain certificates, and minors could not obtain a certificate other than for rifles and shotguns.

Ammunition could not be sold to a noncertificate holder.

With this proposal we should insure that noncriminal, responsible, mature citizens would be in lawful possession of firearms.

We obtain a license to drive an automobile without inconvenince and I see no more burden involved with respect to the obtaining of a certificate to possess firearms.

A certificate initially obtained would be valid for life, unless revoked because of the holder's falling into one of the prohibited classes by virtue of his actions.

The fee to obtain a certificate is $1, no matter how many firearms the applicant possesses.

A person purchasing a firearm from a licensed dealer would furnish a copy of his certificate and the dealer would record the certificate number and retain it as part of the records which he is now required to keep by Federal law.

Transfers of firearms between nonlicensees would be regulated and the information furnished to the Secretary.

I am certain that such an approach is necessary if we hope to reduce crimes of gun violence in America.

I am convinced that the time has come to take a firm stand on this controversial and emotional issue and I invite Members in both Houses to study my proposal and join me in this fight.

What I propose in this bill would not seriously inconvenience the law abiding citizen. It would require that he apply for a certificate of eligibility to possess a firearm.

It would vest the regulatory authority with the Secretary of the Treasury and would require that he issue a certificate to any person who does not fall within prohibited class.

What I am proposing is that we provide additional tools to implement and enforce the Gun Control Act of 1968.

That act makes it unlawful for a Federal licensee to sell a gun to a felon or a fugitive or a drug abuser or a mental incompetent. But it does not require that the licensee take any positive action to determine whether the purchaser is in one of the prohibited classes.

However, if a purchaser possesses a certificate of eligibility to buy guns, as my new bill requires, then the dealer is secure in the knowledge that he has made a lawful sale.

If a prospective purchaser does not have a certificate, then the dealer could not sell to him lawfully.

This is simple and expedient. I am convinced it will be effective.

In view of the current crime picture in this country and the contribution made to it by gunfire, I see no other alternative than to press for the enactment of the type of Federal controls contained in my proposed Federal Gun Certification Act.

We can no longer afford the extravagant human expense of inaction.

We can no longer tolerate gunsmoke in the streets.

I include a document entitled "Brief Summary of the Provisions of the Federal Gun Certification Act of 1971" in the RECORD Immediately following my remarks:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE PROVISIONS OF CONGRESSMAN MURPHY'S PROPOSED FEDERAL GUN CERTIFICATION ACT OF 1971

1. The bill provides that a person who possesses a firearm on the effective date of the Act obtain within 120 days, (unless he elects to sell the gun), a "Federal Certificate of Eligibility to Possess a Firearm."

2. It provides that a person who purchases a firearm must obtain a Certificate prior to such purchase.

3. In applying for a Certificate the applicant must submit the following information to the Secretary of the Treasury:

(a) Name, address, date and place of birth, social security or taxpayer identification number of applicant;

(b) Name of the manufacturer, the caliber or gauge, the model and the type and serial number of any firearm;

(c) Name and address of the person from whom the firearm was or is to be obtained and the date and place of the transfer; and,

(d) Date on which the application was made.

4. The application for a Certificate is valid as temporary evidence of eligibility to possess a firearm for a period of 90 days unless it is rejected by the Secretary because of the applicant's status in one of the following classes of proscribed persons:

(a) A person under indictment for or convicted of a crime punishable by a term of imprisonment exceeding one year;

(b) A fugitive from justice;

(c) An unlawful user of or addicted to marihuana, a depressant or stimulant drug or a narcotic drug;

(d) An adjudged mental defective or a person committed to a mental institution;

(e) In the case of a rifle or shotgun, a person under 18 years of age and in the case of all other firearms a person under 21 years of age;

(f) a person dishonorably discharged from the Armed Services;

(g) A person, who having been a citizen of the United States, renounces his citizenship; and,

(h) An alien who is illegally or unlawfully in the United States.

5. None of the above classes of persons in Item 4 may lawfully posses a firearm.

6. The Secretary is given the authority to revoke a Certificate if the holder subsequently falls into one of the classes outlined in Item 4.

7. In sales or deliveries of firearms involving Federally licensed dealers, the transaction would be lawful if made to a Certificate holder and the transaction would be recorded by the dealer and the information including the Certificate number retained in his records.

8. All private transfers of firearms would be regulated in the following manner:

(a) The transferor within five days would be required to forward to the Secretary the following information:

(1) Name, address and Certificate number of the transferee;

(2) Identification of the gun (as in 3(b) above); and,

(3) Name, address and Certificate number of the transferor and the date and place of the transfer.

(b) Lawful transfers could only be made between Certificate holders.

9. A licensed dealer may not sell ammunition to a non-Certificate holder.

10. Unlawful acts include possession or purchase without a Certificate, transfer or sale to a non-Certificate holder and possession by one of the classes of proscribed persons outlined in 4(a) through (h).

11. General penalties prescribed are: 2 years maximum imprisonment and $2,000 in fines, or both. Penalties for furnishing false information to avoid complying with the Act's provisions are 5 years maximum imprisonment or $10,000 in fines, or both.

12. Exceptions: Residents of states with comparable firearms certification systems are exempted provided that they furnish proof of state certification to a licensed dealer when so required by the Act's provisions.

TRUTH COULD COST MUSKIE DEARLY

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Paul Hope published in the Evening Star September 27 is worth reading. I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD:

TRUTH COULD COST MUSKIE DEARLY

(By Paul Hope)

If it is true—as every politician, including President Nixon, is wont to say—that politics is the art of the possible, then why all the hullabaloo over Sen. Edmund S. Muskie's statement that he couldn't be elected president with a Negro on the ticket?

The way the Republicans and a number of Democrats are carrying on, one would think that maybe politics has been redefined as the art of lying.

If it has, then Muskie comes up short. Whatever else may be said about him—that he sometimes seems overly cautious, that he has a temper, that he has demonstrated some ineptness as a political organizer—it can't be said that he is untruthful.

Muskie's comment is being equated by some with George Romney's remark in 1967 that he was "brainwashed" by American officials when he visited Vietnam. Romney was crucified for it, and the remark turned out to be a major factor in scuttling his race for the 1968 Republican nomination before it even got under way.

A very high-ranking official of the Johnson administration remarked not long ago in an off-the-record discussion that Romney was absolutely right—that he had indeed been brainwashed. "They brainwashed me, too, not once but twice—and I swore, by God, they would never do it again," he said.

If the time is at hand that a candidate for elective office can't tell the truth as he sees it without wrecking his future, then politics really has reached a low state.

What Muskie did was to tell a group of black leaders that in his judgment it would be a futile gesture to put a black on his ticket. More than that, it would be a setback to efforts to implement his and their commitment to equality for blacks, because one first has to be elected to be able to do much about the problem.

That is practicing the art of the possible.

Now comes the Republican National Committee's newsletter with a long and pious article accusing Muskie of shifting "rightward on the civil rights issue" and of making blacks "second class citizens" in the Democratic party.

"The remark," said the GOP newsletter, "made it plain—if Muskie is in the driver's seat at the Miami Beach convention, black Democrats will ride in the back of the bus."

Considering that the Republican National Committee at a recent meeting in Denver thought the subject of how much black participation there should be at the Republican convention was too touchy to handle, one might ask if very many blacks will get on the bus at all when the GOP gathers at San Diego next year.

The newsletter makes a lot of to-do about criticism of Muskie's statement from three black Democratic House members. One can understand their "exasperation and rage," said the newsletter. It might be stated here that at least the Democratic party has some black House members. There are no black Republicans in the house to express exasperation and rage about anything.

The GOP newsletter's solicitude for blacks would be touching were it not for reminders from Republicans such as Michigan Gov. William Milliken and Virginia Gov. Linwood Holton that the Republican party's arms aren't exactly thrown wide open to blacks.

Then comes President Nixon, vowing not to talk about politics, but accusing Muskie of a "libel on the American people" for suggesting that they would not approve a Negro nominee for vice president—and declaring that it is "very important for those of us in positions of leadership not to tell a large number of people in America . . . that because of the accident of their birth they don't have a chance to go to the top."

No one asked Nixon, when the subject came up at his press conference, whether he would take a black on his own ticket next year.

Says the GOP newsletter: "Perhaps more important than the political issue is the moral issue. Sen. Muskie has said, in effect, to every Negro—'You have no chance to participate equally in the white community.'"

Well, let's wait until August and see if Nixon puts a sign in the convention window at San Diego: "Help Wanted: Candidate for Vice President. Equal Opportunity Employer."

A FRIEND IN NEED

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, opposition to the appointment of Peter B. Hutt as General Counsel of the Federal Food and Drug Administration is widespread and well founded.

The game of "musical chairs" played between Federal regulatory agencies and the firms they are charged to supervise finds the consumer losing every round. He is left standing—without protection and without recourse.

Friendly association is fine; it is federally associated friends within the regulatory process which disturbs me. It is time the consumer had reliable friends.

I am inserting the following editorial from the Miles City, Mont., Star of September 12, 1971, into the RECORD at this point:

AN "OILY" FRIENDSHIP

Some U.S. Congressmen certainly are unreasonable. Take Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, D-N.Y., for instance.

It seems that back in May, William W. Goodrich, general counsel of the federal Food and Drug Administration (FDA), announced his retirement and recommended a friend, Peter B. Hutt, to succeed him.

This ruffled a few feathers among con-

sumer advocates such as Ralph Nader, because Hutt's private law clients included the Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, a trade group of about 15 firms, all of whom are subject to FDA regulation. Nevertheless, Hutt got the job.

But the day before Hutt started his new job, guess who else started a new job? Goodrich—as president of the Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils.

Hutt and Goodrich said the job switch was just a coincidence. But Representative Rosenthal said, "It's an outrage. It's shameful, disgraceful . . . for high level people to engage in this musical chairs game where they may favor a special interest . . ."

Well, perhaps we can smell a slight odor of oil on the breeze, even this far from Washington, but what about that Congressman Rosenthal? Has he no respect, do you suppose, for the sacred ties of friendship?

Would he want the FDA general counsel to have to deal, over at the Institute of Shortening and Edible Oils, with a stranger?

PROFESSIONAL SPORTS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation explicitly placing organized professional team sports under the sanctions of the antitrust laws, thus remedying an increasingly evident pattern of oppressive business practices in this country.

In this effort, I am delighted to join with my distinguished friend, Senator SAM ERVIN of North Carolina, who is today introducing an identical bill on the Senate side.

Following is a copy of the legislation and a press release calling attention to the bill and the intolerable abuses it seeks to eliminate:

To provide for the application of the prohibitions contained in the Sherman Act to the businesses of organized professional team sports

That the Act entitled "An Act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies", approved July 2, 1890, (26 Stat. 209, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 1 et. seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding any other provisions of the law, on and after the effective date of this section, the business of providing for profit public games or contests between any teams of professional players shall not be exempt from the prohibitions contained in sections 1, 2, and 3 of this Act."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect one year from the date of its enactment.

ERVIN AND CELLER ASK FOR END TO ALL PRO SPORTS MONOPOLIES

WASHINGTON, D.C., Sept. 30, 1971.—Today Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-N.C.) and Congressman Emanuel Celler (D-N.Y.), Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and its Antitrust Subcommittee, introduced legislation to end the antitrust exemption which professional baseball and football have enjoyed in this country. The legislation would remove the preferred status that baseball and football have enjoyed by placing them under the same antitrust sanctions applicable to all professional sports.

Ervin and Celler charged that "too often, the sport monopolies come crying to Congress for special legislation because they feel that the health of professional sports is in the national interest. But when it comes to blacklisting and throttling player negotiations, charging high prices to fans, blacking out TV, and moving franchises at will; the sports monopolies act with the greedy single-mindedness of a child reaching in a candy jar—more, more and more. There is no question," said the lawmakers, "that the same abuses that prompted the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act in the 19th century are at work among the sport trusts today."

Both Ervin and Celler decried the restrictions which professional teams impose on the players right to bargain. "There is no question that these restrictions are the only government sanctioned restraints on an individual's right to bargain to sell his services and they effectively exclude the player from the free enterprise system. The restrictions amount to serfdom," they continued, "and we can think of no better term for the team owners than 'czar'."

Chairman Celler said he is considering holding hearings on the entire sports field that would necessitate a careful look at all team finances, including the tax uses which an owner makes of his team. Ervin said that the Senate Antitrust hearings on the proposed basketball merger which he is currently chairing could be broadened to include all professional sports.

WEEP FOR JACK THE RIPPER?

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, agitation in and around our penal institutions is moving to the fore as an essential aspect of what the Communists refer to as their "extended democracy program"—see my newsletter 70–22. The battle for "extended democracy" is directed against all aspects of local, State, and Federal law enforcement designed to protect our citizens from criminals—politically motivated and otherwise. Tactics vary from assaults on police officers, to smear campaigns against intelligence-gathering agencies and congressional committees investigating subversive activities, to pressure campaigns to repeal internal security laws, to disruption of our Nation's courts. The battle has now been carried dramatically into the prisons.

The goals of the "extended democracy program" are: First, to cripple and render usless the institutional mechanisms of government designed to cope with the destructive activity of individual and organized predators; second, to overturn constitutional government in the name of the Constitution; third, to create conditions for the establishment of a totalitarian state using the banner of freedom; fourth, to establish total tyranny under the guise of fighting oppression.

Although, according to Marxist-Leninist theory the criminal class is not considered an adequate base from which to launch a revolution, the chairman of the defense commission of the U.S. Communist Party, James J. Tormey, stated in last October's issue of the CPUSA theoretical monthly Political Affairs that "What is needed is a comprehensive campaign against anti-Communism in general"—read internal security—"always associating our oppression as a political minority with the oppression of other minorities." The Communists, in other words, will manipulate, glorify, and attempt to identify with the "lumpen proletariat," as they call the criminal elements of "bourgeois" society, as a tactic in their drive to dismember our legal system.

The case of George Jackson is a striking current example of this tactic. Jackson had a criminal record dating back to 1957 and was what is known as a "three-time loser." Prior to being sentenced for robbery in 1961, he had been in and out of California Youth Authority institutions, escaping twice and being paroled twice. In January 1970 Jackson was implicated in the brutal slaying of a guard at Soledad Prison. His recent breakout attempt from San Quentin resulted in the murder of three guards and two other inmates. To paraphrase Washington Star Columnist Smith Hempstone, you might as well weep for Jack the Ripper as for George Jackson.

But the stage has been set for transforming hoodlum into hero. The murder of the Soledad prison guard had elevated Jackson and the two other implicated to the role of celebrities. The so-called Soledad brothers were touted as victims of racist oppression and became a focal point for agitation against the entire correctional system. The "Soledad Brothers Defense Committee" was formed as an organizational nucleus for operations. Its chairman, Lenin Prize winner, Carlton B. Goodlett, is a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, which was cited as "subversive and Communist" by former Attorney General Tom Clark, is a member of the presidium of the World Peace Council, and was a member of the coordinating committee of the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice—PCPJ. See my newsletter 71–23. Treasurer of the Soledad Brothers Defense Committee is Lenin Prize winner, Linus Pauling. Members include named Communist Party members Jessica Mitford, Pete Seeger, and Craig Vincent, along with such radicals as Tom Hayden, William Kunstler, and Mario Savio. John Thorne, a long-time member of the National Lawyers Guild, cited as a Communist front and the "foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party," acted as a counsel for Jackson and his cohorts.

In August 1970 an attempt by Jonathan Jackson, George's brother, to take a convict charged with knifing a prison guard from a San Rafael courtroom by force resulted in a blood bath. During the escape attempt, Jackson blew off Judge Harold Haley's head, the district attorney and one juror were seriously wounded, and Jackson and two other convicts were killed. CPUSA member Angela Davis was charged with complicity in this act—see my newsletter 70–9.

The National Lawyers Guild swung into high gear. A "People's Law School" was established in the San Francisco Bay area to instruct radical young lawyers. In March of this year the Prison

Lawyers Association was set up in the Berkeley offices of National Lawyers Guild attorney Fay Stender to further increase tensions and harass the authorities. The propaganda campaign to free the "Soledad Brothers" and Angela Davis took on international dimensions with demonstrations staged in their behalf in the Soviet Union, Cuba, and elsewhere.

Then last month Stephen Bingham, a lawyer associated with Fay Stender's law firm, walked into San Quentin and is charged with having given a gun to George Jackson. In the ensuing escape attempt three guards and two inmates were murdered by having their throats slit, and Jackson, who some feel was set up by the good comrades, was killed.

The climate created by this kind of agitation was almost certainly responsible for the recent riot and murders at Attica State Prison in New York. The PCPJ has included agitation at Danbury Prison in Connecticut in its fall offensive this year. We must understand that these people are not fighting for freedom but working to destroy those essential mechanisms of civilization which protect the decent and law-abiding citizen from the ravages of criminals and violent revolutionaries.

NATION'S FIRE CHIEFS HONOR CAMBRIDGE BOY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, our youth today is constantly being criticized from many quarters of American society. The news media seems to concentrate on incidents involving youth which concern demonstrations, violence, or drugs. Too often the public loses sight of the fact that it is the Nation's youth which soon grows up to assume the reins of leadership and responsibility. I have placed this story about a Cambridge boy in the RECORD so that all can be made aware that there are outstanding young individuals in this Nation who will give an excellent accounting of themselves when the time comes for them to take their rightful place in American society.

SAVED 6 IN FAMILY—NATION'S FIRE CHIEFS HONOR CAMBRIDGE BOY

ST. LOUIS.—The nation's fire chiefs honored a Cambridge teen-ager yesterday for saving his mother and five brothers and sisters from a fire that swept the family home in April.

Teddy Dizon, 13, was awarded the 1971 Junior Fire Marshal Gold Medal at the opening session of the International Ass'n of Fire Chiefs convention.

Dizon also received a citation from the U.S. Federal Fire Council and a paid-up $5000 life insurance policy from the sponsor of the junior fire marshal program, The Hartford Insurance Group.

Young Dizon, awakened by shouts of "fire!" at 5 a.m. on April 5, led his mother and four of his brothers and sisters down two flights of stairs to safety.

Realizing an 8-year-old brother was missing, Ted reentered the burning house and found the boy still asleep. He was unable to rouse his brother sufficiently to walk out of the house, so he carried the child outside.

A Junior Fire Marshal program spokesman said Dizon followed safety rules he learned through participation in the program at his school. These included holding a damp cloth over his nose and mouth to prevent smoke inhalation and opening his bedroom window from both top and bottom.

VICTIMS OF FLOODS NEED CONGRESSIONAL HELP

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to make it possible for people in flood-ravaged areas which have been declared disaster areas to receive the Federal aid to help in their rebuilding job.

The action is necessary because of a provision in the Federal flood insurance program which at this stage serves to penalize innocent victims of flooding conditions.

In my own congressional district, Elizabeth, Linden, and Rahway, as well as other Union County cities were hard hit by floods in late August and then by heavy rains which followed in early September.

The State was declared a disaster area, opening the way for assistance to residents who sustained damages from the rampaging waters.

But then a stumbling block appeared, Mr. Speaker, in the section of the flood insurance program. This language provides that in areas where the program is available and 1 year has elapsed, people who failed to buy the insurance for whatever reason are denied financial Federal disaster relief to the extent they could have purchased the insurance.

Only a relatively few flood insurance policies were issued in Elizabeth and similar situations have arisen in other areas of the country. I feel this happened, Mr. Speaker, in large measure because of a lack of sufficient notice by the Federal Government.

The legislation I am introducing, Mr. Speaker, would extend the signup period for one additional year and make the Small Business Administration loans available under provisions of the flood insurance program.

This is the only fair thing to do for the people who have been so hard hit in Elizabeth and other cities where damage is widespread because of recent hurricanes and tropical storms.

Even as these words are being spoken, Mr. Speaker, another devastating hurricane named Ginger is slamming into the State of North Carolina. It has been tagged as one of the largest and most durable hurricanes on record.

I pray that this storm's wrath quickly turns back toward the open sea and that injuries and damage are held to an absolute minimum. But, Mr. Speaker, people in this area may find themselves in a situation comparable to the one facing my own constituents and those from Texas. We need to provide assistance and we need to do it now. It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced this legislation to clear away obstacles imposed by the existing provisions relating to a duplication of benefits.

In Elizabeth, N.J., alone, Mr. Speaker, more than 20 square blocks were affected by the flooding. There was damage inflicted upon some 10,000 dwelling units in this city of about 112,000 people.

Mayor Thomas G. Dunn of Elizabeth has sheduled a public meeting for Friday night so residents of the area can get the answers to questions about the flood and its aftermath there.

I also have been working, Mr. Speaker, with Mayor John T. Gregorio of Linden and Mayor Daniel Martin of Rahway on flood problems in their communities with a view to providing control measures to stem the flood tide at its source.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that Congress will take prompt action on my proposal. It is just. It is necessary.

NAVY DEPARTMENT NOT ACTING IN BEST INTEREST OF SMALL BUSINESS IN AMERICA

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on August 5, 1971, I made a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives calling upon the Department of the Navy to have its supplies made by an American company and American workers.

This week I presented a statement to the House Small Business Committee, Subcommittee on Government Procurement, in which I again called upon the Navy to reconsider its decision and award a defense contract to an American firm rather than a foreign firm.

In view of the high unemployment and business recession which plagues our Nation, it is incumbent on the Department of Defense to consider the needs of the American people for jobs when it awards a contract.

The Department of Defense should not buy supplies from foreign firms unless the supplies cannot be obtained at a reasonable cost here at home. If the Defense Department cannot or will not take such action, then Congress must.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement before the Small Business Committee in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues in the House and Senate:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE CHARLES J. CARNEY

I regret that I must bring before the Committee today a case which indicates that the Department of the Navy has not been acting in the best interest of small business in America.

I am referring to a case in which the Navy Department by-passed four American companies and awarded a defense contract to a Canadian company. The contract was for torpedo tubes which the Youngstown Welding and Engineering Company, in my home district, has been making since 1958. The Youngstown Welding and Engineering Company has an excellent record of service to the Department of Defense. In addition, the

Youngstown company was led to believe that it would be awarded the contract again. Instead, the contract went to Canadian Vickers Ltd. of Toronto, Canada. The loss of this contract may mean the closing of still another American business and force proud American men onto the welfare rolls.

Each year Defense Department officials ask American taxpayers for more and more of their hard-earned money. But, these same officials are unwilling to cooperate with American companies and American workers in the granting of Defense contracts.

The justification given by the Navy for bypassing the Youngstown company was that the Canadian company offered the lowest bid. However, there was only a 1% difference in extended bids. The contract is presently being held up by the GAO pending an appeal by Youngstown Welding and Engineering, and I am hopeful that the 10% import surcharge imposed by President Nixon will force the Navy to reconsider this vile act.

As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, the existing laws are lax enough to permit this blatant sellout to a foreign firm. Navy officials have been quick to point out that the contract was in full accord with the Buy-American Act and other statutes. For this reason, I urge this subcommittee to investigate the possibility of amending the law to prohibit consideration of bids from foreign firms for the manufacture of American defense supplies unless the supplies are unavailable in the United States.

The American people have built the Navy with their tax dollars and it is their sons who serve in it. When the Department of Defense awards a contract to a foreign-based firm, then Congress should act to correct this situation. The American people are fed up with policies that favor foreign companies and foreign workers over American companies and American workers. It's time we started putting the interests of American workers and American industry first.

TRUONG DINH DZU

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ANDERSON) introduced House Resolution 627, expressing the sense of the House that Truong Dinh Dzu, the runner-up in the 1967 South Vietman presidential election, be immediately released from prison. I wish to lend my wholehearted support to this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Dzu was jailed by President Nguyen Van Thieu very shortly after the 1967 presidential election because he had had the temerity to suggest during the campaign that a coalition government might be necessary to achieve peace in Vietnam. Today, nearly 4 years later, on the eve of this year's presidential election, he still languishes in prison despite failing health.

This travesty of justice and democracy forcefully underscores the corrupt and dictatorial nature of the regime in Saigon, which the United States continues to insist upon supporting.

Surely the release of Mr. Dzu from prison after these long months and years would be a safe enough act of charity for President Thieu, who has so skillfully bulldozed his way to certain victory on October 3.

For this House, and this country, to countenance such blatant repression belies our stated commitment to principles of justice and humanity and can only make the rest of the world wonder about our sincerity.

DOW CRITICIZES DRUG CONTROL EFFORTS

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the outlook for stopping the international traffic in heroin is pretty dismal.

I joined a number of other Congressmen at a Capitol meeting today with U.S. officials working on the drug problem who included David Popper, U.S. Ambassador to Cyprus; Ed Masters of the East Asian Bureau for Narcotics at the State Department; and George Belk of the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics.

There are several basic handicaps. The poppies which produce opium and heroin grow in a belt running from Southeast Europe all the way across Central Asia.

Thus a reduction in the growing of poppies in Turkey, where the main supply originates, will not necessarily end worldwide production. In fact, U.S. officials expect that Burma, Thailand, and Laos will be growing more poppies than before. This is another reason for us to pull our boys out of that disgraceful situation in Southeast Asia.

A second major problem is the fact that none of the many nations involved will easily accept any control that limits their national sovereignty. The power of the United States to override them within their own borders is very limited.

This is especially true of France where much of the opium is refined into heroin. France does not depend any longer on the United States for financial or military help.

There will be a United Nations convention in March 1972 to deal with narcotic drugs. The United States will propose a number of amendments to the very feeble control exercised by the existing international system.

Some of these amendments relate only to information gathering. The strong amendments that may tread on their sovereignty will be opposed by the prideful little countries involved.

At the moment the most active drug traffic arises in Turkey and moves in sealed containers across many international borders of Europe, ending finally in the Marseilles area of France. The State Department officials were a little vague on why the Turkish authorities continue to seal these containers and send them scot-free out of the country.

It is true that Turkey has agreed to end opium production after planting the year end crop for 1971 and the spring crop for 1972. Many of the Congressmen were critical because this supply will still be flowing perhaps years after the 1972 crop is harvested.

Congressmen at the meeting also asserted that the optimistic picture which the U.S. agencies painted of cooperation by French officials toward closing down the French refineries was not justified. Some Congressmen while in France observed that French authorities are helping very little.

Although they are critical and frustrated about the very slight progress which is really being made to slow down international traffic, the Congressmen frankly admitted that control of drugs in many of their home districts is not succeeding. It will take a great deal more outcry from the public and from our legislators to make the institutions of Government work hard and more effectively on this grave ailment in our society.

Just think, despite all the clamor and all the pressure, the U.N. budget for staffing the International Narcotics Control Board is only $100,000. This is utterly ludicrous when you consider that one person could probably smuggle heroin of that value into the United States any Wednesday afternoon.

I will say again that the great institutions of our society, including the Congress, the Defense Department, the State Department, our court systems, our prison systems, and a great many others are not responsive to the needs of individual human beings. These institutions deserve a good shakeup.

PRAYERS IN PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND SCHOOLS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment to the Constitution declares that—

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Soon the House of Representatives will be called upon to approve a postscript to the first amendment in the form of a new constitutional amendment which would permit nondenominational prayers in public buildings, including schools.

Those who support this amendment are dedicated citizens. They believe, as I do, that the practice of religion should be encouraged. I also believe that the proponents of this amendment would be among the first to defend each person's right to worship as he pleases.

The proposed constitutional amendment would permit voluntary participation in nondenominational prayers in public buildings, including public schools. Its intent is to skirt the first amendment so as to authorize prayer in the classrooms of our public schools.

Someone would have to select or write the prayer. It might be the State legislature, or the school board, or the individual teacher.

But whomever makes this selection, no matter how dedicated to its "nondenominational" content, there is the clear prospect that the legislature, or the school board or the teacher will write or choose a prayer reflecting the majority will of the community and in the process impinge upon the beliefs of the minority albeit that they may choose not to participate if they so desire. Quite frankly, I do not believe it possible to write a "nondenominational" prayer that will satisfy Baptists, Methodists, Jews, Mormons, Lutherans, and Catholics, much less the many other religions practiced by our citizens.

In some communities, I am sure, the prayer will reflect the inclinations of a Protestant majority; in others the prayer might well tend to conform with the Catholic faith; in some western communities the prayer could be expected to be associated with the scriptures as discovered by the founder of the Mormon religion, Joseph Smith.

What about the rights of the minority—whether it be Protestant, Catholic, Jewish or any other religion—in these cases?

This danger is recognized by representatives of a number of leaders of major religions, who recently issued a statement expressing opposition to the proposed amendment.

In it the church leaders declare:

The major faiths themselves have never been able to achieve consensus on a definition of prayer, much less a definition of "nondenominational" prayer. We deny that any elected body or governmental authority has the right to determine either the place or the content of prayer, as implied in the proposed constitutional prayer amendment. To authorize government by a constitutional amendment to intervene in the sacred privilege of prayer, long enshrined in the character and tradition of our nation, is to make of government a judge of theology and an administrator of religious practice. If such a proposed amendment should become a part of the Constitution of the United States, a new religion of "nondenominationalism" would in a measure become established which could destroy the integrity of both church and state.

The statement contains a warning which should not be taken lightly:

The proposed constitutional amendment would introduce devisiveness into our national life and among the institutions of religion. Ostensibly proposed in behalf of religion, it would paradoxically proscribe and distort freedom of religious expression.

If the proposed prayer amendment should become a part of the Constitution, the Bill of Rights would have been amended for the first time in our nation's history. Such an amendment would open the doors for governmental instrusion into the religious affairs of the people. This we protest.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, while its implications are complex, is now widely known simply as the "prayer amendment." Inevitably, many will interpret our votes as being for prayer or against it, or proreligious or antireligious. In this statement I have tried to illustrate that the issues go deeper than this simple label implies.

I would like to see more religious training and greater religious faith among all mankind. But I do not believe that the way to do this is through government sanctioned prayers. I believe that when the people consider the very serious implications of this amendment, they will agree that Government best stay out of religion leaving the development of religious faith to parents and to the churches.

Mr. Speaker, my children receive regular religious instruction. I insist upon it. They receive their training at the church of their parents' choice, with their mother and I offering appropriate guidance.

I do not want a school board, Mr. Speaker, or an individual teacher, telling my children how they ought to pray.

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, since the colonial period, the Port of Philadelphia has been one of America's great shipping centers. It is our largest fresh water port and it ranks first in the total tonnage handled annually.

But, a port must be continuously growing and improving if it is to serve the needs of modern day shipping. For this reason, Philadelphia has embarked on a $120 million port development program to make sure the most up-to-date facilities are available on the city's waterfront.

A recent message from Philadelphia's Office of the City Representative outlines one of the steps being taken to modernize the port.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I ask that it be included in the RECORD:

PORT OF PHILADELPHIA

As a result of increased general cargo business and in anticipation of future needs for handling containerized cargo at the Port of Philadelphia, the City will purchase two more general-purpose gantry cranes, City Representative and Director of Commerce S. Harry Galfand announced today.

One of the cranes will be installed at the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal and the other will be installed at the new Tioga Marine Terminal, making them the second such cranes for handling cargo at these two terminals.

Specifications are being prepared for the new cranes which are expected to be similar to the Kocks cranes presently in operation at the two terminals. The estimated cost is between $1.3 million and $1.4 million each.

While the Kocks cranes are used for all types of general cargo, Galfand said, they are especially suited for containerized cargo. In raised position, the cranes' boom extends about 200 ft. in the air, the equivalent of a 20-story building. They have a forward reach of 113 ft., beyond the outshore rail for loading and unloading ships, and a back reach of 94 ft., from the inshore rail for stacking shoreside cargo.

The cranes each weigh 700 tons, are 93 ft. long, travel on 32 wheels, and have a lifting capacity of 45 tons.

The new cranes will be leased by the City to the Philadelphia Port Corporation which will sub-lease them to a commercial operator. They should be in operation in about 18 months from now since it takes about that time for the awarding of the contract and setting up large cranes of this type.

Galfand said the purchase of the two new cranes are part of the City's program to strengthen the Port's competitive position among other East Coast seaports for general cargo business including containers.

"Because of the new facilities at both Tioga and Packer Avenue terminals, we now have three regularly-scheduled containerized services from Philadelphia and serious negotiations are going on with other container operations," Galfand said.

"While the prospects are encouraging, this is a period of intense competition among Port cities. It is therefore vital to the economy of this entire region that the Port construction and development be continued. The new business which these new facilities will attract will favorably affect labor and many Port-related industries."

The Tioga Marine Terminal, the newly-completed all purpose terminal, is considered one of the finest in the world capable of handling all kinds of general cargo, and serving seven ships at one time.

The Packer Avenue complex is essentially a twin of Tioga in that it provides the same complete flexibility. In addition to the Kocks container crane, the Packer Avenue Terminal has a mobile LeTourneau all-purpose crane which works in combination with the Kocks crane.

Both terminals are part of the City's $120 million Port development program, made possible by voter approval of City bonds in previous elections. Additional Port related improvements will be authorized by voter approval of bonds at the November 2 election.

TORTURE OF GREEK PRISONERS AGAIN REVEALED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS Of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a letter written by my good friend, Maurice Goldbloom, which appeared in the New York Times on the 21st of this month. Mr. Goldbloom, the editor of News of Greece, is a frequent witness for House and Senate committees investigating the current deplorable political situation in Greece. His letter tells not only of the torture of prisoners by the present Greek regime, but also exposes that Government's unsuccessful attempts to hide this aspect of their oppression:

TORTURE OF PRISONERS IN GREECE

Thrasyvoulos Kamarineas, Director of the Greek Consulate General's Press Service, in his recent letter seeks to discredit without really denying my statement that the cruiser Elli, under his command, was a place of torture for political prisoners. He does this by asserting that the Elli "was dismantled ten years ago and auctioned for scrap last year."

It is true but irrelevant that the Elli was decommissioned—not "dismantled"—when it served as a place of confinement and torture for political prisoners in 1968. Gerassimos Notaras told the Athens Court Martial:

"I was taken to the naval ship Elli, which was out of commission, where Lieutenant

Commander Kamarineas, R. N., and Major Theophiloyannakis of the Security Police were waiting for me. I remained under interrogation on this ship from the above date [Feb. 10, 1968] until March 8, 1968. . . . I repeatedly suffered the Falanga torture . . . they put me to the torture of electric shock . . . they continually threatened that I should be drowned, as if by accident, if I did not confess. . . . I was never allowed to wash or smoke or read and only two glasses of water a day were allocated to me. . . ."

Further details may be found in the European Human Rights Commission's report on the Notaras case in Vol. II, Part 1 of "The Greek Case," published by the Council of Europe, on pages 266–289. The junta did not let the commission interview Notaras, but submitted the transcript of an official investigation of his charges by Lieut.-Col. Nostrakis—which, of course, produced a whitewash.

At one point (p. 276) Nostrakis asserted that when Police Inspectors Mallios and Babalis arrived on the Elli, "Lieut. Kamarineas gave them your extensive, revealing notes, and they proceeded to make additional arrests based on the information contained therein."

Notaras replied: "When I met Police Inspectors Mallios and Babalis on the Elli, I had not yet written the notes in question. On the contrary, it was Police Officer Mallios, who, together with Lieut. Kamarineas and Major Theophiloyannakis, put to me the questions I was to answer."

He had already (p. 275) told Nostrakis: "Those notes were the result of a whole week of torture, and most of the information in them was known to my interrogators. They knew these things and they made me include them in my allegedly spontaneous confession."

Mr. Kamarineas's own account of his role in the questioning of Notaras is on p. 286, followed by the commission's analysis of unexplained discrepancies between it and the testimony of other official witnesses, and its reasons for believing Notaras.

The commission did not examine the Paleologos case in detail—he could not be brought back to life to testify—but the facts are summarized on p. 35 of Volume II, Part 2 of the report.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION—REPORT NO. 8

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, for the last 2 days I have been including in the RECORD parts of a report prepared by my daughter Jackie, following her visit to Northern Ireland recently.

Today in the last segment she describes the effect a constant state of war and a fear of death has on the individuals involved. These oppressed people need help. An outcry of indignation at the affront to basic human rights by the government of this country would be a start. Moreover, the United States should insist that the United Nations intervene to restore peace. How much longer must these people suffer?

The report follows:

REPORT OF JACKIE BIAGGI—PART III

There is one point, however, that I think has been lost in all news accounts of the Northern Ireland crisis—the human element, the frustration and fear of these people and as it happened the human element played a very important role in our stay in Belfast. Take for example, the case of a seventeen year old boy, Gerard B. On August 9, 1971 the army entered his neighborhood and began dragging people out into the streets. The people state Gerard was virtually unarmed and began breaking windows, stealing buses to block the army. It was during this melee that Gerard, unarmed, though taking part in the attempt to protect himself and neighbors, was shot. I saw the bullet wounds. It is something I never hope to see again. However, the real irony in the situation is that should he go to the hospital there is danger of his being arrested. Consequently, he is receiving inadequate medical attention. But Gerard considers himself lucky—at least he is alive to tell about it. Later two other men, who had been detained were brought in for interviews with similar stories. Thomas L. fifty-three years of age, was at home with his wife when at approximately 4:30 a.m. British soldiers barged into his home, knocking his wife to the floor and dragging him out of the house. After running him about ¾ mile, he was thrown into a truck with several other men and covered with a blanket. Neither at this time nor at any later time was he told where he was being taken and why. All belongings were removed from him. When orders were not obeyed immediately, his legs were hit with a bat and a soldier stepped on Mr. L's bare feet with hob nailed boots. After a Polaroid picture was taken he and the others were made to sit in a room where periodically six men were taken out, later returning after screams and shouts of pain had been heard in the next room. When it was Mr. L's turn to be interrogated, he was threatened with the possibility of a one to two year sentence without any reason being given. At this point several hours had passed but he, like the others were afraid of falling asleep because the butt of a soldier's gun kept them awake. During the entire time requests for medical attention (because of injured feet) went unheeded. Prior to his release he was told "you came into the world at the end of a war and you're going out at the beginning of one." A group picture was taken and the men were warned that if they were ever seen in a riot area, they would be arrested. Consequently, they would have to live the rest of their lives under constant threat. From what I gathered, it seems mass arrests do occur so that more often than not, innocent people are brought up on charges, detained or unheard of for long periods. For example, in a recent report of three hundred "suspected IRA members" being arrested, it seems from everyone I spoke to that a good deal of those people were innocent. There appears to be another interesting practice—i.e. substitution of one person for another when the wanted person is not present at the stated address. For example, one man interviewed was the father of a suspected IRA member. When the soldiers came, the boy was not at home so the father was arrested.

Of course these are not all the occurrences of our three day stay—just some highlights. The fear, the tension that stalks the city of Belfast is *incredible!* We were lucky we could escape it but for those who must stay for whatever reason, there is no escape and that is a pretty sad thing to live with when your city is dying.

JOB DEVELOPMENT TAX CREDIT ACT

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, the President and Congress are moving with boldness, vigor, and imagination in this year of domestic and international economic crisis to control the inroads of inflation and stimulate the economy so as to create new jobs in an environment of greater productivity.

We on the House Ways and Means Committee, for our part, have been attempting to deal soundly with the tax aspects of President Nixon's new economic program, and under the leadership of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES), I am sure the committee is succeeding in that very important undertaking.

As Members of the House know, the Ways and Means Committee has reported, in somewhat modified form, the proposed Job Development Tax Credit Act or investment tax credit bill, as some prefer to call it.

We have approved, and the administration has accepted, a 7-percent tax credit, retroactive to April 1, 1971, on capital investment by American business and industry.

Unfortunately, this important stimulus for the risk of capital in new plant and equipment will have its least beneficial effect in the very sector of industry that today most sorely needs a boost.

I am referring, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the research and development-oriented, high technology industry of the United States, which has borne the brunt of budgetary cutbacks during this transition period from war to peace, with resulting shifts in program emphasis.

This American industry, too, has borne the brunt of a major technology lag in comparison with its competition in advanced countries in Europe and the Far East, which are driving us out of world markets the United States has been accustomed to dominate since World War II. This is one big reason for our current world trade deficits.

R. & D.-oriented, high-technology industry is not normally capital intensive, in terms of plant and equipment. Its biggest investment is in the brains of its scientists and engineers, and the knowledge they accumulate through costly research and experiment.

Congress must give this crucial segment of American industry the same incentives to invest in progress, to create new products and new jobs, that it intends to give to capital-intensive industries like autos, steel, and the like. In this effort, Congress would be both doing equity to a highly important sector of the U.S. economy and better achieving the principal purpose of the job development tax credit—the prompt creation of new jobs for thousands of unemployed.

The President, in his recent address to Congress on the new economic program, assured us that the problem of promoting American technology and science has his serious attention. He promised recommendations for R. & D. incentives early next year. High administration officials, including Commerce Secretary Maurice Stans and Treasury Assistant Secretary Murray Weidenbaum, have expressed similar concern and have given similar assurance in recent congressional hearings.

But to delay until next year may bring relief too late. We are confronted today

with a crisis in scientific and technological unemployment, a lag in productivity and new product development.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 10793, to provide that investment credit tax benefits would be available for qualified research and experimental expenditures.

My amendment would extend the investment tax credit provisions, approved by the Ways and Means Committee for plant and equipment spending, to R. & D. investment as that term is now defined in the Internal Revenue Code.

No exact figures are yet available to me as to the cost in tax revenues. The growth in research spending in the private sector slowed in the 1960's. Last year it totaled just over $10 billion. Only a 6-percent increase is projected for this year.

A 7-percent R. & D. credit could thus total, across the board, perhaps $1 billion a year. This would put the stimulus where industry needs it most, and give important new meaning to the President's job development program.

Such a program, Mr. Speaker, would have its own multiplier effect. It would first generate new jobs for thousands now unemployed in science and technology; it would then generate new products as research and development resumed its interrupted growth; and finally the manufacture and marketing of the resulting new products would generate still more jobs.

I can think of no more effective tax stimulus for our troubled economy. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am urging the early and favorable consideration of H.R. 10793 by the administration and by the Congress.

GOOD OLD-FASHIONED SOAP MAY HELP RESOLVE POLLUTION

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, modern science has brought forth many wondrous things. Man has walked on the moon. He invents things which were not even dreamed of a decade or so ago. He turns his technology into many labor- and time-saving devices.

But with all this advancement, he still falls prey to a false adage: "If it's new it must be good."

The detergent industry was quick to jump into the cleansing business. The answer, we were told, was increased use of phosphates, Then it was discovered that phosphates generate pollution in our water supplies. The next answer brought about the use of the so-called phosphate substitutes. Within the past few weeks these substitutes, according to the U.S. Surgeon General, are worse than the phosphates.

Federal officials then urged a switch from the substitutes back to phosphates as the lesser of two evils. I regret a simpler approach was not taken. That is the good old-fashion soap like my mother and hundreds of thousands of Americans with her used for cleaning the weekly laundry, the dishes and for other household chores.

Mr. Speaker, the Evening News, a daily newspaper in Newburgh, N.Y., which I represent, carried an editorial on September 28, 1971, pointing out the confusion the Federal Government has generated over the use of phosphates and detergents. I would like to share that editorial with my colleagues and a weekly report I recently distributed to my district.

The articles follow:

AS WE SEE IT—DETERGENT CONFUSION

Federal officials may have made a serious mistake in recommending that housewives return to using phosphate detergents despite their role as a cause of water pollution.

U.S. health and environmental officials said that phosphate substitutes in non-polluting detergents are too great a personal hazard.

They cited NTA and caustic soda, both of which can be harmful to human health. NTA, however, is no longer used in detergents because it also is ecologically harmful.

The statement— by William D. Ruckelshaus, administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency; Dr. Jesse L. Steinfeld, surgeon general; Russell E. Train, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, and Dr. Charles C. Edwards, head of the Food and Drug Administration—said caustic soda "is a cause for serious concern" because it could damage eyes, nose and throat.

Phosphate detergents "are the safest thing in terms of human health," Dr. Steinfeld added.

Unfortunately the new U.S. policy overlooked other safe alternatives to caustic detergents and failed to recognize that some phosphate detergents are also dangerously caustic. Other household cleaning products such as liquid bleach and ammonia, in fact, are far more dangerous.

In its most recent report on the subject last May one science group warned:

"No detergent of any kind is safe in eyes or nose or mouth. Some phosphate-free detergents are not substantially more alkaline than those which contain phosphates. Therefore, they are no more likely to cause skin troubles."

The new federal policy also fails to recognize non-detergent, non-caustic and non-phosphate alternative laundry products such as old-fashioned soap flakes and soap powders.

Unless the government can show that the new policy was not based solely on convenience considerations or that it was simply the result of manufacturers' pressures, it has performed a disservice to the cause of clean water.

In the light of evidence now available, we urge manufacturers to continue to offer non-phosphate detergents adequately labeled with clear warning about the danger of exposure to eyes, nose, mouth, throat and skin.

And those who choose not to turn to safe soaps should continue to use non-phosphate detergents with the same caution with which they would use any dangerous drugs, poisons and hazardous household cleaning products.

GOOD OLD FASHIONED SOAP MAY HELP RESOLVE POLLUTION

(By Congressman JOHN G. DOW)

In the fight against pollution we are becoming increasingly aware that keeping the environment clean is everybody's business, and not just the job of government or industry.

Everyone has a role to play in choosing the products we buy, the manner in which we maintain our automobiles, the type of chemicals we use on our lawns and gardens, whether we litter, and in many other areas.

Like many other products of modern technology, our powerful laundry cleaners have turned out to be a mixed blessing. Accordingly, one of the greatest areas for an individual contribution to the quality of our environment lies with the simple choice we make about laundry products.

Modern detergents have chemicals for brightening and whitening clothes, protecting washing machines against corrosion, stabilizing suds in top-loading machines and for suppressing suds in tumbler machines.

Unfortunately, the phosphates in these detergents which get our clothes so clean are the same chemicals which have a lot to do with making our lakes and rivers so dirty.

These chemicals can cause what the scientists call "eutrophication"—a process in which water becomes increasingly choked with algae and other aquatic vegetation upsetting the normal balance of life. While eutrophication can occur naturally, as when a lake "ages," scientists have now shown that a substantial part of the increasing nutrient load in our lakes and rivers can be traced directly to the phosphorous-based detergents used extensively at home and industry.

As a result, many states and communities have moved to ban the sale of phosphate detergents.

A great deal of effort has been made in recent years to find phosphate substitutes which are safe and effective for household and industrial uses but do not pollute. What is needed is a greater degree of coordinated national action.

I was quite surprised to learn that the Surgeon General of the United States, in cooperation with the Food and Drug Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency is now urging housewives to return to the use of phosphate-based detergents as the lesser of two evils. This decision is based on the very commendable motive of protecting the public from the dangers of the various substitute cleaners that have been developed.

This decision, however, is very confusing to the housewife who at first was told that phosphates were bad, but now has been told that she should go ahead and use them anyway. Such on-again-off-again advice must cause some people to wonder if our government knows what it is doing.

Such a lack of government planning and foresight is almost tragic. The government has overlooked a third possibility of encouraging the housewife to use soap powder for her laundry, instead of either phosphates or the new harmful synthetic substitutes.

Soap powder is "bio-degradable." It is easily absorbed into the environment and reduced to harmless component parts. Moreover, soap powder does not contain either the phosphates which pollute our waterways or the harmful substitutes which endanger mothers and children.

My mother always used to rely on borax soap and tar soap as well as good old fashion regular soap.

By using soap powder, our clothes may not always be blindly bright, but combined with other efforts, its use can make our waterways sparkling clean.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 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?

U.S. TECHNOLOGY IS THREATENED

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article, written by Mr. Charles A. Anderson, president of the Stanford Research Institute in Menlo Park, Calif., which appeared in the August 22 edition of the New York Times.

In my opinion, Mr. Anderson has made some very important points concerning the need to maintain a balanced and adequate level of basic R. & D. expenditures, and I believe his comments merit perusal by readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1971]

U.S. TECHNOLOGY IS THREATENED—CURBING R. & D. CRIPPLES PROGRESS

(By Charles A. Anderson)

The United States must soon face the fact that it is living on its research and development capital and the account is beginning to run low. If we fail to acknowledge this, our technological affluence will be lost.

The assault on America's leadership in science and technology is both external and internal. Externally, Western Europe, Japan and the Soviet Union are making rapid strides in areas that have traditionally been controlled by the United States. In radio astronomy, high energy physics and conventional energy research we have already been surpassed. Internally, a new national distaste for science and technology is undermining the national research and development effort.

The external challenge is beyond our control. But we must correct negative attitudes toward science and technology at home.

To be sure, technology assessment is necessary if individual freedom and the quality of life are to be maintained. Our concern, however, should be with the end-product of technology and its use, not with the research and development process itself. To attack the value of this process is to discard our best tool in achieving whatever goals we might formulate for the nation.

Our technological society is the product of past research and development efforts. We have inherited both the benefits and problems of technology, and one's point of view determines which of those two elements is dominant. One thing does seem clear, however. The solution to our present environmental, population, urban housing and other problems lies primarily with more technology, not less. A romantic retreat to cottage industries in a pastoral setting is both undesirable and impossible with a population of over 200 million people.

Our supply of natural resources is shrinking while our demands for such materials are growing. Only research and development can produce the advances in recycling, transportation systems, oceanographic research and nuclear fusion for clean electricity that must be made in the remaining years of this century.

At the same time, we are moving steadily toward a service-dominated economy. By 1980 nine of every 10 new jobs will be in the service area. Service functions have traditionally been resistant to productivity increases. We are still early in the learning process of applying technology to the service industries in order to yield productivity growth. We must succeed in this task if we hope to have the healthy economy necessary to pay for social programs.

The source from which advances will be drawn is not a cornucopia but a pipeline in time. Research and development funds and manpower must be added at this end if new technology is to be produced at the other end 10 years hence. By constricting the flow of funds and manpower into the pipeline now, we are crippling future progress.

A major source of our current problems in R. & D. undoubtedly lies in the financial and spiritual disruptions caused by Vietnam. In addition to aggravating the general inflationary picture and dislocating both the civilian and military R. & D. effort, it has among many people stamped science and technology as a war machine that produces such things as defoliants and napalm. This view is perhaps predominant among the young, which further imperils the future of technology.

In a military sense, the war has been most kind to the Soviet Union. While we have been forced to divert substantial portions of our defense budget from research and development into tactical hardware, the U.S.S.R. has been free to move forward in the development of the next generation of missiles, aircraft and naval vessels. The Soviet military R. & D. input is growing by 10 to 13 percent annually. If present trends continue, the U.S.S.R. could assume technological superiority over the United States within a few years. Congress is now facing this situation. The cost of military R. & D. and procurement deferred by the war will probably negate and exceed any "peace dividend" generated by the end of our major commitment in Southeast Asia.

The effect of insufficient government funding for high-technology programs, research and development has been predictable program cancellations, professional unemployment, disbanding of research teams.

While trained scientists and engineers are being forced out of their fields, young professionals are entering at a diminished rate due to the uncertain occupational future and declining reputation of the scientific professions. In aerospace, the hardest hit area, the scientific and engineering labor force is down from 223,000 in 1968 to 154,000 today.

The Stanford Research Institute, a nonprofit contract research organization, has moved against the tide and its 1970 revenues of $65 million marked a record high.

Another significant problem is funding continuity. Important programs have been cut back or canceled in midpoint. As a result, budget-wise scientists are now lowering their sights and submitting proposals for shorter-term projects that have a better chance of maintaining funding to completion. Thus, scientists are becoming responsive to finances rather than need, and many worthwhile projects are being shelved in the process.

We've long since passed the time when the individual scientist, working with little equipment, could produce the significant discovery. Research today requires the assembly of men and equipment and the development of programs pointed toward long-term goals. Funding continuity becomes a vitally important element in such an environment.

Basic research is particularly vulnerable in the budget-pruning process. Increasingly, it is considered "irrelevant" and a low-priority item by critics and legislators more concerned with the immediate solution of social problems through infusion of Federal funds.

We cannot go on attempting to judge basic research in physics or biology on the same scale with social programs and determine that one is more relevant than the other. It is not "either-or." All have value, but they must be considered independently. Basic research must be justified first as part of the continuing search for knowledge. At the same time there is a need for balance between basic and applied scientific work. They are interdependent since knowledge without application is useless and application without knowledge is impossible.

Inevitably, the Federal Government must continue to play the biggest role in supporting basic research in the United States. There are definite limits to the amount of R. & D. risk that can be assumed by the private sector. Only the Federal Government, for example, can afford the immense investment necessary to sponsor research in space travel or astronomy. Government-sponsored research has, over the years, produced the discoveries that have triggered the development of computers, lasers, atomic power and many others. We all benefit from such advances.

Despite our position as the world's leader in science and technology, we are still unsure of their place in our society. How shall they be programmed? How shall they be financed? Who shall judge the priorities for research funding allocations?

These questions need to be answered so that a rational science policy can be developed that will avoid the erratic expansions and contractions of recent Federal research and development budgets and the manpower dislocations that accompany them. Like it or not, this country's future is tied to science and technology, and it is time to give that fact its just due.

URBAN LAW INSTITUTE

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Monday, a statement critical of the Urban Law Institute of Antioch College, an OEO-funded research and demonstration program. This program, which has received the highest marks in several consecutive years of OEO evaluations, as well as a clean bill of health from the GAO in recent months, is if anything an example of the excellent work which OEO is doing in the area of assisting the poor people of America. The statement seems to take the position that the OEO amendments coming up this week should be opposed because of the agency's funding of the Urban Law Institute. I would submit just the contrary. The Antioch College grant, which goes only for the planning of a new public interest law school, is a model of the kind of reform in legal education which the poor people of this country must have if legal redress is to mean anything to them. The need is not only to increase the number of lawyers who will serve the poor, but also to create new institutions to develop the field of poverty law and to build acceptance for this field within the legal profession generally. I think the OEO grant is doing just that, and I commend the agency for its innovative and constructive use of research funds to that end. I am confident that if my colleagues

read the GAO evaluation of the Urban Law Institute they would see that OEO was entirely justified in making its award, and that the untimely termination of former sponsorship of the program by George Washington University was hardly justified. For the RECORD, I submit at this point the text of the GAO report and several recent newspaper articles and editorials on the Urban Law Institute of Antioch College:

AUDIT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY GRANT TO THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FOR OPERATION OF THE URBAN LAW INSTITUTE

(By the Comptroller General of the United States)

APRIL 13, 1971.

MRS. JEAN CAMPER CAHN,
Director, Urban Law Institute,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. CAHN: Enclosed is a copy of our report to a Member of the Congress on our audit of the Office of Economic Opportunity's grant to the George Washington University for operation of the Urban Law Institute during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Very truly yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE AUDIT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY GRANT TO THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY FOR OPERATION OF THE URBAN LAW INSTITUTE

INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to a congressional request, we made an audit of the records pertaining to a grant to the George Washington University for operation of the Urban Law Institute during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. The grant of $568,880 was made by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). Our audit was directed toward determining whether the grant funds were expended in accordance with conditions of the grant and applicable OEO policies and instructions. We did not attempt to determine how effective the Urban Law Institute had been in attaining the program objectives for which the grant was provided.

We examined personnel records and, on a test basis, financial transactions for the period July 1 to December 31, 1970. Our test of financial transactions included items amounting to about $124,725 of the $285,534 expended during the 6-month period under the fiscal year 1971 grant. We reviewed applicable legislation, OEO policies and instructions, and the grant agreement. We also interviewed officials of the university, institute, and OEO who had cognizance of the grant. The audit was made at the George Washington University and OEO headquarters in Washington, D. C.

Officials of OEO, the university, and the institute have not been given an opportunity to examine and comment formally on this report, but the findings were discussed with their representatives.

The Urban Law Institute program includes training lawyers and has been funded by the Federal Government since May 1968 as a demonstration project under section 232 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2825). The objective of the institute's program for training lawyers is to experiment with and demonstrate new approaches and methods in the delivery of legal services to groups or classes of disadvantaged persons. Under arrangements with private law firms and private organizations, program participants are to be assigned to work for the public good under the supervision of senior attorneys. An important element in accomplishing this objective is the development of a curriculum for effectively teaching this type of legal practice. The program also provides assistance to candidates in obtaining a master's degree in poverty law. Grants made to the university for operation of the Urban Law Institute were as follows:

Fiscal year:	*Amount*
1969 [1]	$117,066
1970	331,656
1971	568,880
Total	1,017,602

[1] Covers the period May 1968 to June 1969.

The university administers the grant funds under its regular procedures for handling grants and maintains the accounting records for the grant. Under these procedures expenditures, including payrolls, are first approved by the institute's management and are then paid by the university if the expenditures are within the limits of the budget as approved by OEO. As shown on page 6, expenditures under the fiscal year 1971 grant for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1970, totaled $285,534.

As of December 31, 1970, the institute's personnel consisted of 16 professional and 12 administrative full-time employees, 13 candidates for master's degrees in law, one candidate for a law degree, and several part-time employees. The candidates are required to work 30 hours a week on institute activities.

The university's Office of Public Relations, in its "Monday Report" dated March 1, 1971, stated that the university's National Law Center had announced that it planned to sever its ties with the institute because the institute was evolving into a large public-interest law firm over which it had no control.

FINDINGS

We found that the Federal grant funds were expended in accordance with the conditions of the grant and applicable OEO policies and instructions except for a few expenditures discussed below. To put these questioned expenditures in proper perspective, we want to point out that the amounts of the questioned items were small both in relationship to the total of the institute expenditures and in comparison to amounts we have questioned in reviews of other OEO demonstration grants. Furthermore, the university records maintained for the grant compare favorably with those maintained by most other OEO grantees whose records we have reviewed. The university has orderly financial management procedures and an adequate accounting system; for the most part, its expenditures are well supported by appropriate documentary evidence.

In addition to our review of financial transactions, we also reviewed the quarterly reports submitted by the institute to OEO for the period covered by our review to determine whether the activities reported by the institute were within the scope of activities contemplated under the terms and conditions of the grant. The institute reported on (1) its accomplishments in developing teaching material for university courses in urban law, (2) cases pending and under litigation in which it was involved, and (3) other activities such as providing guidance and assistance to disadvantaged economic and social groups. The activities of the institute, as described in the quarterly reports to OEO, were, in our opinion, within the scope of activities contemplated by the terms and conditions of the grant.

There has been some confusion by certain OEO headquarters officials responsible for administering the grant as to which OEO instructions applied to this grant. OEO has not issued a complete set of instructions and requirements that are applicable to demonstration grants, the type of grant under which the institute is funded. As early as February 1965, OEO had planned to issue instructions applicable to such grants. As a stopgap measure, OEO since 1965 has relied, in part, on its instructions applicable to community action grants although some of the instructions do not apply to a demonstration grant.

Details of the expenditures which we questioned follow.

Limitation on starting salaries of new employees

OEO instructions governing compensation of employees of grantees require that starting salaries of new employees paid over $5,000 annually be limited to an increase of 20 percent over their prior salary or $2,500, whichever is less, unless OEO approval is obtained.

Our review of employees' personnel folders for the 36 employees hired by the institute during the period July 1, 1970, through December 31, 1970, showed that incomplete or no information had been obtained on prior salaries of 12 employees. For these employees we were thus unable to determine whether the salary limitation had been complied with. We were informed by a university personnel official who had responsibility for maintaining records of employees' qualifications that he was unaware of the OEO requirement governing starting salaries and therefore had not always obtained prior salary data.

Our review of the personnel folders for the 24 employees which contained complete prior salary data revealed that two employees had received starting salaries in excess of the OEO limitation. The folders contained no evidence that the required OEO approvals had been obtained. The annual salaries of these two employees exceeded the limitation by $627 and $877, respectively. The amounts actually paid to the two employees in the 6-month period covered by our review exceeded the limitation by a total of $360. The university advised us that the two employees' salaries had been set at these levels so that their salaries would be consistent with the university's pay scale for comparable work.

In March 1971, we discussed this matter with officials of the university and OEO. Subsequently, by letter dated April 1, 1971, OEO advised the institute that the starting salaries granted to the two employees were approved.

Overhead

The terms of the OEO grant provide for the university to be reimbursed for its overhead from grant funds at the rate of 20 percent of the approved grant personnel costs. The university in computing the reimbursement applied the overhead rate to personnel costs and stipends paid to candidates for master's degrees. These stipends, however, were not classified as personnel costs in the OEO-approved budget for the grant.

The budget provided for financial assistance to 16 candidates for master's degrees in the form of a stipend to each of $6,800 and classified the amount budgeted as nonpersonnel costs. The university, by applying the overhead rate to these nonpersonnel costs, charged the grant for additional overhead of about $6,000 for the period July 1, 1970, to December 31, 1970.

We brought this matter to the attention of the university's comptroller, who advised us that the university would seek to obtain OEO's approval to reclassify the stipends as personnel costs.

Travel expenses

OEO instructions require that travel by employees of grantees be authorized and paid for in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. Our examination of travel expenditures of about $5,900—selected from the total expenditures of $9,800 for the period July 1, 1970, to December 31, 1970—showed that the university had not followed certain administrative prac-

tices required by the regulations relating to the authorization and approval of travel on an actual expense basis.

The regulations permit travel expenses to be paid on the basis of a per diem rate of up to $25 or of actual travel expenses. The regulations require, among other things, that conditions be prescribed under which reimbursements may be authorized or approved for actual travel expenses and that such conditions shall restrict travel on an actual expense basis to those travel assignments where necessary subsistence costs are unusually high.

The university followed the practice of reimbursing institute employees on the basis of their actual travel expenses and had not prescribed conditions restricting such travel. Although the amount of the reimbursements to some institute employees for actual travel expenses exceeded the amount allowable under the regulations on a per diem basis of $25, we were unable to determine the amount of the overages and underages because some of the travel claims did not show the departure and arrival times which affect a per diem computation. However, of the $5,900 travel expenses that we examined only $1,500 was for per diem type travel.

University officials advised us that it was the university's policy to pay actual travel expenses for its employees and, since the grant was being funded through the university, they were of the opinion that the university's travel policy should apply to the institute. We were advised also that they were not aware of the OEO requirement that the Standardized Government Travel Regulations were to be followed.

Salary ceilings

The grant contains a requirement that salaries of institute employees in excess of $15,000 must be approved by the Associate Director, Office of Legal Services, OEO. We found that two employees, one is the director of the institute, were being paid salaries from grant funds of $17,500 and $18,000 without approval from OEO. Although the institute notified OEO on August 18, 1970, of the salaries being paid to these two employees, OEO and institute officials were unable to furnish us with evidence that the salaries had been approved.

In March 1971, we discussed this matter with officials of the university and OEO. Subsequently, by letter dated April 1, 1971, OEO advised the institute that the salaries being paid the two employees in excess of $15,000 were approved.

Financial reporting

For the months of May 1970 through January 1971, the university did not prepare and submit to OEO monthly financial reports as required by OEO instructions. An OEO directive states that delinquent reports by grantees impair OEO's ability to administer grants and to meet its financial reporting responsibilities to the Congress and other Federal agencies.

Although OEO did not receive the required monthly financial reports, we found no record indicating that OEO had sought to obtain the reports.

In February 1971, we brought this omission to the attention of university officials with the result that the required reports were prepared and promptly submitted to OEO.

The expenditures under the fiscal year 1971 grant for the period July 1, 1970, to December 31, 1970, are shown below.

Expense category and amount expended	
Salary—faculty full time	$8,750
Salary—nonacademic	108,214
Wages—part-time personnel	21,973
Stipends—candidates for degrees	30,075
Personal services, other	23,522
Telephone	3,923
Travel	8,831
Conference—includes about $1,000 for travel	2,481
Printing	10,556
Program development	6,026
Tuition—candidates for degrees	6,753
Office expense	10,221
Books and material	657
Staff benefits	14,620
Overhead—preliminary, subject to adjustment at end of fiscal year	28,932
Total	285,534

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

LAW STUDENTS: A PLAN TO "LEARN WHILE YOU DEFEND"

Many of the young people who are applying to the nation's law schools in record numbers see the law as a tool to help the underprivileged and oppressed. At the same time, a growing faction in the legal profession is expressing doubts about the capacity of the law schools to respond to a demand for that kind of legal education.

Last week, a group of activist lawyer-educators and a small liberal arts college announced a plan aimed at reconciling the two views. Antioch College, in Ohio, has agreed to join the Urban Law Institute in the establishment in Washington of a new kind of law school, dedicated to "clinical legal education" of a learn-while-you-defend orientation.

FIRST SUCH VENTURE

Apart from its graduate school of education, this will be Antioch's first venture into professional education. The goal—depending on funding—is to admit the first class in the fall of 1972.

The plan is the offspring of an academic controversy. The Urban Law Institute, founded by Jean Camper Cahn, a young black alumna of Swarthmore and Yale Law School, had for the past three years been part of the National Law Center of George Washington University. It is funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity and staffed by about 20 lawyers who divide their time and efforts between offering legal services to the urban poor, and reforming the curriculum and teaching methods of traditional law education.

Earlier this year, Dean Robert Kramer of the university's law school, though reaffirming the institution's own concern with poverty urban law, severed the relationship with the institute. "We never contemplated that the university would operate a large law firm and engage directly in * * * Washington would be happy to cooperate with some of the institute's activities, it was "not willing . . . to take responsibility for a public interest law firm."

Supporters of the institute saw in this an academic institution's reluctance to enter into activist, i.e. controversial ventures. Ralph Nader, citing that "during World War II, Harvard Law School and other law schools scrapped their entire curriculums and turned themselves into complete instruments of the wartime effort," considered the current social crises serious enough to call for similar activism.

Mr. Nader and other supporters of drastic changes in legal education denounced the "concept of legal educational academitis" which, he charged, must shoulder part of the responsibility for "a pretentious legal system which puts the premium of access and success on wealth and power. . . ."

As the initial anger over the separation of the institute from the university died * * * institute concluded that the traditional law schools might be more readily persuaded to consider new approaches, if a new kind of school could become the proving ground.

Washington seemed the best location for such a school. Antioch College, with a tradition in progressive education and community involvement, seemed ideologically well suited. The college has always operated on a plan of alternating campus attendance and off-campus field work which regularly takes many of its students and faculty away from the home community.

MEDICAL MODEL

The concept of clinical legal education borrows heavily from medical training, with its combination of academic work and internship, involving the student with the patient or client. The law school that really is a teaching law firm is comparable to the teaching hospital.

* * * * *

Recently, Chief Justice Warren Burger said: ". . . One could hardly conceive a system of legal education farther removed from the realities of life than the pure case method." He complained of lawyers licensed "without the slightest inquiry into their capacity to perform the intensely practical functions of a counselor or advocate." He criticized the kind of preparation that avoids "the antiseptic odor of the jail house and the problem of the 'unmarried mother,' of dependent children and the aged and infirm—in short, escapism from the depressing atmosphere which surrounds 'the short and simple annals of the poor.' "

The clinical law school experiment plans to stress, in addition to traditional academic instruction, the following priorities:

Curriculum development, drawing on field work and research.

* * * * *

Client services, by providing lawyers as counsel to community groups, locally and nationally, as an aid to the poor, a laboratory in which to develop techniques and curriculum materials. The institute has already completed five textbooks to be published in the 1971–72 academic year.

Among the areas to be stressed in curriculum development are actions related to Federal programs, community organization, consumer problems, and housing for the poor. This will lead to the production of case studies that eventually could be used by other law schools, as supplementary reading in traditional courses, and by poverty lawyers in the field.

In addition, the school wants to work on the improvement of legal office management because its planners believe that "legal service programs have by and large suffered from weak administration, and virtually no lawyers coming out of law schools today know how to manage an office."

SOME RESERVATIONS

Mrs. Cahn and her husband Edgar may, in the view of many law school deans and faculty members, exaggerate the extent of the educational revolution they see necessary and feasible. They may also underestimate the changes that are already taking place in established schools.

But one eminent legal educator, though questioning how much of the experiment will be applicable to the majority of law students, emphatically agreed that the clinical approach offers a valuable alternative for some.

Moreover, the history of education reforms shows that, despite the Establishment's initial skepticism, change in traditional institutions has usually come in the wake of iconoclasm of a few who decided to go it alone. Antioch College itself is among those historic examples.

The Cahns, writing in the May, 1970 "Yale Law Journal," said: "The law school in the future will have to begin working with colleges and high schools—and even grammar schools—to develop legal curricula . . . and to take responsibility for imparting to the populace at large not merely a rote legal knowledge, but a sensitivity to those fundamental values of due process, fair play, free speech, privacy and official accountability."

[From the Advocate, Mar. 1, 1971]

BURGER MAKES MEDICAL ANALOGY

(By Chief Justice Warren E. Burger)

The modern law school is not fulfilling its basic duty to provide society with people-oriented counselors and advocates to meet the expanding needs of our changing world.

In retrospect one could hardly conceive a system of legal education farther removed from the realities of life than the pure case method. And that is why so many modifications have been made in recent years. Perhaps we may shed light on the problem by asking whether we could train doctors simply by having them do autopsies for five years in medical school and then finish up with one course on how to examine and question and diagnose a live patient with a pain. Obviously this would not produce very good doctors.

When medical education became more formalized a half century ago, the medical educators quickly realized that the purpose of medical education was to train doctors to heal patients and that this could be done with patients—not just with books and lectures. It is axiomatic that no medical school can function without ready access to a large hospital where students see and work with people afflicted.

Today the education of a doctor is approximately 20–25% books and classrooms and 75–80% clinical or the direct observation of a doctor's treatment of the sick. In this real life process the medical student spends roughly 80% of his time with practicing doctors as his teachers.

Today, in many courtrooms, cases are being inadequately tried by poorly trained lawyers, and people suffer because lawyers are licensed, with very few exceptions, without slightest inquiry into their capacity to perform the intensely practical functions of a counselor or advocate.

An increasing number of law professors have become involved in activities outside the Law School and in turn have related their practical experience in their teaching. A growing number have taken part in government and community work and as volunteer counsel for the poor in civil and criminal cases.

[From the Advocate, Mar. 1, 1971]

THE CAHNS ON CLINICAL LAW

The issue is whether the law school, as an institution of higher education, can utilize its unique vantage point and its relative detachment to enable society to proceed more rationally to reshape its legal system, to provide effective redress of grievances and to permit orderly and rapid social change within the framework of the rule of law. As quasi-public institutions, law schools have a fiducary obligation. That obligation must be given a structural correlative in order to discharge an institutional commitment which transcends the good intentions, and even good deeds, of any individual professor.

If the law schools are to fully discharge their institutional obligations and remedy the defects generic to legal education, the line of demarcation between the law school and the outside world will have to be redrawn.

Just as the outside world must enter the law school, so too the law school must expand its walls to include the urban environment in which it is situated. Clinical legal education is the rubric under which the law schools have undertaken their initial sortie in this direction.

Clinical programs must not be permitted to degenerate into a grandiose abdication or responsibility whereby the law school simply abandons the student during the third year and leaves him largely to his own devices under the guise of affording him "practical experience." It must become a joint venture in discovery for the academic community where undigested chunks of reality are subjected to the most highly disciplined form of intellectual scrutiny.

If the relative insulation of the law school is to serve any unique function, it is to be found in the partial liberation which the detachment of the institution affords from consumption pressure, and the freedom it provides to design new legal institutions, new doctrines and new modes of coping with the clear and present danger to the rule of law. That insulation, that tradition of a community of scholars, becomes even more precious if the law school ceases to be an island for contemplation of one's jurisprudential navel and becomes instead the sanctum in which the inner life of the law is born and reborn of experience.

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1971]

BETTER LAW FOR THE POOR

For a few years now, many of the nation's law schools have been offering one of the most meaningful and exciting kinds of legal education: involving the student with the client. This is comparable to the teaching hospital where medical training combines learning in the classroom with daily work in the sickrooms and wards. The practice of clinical law has been a way of facing the problem recently expressed by Chief Justice Warren Burger, of lawyers licensed "without the slightest inquiry into their capacity to perform the intensely practical functions of a counselor or advocate." Among the better known and more successful experiments has been the Urban Law Institute which until recently had been a part of the National Law Center of George Washington University. The bitter dispute following the university's still-puzzling decision to drop sponsorship of ULI was happily resolved last May when Antioch College of Ohio agreed to sponsor the institute and begin work on opening a law school in Washington, one that will be dedicated to clinical legal education—learning while you practice.

The union of ULI and Antioch is fitting, and promises a type of reform that is needed. The college as a long history of embracing educational innovations and of not being afraid of involving its faculty and students in the social problems of the community. Although the college has a graduate school of education, this is its first move into a professional field. As for the record of the three-year-old Urban Law Institute, it has served and defended many of the clients that traditional law firms seldom if ever go near—the poor. The program's lawyers and students have ruffled, even clipped, the feathers of many established powers, but the Nixon Administration, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, has not hesitated to fund it from year to year. The director of ULI, Jean Camper Cahn, a young black graduate of Swarthmore and Yale Law School, has had her share of controversy, but her successes overshadow it. As Rep. Parren J. Mitchell of Baltimore told Mrs. Cahn followed the Antioch merger, "Your success means that given the courage and commitment of black folks, racism, apathy, bigotry, deceit, hypocrisy—all of these can be beaten into the ground." An article in a 1965 Yale Law Journal by Mrs. Cahn and her lawyer husband Edgar led to the formation of the federal Legal Services Program.

The ULI-Antioch law school, now on the drawing board, is scheduled to open in September, 1972. As a teaching law firm, it will be valuable not only to the legal profession and the students, but also to the power community of Washington—the consumers of law who need justice the most.

EAST AND WEST CENTRAL HOSPITAL COUNCILS' SEMINAR

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 17, 1971, Mr. James W. Foristel, assistant director, department of congressional relations, American Medical Association, delivered an address to the East and West Central Hospital Councils' seminar at Tampa, Fla.

Mr. Foristel directed his remarks to health legislation before the 92d Congress, and I would like to insert, at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Foristel's remarks for the benefit of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF JAMES W. FORISTEL

The Nation's Capitol is full of NIH proposals and the Ways and Means Committee is planning to commence public hearings after it completes its work on revenue sharing. According to that committee's chairman, Wilbur Mills, there will not be time for any bill to be passed by the House of Representatives in 1971. It is quite likely, he says, that legislation will be enacted in 1972, but surely not later than sometime in 1973.

Therefore, it is all to the good that so much thought and effort has already been given, it is good that legislation has been introduced in support of plans offered by AMA, American Hospital Association, the insurance industry and by many other groups and legislators who now make up the more than 350 sponsors of NIH type legislative proposals.

I welcome the opportunity to discuss AMA's entry in this legislative idea derby and for approximately one-half of my allotted time I will try to make clear the several elements of AMA's Medicredit proposal. Let me say now that I do not consider it important that you understand every minute detail of the AMA's bill. What is important at this stage is that AMA make known to Congress and the public the conceptual design of its plan.

Let me begin then with the list of principles which AMA's Council on Legislation prepared before their legislative draftsmen began their work on what is admittedly a set of medical benefits and a financing mechanism. The AMA's Council on Legislation and its Board of Trustees has committed the Association to support other programs and legislation such as peer review, the health manpower extensions and improvements and others. In this connection Senator Kennedy claims that Medicredit is inadequate because it is only a financing mechanism. AMA admits Medicredit is only a financing mechanism, but the Association, as I have already said, is committed to actively support ideas to correct deficiencies in the health care system such as the manpower shortage and to completely dispose of the Kennedy criticism let me read you a letter from Congressman Paul Rogers, the Florida Democrat Chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1971.

Mr. JAMES W. FORISTEL,
Department of Congressional Relations,
American Medical Association,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIM: Today the House Rules Committee granted a rule in connection with the Health Manpower and Nurse Training bills (H.R. 8629 and H.R. 8630). Passage in the House in the next several legislative days seems assured.

Please convey to AMA's officers and mem-

bership my personal thanks and congratulations for being in the forefront in the support of this legislation. The data and expertise of the Association's witnesses were most helpful. The AMA's governing body wisely included medical manpower legislation as a part of the Association's legislative package. I feel this legislation is a keystone to any additional health programs that may be passed by the Congress. As Chairman of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, it is my intention to continue for the balance of this year considering other areas in which the Federal Government might be of assistance, and this will include the several bills before our Committee on Health Maintenance Organizations and various approaches providing better preventive medicine to the public. I am looking forward to continued cooperation from the American Medical Association in these endeavors.

Kind regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL G. ROGERS,
Member of Congress.

I said earlier that the Council on Legislation first prepared a list of principles which should be followed in any legislative proposal. That list reads as follows:

1. Solutions to financing health care should be through the voluntary health insurance industry on an underwriting and risk-taking basis.

2. The mechanism should be voluntary, but with financial incentives to encourage participation (rather than compulsion).

3. There should be a pluralistic system for the delivery of health care.

4. Financing should be done through general revenues, state funds, and private sources—not through a payroll tax.

5. The scope and duration of benefits must be comprehensive and adequately applied, and adequate in their description and provision.

6. State certification for licensure of physicians should not be violated.

7. Any corporate arrangements must specifically be under professional medical control with strict conformance with medical ethics.

8. There should be provision for cost-sharing and coinsurance by the recipient.

9. Government assistance should be related to the individual's financial resources.

Now, with the principles I have just read in mind, the Medicredit proposal was drafted to accomplish three things. First, replace the present Title XIX or Medicaid Program with a federally financed free enterprise type insurance mechanism for the poor. Second, toward the cost of health insurance premium, the bill authorizes tax credits ranging from 99 percent to 11 percent to assist those taxpayers who have income tax liabilities ranging from $1 to $890 and to assure a 10 percent credit for all those who pay in excess of $890 in federal income tax. Third, to require that all eligible insurance plans must include catastrophic coverage so as to assure that no individual or family need ever suffer bankruptcy or spend life savings to meet medical expenses.

This three-prolonged legislative approach has met the approval of 151 Members of the House and Senate who, at this point in time, are sponsors of the AMA bill. The closest competitior proposal is the labor bill offered by Senator Kennedy sponsored currently by 103 Members of the House and Senate. Another bill providing catastrophic coverage introduced by Congressman Hall, a physician Member of Congress, has about 40 sponsors and none of the bills have as many as 20.

Let me discuss the three main missions of Medicredit. First, replacing the Title XIX or Medicaid Programs needs little more explanation other than to say that insurance company administration of health care would be substituted for the present arrangement under which states administer Medicaid. Regarding financing, the states would be relieved of their responsibility and the federal government would pay the total cost of almost all health care except the deductibles and co-insurance. Part two of the AMA's Medicredit Bill allowing tax credits might be explained in more detail by saying that for every $10 of tax liability after the first dollar, the tax credit decreases by one percent.

For example, a taxpayer whose tax liability is only $10 receives a 99 percent credit. Taxpayers with liability from $91 to $100 receive only a 90 percent tax credit. Taxpayers who pay between $591 and $600 income taxes receive only a 40 percent tax credit. Taxpayers who pay in the range of $881 to $890 receive only an 11 percent tax credit and those who pay $891 and over [also] receive a 10 percent tax credit. This arrangement of varying tax credits was included in the AMA bill to overcome the Ways and Means Committee concern of phasing in those persons not considered poor and those who have little income and are just above the poor category.

Let me admit here and now that this section of the AMA's bill may meet difficulty in the Ways and Means Committee because there has been an objection on the part of some members of the Committee to any tax credit mechanism. Chairman Mills several years ago made a public statement that tax credits tend to destroy a tax system. The third and final section of the AMA's bill has to do with providing catastrophic health protection.

To further detail this section, let me explain that no health insurance program under AMA's proposal would be deemed eligible unless it includes catastrophic protection. Prior to the catastrophic health protection being activated, the patient must have exhausted the health benefits included in the basic package of health protection which includes, for instance, 60 days of inpatient care in a 12-month period, inpatient hospital services which covers all care customarily provided in a hospital such as bed, board, nursing services, drugs and oxygen, blood and plasma, biologicals and supplies, appliances and equipment furnished by the hospital, surgery or delivery room, recovery room, intensive care services, rehabilitation services and psychiatric care.

It includes also all of the inpatient extended care facility services customarily provided in an extended care facility. It provides also outpatient or emergency care and all care customarily provided under that classification. Finally, all medical services ordered by an M.D. or an osteopath without limitation with the exception of cosmetic surgery and even here this is included when related to birth defects or burns or scars caused by injury or illness.

As a lobbyist for AMA for more than 20 years, it is my considered opinion that the most compelling reason to most of AMA's 151 legislation sponsors has been the inclusion of this catastrophic protection section of the bill. Members of Congress receive the horror stories of families made destitute by long-term expensive catastrophic illnesses and recognize the need for including this kind of protection. In constructing the language of a catastrophic section, AMA draftsmen were careful to write the protections which would guard against over use and abuse of medical service by erecting a deductible corridor of dollars which must be spent by those above the poor class before the government offered protection.

This was accomplished by providing that the corridor be computed as 10 percent of the first $4,000 of taxable income. Now, let's make this clear. Persons who need the additional help of catastrophic or extended care coverage are required to satisfy a deductible corridor after expenses under basic coverage runs out and before catastrophic begins. Thus, when I mentioned that persons have to expend 10 percent of the first $4,000 of their taxable income before the corridor begins as this would apply to an individual or family, it means that with exactly $4,000 of taxable income an individual or family would have to expend $400 of his or its own money.

This section provides further that the individual or family would have to pay 15 percent of the next $3,000 of taxable income. There is a further provision that individuals or families with taxable incomes exceeding $7,000 would have to expend an additional 20 percent of taxable income.

Additional protection is built into the bill. Three deductibles are required. 1. The patient will pay $50 per stay in the hospital as an inpatient. 2. The patient must pay 20 percent of the first $500 of expenses for outpatient or emergency care in a 12-month period. 3. The patient must pay 20 percent of the first $500 of expenses for out of hospital medical services in a 12-month period. However, whatever deductions the patient pays in the basic medical coverage of the Medicredit Bill may be counted as part of the corridor liability of the patient under the catastrophic protection section.

Now, if I haven't been specific enough to satisfy you or if my explanations have not come through clearly, let me say this is not important. It is only the concept of AMA's Medicredit or of these other bills being discussed here that has any importance because experienced legislators will tell you that no bill will be enacted as it is introduced. What is important is that the Committee agree with a concept—its draftsmen will write the finished product.

Now, let me devote the balance of my remarks to the legislative situation in Washington as I view it. It is this situation with its many aspects under which any health insurance bill will be considered. First, a majority of the Congress is desirous of enacting a national health insurance plan although most every Member of Congress will tell you that he does not yet have a clear concept of the details of such a program. Second, the cost of the eventual program to be passed will be the major consideration.

Surely, in this connection the Kennedy Bill, in the opinion of most Congressmen, would do more harm to a balanced budget situation than any of the other proposals since one half of those costs must be raised from general revenue. Can you imagine the Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee being willing to subject federal Treasury funds to a $53.1 billion annual bite by 1974 (the Administration study of national health insurance proposals made, at the request of Congress and delivered to them in early August, predicted that the Kennedy Bill would cost $81.6 billion in 1974) and that the prescribed payroll tax would yield only $28.5 billion (see page 26 of cost report)? Fact number three is that cost controls such as prospective charges of providers (possibly a full year in advance) will be required to assure against cost overruns during any single year. Fourth, cost and quality controls will be enacted likely as part of H.R. 1 in this Congress. Thus, this item may be removed from consideration in an overall NHI proposal. Fifth, an employer-employee mandated program of financing such as is suggested in the Administration's and the Health Insurance Association's proposals possibly is the most popular currently with the House Ways and Means Committee. I don't have a reading among Senate Finance Committee Members. It is certainly more popular than a Social Security type payroll tax included in the Kennedy proposal because the employer-employee mandate concept would have the least damaging affect on budget balance. Sixth, a

catastrophic provision seems certain to be part of any program to be enacted because so many Members favor insuring against medical bill bankruptcy of their constituents.

I appeared on a panel of the Georgia Hospital Association some months ago as the representative of the AAA. Other panelists were Doctor Egeberg explaining the Administration's plan, Doctor Ainsworth speaking for the American Hospital Association and E. G. Marshall representing the Committee of 100, the Kennedy plan. I said then and I want to re-emphasize here that I have no criticism of any of these plans except the Kennedy plan on the basis of concept.

Conceptually only the Kennedy plan would tear down the present medical structure, only the Kennedy plan would totally destroy the private enterprise insurance system in this nation, only the Kennedy plan would provide that the sole payor of all health providers would be the Federal Government. I pointed out then that it is hypocritical of organized labor to have drafted a bill which would have all providers totally subservient to the sole provider, the Federal Government, when the same labor unions would scream their bloody heads off if their members had the Federal Government as their employer.

It is time that the sponsors of legislation whose proposals rely upon the concept of not having the Federal Government take over the health delivery system join together to debate representatives of the Kennedy supporters who urge a total federal system. I re-urge that point for the consideration of all those in this audience who are not sold upon a total federal system.

NIXON ECONOMICS AND THE TAX BILL

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, at the recent Governors' conference, Vice President AGNEW stated that—

Rising corporate profits are good for the average man and are needed more than ever by the poor.

The President's tax proposals, being reported out by the Ways and Means Committee with some amendments, substantially support this economic theory of "trickle down." The President's tax proposals are harsh and cruel to the individual. A taxpayer with $9,000 income and three dependents would save only $26 this year, or 7 cents a day. This policy will clearly fail to spur consumer demand. It will fail to put unemployed workers and idle machinery back into production.

I enter in the RECORD a column which appeared in the Friday, September 25, 1971, Evening Star, entitled "Why Do Profits Trickle Only Down?":

WHY DO PROFITS TRICKLE ONLY DOWN?

(By Arthur Hoppe)

"Rising corporate profits are good for the average man and are needed more than ever by the poor."—Vice President Agnew, addressing the National Governor's Conference.

"Good news, Maude! Good news!" Jud Joad's breath came raspingly as he negotiated the last of the 120 steps leading to the Joad's fourth-floor, cold-water walk-up on Clancy Street.

"Oh, Jud," cried Maude, clapping her wrinkled hands together like a young girl. "The landlord—he's going to fix the toilet?"

"Better'n that," said Jud, easing himself down on a rickety kitchen chair and spreading out a day-old newspaper. "It says here where General Motors is looking forward to knocking down an extra billion or two in the current fiscal year."

"Oh," said Maude. "Well, I'm right happy for the General. But what's it got to do with us?"

"What's good for the rich is good for the poor. The vice president, says so himself. What us poor folks need more'n ever, he says, is rising corporate profits."

"We need what?"

"Pay attention, Maude. It's called the old Trickle Down Theory. Now I been fighting poverty man and boy for nigh on 60 years. And if'n there's one thing rich folk believe in with all their hearts, it's that their riches are going to trickle down on us poor folk."

"How's it work, Jud?"

"Well, now, Maude, you know how I've been hankering to be a night watchman."

"And a good one you'd be, Jud, the way you like watching things. Besides, you been sleeping poorly lately."

"Only I can't find a job. But if'n the fellow who runs General Motors can make a few more billions for the company by firing some of the help, shoddying up the merchandise and raising the prices, why then the company's going to be mighty grateful. And they're going to give him a big bonus. Maybe half a million dollars. And what's he going to do with it? He's going to buy himself a great big shiny old yacht."

"How's that going to help us, Jud?"

"Wait, now. You forgot about the fellow who sells him the yacht. He's going to make maybe $100,000 on the deal. So he's going to buy this big estate in the country. And the real estate man is going to make $10,000 and put in that swimming pool his wife's always wanted. And the swimming pool man, he's going to make a thousand or two and buy a new car from General Motors. And . . . Well, you can see how it goes."

"My, Jud! Yachts, estates, swimming pools, fancy cars . . . But now does it all trickle down to us. Seems like the rich just keep getting richer."

"That's right, Maude. Like the fellow says, "The rich get richer and the poor get madder." And the madder the poor get, the more they want what the rich folks got. So the vice president's right: The more the rich get, the more they'll need me around night to watch the things they got."

"Well, I don't know, Jud. Seems like a long way 'round just to get you a job."

"You got a better idea, Maude?"

Maude was thoughtful for a moment. "I know, Jud!" she finally cried triumphantly "Why don't they start with us for a change and trickle up?"

ERIE COUNTY LEGISLATURE SUPPORTS PRESIDENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the text of a resolution adopted by the Erie County Legislature commending the President on his courage in ordering a freeze on wages and prices as a means of controlling runaway inflation.

The President's recent economic proposals, I feel, are important steps in solving our domestic and international economic problems, and these measures should have the support of all Americans.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, runaway inflation has destroyed the buying power of the American dollar, and

Whereas, persons on fixed incomes, pensions and annuities, usually the old and retired are most directly affected, and

Whereas, inflation leads to unemployment and loss of business confidence,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that the Erie County Legislature lauds the courage of President Nixon in clamping a wage and price freeze on the American economy in an effort to curtail this inflation, and be it further

Resolved, that this Legislature pledge to the President its full support, and cooperation, and be it further

Resolved, that this cooperation be exhibited by sending a copy of this resolution to the President and this area's Congressmen, which the Clerk of this Legislature is authorized and directed to do.

THE F–14 OR THE BOMBER WHICH IS A BOMB

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Senate voted to keep on funding the F–14. This was a costly mistake, for the plane is an unnecessary aviational extravaganza which will cost the taxpayer $16.7 million each, for a grant total of $801 million for the proposed 48 planes. The plane has so far shown itself to be only a mediocre improvement on existing technology. It is designed to protect aircraft carriers against Soviet bombers and fighter planes in a prolonged conventional war, and tries to serve two functions—that of a fighter and that of a launch platform for Phoenix air-to-air missiles. But in truth, the plane is good for neither function—it is too slow to serve as a fighter and the Phoenix missiles are still plagued by bugs.

An excellent editorial on the subject appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, as follows:

THE F–14: IS THIS PLANE REALLY NECESSARY?

For the past 10 days or so the Senate has been considering a variety of amendments to the $21 billion military procurement bill, and the debate will continue for some time. Most of the amendments have been designed to trim or eliminate authorizations for specific weapons systems. So far, none has succeeded. Whether or not they should have, and whether or not the string of amendments yet to come should be approved, it seems to us that the vote on one amendment—possibly to be taken today—is crucial and that the amendment should be passed. We refer to the move to eliminate from the fiscal '72 budget some $800 million in funds for the purchase of 48 tactical aircraft that go by the name of the F–14. This air-to-air-missile-bearing Navy fighter plane is pretty much a textbook case of what can go wrong in weapons planning—from the drawing board on.

The F–14 is meant to fulfill the mission of protecting our aircraft carriers against Soviet

bombers and fighter planes in any prolonged conventional war we might have with the Soviet Union. It is thus to be equipped with the Phoenix air-to-air "standoff" missile for dealing with Soviet bombers and it is also supposed to have the characteristics—speed, maneuverability, and so forth—that would be necessary to engage Soviet fighter planes. Two large questions loom over the vote that now faces the Senate. One is whether a plane is needed at all to fulfill this particular mission. The other is whether the F–14 is the right plane to fulfill that mission if it is indeed a realistic or legitimate one.

It is our opinion, based on the argument and testimony so far concerning the F–14 that its mission is at the very least a dubious one. We are inclined to credit the widespread view that any conflict such as that for which the F–14 is designed—i.e., prolonged conventional warfare with the Russians who have the only aircraft that would make such plane necessary—the F–14 would be unable to protect U.S. carriers from the main threat they would face, namely, Soviet torpedoes and cruise missiles. The very notion that carriers would have a useful role to play in this particular kind of conflict is questionable, and to invest in this plane before the future size and shape of our carrier force has been determined seems impractical and reckless to say the least.

More to the point, even if the F–14's mission could be justified, it would be far from obvious that the F–14 as we are about to know it is the plane for the job. In endeavoring to create a plane that could fulfill two different functions—that of fighter and that of launch platform for the Phoenix air-to-air missile—the Navy and Grumman aerospace appear to have wrought a plane that can likely fulfill neither very well. Owing to the requirements for the Phoenix missile, for example, the F–14 is a relatively slow and inadequate fighter plane. And the Phoenix missile which it is meant to bear is still in the throes of 10 years worth of trouble that has plagued it. The F–14 is less adequate as a fighter plane than the modified F–4 which it would replace. What is especially interesting about this point is that it will cost four times as much. Current estimates are $16.7 million per plane, and each firing of the Phoenix—if it can be made to function properly in this aircraft and if its mission has any point in the first place—will cost around half a million dollars. The F–14 program, at Senator Proxmire has observed, "is in many respects a microcosm of many of the problems which plague our defense establishment today: Initial cost estimates which later balloon; the incredible inertia of 10-year-old ideas which have never been thought through; the failure to test new systems before they have been deployed; and the continued emphasis on multimission aircraft which do no mission well."

Though the Senate Armed Services Committee in its careful report on the military procurement bill recommended procurement of these planes, it can hardly be said to have done so in a spirit of enthusiasm. It restricted purchase to 48 planes, the minimum possible under the terms of the contract with Grumman, and made its principal argument the fact that it would be even more expensive to buy the planes under any renegotiated terms. As it happens, the administration—if it is authorized to go ahead with the purchase—will have to do so by Oct. 1 to observe the contract's terms. Thus the Senate vote has a double urgency. The F–14 has too many attributes of another great defense turkey to be approved at this time by the Senate. We believe the Senate should send the Navy back to the drawing board to come up with either an improved F–4 or a new fighter plane that is not too costly to be purchased in adequate numbers and that has a reasonable chance of performing a valid function.

NATIONAL 4–H WEEK

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, today we constantly hear of the idealism of American young people, particularly the young citizen who becomes an activist regarding government and politics, We are also reminded constantly that through this idealism we can reshape America so that we all can truly enjoy the fruits of the American dream.

I recognize this, but I am concerned that so much of what we hear and see involves not idealism but the politics of blame and negativism. Instead of providing the necessary idealism and motivation for government to institute the decade of reform and change that we so urgently need, too often we find ourselves involved in the new politics of partisan blame, problems, and no answers.

Personally, while I understand and share the frustrations of many or our young people, I feel the politics of blame and emotion are too easy, and worse, do not really accomplish what the art of politics can provide—answers for our problems.

In this regard, I think it is most important that we try to work together to solve problems rather than antagonize, blame, and create divisions in our society. And to this end, there is one outstanding youth organization that does just that. I am speaking about a national 4–H organization composed of millions of young people throughout our Nation. These young citizens are concerned, are enthusiastic, and are truly believers in a better America. Most important, they work for a better America rather than taking the easy way out.

I would like to take this opportunity to call attention to the fact that this coming week is National 4–H Week. The theme for this year's observance is "4–H Bridges the Gap."

This theme is most appropriate since the 4–H program provides the means for combining the idealism of American youth with the practical experience of parents and adult leaders.

The record of 4–H in both rural and urban America is an outstanding success story; 4–H provides that rare blend of motivation and discipline which spells progress and achievement; 4–H youngsters, through their project work and business meetings, learn responsibility and must rely on personal initiative and ingenuity for success. They also learn to accept responsibility for their actions—a very important lesson in life.

Over 4 million rural and urban youth and millions of volunteer leaders and parents participate in 4–H. Through individual projects in agriculture, citizenship, personal development, and leadership training, 4–H'ers have the opportunity to learn by doing.

The 4–H pledge—"I pledge my head to clearer thinking, my heart to greater loyalty, my hands to larger service, my health for better living for my club, my community and my country"—captures the spirit of our American heritage and serves as a constant reminder to 4–H'ers that they must continually seek to make their best better.

In observing National 4–H Week, I want to pay special tribute to USDA extension personnel, volunteer leaders, parents, and local civil leaders who "put it all together" in coordinating 4–H programs. Their self-sacrifice and personal involvement bring about the two-way communication and sincere interest so necessary to successfully bridge the "generation gap."

Through youth-adult cooperation in 4–H work, a depth of understanding and mutual respect is achieved that could serve as a model for successful youth programs and service efforts throughout the Nation.

The positive influence of 4–H is well summarized in a recent editorial by Dr. Glenn M. Busset, Kansas State 4–H leader. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert this editorial, "If there were a fifth leaf—A philosophy for 4–H Sunday," to emphasize the value of a 4–H experience in bridging the gap between the real and the ideal—and the young and the old:

IF THERE WERE A FIFTH LEAF—A PHILOSOPHY FOR 4–H SUNDAY

(By Glenn M. Busset)

Many persons have paraphrased the H's with words suited to their purposes, such as Happiness, Help, Home, and Humanity. They are all meaningful words, but if there were another leaf to the clover, Hope would be a worthy word for it.

A word or phrase may drop out of use for years, then through some event it suddenly takes on new life and is on everyone's lips. Such a word is Hope and since there is no fifth leaf, I would like to think of Hope as a part of our Heart H.

Hope is based on a vision or image of what is coming. Hope arises when we believe we have power to shape the future. The case for Hope has never rested on provable facts or rational assessment. Hope, by its very nature, is independent of the apparatus of logic. What gives Hope its power is not the accumulation of provable facts, but the release of human energies generated by a longing for something better. Logic and fact tell us what we cannot do, but just the capacity for hope is the greatest fact in life.

Hope is the beginning of plans. Hope is dreams, it is plans, it is the spirit of Christmas for every day. Hope gives us a destination, a sense of direction for getting there, the energy to get started, and the sustenance to maintain us through discouragement and disappointment. Hope enlarges our sensitivities and brightens our lives, so that in time that for which we only hoped becomes our expectations, our ambitions, and our life goals.

Life is offered to each of us on different terms. Life was offered to Helen Keller on different terms from those on which it was offered to Albert Schweitzer, yet each accepted the gift of life with reverent hands; each made something wonderful out of the gift and enriched the world.

Regardless of our physical and mental equipment that may seem to place the odds against us, each of us has something in our favor to use in facing life—we have our own unique brand of hope. This is an asset that we bring to the task, an asset that is peculiarly ours. No one else can have dreams—and hopes—just like ours.

How about you? What is your acceptance, your philosophy in life? Will you reason, as

did the Old Testament poet, "Is this cup half full or half empty? No one's cup of life is full and no one's empty. Each of us has some happiness and some sorrow. One's life is sad or happy depending on how one sees the cup—rejoicing always that it is half full or sorrowing always that it is half empty."

Romans 5:3–5 has always had an inspirational meaning for me in this special sense ". . . we rejoice in our sufferings, knowing that suffering produces endurance, and endurance produces character, and that character produces hope, and hope does not disappoint us . . ."

Admittedly, there is more passion than logic in hope, but more people are held back by the absence of dreams than by the pressures of reality. If the dreams are good enough, no realities can stand against them. It was man's imagination far more than science that sent him to the moon. Human uniqueness is represented by man's ability to disprove elaborate theories about the impossible.

Less than one hundred years ago, a bishop was talking one day to a college president. The bishop expressed the view that everything of human importance had been invented, discovered, or revealed. All man had to do now was learn to use what he had in the world. The college president disagreed, saying, "I predict that within fifty years man will fly like the birds." The bishop was shocked, replying, "Flight is reserved for angels, and you are guilty of blasphemy." The bishop was Milton Wright; he had two young sons named Wilbur and Orville.

"Hope springs eternal in the human breast," wrote the eminent Alexander Pope. In the years ahead, 4-H'ers have much to dream—and hope—for. They have had educational experiences in projects and in the social process that place them in an excellent position to hope—and work—to "Make the Best Better." Reason tells us that we can't improve on the "best"—Hope says that we can and will.

GERMAN KNIVES, DANISH PISTOL CHILDHOOD MEMORIES

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I want to bring to the attention of our colleagues a story which appeared recently in the Savannah Morning News in Savannah, Ga.

This story comes from the heart of one who saw her country turn toward socialism and later suffered under Hitler's invasion of Denmark. She is Mrs. Birthe Turner, formerly of Kalundorg, Denmark. Her observations are worth taking the time to read, for here in our country today we are seeing similar circumstances developing and must not only become aware of the danger signals but do something about them while we can.

The story follows:

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Sept. 14, 1971]

GERMAN KNIVES, DANISH PISTOL CHILDHOOD MEMORIES

(By Trish Ainsworth)

"Please Mama, I don't want to go to that school!"

Mother gathers her child to her and soothes her. "Hush, you'll be all right. Don't worry about it, just go to school."

As contemporary as this conversation sounds, you'll be surprised to hear that it took place almost 40 years ago in Denmark.

The little girl is grown now, with children of her own. And now she's a citizen of the United States.

Mrs. Birthe (pronounced Beer-ta) Turner, a resident of Savannah, remembers that she did, indeed, "hush and go to school" . . . which was four towns away.

"The military bused us there. Later children were trucked and boxcarred to school. Our government was more considerate . . . at least we had seats in the trucks and boxcars. Hitler didn't even bother to build seats for the children to sit on."

That began in 1932, and Birthe grew up watching the children across the border in another school like hers. "The only difference is they would get BB guns and prance around in the schoolyard like little soldiers during a military drill. They were members of the Hitler Youth. We didn't have that at our school because we were across the border."

Life was tense, both for children and grownups, in those days in Denmark before 1939. Parents were soon forced to pay for the train rides their children had to take to school, as well as for their lunches, and a special tuition fee . . . although the parents had no say in where their children attended school.

The government eventually took control of the schools entirely, then they financed the churches, and gradually turned toward socialism.

"There was only one private school on that side of the island," says Mrs. Turner, whose hometown was Kalundorg, Denmark, "and the upper class had that filled fast. By the time anyone realized it was wrong, there was nothing you could do about it." The children came home from the government day care centers until their parents came home from work. "Children and parents were together just long enough to say goodnight and good morning."

The year 1939 found Denmark a land of plenty. There was food, mainly because Denmark is a farm country, and there jobs for people. It didn't seem to matter that Denmark had few troops. They were concentrated at the little border that exists between Germany and Denmark, and that seemed enough.

The morning of April 9, 1939, dawned very clear and pleasant in Kalundorg, but by the time the townspeople managed to get to their windows, the sky was dark and gray with German planes from horizon to horizon. German tanks lumbered through the streets bumper to bumper, so to speak.

The invasion of Denmark was so organized the German troops even knew which offices and buildings they were going to occupy. They knew every building that held important documents and records, remembers Birthe, who was in secondary school at the time.

Mrs. Turner recalls that the Danish king came on the radio periodically that day, begging the people not to fight until they got better organized and had weapons. "It's no good to get mowed down senselessly," he said.

It wasn't long before everyone in Denmark was either a member of the underground resistance movement organized from England by Sir Winston Churchill, or they were the enemy. "There was no neutral stand," says Birthe, "either you were with us or you were against us."

Birthe and her family joined the resistance when she was still in her teens. Orders and weapons for the resistance fighters came from England or Sweden, and the fighters did everything from gathering information on troop movements and freeing resistance prisoners to "liquidating" German soldiers.

"The Germans would house resistance prisoners on the lower level of the buildings they occupied in an effort to keep themselves safe. But we would free the prisoners moments before the English bombers arrived to level the buildings," says Mrs. Turner, who watched neighbors gunned down mercilessly, and her own father tortured.

Her brow wrinkles as she recalls painful memories. "There was a time in Denmark when you couldn't leave town for 24 hours without reporting it to the police. Denmark became a police state, complete with Gestapo."

Among the mementos of her childhood are such "playthings" as German knives and the pistol she was given to fight with. There's the German knife she took off a German soldier who got too curious about the sack of "potatoes" she was carrying, which were really hand grenades. And there are the scars she carries, both inside and out.

Mrs. Turner is proud of her adopted land, but each night she listens to her shortwave radio and picks up broadcasts from many nations, some of which are Communist.

"Do you know what they're saying?" she asks, obviously concerned. "They're saying they will take America without firing a shot. They say the U.S. is infiltrated with Communism, and the American people don't even see it!" Mrs. Turner is obviously upset by these slurs on the U.S. She is also upset over the busing issue.

"That's how it started in Europe. The government bused the children, gained control of the schools and the churches and finally turned to socialism, which is only a refined form of Communism. Mrs. Turner also warns against the suppression of any one race. "If there is a suppressed race, that's a weakness. That's where communism can gain a foothold. People who are happy with capitalist government will not turn to communism . . . suppressed people will. They are ripe for communism."

One of Mrs. Turner's children was scheduled to be bused this year, but she has removed him from school. She is planning to enter him in a private school not far from her home. Her other two children luckily attend the school of her choice.

"I fought this in my country before the war. I came to the U.S. because they guaranteed me freedom of choice when I immigrated. What kind of freedom of choice is this? I will fight it here, too, if I have to."

When a woman like Mrs. Turner vows to fight for her freedom, it doesn't take much to believe her.

THE NONWAR WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Mitgang, the highly respected member of the editorial board of the New York Times, has seen with clear perception beyond the smokescreen which the administration has sought to create around the American involvement in the Indochina war. Mr. Mitgang, whom I am proud to count as a constituent, wrote a column which appeared earlier this week and which showed that the air war over Indochina is not winding down at all.

At a time when the American people are so clearly joined in a desire to see an end to this war it is most unfortunate that the administration continues to prop up a corrupt regime with U.S. air support. Hopefully, columns such as that

by Mr. Mitgang will help bring an end to this senseless business. In order that my colleagues might have the benefit of Mr. Mitgang's column I include it in the RECORD at this point:

THE NONWAR WAR

(By Herbert Mitgang)

The uncontested nonelection next Sunday for the South Vietnamese presidency has its counterpart in creative fantasy for over 200,000 Americans there: from the Delta to the DMZ and beyond they are shooting and being shot at in an unofficially undeclared nonwar.

The biggest public relations triumph of the Administration thus far is planting the impression that, like Pan Am's commercial, President Nixon is making the going great. He told Congress and the country this month about "our success in winding down the war" but, skeptical Senators and Vietnam-watchers say, he has only succeeded in winding down persistent opposition to the war.

This year the casualties and body counts have dropped sharply but the going is slow, costly, still perilous and pegged to politics. Senator Mansfield's original amendment to the draft-extension law calling for a nine-month troop withdrawal deadline was weakened into phrasing that is openended. The only "date certain" for withdrawal there is considered to be the '72 election here.

It was not Mao but Confucius who said that the best way to leave is simply by going through the door. But the revived fury of United States aerial strikes in the last fortnight indicates that our exit is through the bomb bays.

The air war is very costly in human and financial terms. A year ago about 5,000 American planes (1,000 fixed-wing and 4,000 helicopters) were operating over Indochina. There are still 3,500 American planes (500 fixed-wing, 3,000 helicopters) in action today. One and at times two aircraft carriers are in coastal waters. Plane losses by hostile fire and accidents have been heavy: more than 3,300 fixed-wing and more than 4,500 helicopters in the war up to now.

Nor has the theater of combat been narrowed in this twilight time of disengagement. Five states are still directly involved. Thailand remains the base of operations for B-52 missions; Laos and Cambodia are regularly interdicted to hinder the enemy's supply system; North Vietnam above the demilitarized zone is photographed by reconnaissance planes and struck by fighter-bombers on "protective reaction" missions; South Vietnam is one big free-fire zone when required to bail out Saigon's soldiers.

In the semantic acrobatics of the Vietnam war, "protective reaction" strikes against antiaircraft emplacements and missile and fuel sites have been stressed. But far more dangerous in the future are the actions behind two less-familiar phrases: "pre-emptive attack" against troop infiltration on the trails and "ancillary effect" bombing—meaning, in support of South Vietnamese forces. When ARVN troops retreated from a Cambodian town a few months ago, under heavy United States air cover, Gen. Creighton Abrams remarked, "Dammit, they've got to learn they can't do it all with air. If they don't, it's all been in vain."

In this withdrawal phase of Vietnamization, American troops are supposed to be in a defensive posture. On-the-ground combat responsibilities now belong to the ARVN; it is their turn to search-and-destroy and carry the fight. But an Air Force colonel explains, "Consistent with this concept we support ARVN ground operations with air and artillery. Both B-52's and tactical fighter-bombers have been involved." In this operations the American Air Force's role is restricted to "air logistical support and close air support."

Translated into what has taken place this month alone, the clear implication of these terms seems to be that American "advisers" and fliers are very much part of offensive actions. They have been engaged in a two-front war in September: carrying South Vietnamese infantrymen into battle deep in the Mekong Delta 145 miles southwest of Saigon and backing them up with helicopter gunships; bombing in the southern panhandle of Laos in direct support of Royal Lao forces and C.I.A.-trained guerrilla battalions. These activities hardly accord with the periodic announcements from Washington about "winding down the war" through Vietnamization.

It is difficult to predict what American casualties will be in the next twelve months of nonwar if no settlement is achieved in the Paris talks (and the Administration shows no eagerness to advance the prospect of a settlement there). The present rate of fewer than 100 killed a month is an encouraging drop but it could go up or down, depending not on American-originated actions but on the support given to sustain the governments of client states. The United States has become their hostage militarily.

The probability at this point is that the Air Force activity will be kept at a steady level. Two years ago there were 1,800 sorties (one aircraft on one mission) a month; currently the monthly rate is 1,000. It has gone up this month. The cost of one B-52 sortie in Southeast Asia today—for fuel and bombs alone—is between $35,000 and $45,000. Multiplied, this comes to more than $35 million a month.

Many moribund national programs—for education, housing, employment, parklands—could be revived by the hundreds of millions of dollars now falling out of the bomb bays on Southeast Asia. Perhaps a more meaningful local measure, even though Federal funds are not directly involved, is to compare just the financial costs of the B-52 bombings with what it would take to reopen the main branch of the New York Public Library evenings ($350,000), Saturdays ($350,000) and Sundays and holidays ($200,000) for a full year.

A few nonflying days, not to mention peace, would do it.

MISS MILDRED BIXBY IS HONORED AT WORLD CONFERENCE OF WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Center Associates of the World Peace Through Law Center held its first world conference in Belgrade in July 1971, in conjunction with the Fifth World Conference on World Peace Through Law.

More than 250 lawyers, jurists, legal professors, and interested persons assembled in Belgrade to participate in the world conference.

One of the women was Miss Mildred Bixby, a prominent Boston lawyer, who is a longstanding member of the center planning committee.

At the conference Miss Bixby was selected as one of the seven outstanding women members of the legal profession from throughout the world to receive the "Pax Orbis Ex Jure" Award, in recognition of her dedicated support of the cause of world peace. I would like to take this opportunity to express my hearty congratulations to Miss Bixby who is indeed worthy of the award she received. I know that she will continue to work with her associates for the cause of world peace.

CHINA-UNITED NATIONS POLICY

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to comment upon what I consider to be the very ill-considered two-China-U.N. policy being proposed by the United States. It just so happens that my views on this matter mirror the sentiment of the overwhelming number of people in northwest Texas; and since this is the case, it is all the more reason for me to make my views known.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make crystal clear my longstanding opposition to U.S. participation in that international debating society known as the United Nations. I use the words "international debating society" because on occasion after occasion and in crisis after crisis the United Nations has proved impotent—it has proved incapable of preserving world order or world peace.

My personal opinions regarding U.S. involvement in the U.N. notwithstanding, however, I do think it would be most regrettable if Red China were to be given a seat in the U.N. The famed Spanish philosopher Santayana once made a telling observation which I think is most appropriate here. He said:

Those who are ignorant of history are doomed to repeat it.

Have we forgotten what Neville Chamberlain's policies of appeasement toward Nazi Germany cost this Nation and Europe during World War II? Will we never learn that aggression is not stopped by yielding to it?

Some who cry for the seating of Red China in the U.N. claim that this will help further promote the cause of world peace and world justice. To them I say that Red China in its domestic and foreign policies has given no indication that it is interested in pursuing either peace or justice. At home the Communist leaders have enslaved and dominated 700 million people in conditions which are tolerable for some, but for many mean little food, little material comfort and no freedoms. As for foreign affairs, there is hardly a nation in the third world whose leaders have not been threatened by Chinese Communist behind-the-scene's maneuverings, or whose peoples have not been propagandized and urged to revolt by Red Chinese agents and their fellow travelers. This, by no stretch of the imagination, is behavior that would be pursued by any country that was concerned with peace and justice.

I find still another aspect of this matter most disturbing, and that is if Red China is seated in the U.N. then the Republic of China, one of our stanch allies and a founder of the organization, may well be given the boot. Such an action

would, I think, run clearly contrary to the express provisions of article 6 of the U.N. Charter which declares that a member nation can only have its membership revoked for committing serious and continuing violations of the U.N. Charter and by two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. Since no one even pretends that Nationalist China has violated any provision of the U.N. Charter, to kick that country out of the U.N. and seat Red China in its stead would be an international power play of the crudest and most illegimate sort.

Finally, seating Red China in the U.N. may seriously imbalance the delicate fabric of world power relationships. At the present time the United States and Soviet Russia are at a standoff. At the present time there is an uneasy peace existing between Soviet Russia and Red China. If Red China gains further legitimacy by being admitted to world councils, this will have serious repercussions on existing power balances. In the East-West area for example Japan, which has since the Second World War been firmly alined with the United States, may find that it is in its own national interest to forge a new alliance with Red China. In this connection, even today, quiet overtures are being made by the leaders of Communist China to various individuals and groups in Japan. Couple this with Japan's recently awakened interest in creating its own nuclear military force the alarming potential for a third world war, this one between the Caucasians and the Orientals, becomes chillingly apparent. I need not comment further on this latter point as those of us in this Chamber are all too well aware of the twisted and tortuous turns that international relationships and international power struggles take.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, the risks to this Nation and the world that would be created by seating Red China in the U.N. far outweigh any imaginable benefits that could be derived from such an occurrence. For this reason, I fervently hope that this Nation will rethink its activities in this regard, and I have urged appropriate Government leaders to reexamine the situation before it is too late. It is one thing for the President to go to Peking and talk with the Chinese leaders. After all this Nation can no longer afford to act as though the most populous nation in the world does not exist. It is an entirely different matter, however, to welcome that nation into the peace-keeping councils of the world.

STATEMENT OF CHURCHES AND RELIGIOUS ENTITIES IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, recently, every Member of the House of Representatives received in the mail a "Statement of opposition to proposed constitutional prayer amendments." It was also inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 20, 1971. The correspondence was signed by various religious groups and leaders and expressed their opposition to House Joint Resolution 191, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings.

Many clergymen, religious entities, civic organizations wholeheartedly endorse a prayer amendment to the Constitution. An analysis of the broad based support for the prayer amendment is contained in a recent publication prepared by "Citizens for Public Prayer," a nonsectarian, nonpartisan group. I commend this information to the Members for careful study:

SUPPORT FOR CIVIL RIGHT OF FREE PRAYER IS NATIONWIDE

One of the most wonderful aspects in the national drive to repeal the Supreme Court's two tragic prayer-ban decisions (1962 and 1963) is the survival of a massive public will for repeal. Despite the incredible silence of some so-called "religious leaders" and the open opposition of others, Americans everywhere have persisted in their conviction that the Court was very seriously wrong and that only a radical reversal of its majority conclusions can suffice to make safe again the civil right of public reverence in these United States.

"Religious leaders" who oppose a carefully worded prayer amendment are in most cases, we are certain from our long experience of the situation, *generals without armies*. There are, however, a number of religious leaders and organizations which do support free prayer in our public schools. Among them:

1. Dr. Billy Graham.
2. Patrick Cardinal O'Boyle (DC).
3. The North Carolina Baptist Convention.
4. Bishop Fulton J. Sheen.
5. The National Council of Catholic Youth.
6. Professor Charles E. Rice (Notre Dame).
7. Very Rev. Theodore Hesburgh (Notre Dame).
8. Nat. Association of Evangelicals.
9. Orthodox Greek Diocese of N. America.
10. Dioc. Council of Cath. Women (Pitts).
11. Dioc. C. of Cath. Women (Worcester).
12. Dioc. Council of Cath. Women (Buffalo).
13. Bishop Bernard J. Flanagan (Worcester).
14. Daughters of Isabella (RC).

Among other organizations supporting free prayer in public schools are:

1. The National JAYCEES.
2. Veterans of Foreign Wars.
3. The American Legion.
4. The legislature of Massachusetts.
5. The legislature of Maryland.
6. The legislature of North Carolina.
7. The legislature of Louisiana.
8. Nat. Federation of GOP Women.
9. National Kiwanis.
10. Nat. Conference of Mayors.
11. Nat. Conference of Governors.

Other indications of the massive public will for amendment are:

1. In the first official referendum on school prayer, on the Maryland ballot in November of 1970, 73% voted for amendment despite the tacit opposition of a popular governor who was overwhelmingly reelected and the absence of any organized campaign to win votes.

2. The latest Congressional poll of a home district on the subject of school prayer, announced by Congressman J. Irving Whalley of Pennsylvania on 21 July 1971, shows 94% in favor of free school prayer.

3. An Opinion Research national poll conducted for The Advocates TV program in January and February of 1971 shows upwards of 80% across America united in support of free school prayer, with majorities in each of the major faith groups.

4. Polls by Gallop, Harris, "Good Housekeeping" magazine, and numerous local and regional news media show, unanimously, a massive will for reversal of the Court.

5. One Congressional staffer, from Connecticut, told CPP that "in my eight years on the Hill, here, no subject has so motivated our district to political awareness as the subject of free school prayer." Another, from Maine, told CPP that his office had received "an unprecedented volume of mail on this matter." Senator Dirksen, who led the fight in the Senate at one point, described his mail as "king size."

Speaking to the Congressional First Friday Club in the Rayburn House Office Building on 10 September 1971, the National Coordinator of Citizens for Public Prayer, Rev. Robert G. Howes said in part:

It has been said there is no power like the power of an idea whose time has come. We are convinced that the idea of a national rededication to the principles of our foundation has come and that no better means to assure this exists than through ratification of a peoples amendment for public prayer.

ATTENTION ON STRIPPERS

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Toledo Blade recently carried an article by its fine writer, Frank Kane, outlining the untiring efforts of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia, Representative KEN HECHLER, to ban strip mining in the United States. As one of the 80 House cosponsors of this legislation, I applaud his efforts to secure passage of a strong law to end this wanton destruction of our environment.

At this point, I should like to insert in the RECORD the Toledo Blade article:

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade, Sept. 26, 1971]

ATTENTION ON STRIPPERS: CONGRESS TO LOOK AT A BUNCH OF BILLS ABOUT SURFACE MINING

FRICTION ARISES OVER CARE OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATION'S COAL NEEDS FOR ELECTRICITY

(By Frank Kane)

WASHINGTON.—The biggest environmental argument going on in Congress today centers on whether the strip mining of coal—otherwise known as "surface mining"—should be banned or strongly regulated by the Federal Government.

A score of bills have been introduced on the subject.

The most stringent is one sponsored by Rep. Ken Hechler, a Democrat from West Virginia, the No. 1 coal-producing state in the nation.

His bill calls for prohibiting all strip mining for coal within six months after enactment, except for those operations that the administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency might find necessary for effective reclamation of the land.

Mr. Hechler says he has lined up 90 cosponsors in the House and Senate, including Edward Kennedy of Massachusetts, George McGovern of South Dakota, and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin.

On the House side many of his supporters are from the urban areas, such as Thomas

Ashley of Toledo; Louis Stokes, Charles Vanik, and James Stanton of Cleveland; John Seiberling of Akron, and Charles Whalen of Dayton.

Significantly, no other West Virginia member of congress has endorsed the Hechler bill.

Also backing the Hechler measure are such environmental groups as Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, and Environmental Action, banding together under the name COALition.

Passage of the Hechler measure is given little chance, primarily because of the nation's need for coal and because more and more of it is supplied through surface mining.

But Mr. Hechler's arguments dramatize the case for some federal legislation to regulate the practice, and he thinks that some will emerge, "which would be a great victory in itself."

As of now, according to the West Virginian, 26 states have strip mining operations. An area of land nearly the size of Delaware and Rhode Island has been what he calls "disturbed" by them.

He says that the U.S. Geological Survey has estimated that mining of all the strippable coal reserves in the nation would increase this to an area larger than the states of Pennsylvania and New Jersey combined.

He goes on to recite the horrendous things that he says strip mining has left in its wake: huge acreages of devastated and unreclaimed land; 1,500 tons of mine acid a day which pollute streams and kill fish and other aquatic life; highly unstable spoil banks which cause massive landslides; an outward migration of people from those areas which have been heavily strip mined.

One thing that should particularly alarm people, he contends, is the startling growth of strip mining versus underground mining—from only 1.2 per cent of the total coal production a half century ago to 32.3 per cent in 1961 and 43.7 per cent in 1970.

He says that the 1971 figures probably will show that strip mining now accounts for half the coal mined in the nation.

Ohio was the second leading state in the nation in surface-mined coal production in 1970, according to the National Coal Association, composed of the major coal companies. It produced 37 million tons, valued at $64 million, in a surface mining industry which employed 4,039 persons with a payroll of $43 million.

Kentucky was the leader, with 62 million surface tons.

Mr. Hechler and others also cite what they term a great strip-mine boom going on in Arizona, Colorado, Montana, New Mexico, North Dakota, and Wyoming.

There are reportedly many billions of tons of strippable coal reserves, much of it the low-sulphur type preferred for combatting air pollution, in these states.

Strip mining is relatively cheap compared to underground mining. Power equipment such as "Big Muskie," a giant earth mover that can pick up 220 cubic yards of earth in one scoop and 4 million tons a month, is utilized in the southeastern Ohio coal fields.

Fewer workers are required, although Mr. Hechler says that they are often quite highly paid because of the machinery they operate, and there is no need to meet the safety regulations recently enacted by Congress for underground mines.

Mr. Hechler says he introduced his bill because of a growing feeling on the part of the people of his home state that something should be done to protect its hills, streams, and forests from the strip miners.

"West Virginia is a great hunting and fishing state," he notes. "Even the people in the coal industry like to hunt and fish and don't want a state scarred like the face of the moon."

It also may be of interest that in West Virginia only about one-eighth of those working in coal mining are employed in surface mining, according to National Coal Association figures.

Mr. Hechler also contends that the West Virginia tourist industry employs about four times as many people as those in strip mining.

Thus, the relative employment impact of a ban on strip mining in West Virginia would not be too great, he argues. Besides, many of the earthmoving equipment operators in strip mining could be shifted to housing or road construction, he contends.

West Virginia Secretary of State John Rockefeller IV recently tried to get the state legislature to ban strip mining but failed. A coalition of coal firms, public utilities (principal users of coal), and railroads (which haul it) put enough pressure on the legislature to defeat it, Mr. Hechler says.

But the legislature did prohibit new mines in certain counties. The congressman says that this was a laughable move because many of those counties don't have strippable coal anyway, and in the process the state's law regulating strip mining was weakened.

Most of the states where strip mining occurs do have laws requiring the operators to put the stripped land back into decent shape. But, Mr. Hechler contends, most of these laws are weak or not effectively enforced.

And since the laws vary in severity from state to state, they create competitive pressures which can be used to persuade the legislature of one state to further weaken its own law in order to prevent strip miners from moving jobs to another state, he adds. This argument, of course, is one of the chief points in favor of some form of federal regulation.

The National Coal Association, the United Mine Workers Union, and the Nixon administration all are opposed to any outright ban on strip mining.

Carl Bagge, president of the mine owners' group, argues that without strip-mined coal the electric utility industry simply would not be able to meet the demands now placed on it.

Russell Train, chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, says that "foreclosing surface coal mining would mean more reliance on other forms of mining which have not at all been proven to be less damaging to human values."

Environmental consequences of underground mining, such as acid mine drainage and the subsidence of the land above the mines, can be very serious without adequate controls, he adds.

"In light of the cost advantages of surface mining, it may prove cheaper in human and economic terms to require surface miners to be environmentally responsible than to rely solely on underground mining," Mr. Train argues.

As a result, the Administration is backing a bill which would set up federal guidelines for the regulation of both surface and underground mining. The states, however, would be given a two-year opportunity to develop "effective" regulations and if they did not act then the Department of the Interior would step in and promulgate and enforce regulations.

This provision for giving the secretary of the interior regulatory powers has evoked considerable criticism. As noted by Rep. Clarence Miller, a southeastern Ohio Republican who has a strip-mine bill of his own, the Interior Department has some interests which could "compromise its effectiveness."

For one thing, it controls millions of acres of federally owned land in the West which the coal interests want to lease or already are leasing for mining. And Interior's Bureau of Mines, according to both Mr. Hechler and Mr. Miller, is oriented toward increasing coal production.

Therefore, these congressmen want EPA to take over any federal regulatory functions.

Mr. Miller also wants the EPA administrator to issue regulations without waiting for any further state actions and to allow a state to assume the regulatory function only if it adopts standards which are equal to or exceed those at the federal level.

Another bill, introduced by Congressman John Seiberling of Akron, a Democrat, incorporates the Hechler ban on strip mining but also goes a step further by calling for federal financial aid to any workers who are laid off by mine shutdowns.

Rep. Wayne Hays, a southeastern Ohio Democrat, has put forward a bill to prohibit strip mining in areas where, after public hearings, it is determined that the land could not be reclaimed through natural growth or technological processes.

The Hays bill also provides that mining also could be banned if it might cause such things as stream pollution, landslides, flooding, or destruction of esthetic values. A three-man presidentially appointed commission would be established to issue licenses for strip mines and enforce the act, including reclamation processes.

The National Coal Association appears resigned to the prospect that some federal regulation may be inevitable, but it wants to make sure that the industry and the states will have some voice in shaping the rules. The association also keeps pouring out statistics on what it says are the tens of thousands of acres of strip-mined land that are being reclaimed successfully for other uses each year.

Mr. Hechler contends that in many cases true reclamation is impossible, citing a Case Western Reserve University study of a reclaimed area in Belmont County in Ohio.

The study found, among other things, that three years after reclamation, the area cannot support plant and animal life; that the acid condition produced by strip mining releases amounts of minerals and nutrients toxic to plant life, and that eutrophication processes of a lake in the area have been rapidly increased by dissolved chemicals, according to Mr. Hechler.

Mr. Seiberling and the environmental groups also say that, with 750 billion tons of deep coal reserves in the United States, the coal industry could easily reverse the trend toward strip mining and concentrate on underground mines.

The industry's answer is that it would cost much more to mine all the coal from underground mines and that this in turn would lead to higher electric power prices for the general public.

GREEK REGIME OPPRESSES WOMEN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the repressive Greek dictatorship of Premier George Papadopoulus, a beneficiary of U.S. military and economic aid, is to get still another seal of approval from the Nixon administration, with the announcement that Vice President SPIRO AGNEW will pay an official visit there soon.

As one who believes that our tax dollars should not be used to help foreign governments deprive their people of elementary democratic rights, I voted for a cutoff of economic aid to Greece and believe we should not send another weapon or dollar there as long as the current

military junta remains in power. Announcement of the Agnew visit was in sharp contrast to our Government's deliberate silence about the mass arrests and trials that mark the Papadopoulus regime's response to political opposition.

We were informed of the Vice President's visit at the same time that we were reading of the military trial and conviction in Athens September 28 of Lady Amalia Fleming; Mrs. Athena Psychoghiu, a Greek-American; John Skelton, an American student; and Constantine Androutsopoulus, a lawyer. There has not been a word of protest from our Government, just as it has remained silent about the arrests in Saigon of Madame Ngo Ba Thanh and other political opponents of the Thieu military dictatorship.

According to newspaper accounts, Lady Fleming, the widow of the British discoverer of penicillin, confessed that she had tried to arrange the escape from prison of Alexander Panagoulis, who had been accused of an assassination attempt against the Greek Premier. Lady Fleming was quoted as saying she was obsessed by the thought that Mr. Panagoulis had been tortured in prison for more than 3 years.

According to information I have received from Margaret C. Papandreou, chairman, Relief to Junta Victims, Panhellenic Liberation Movement:

Lady Fleming remained in Greece after the dictatorship, regained her Greek citizenship which she had lost earlier because of her marriage to Sir Alexander Fleming, and regained it in order to stay in Greece and fight the junta as a Greek. She had free access in and out of the country and could have left at any time to live in a more civilized environment. Instead she chose to fight. She made known her views by standing up for defendants in military trials who had been charged with anti-regime activities.

The Greek Government has been charged repeatedly with torturing political prisoners, with exiling opponents to remote mountain villages where they are harassed and threatened by the police, and with being especially vindictive against women prisoners. In the women's prison in Alicarnassos, Crete, women have reportedly been awaiting trial for as long as 4½ years, separated from their children and husbands.

One particularly tragic case that has been brought to my attention is that of Eleni Voulgari, who, several months after her arrest and trial, gave birth to her son in Averof prison in Athens. Her husband is in prison under a life sentence, she for 10 years. The child stayed with her in prison for 2½ years and was finally removed to a private school when his health began to deteriorate. The mother is reportedly very ill, but has been denied medical help.

In a speech last August to the National Student Association meeting in Colorado, Margaret Papandreou paid tribute to the remarkable courage of Greek women who oppose the antidemocratic government. She said:

Today, right now, there are women in jail in Greece and in island concentration camps. Some have been there since the night of April 21, 1967. Others have been arrested for anti-national activities and given long jail sentences. Others have been denied the right to work for refusing to cooperate with the police in giving information on fathers, brothers and husbands. Many, many have been tortured by the sadistic interrogators at Bouvoulinas Street and in the Military Security Headquarters.

Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that our Government's foreign policy is linked so closely with the perpetuation of oppressive, militaristic governments, such as that in Greece, South Vietnam, and Spain. I hope that more and more Americans will demand the release of political prisoners and a change in a Government policy which insults the beliefs upon which our country is founded.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the text of Madame Papandreou's remarks at the NSA meeting:

TRIBUTE TO THE WOMEN OF GREECE

Since I mentioned women, I want to talk about women in Greece. It was fascinating to me after the coup to watch what happened in that male-dominated culture to the men, and to the women. When I say male-dominated I think I can best express what I mean by describing an answer a Greek may give to the question, "How many children do you have?" and he will say, "two children, and, excuse me, two girls." Girls fall into a category other than children, and one must apologize to the listener before mentioning their existence.

After the coup, when totalitarian rule stomped down on all human rights and freedoms, when the male could no longer expound his political theories in the local tavern, and it became clear that the choice was either silence, or collaboration with the junta, or resistance—it was the women who were adamant. When the men wavered, the women stated their position, defiantly and without doubt, and readied themselves for the struggle ahead.

The first two people to make visits to my home as the morning dawned after the night of the military takeover, were women asking if they could help. The second day after the coup a Greek woman who had been planning a trip to France, came by to offer to take out any messages or materials. Being a Greek national, she could have been searched at the airport and arrested.

Outside of Greece, the first voice of protest from a known Greek came from Irene Pappas, who was attending the festival of Cannes to promote a picture. She agreed to see reporters on one condition, that they not ask her about her new film but ask her questions about the barbaric military takeover of her homeland. She would speak on that subject, and that subject alone.

Melina Mercouri, playing in the broadway version of Never on Sunday used her intermissions to plead that the Western world react to the rape of democracy in Greece. Mrs. Nikos Kazantzakis, the wife of the writer of *Zorba the Greek, Freedom or Death,* and many other magnificent books, started a tour in the United States and Europe for the cause of freedom in Greece.

Back in Greece, as perhaps you know, many women joined the group active in the hiding of Mikis Theodorakis, the songwriter and a political leader of the left. Eleni Vlahos, the publisher of two right-wing newspapers, refused to publish under a dictatorial regime, called Pattakos a clown, was put under house arrest, and finally escaped to London. Mrs. George Magakis, wife of a professor of law at the University of Athens, called in the press and charged the junta with torturing her husband. She was convicted for "slandering the government" and spent a year and a half in Averof prison. Mrs. Anastasia Skoulas of Crete was arrested while pregnant for anti-regime activities and lost her baby in jail.

Today, right now, there are women in jail in Greece and in island concentration camps. Some have been there since the night of April 21, 1967. Others have been arrested for anti-national activities and given long jail sentences. Others have been denied the right to work for refusing to cooperate with the police in giving information on fathers, brothers and husbands. Many, many have been tortured by the sadistic interrogators at Bouvoulinas Street and in the Military Security Headquarters.

So I would like to pay a tribute tonight to the women of Greece, and state this hope, that the liberation of Greece will be their liberation as well, for they deserve much better than what they have got.

SCHOOL OF ECOLOGY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 19, the Washington Post contained a most interesting article about a unique experiment in higher education being conducted on the Maryland shore. I refer to Kirkland Hall, a junior college, which has become an ecology institute at the suggestion of the distinguished newspaper columnist, Jack Anderson.

Exploiting its fine location, Kirkland Hall is giving high emphasis throughout its entire program to matters of the environment. Not only will the school train specialists in this important field; all graduates will have vital knowledge about conserving our environment.

Mr. Anderson is to be congratulated for this innovative idea and the administrators and faculty of Kirkland Hall are to be congratulated for having the courage to undertake what should be a valuable experiment.

Because Kirkland Hall may well prove to be a model for other efforts in other parts of the country, I include the aforementioned article from the Washington Post in the RECORD at this point:

SCHOOL OF ECOLOGY: FUNDS SHORT, PLANS PLENTIFUL AT EASTERN SHORE COLLEGE

(By Tom Huth)

EASTON, MD., September 18.—Kirkland Hall, a very young and very small junior college that is short of money but has a wealth of natural beauty on its riverside campus, is being transformed into a school of ecology.

When classes begin Wednesday, each of the 130-odd students will be required to attend ecology seminars and take part in outdoor activities and projects. Environmental issues will be woven into other areas of the curriculum. A division of ecology and conservation has been established and will grant two-year degrees. An ecology research center is operating.

The idea came from syndicated columnist Jack Anderson, who has been granted strong authority in setting the new direction of this five-year-old private school.

"This isn't going to be accomplished in one summer," he says, but he thinks a good start has been made toward creating "the finest ecology center in the country."

If ever a college made peace with its own environment, this is it. The 80-acre campus is part of an old 700-acre estate on the Miles River near the Chesapeake Bay.

The farm buildings have simply been refitted inside for academic use. Thus the

Georgian manor house is now the president's residence, the adjoining guest house is the administration building, the carriage house is a science laboratory, an old storage barn is a dining hall and library, the dairy barn serves as a dormitory, and the milk shed is now the bookstore.

A fair was held on campus today to raise money for the college. A White House limousine used by President John F. Kennedy and Mrs. Kennedy and donated by an obstetrician who is a friend of the college was sold for $9,000 to an ad hoc "syndicate" of eight couples, including Maryland Comptroller Louis L. Goldstein and his wife.

Among others buying the car were Carter Burgess, former ambassador to Argentina under President Kennedy, and J. Robert Sherwood, president of Suburban Trust Co. The car, a 1960 Lincoln, may be sent on a tour of the country to raise funds for the college, said Washington investor George DeFranceaux, another of the buyers.

Kirkland Hall was established by a group of private citizens in 1967 and had only 10 students that year. Now there are 15 faculty members, all with master's degrees or doctorates, and two full-time administrators.

The bottom-heavy structure is intentional. "Our primary objective right from the start was to really concentrate on individual instruction and to make the student our most important product," says President Walter Stencil, 56, a retired Navy captain.

From the beginning, "we had conservation courses, what we called nature studies, but we didn't formalize it into a program until this year," Stencil says.

Columnist Anderson got involved because his son attends Kirkland Hall. Anderson went to parent's day last May and had a talk with Stencil.

"Jack and I spent the day together, and, well, we turned each other on," Stencil recalls. "He looked at the advantages of our location, what he calls the nature wonderland. He said, 'Why can't we specialize?' I said, 'There's no reason why not.' "

Anderson tells it a little differently: "Stencil told me that the college was in financial trouble and asked me to help . . . I said, 'I'm not interested in supporting a junior college, but I am interested in supporting an ecology college.' "

So, Anderson says, the board of trustees "agreed to transform Kirkland into an ecological institute" and "in effect voted me a right of veto over any policy matter, so that I wouldn't wind up supporting an ecology college that endorsed Dow Chemical or General Motors or something."

Summer school this year served as a trial run for the school's new focus. Courses were held in marine technology, biology of the Chesapeake Bay, conservation, the seafood industry and other fields.

Every student chose at least one of the courses, Stencil says, "and student interest was the highest I've ever seen."

A vice president for development, Hal Walter, was appointed with Anderson's approval and began working July 4 to raise money.

So far, Walter says, the college has received an $85,000 grant from the U.S. Enviromental Protection Agency for a series of workshops and is hoping for another $200,000 grant from the federal government. Two corporate gifts, totaling $50,000, have been pledged and more are being sought.

Stencil is reluctant to talk about financial difficulties, pointing out that "every private college has budget problems." Anderson says the school was "in deep financial trouble." Walter says that there were times when the school was in danger of closing, but that now "the college is over a great many hurdles."

One aspect of Kirkland Hall's new orientation will be ecology workshops presented with the help of the national organizations of governors and mayors, according to Anderson.

Other workshops, to be held at the college or at a site that has been offered to the school in Naples, Fla., are expected to bring "the top executives of the companies that are in pollution trouble together with some of the conservationists . . . to seek a practical solution," the columnist says.

While Anderson provides a certain overall direction, raises money, serves as a trustee and promotes the school through his column and his high-level contacts, Stencil and his faculty are working out the curriculum.

The required seminars, for which students will get academic credit, are meant to heighten awareness of ecological issues, Stencil explains. The introduction of environmental issues to psychology, history, literature and other classes will serve the same purpose. All students also will get credit for the outdoor activities, such as water survival and seamanship.

The research center will be staffed by faculty and students and will seek out and collect information on the environment. Stencil hopes the center eventually will be able to draw on its pool of knowledge to give outsiders guidance on specific ecological problems.

Besides its regular program, the college will run a training school for specialists in water purification.

EULOGY TO HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, with great regret and a sense of personal grief, I call to the attention of the House the recent demise of the Honorable James S. Golden, who represented the Kentucky Eighth District in this Chamber, from 1948 to 1954.

James Golden was many things—farmer, lawyer, father, legislator, expert in agriculture—and everything he did he did well. At the moment of his parting he had just celebrated his 80th birthday, and had declared his satisfaction with life as it had served him. No Member of the House, I am led to understand, had more close friends than he during his tenure in Washington; and no wonder, for he was indeed a splendid man.

James Golden attended the University of Kentucky during the administration of William Howard Taft, graduating in 1912. He was the grandson of a Union chaplain in the War Between the States and the son of a captain in the war with Spain. As an undergraduate, he was president of the junior class, president of the Union Literary Society, and an outstanding scholar. Following graduation, he studied law at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, but returned to Kentucky to open a law office in Knox County. Entering politics as a Republican, he was elected county attorney and served 4 years before returning to private practice in the Federal and State courts.

For the next three decades James Golden was busy establishing a record as one of the best lawyers in Southeast Kentucky. But with the close of World War II, and the rise of Republican strength in his district, he was called upon to return to the political mill, and answered affirmatively to the call. He was nominated for Congress in 1948 and subsequently elected. In Washington, he brought his influence to bear on all matters coming to his attention as a member of the Agriculture Committee, on which he became at once a leading figure.

Following a forceful canvass, he was reelected in 1950, and won considerable attention in the 1952 campaign as a vigorous supporter of Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Republican candidate for President. Reelected again in the Eisenhower victory of 1952, James Golden found himself a high-ranking majority member of the Agriculture Committee in the 83d Congress, and as such was influential in the consideration and passage of several farm bills of considerable importance. The fortunes of political warfare deserted his cause in the election of 1954, and he retired to private life, where he once again excelled as a practicing attorney.

During his tenure in Congress, James S. Golden revealed that special ability to intermix concern for his district and the rights of his constituents with national concerns and his own philosophical beliefs, predicated on the highest Christian virtues. In all his endeavors, political and personal, he made manifest a special interest in the best American principles and traditions, and all who knew him or were familiar with his work must grieve his departure from this earth.

MORMON WELFARE MEANS YOU EARN WHAT YOU GET

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Mormon Church has been among the leaders all over the world in trying to take care of those in their church who are in genuine need of welfare and welfare supplemental programs.

In a country where welfare seems to be bordering on chaos, we find a religious faith that very quietly is attempting to solve its own welfare problems within the scope of its religion. I had heard about this program, but in view of the fact that the Mormon people seem to work at their religion rather quietly, it had never before been brought to my attention in a public article.

Janice Law, the religion news editor of the Church Chronicle, published by the Houston Chronicle, has an article in the September 24, 1971, issue titled "Mormon Welfare Means You Earn What You Get." I feel sure my colleagues will enjoy reading the theory of welfare in the Mormon faith and how it is brought about.

I know of no other religious group which is working on this problem of taking care of the members of its own church and without application to the Federal Government for assistance. The

real surprising things is that Mormon welfare rolls have shown a steady decline in the past 3 years whereas U.S. Government welfare rolls have expanded in a tremendously increasing rate over the same period.

The article follows:

MORMON WELFARE MEANS YOU EARN WHAT YOU GET

(By Janice Law)

The welfare program of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) is so unique that laymen and government officials from over the world come to see it in operation at its headquarters in Salt Lake City, Utah.

Most visitors shake their heads in amazement and wonder if the Mormon program could be adapted to solve the ever increasing complaints about government welfare programs, Mormon officials say.

The Mormon welfare program is unique because:

Those who receive welfare must work (unless ill or physically handicapped) to produce what they receive.

Those not on welfare must actually help provide welfare commodities.

Welfare items given are first class, brand new.

Great care is taken to preserve the dignity and self respect of the recipient, to remove any stigma of being on welfare.

Budget planning, economic, and social problem counseling are provided, too.

Mormon welfare rolls show a steady decline from 1969 to 1971, in contrast to growing government welfare rolls.

The Mormon program is extended to Mormons only, except in individual cases of extreme emergency or international natural disasters such as earthquakes and floods. In the case of natural disasters, Mormons ship surplus goods from their storehouses to the affected areas.

The bishop, who serves without pay, is the key figure in the church welfare program. He is given the responsibility of caring for the needy in his ward, which consists of 100 to 200 families.

Teams of men and boys, called home teachers, are responsible for visiting the homes of ward members, monthly or more often, and reporting to the bishop any unemployment, sickness, aging difficulties or other problems.

After the bishop determines, from the home teachers' reports, that there is a need for welfare, he sends his chief aide to counsel with the family and determine its needs. The chief aide is always president of the ward's women's group.

She makes out a "bishop's order" for commodities needed, which could include food, furniture, chicken and cattle feed or clothing.

The "bishop's order" is the medium of exchange in over 100 bishop's storehouses across the nation. The storehouses are like large discount department stores. The storehouse in Salt Lake City is the largest and oldest.

FEW IN HOUSTON

Houston area officials said there are so few persons here on Mormon welfare that the church makes arrangements through local chain stores so welfare recipients can pick up groceries and dry goods that are charged to the church. There are about 8000 Houston area Mormons.

The commodities filling the storehouses are made by the people on welfare and through volunteer labor by other Mormons.

Welfare recipients are required to work for one of the storehouses—clerking, bottling milk, harvesting crops, making furniture or storing supplies. Thus the welfare is not a something for nothing dole.

In the case of Houston area Mormons, both those on welfare and those not, work for six weeks each January at a Baytown plant producing over 80,000 20-ounce cans of peanut butter annually. All help is volunteer but those on welfare will be given "work receipts" which may be redeemed later for commodities.

Most of the peanut butter from the Baytown plant is shipped to Salt Lake City.

SOMETHING FROM EVERYWHERE

Each geographical area of the United States is assigned a project compatible with the products produced in that area: Milk and dairy products from Wisconsin and Utah, fruit and vegetables from Florida and California, wheat and grain from Kansas and Iowa.

The products are interchanged to provide a balanced commodity offering in each of the 100 storehouses.

The church owns most of the canning or harvesting facilities, soap factories, bakeries and chicken farms. A few are rented at commercial rates.

Products are labeled with the Deseret brand, which cannot be bought commercially. Deseret means "busy bee."

In 1968, 112,055 persons were on Mormon welfare. In 1969, the number was 113,133. In 1970 it was 96,429 and thus far in 1971, 84,507 persons have been on Mormon welfare. There are two million Mormons in the nation.

Mormon officials can offer no explanation for the program's success except the nature of the welfare program itself, which encourages people to get off welfare.

The church also operates an employment service to find welfare recipients jobs in private industry. The number placed has increased from 6809 in 1968 to 9226 this year.

Welfare Square, Mormon welfare headquarters in Salt Lake City, is a big tourist attraction, with over 2,000 visitors this July alone. A free bus leaves Mormon Square in downtown Salt Lake for the round trip to Welfare Square at 10:15 a.m. and 12:15 p.m. daily. Guides are volunteer laymen (or perhaps welfare recipients) who show people around the square block of white buildings dominated by a huge white grain elevator built with volunteer help.

IT IS ALL NEW

All goods given to welfare recipients are new. "We avoid the policy of some welfare agencies, where welfare recipients are given ill-fitting, worn, cast off clothing, or damaged furniture which is no longer needed by the donors," said an official.

Among the few items purchased outright by Mormons are shoes, because they cannot be easily made. Thus welfare recipients get new shoes in their correct size.

Mormons see to the smallest detail to preserve the dignity of the welfare recipient.

Unmarked trucks take goods each week to those infirm persons who can't pick up goods at the storehouse. Different colored unmarked trucks are alternated each week so recipients never need to worry that "the neighbors know we are on welfare."

Visitors to Welfare Square are always invited to make written comments on the operation and the most frequent is "Why doesn't the government do something like this?"

When the church established the welfare program in 1936, its principle was that of Mormon pioneer Brigham Young, who said: "My experience has taught me that it is never of benefit to give out and out, to man or woman, money, food, clothing or anything else if they are able-bodied and can work and earn what they need. To pursue a contrary course would ruin any community in the world and make them idlers."

THE NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last June, at its national convention, the American Veterans Committee adopted a resolution endorsing a program of national volunteer service. In its key elements, the AVC proposal is very similar to H.R. 1000, the National Service Act, which I introduced with distinguished bipartisan cosponsorship.

Although the Congress has unfortunately voted to extend the draft for 2 years, it must continue to give careful attention to the manner in which American youth will serve their country. I firmly believe that the future lies in a national service system which will give every American the opportunity to choose how he or she will express his or her commitment to this country. The American Veterans Committee is but another clear voice among a growing legion of supporters who favor the national service concept.

The text of their statement follows:

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL VOLUNTEER SERVICE, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

Whereas, the zeal of our youth to build a better society has never been clearer than it is now. Yet opportunities to work constructively for a better society are limited. Compared to national needs, relatively few jobs in the service fields are available to young men and women.

Whereas, such service is vitally needed by society—in such fields as education, health, conservation and municipal services. Many of these needs could be met by young people, those who are asking for relevance in education, for a chance to meet their service responsibility outside the armed forces, and for first-hand experience with problems whose outcomes will determine the kind of world to be passed on to their children.

Now, therefore, be it resolved that in order to meet many of our most pressing needs and to permit young men and women to become engaged in the building of a better society, the American Veterans Committee *endorses a program of national volunteer service,* which would have these basic features:

1. Service opportunities would be available to all young people. The main criterion for admission would be willingness to serve.

2. Each participant would serve and learn. Learning would range from development of specific skills to growth in self-knowledge, problem-solving, and working with people.

3. Service activities would be directed and financed at the local level to the extent permitted by available resources, and would include projects organized and directed by young people. Thus, maximum local initiative would be encouraged.

4. The basic reason for national volunteer service is the need society has for the service of youth. Main areas are tutoring, health and mental health, as well as conservation and beautification, the cleaning up of our rivers, lakes and seashores, our cities and our forests, and various kinds of community and family service. By serving in these fields, young people would be able to test themselves through service to society and would receive valuable experience for their careers.

5. Young people who seem poorly qualified by conventional standards could serve effectively. High school drop outs are today serv-

ing as tutors, and doing a good job; others are receiving specialized training for responsible hospital positions. Each participant would be given the training and supervision needed for the assignment.

6. There would be a transition phase. Growth of national volunteer service would be constrained by identification of useful tasks, finding enough trainers and supervisors, and obtaining sufficient funds. The transition phase would permit experimentation with various techniques and activities on a pilot program basis.

7. Participation would be by means of contract, voluntarily entered into by all parties. The contract would spell out the responsibility of the participant, the sponsoring agency and the funding agency.

8. Duration of service would range from a minimum of one year to a maximum of four years. The normal contract period would be one or two years, renewable.

9. Participation in national volunteer service would be viewed as fulfillment of a person's service obligation. Thus, satisfactory completion of national volunteer service—for at least the same period of time as needed to complete one's military service obligation—would place participants in the same draft category as veterans of military service. Also as armed forces manpower requirements are likely soon to be met solely by volunteers in view of large increases in service pay and diminishing manpower needs for Viet Nam there may be no need to relate civilian service to military service since both would be manned by volunteers.

DEDICATION OF THE WORLD'S LARGEST TOTEM POLE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, today the town of Kake, Alaska—"the town that never sleeps"—is the site of the official raising of the world's largest totem pole. The ceremony is in the form of the traditional "potlatch"—the great winter ceremonial among the tribes of the Pacific Northwest. This is a festival in which gifts are made, totems are raised, and ornaments of cultural significance are exchanged and sold. The festival is accompanied by dancing, singing, and feasting.

It is appropriate that dedication of this totem—136 feet tall—should be the occasion for this traditional celebration. For the program is under the auspices of the Southeast Alaska Community Action program and the totem is fittingly representative of all southeastern Alaskan culture. Tingit and Haida Indians, who inhabit this area, have a long tradition of hospitality and good will.

The ceremony—and the totem by which it is symbolized—is further representative of the vitality and promise of Alaska in the world of today. It is significant that the totem itself comprised the 1967 Alaska Centennial project and thereafter was displayed in the 1970 World's Fair in Osaka, Japan.

I, therefore, express my own great pride in this momentous symbol of Alaska's rich cultural heritage and her hopes for the future. My warmest best wishes go to the people of Kake on the occasion of this happy event in the history of our State.

THE NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL ON THE ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to include in the RECORD a copy of of a New York Times editorial entitled "The Oil Can Wait" which appeared in the Times today. The Times editorial is an excellent and an important one. The editorial argues that a Canadian pipeline, as an alternative to the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline, should be fully studied before any decision is reached on the Alaska pipeline; it points out many of the apparent ecological advantages a Canadian pipeline would have over the Alaska line; and it argues that there is no immediate need for developing the North Slope oil, even within the next decade.

There is, however, one problem with the editorial. It praises the Secretary of Interior Rogers C. B. Morton for his recent statements concerning the Canadian pipeline alternative, which were made in an interview in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. Indeed, those statements by Mr. Morton were both enlightened and encouraging, and deserve praise.

What the Times editorial does not acknowledge, however, is that literally within a matter of hours after the Associated Press had written an article on the Secretary's statements in U.S. News & World Report, the AP reported new statements made by the Secretary which directly contradicted his statements in the U.S. News interview. I attempted to point out the Secretary's inconsistencies in a statement "Trying to Keep Up With Secretary Morton's Flip-Flopping", which appeared on page 33735 of the September 28 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Times carried the first AP story on Mr. Morton's U.S. News interview in its Wednesday edition, a day after most other morning papers carried the story. As far as I know, it did not carry the second AP story on the Secretary's latest and contradictory statements, which appeared in most afternoon papers on Tuesday. Thus, it is entirely possible that the editorial writer on the Times who wrote "The Oil Can Wait" editorial was not aware of the second AP story.

The Times editorial follows immediately below. After that, I have included the first AP article on Mr. Morton's U.S. News interview which appeared on page 1 of the Washington Post under the headline "Alaska Oil May Flow Via Canada" on Tuesday, September 27. Immediately following that, I have included the second AP story on Secretary Morton's most recent statements, which appeared in the Washington Star that afternoon on page A–5 under the headline "Changes Clear Way For Alaska Pipeline".

The three articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 27, 1971]

THE OIL CAN WAIT

President Nixon's recent statement in Anchorage about the proposed trans-Alaskan oil pipeline had the ring of a comment designed to mollify some of the local citizens, in haste to get on with the project, rather than to indicate a final commitment on his part to the building of the line. It promised to reconcile the exploitation of natural resources and protection of the environment without quite saying that this could be done with a pipeline carrying oil from Prudhoe Bay in the Arctic to Valdez on Alaska's southern coast.

What offered hope that Mr. Nixon's mind is still open on the subject was his reference to "alternative means for the movement of Arctic oil"—and, even more, the emphasis on such an alternative in a U.S. News & World Report interview with Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton. The possibility the Secretary dwelt on was the suggested route from Alaska's North Slope, up the Mackenzie River Valley in Canada, all the way south to Edmonton, Alberta, whence some of the oil would move in pipelines to the Pacific Northwest and some to refineries in the Midwest.

The advantages of such a line would be the complete elimination of overwater hazards and the fact that a pipeline is almost sure to be built in the Mackenzie Valley in any case in order to carry natural gas from the North Slope. As Mr. Morton suggests, "that raises the question: Why not bring the oil out that way, too?"

The answer to that question requires time. The Canadian route *could* endanger the Wildlife Refuge in northeastern Alaska and it could prove a hazard to the Canadian terrain, although that land is considerably less subject to the kind of seismic disturbances that add so greatly to the risks of the trans-Alaskan scheme.

President Nixon's statement did pledge that *if* a pipeline is built from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez the job would be done with the greatest concern for the environment, but opponents of the trans-Alaskan line can take little comfort in such a prospect. Even if the pipe could be guaranteed against the kind of rupture that would pour oil over miles of tundra, there would be no assurance against spills and leaks in the beautiful waters of King William Sound, where the oil would have to be transferred to tankers—or along the scenic coasts of British Columbia en route to Pacific Coast refineries.

All of which raises once again the question of timing. No one argues that oil from the North Slope is vital to this country's welfare this year, next year or even in the next decade. And the armed forces have raised no question of national security.

On this major aspect of the matter there is less cause for cheer in the President's suggestion of a decision this fall than in Secretary Morton's disinclination to act until he is "sure that the total spirit of the Environmental Policy Act has been complied with" and that there are no alternatives that would better serve this country's interest.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 27, 1971]

ALASKA OIL MAY FLOW VIA CANADA

Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton hinted strongly yesterday that oil from Alaska's North Slope may ultimately go to market through Canada.

Morton said that a routing through Canada would require extensive negotiations with Canadian authorities and added that, as far as he knows, no application for construction of a pipeline from the North Slope through Canada has ever been lodged with the Interior Department or with Canada.

But, he said, there apparently is going to be a gas pipeline from the North Slope through Canada "because compressing the gas and transporting it by ship is not practical."

He added:

"Now, if there is going to be a pipeline through Canada, that raises the question: Why not bring the oil out that way, too? So we will have to look at the economics of that."

Strong opposition to a proposed Alaskan pipeline has come from conservationists and some Alaska natives who fear its impact on the environment.

Morton in effect ruled out any 1971 start on a trans-Alaska oil pipeline.

He acknowledged he would be unable to meet his tentative deadline of October for a decision on the much-disputed project to bring oil down from the new field on the North Slope. And he implied it may be months before the decision is made.

He said he would not act until he consults other federal agencies and until "I am sure that the total spirit of the Environmental Policy Act has been complied with."

The Cabinet member, who was traveling to Alaska yesterday with President Nixon, gave his assessment in a copyrighted interview in the magazine U.S. News & World Report.

Morton said one thing holding up the final decision is that in the mass of material submitted by the Alyeska Company, which wants to build the pipeline, there were "some discrepancies and some elements that were not congruent with the stipulations which we had made and which we thought the company had agreed to."

He said another delaying factor is the study of alternative routes as required by the Environmental Policy Act. "The major viable alternative is a pipeline over another route, most of which would actually be on Canadian land," he added. This would be an alternative to the Alyeska plan to run the pipeline to the Alaska port of Valdez and then ship it by tanker to the West Coast.

Discussing the possible Canadian route, Morton said:

"It would be up the Mackenzie River, and then would bifurcate at Edmonton (Alberta). From there, part of the oil would go over the intermountain pipeline into the Pacific Northwest, and the other part would go into the pipeline grid on the central part of the continent serving the Great Lakes corridor and the Midwest.

"We have to study the environmental aspects of this alternative route, and we have to study the economic aspects of it, too. Remember this pipeline is to be built by private enterprise, so it has to be commercially viable from their point of view. And since this route would be through Canada, international politics is involved.

"Canadians would obviously have to be for the pipeline and would have to participate. There would have to be sophisticated international agreements dealing with it."

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 27, 1971]

CHANGES CLEAR WAY FOR ALASKA PIPELINE

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA—The Interior Department may be able to make a favorable environmental report on the trans-Alaska oil pipeline because of changes agreed to by the proposed builders, Interior Secretary Rogers Morton says.

The pipeline "can be built compatibly with the environment" and an Interior Department report on the project should be issued by the end of the year, possibly before Dec. 1, Morton said here last night. He said construction could start before March.

Morton accompanied President Nixon on his trip to Alaska to meet Japanese Emperor Hirohito.

Morton said the Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., the combine of oil firms which proposes to build the 800-mile line, has agreed to allow the Interior Department to stop construction if it is not satisfied environmental requirements are being met.

"CAN'T FORESEE DIFFICULTIES"

Morton said virtually all reports on the pipeline were in from other government agencies, including the departments of Commerce and Defense, and added: "I can't foresee any difficulties with any of them."

The pipeline has been opposed by conservationists and Alaska native groups who fear it could harm the Arctic ecology along its route from the Alaska North Slope to the ice-free port of Valdez. Opponents also have argued that fishing grounds would be endangered by the possibility of oil spills at the line's southern terminus on the Gulf of Alaska.

Prior to his meeting with Hirohito, Nixon issued a prepared statement in which he said he felt environmental problems could be solved, although he did not commit himself to support of the project.

NIXON: NO IMPASSE

"Based on the information now at hand, I do not believe that the apparent conflict between oil and the environment represents a permanent impasse," he said.

"Instead," he said, "it presents a challenge—challenge to our engineering skills and a challenge to our environmental conscience."

"I believe we can meet that challenge, proving that natural resources—in the Arctic or elsewhere—can be developed and transported in a responsible manner and respect to environmental values."

Morton suggested later that engineering was equal to the task of solving environmental problems.

WAGES AND OTHER INCOME, INSTEAD OF RELIEF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, all of us are concerned with the heavy cost of welfare and its burden on the working taxpayer. Many efforts have been made to reduce the welfare roles and encourage more of the welfare recipients to become self-sustaining. One of my constituents, Mr. Merlin M. Paine, has devoted much of his time and energy to the study of the welfare problem. Recently he prepared a paper on welfare operations in San Diego County and I wish to bring it to the attention of our colleagues for their review. The paper follows:

WAGES AND OTHER INCOME, INSTEAD OF RELIEF

(By Merlin M. Paine)

A certain number or percentage of relief recipients, leave Welfare because of employment of the *recipient*. An additional number leave, because of the employment of a member of the recipient family, *NOT* a recipient. Still others leave because of an increase in wages, or because of an increase in income other than wages. Therefore, when the figure "5% employable" is used to describe the financial potential of relief recipients, not enough information has been supplied.

To get fuller information, a quick look at San Diego Welfare statistics, summarized herein, shows that at least 12.3%, on relief during an eleven month period, left because of someone's employment; and an additional 5 or 6% left because of increased income. 4.5% were transferred off Welfare to some other public aid, and only 1.7% died while on Welfare.

We say that "at least 12.3%" left Welfare because of employment, since in more than one-third of cases leaving Welfare, the *economic* reasons were not clear. (See comments on "Savings not Clear", following the statistics.) A total of 37.4% left Welfare during the period studied, of which possibly 30% left in order to improve their economy, while saving taxpayer's money, at the same time. Moreover, this percentage would rise if we extended the period studied. In fact, every one leaves relief eventually, with surprisingly few because of death. And this suggests the *time on relief*, as our major problem.

Social workers know very well how to reduce the time on relief. A book, "Social Diagnosis", by Mary Richmond, is the key to good social work. It describes the only, fully tested way to help people off relief, who do not realize their own need for help. First printed in 1917, this book is still a text in schools of social work. The best social workers are needed at Welfare intake, to stress with applicants what each can do to improve his own income. Delays in using applicants to help themselves can be very costly. Except for "emergency grants", no grant should be confirmed until after a first home visit, as described in "Social Diagnosis". Then "resources" listed in this book should be visited. The list of facts now checked by eligibility workers (all items listed in "Social Diagnosis") is not enough, either to justify relief or to help people off relief.

The cost of government is persistently rising, faster than the growth of taxpayer incomes. We must reverse this trend or go broke. To help relief recipients to find work, or to find other income that will take them off relief, a Governor's Study of Welfare, in 1962, recommended five new schools of social work in California State Colleges, and a school in each University that had no such school. Only the schools in State Colleges were started. Before the depression of the 1930s, social workers were highly successful in reducing relief rolls. Obviously, jobs must be available; and obviously, when we tried raising interest rates "to stop inflation", this threw millions out of work—and did not stop inflation. The San Diego Chamber of Commerce is working on jobs for the needy, and social workers should support this drive.

Next to the Welfare Department, the Employment Service has second most responsibility for clearing relief rolls. For example, only the Employment Service can make direct placements on work; but actually, direct placements do little to clear relief rolls, because 95% of job placements, in some industries, are made "at the gate", with no clearance through the Employment Service. Moreover, jobs not sought by the relief recipient, himself, may not satisfy him, so that he will do poorly and soon be out of work, again.

To help fit the worker to the job and the job to the worker, a suggestion has been made that social workers in Welfare be moved to the Employment Service. A number of questions need answers before this happens: Can social workers promote work, if they believe that only 5% of relief recipients are employable? Can social workers promote work, if employers feel that social workers are siding against them in a political battle? And will social workers lose "authority" if they are moved to the Employment Service? At present, when a relief recipient fails to cooperate with the Employment Service, he is returned to Welfare, because Welfare has more authority, due to its control of eligibility determination.

Not only can social workers be more "authoritive", if they remain with Welfare, they can also control the many reasons for leaving Welfare, of which the Employment Service has no knowledge. These include all of the dozens of reasons for leaving relief, other than employment, that are included in the following statistics. Help on all of these reasons for leaving relief would be lost, if Welfare surrenders its social workers.

A more serious threat to social workers in Welfare is the presence of eligibility workers in Welfare. Both sets of workers must know and interpret all eligibility rules which makes workers compete. But "authority" now rests with eligibility workers who may dismiss a relief recipient, with no notice to the social worker.

When social workers lost authority to eligibility workers, this placed social workers, in Welfare, on a par with social workers in private family agencies, who also lack authority, because they handle no relief. The San Diego family agency commented on this Welfare-social-worker loss of authority, before it happened, and they are still concerned, because stripping social workers of authority, in effect, abandons those relief recipients who most need counsel but will not ask for it. These "reluctant" relief recipients must be visited, if we expect to serve them; and "authority" is needed to justify such a visit.

To solve these problems, a further change, in the status of social workers in Welfare, can be expected soon. For the change to be successful, here are some items that need careful thought: Our most able social workers should remain, at Welfare intake, to discuss withdrawal from relief, before relief is approved.

Next, only those social workers should be hired by Welfare, who are hopeful about moving recipients off relief, whether by employment or by the other means listed in the following statistics. Those not hopeful may be usable in other agencies, but not in Welfare. The Welfare personnel office is already considering this point.

A proposal, that Welfare "contract" for social work, from an agency outside Welfare, would still leave "authority" impaired. No contract is needed with existing family agencies; they have always accepted referrals. The proposal, to place social workers in more "Service Centers", also discounts "authority". In fact, these centers may condone inadequacy, more than they promote self-reliance. The centers are "kind", but not always "stimulating".

It is conceivable that eligibility workers may completely replace social workers in Welfare—because eligibility workers accept "authority" as a social tool, as some social workers do not. Many eligibility workers are already good social workers, but if they take over the job of "social worker", this would leave eligibility workers overworked, as social workers were overworked, before eligibility workers appeared. Therefore, whichever group remains with Welfare, it may need more clerical help, and/or reduced caseloads. Finally, we must distinguish between "authority" and "legal dictation". See later comments, on page 6, under the heading "Refused to Cooperate", as a reason for leaving relief.

Statistics on Old Age Security, 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71.

(a) Total on relief during July: 15,646. Left during July: 249.

(b) Percent leaving in July, 1.6%.

(c) Total on relief for 11 mo: 15814 (end of May), plus 3212 turnover=19,026.

(d) Percent turnover during 11 mo: 16.8%.

Reasons for leaving relief:

1. Left for employment	46
2. Savings not clear	2,105
Left San Diego, or lost residence	524
Left relief, giving no reason	194
Change in property value	205
"Other," with no reason in report	1,182
3. Help from relatives and other income	88
4. Pensions	66
5. Transfer to institution, or to other public aid	87
6. Died	820
Total turnover, same as turnover in item (c), above	3,212

Statistics on Totally Disabled, 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71.

(a) Total on relief during July: 8295. Left during July: 239.

(b) Percent leaving in July: 2.8%.

(c) Total on relief for 11 mo: 8940 (end of May), plus 2692 turnover=11,632.

(d) Percent turnover during 11 mo: 23.7%.

Reasons for leaving relief:

1. Left for employment	91
2. Savings not clear	1,347
Left San Diego, or lost residence	252
Left relief, giving no reason	380
Change in property value	87
No longer disabled	51
"Other", with no reason in report	577
3. Help from relatives and other income	102
4. Pensions	191
5. Transfer to institutions, or to other public aid (323 to OAS)	583
6. Died	398
Total turnover, same as turnover in item (c), above	2,692

Statistics on Blind, 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71:

(a) Total on relief during July: 750. Left during July: 13.

(b) Percent leaving in July: 1.7%.

(c) Total on relief for 11 mo: 778 (end of May), plus 183 turnover=961.

(d) Percent turnover during 11 mo: 19.6%.

Reasons for leaving relief not detailed (see later comments).

Statistics on Children in Boarding Homes and Institutions, 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71.

(a) Total on relief during July: 1875. Left during July: 221.

(b) Percent leaving in July: 11.7%.

(c) Total on relief for 11 mo: 1686 (end of May), plus 2044 turnover=3730.

(d) Percent turnover during 11 mo: 54.6%.

Reasons for leaving relief not detailed (see later comments).

Statistics on Family Group, no breadwinner (AFDC–FG), 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71.

(a) Total on relief during July: 15,417. Left during July: 883.

(b) Percent leaving in July: 5.6%.

(c) Total on relief in 11 mo: 17,327 (end of May), plus turnover 10,855=28,182.

(d) Percent turnover in 11 mo: 38.5%.

Reasons for leaving relief:

1. Left for employment reasons	2,802
New employment	926
Increased income (plus 52 other income)	511
Parents resume support	1,365
Parent returns home	405
Marriage	272
Parent takes chn, etc	688
2. Savings not clear	5,580
Lost residence, or left San Diego	1,681
Whereabouts not known, etc	1,038
Change in property value	122
No longer disabled	150
No eligible child in home	725
Refused cooperation	389
"Other", with no reason in report	1,475
3. Help from relatives and others	40
4. Pensions	none
5. Reduced budget (medical & other)	470
6. Changes in law, or in interpretation of law	308
7. Transfer to other public aid	1,664
8. Died	none
Total turnover for 11 mo., compare (c), above	10,864

(Corrected figure, 10,855.)

Statistics on Family, with unemployed breadwinner (AFDC–U), 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71.

(a) Total on relief during July: 2,204. Left during July: 386.

(b) Percent leaving in July 17.5%

(c) Total on relief in 11 mo.: 2,372 (end of May), plus 6241 (turnover)=8,613.

(d) Percent turnover in 11 mo.: 73.0%.

Reasons for leaving relief:

1. Left for employment reasons	3,563
New employment	2,403
Increased income (12 other income)	1,152
Parents resume support	8
2. Savings not clear	1,375
Lost residence or left San Diego	331
Whereabouts not known	389
Change in property value	32
No longer disabled	1
No eligible child in home	35
Refused cooperation	209
"Other", with no reason in report	378
3. Help from relatives and others	3
4. Pensions	none
5. Reduced budget (medical & other)	103
6. Changes in law, or in interpretation of law	24
7. Transfer to other public aid	1,171
8. Died	none
Total turnover for 11 mo. compare (c), above	6,239

(Corrected figure, 6,241.)

Statistics on General Relief, 7/1/70 thru 5/31/71 (based on four month averages).

(a) Total on relief for one mo: 1,405. Left during one month: 345.

(b) Percent leaving during one month: 24.5%.

(c) Estimated total 11 mos: 1405 (1st Mo), plus 10x403 (new cases)=5435. Left relief during 11 mo: 11×345=3795.

(d) Percentage leaving during 11 mo: 69.1%.

Reasons for leaving relief not detailed (see later comments).

STATISTICS SUMMARIZED FOR 7 CATEGORIES, JULY 1, 1970 THROUGH MAY 31, 1971

Category	Total for 11 months	Turnover, 11 months
Old Age (OAS)	18,026	3,212
Disabled (ATD)	11,332	2,692
Blind (AB)	961	183
Children in boarding homes (BHI)	3,740	2,044
Family, no breadwinner (AFDC–FG)	28,182	10,885
Family, includes unemployed (AFDC–U)	8,613	6,241
General relief (GR)	5,435	3,795
Total	77,389	[1] 29,052

[1] Equals 37.5 percent turnover, 11 months; 6.1 percent turnover, 1 month.

REASONS FOR LEAVING RELIEF, HELPFUL TO TAXPAYERS AND TO RELIEF RECIPIENTS

Category	Employment	Relative	Pensions	No longer disabled	Dependent placed	Reduced budget	Other
OAS	46	88	66				
ATD	91	102	191	51	0	?	?
AB	?	?	?	?	0	?	?
BHI	?	?	0	0	2,000	?	?
AFDC-FG	2,802	40	0	1	0	470	?
AFDC-U	3,563	3	0	150	0	130	?
GR	3,000	?	?	?	0	?	?
Total	9,502	233	257	202	2,000	573	?

Percentage Leaving Relief, for different reasons:	Percent
Percentage employed in 11 months	12.3
Savings not clear	13.3
Child placed in family	2.6
Reasons, each under 1%, including relatives, pensions, no longer disabled, reduced budget, etc	3.0
Transferred (still on public aid)	4.5
Died	1.7
Total turnover in 11 months	37.4

(Compare 37.5%, above.)

Statistics Omitted from Study: This study includes turnover figures for eleven months, in every category of relief. The study has included reasons for turnover in only four categories, omitting reasons for the Blind (a small figure), for Boarding Homes, and for families on General Relief. To replace these missing figures, we have estimated just two figures to show 3000 leaving General Relief because of employment, and 2000 leaving Boarding Homes because of adoption, or return to the child's own home.

Turnover: In the turnover figures shown in this study, only 6.1% of those on relief for one month, left during the month; but 37.5% of those on relief during eleven months, left during the eleven months. If additional months had been added, the turnover could rise above 100% because of recipients repeating on relief, and a surprisingly few departures are because of death.

Statistics to Show Time on Relief: Although every one leaves relief, eventually, and for reasons that can be speeded up, we have no figures showing the time on relief.

"Savings not clear": Under item 2, in each category of the statistics here shown, we have tried to collect reasons for leaving relief, where a savings or lack of it, is not clear. Here are some questions about these statistics:

1. *"Loss of residence":* Who supports recipient after he leaves Welfare? Could the recipient have found the same support before relief started? etc.

2. *"Whereabouts not known":* Did this recipient leave for employment? Should he have left sooner? Although we cannot always anticipate, can we anticipate better?

3. *"Left San Diego":* Same questions as above.

4. *"Change in property value":* Do most of these return promptly to relief? Does the new value result from hidden assets? Or is the change due to a tax revaluation that adds nothing to the landowner's financial position? When the law forces a sale which results in rental payments, does the government lose money? When relatives start support to prevent a sale, should they have been approached sooner? Is this law flexible enough to permit good judgment?

5. *"No longer disabled":* Was it medical care or vocational training that changed the disability status? Presumably, this recipient left relief to accept employment; is it never possible to tally two or more reasons for leaving?

6. *"No eligible child in home":* How many of these families are "transferred" to another category, and remain on relief? Could the "transfer" be tallied?

7. *"Refuse to cooperate":* Why is this item tallied for ADFC families only? Is it "cooperation", if one side controls the other? Some social workers side with the poor against the taxpayer; if the poor (with help) controlled the rich, would this produce "cooperation"? No law can force an employer to hire, or a workman to work—apart from slavery; can both sides profit under mutually agreeable terms? Are social workers responsible for getting mutually agreeable terms?

8. *"Other"*, totalling 3,612, show no reason for leaving in the statistics studied.

Summarizing all eight items.—For one-third of families on relief, Welfare statistical reasons for leaving relief show no benefit either to the taxpayer or to the persons leaving relief. Since the reasons for leaving relief are multiple, rather than one reason per case, as shown, could we get more meaningful statistics by selecting those reasons that have an economical significance? On the other hand, if the economic reasons are not known, what does this tell us about Welfare supervision? A social worker cannot *always* "anticipate", but he *must* anticipate, if he is to be helpful in substituting wages, or other income, for relief.

Discrimination against the aged.—With little doubt, "discrimination" keeps many of the aged off work, before they are ready to "retire". Only 46, on relief, found employment during the eleven months studied, and only one of these got County help in finding work. Only one-quarter of the aged on relief died while on relief, and less than 3%, of those who left relief, entered an institution. In fact, we have placed nearly two-thirds of the aged in the class "Savings not clear" (see the last paragraph, above.)

Major implications of this study:

1. Our statistical knowledge can be improved.

2. It is misleading to suppose that only 5% of relief recipients will ever find work. We are doing much better than this now, and can do still better.

3. Moreover, "through wages" is not the only way to help the poor, and relieve taxpayers. There are scores of other reasons, and combination of reasons, why people leave relief.

4. A social worker can be "advocate" for relief recipients *and for taxpayers*, at the same time, if more wages and more other income can be substituted for relief. No political battle can help either rich or poor. We must inform both sides, not fight.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of a newsletter I am releasing for distribution in my congressional district:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES, OCTOBER 1971

GOD'S FROZEN PEOPLE

The President has asked Congress for sweeping changes in economic policy, including stimulation of buying power through tax revisions. As a result, what looked like a fairly speedy wrap-up for Congress now has been transformed into the prospect of weeks of work on some knotty problems.

Ironic, isn't it, that most of the moaning and groaning about the wage-price freeze is coming from the same people who were pushing it on him six months ago and those who complain loudest about unemployment? They forget that it takes a healthy business economy to provide jobs and wage increases.

WHAT IS THE AREA CODE FOR PEKING?

In outlining U.S. foreign policy for the 1970's, President Nixon was referring to Red China when he said: ". . . an international order cannot be secure if one of the major powers remains largely outside it and hostile toward it. In this decade, therefore, there will be no more important challenge than that of drawing the People's Republic of China into a constructive relationship with the world community, and particularly the rest of Asia."

Evidence is mounting, beyond the President's slated trip to Peking, that the Red Chinese are making moves to rejoin the world. They have resumed direct telegraph communications with the U.S. after a break of nearly three years. AT&T also has received notice that the mainland Chinese switchboard in Shanghai is being reopened for direct calls—again after a three-year silence. Communications is a small step, but a beginning toward workable relations with a hostile, but nonetheless important, nation.

THE DOOMSDAY LOBBY

Commenting on dire predictions that the country is going to hell in a hack, Thomas R. Shepherd, Jr., publisher of *Look* magazine, pointed out some pertinent facts:

"Environmentalists to the contrary, there is precisely as much oxygen in the air today as in 1910; despite pollution, drinking water is safer than ever before, certainly safer than that which caused Philadelphia's 1793 epidemic which killed one of every five residents; if the present drop in United States birth rates continues, nobody will be here in the year 4,000, but don't worry about that either; fish caught 44 years ago contained double the mercury as any fish processed this year; while 50 species of wildlife will probably become extinct in this century, the same number disappeared in the 90's. Life expectancy of Americans has doubled in 150 years . . . and our economic system with all its faults is the world's best."

NOTICE

In the event of atomic attack all rules against praying in schools will be considered suspended!

MORE HOMES

Housing appears to be on its way to an all-time record during 1971. The National Association of Home Builders says new housing may pass the 2 million mark during the year. The best previous showing was in 1950

when 1.95 million homes were built. One reason: The Administration has moved to have the Federal Home Loan Bank Board raise the price paid thrift institutions on Goverment-backed mortgages. Chief result will be a break for home buyers, as it will help hold down the cost of mortgages for homes in the $24,000 to $33,000 range.

The nation's 55,000 home builders expect to benefit from the wage-price freeze through stabilization of prices on construction materials. While factory built housing offers a vast market for the future, the industry today still depends on the small builder who constructs about 25 houses a year, with only 5 percent being built by the "giants" of the industry. Economists also are predicting that mortgage rates will soon dip—more good news for prospective home buyers.

BIG YEAR FOR SCHOOLS

The hue and cry of many educational groups would lead the public to believe that our schools are being fiscally abused, operating at the pauper level. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare points out that during the coming school year Americans will spend $85 billion educating 60.2 million students, a record high and an increase of $7.5 billion over last year.

CUBAN CASABA CAPER

While the news media made much of a recent victory over the U.S. by a Cuban basketball team at the Pan American games, there was hardly a line about the fact that five members of the Cuban squad defected, cited political repression and asked for asylum in Colombia.

LIFE IN SHUN CITY

While New York Mayor John Lindsay was making statements about the need for ending the Vietnam war, the Defense Department announced ZERO casualties for U.S. forces. Meanwhile, the murder rate in New York City rose to 786 for the first six months of this year, over 30 per week. Perhaps John ought to begin talking about ending the war against the citizens of Gotham.

STATE BLESSING FOR WILDLIFE REFUGE

The State Fish and Game Commission has taken the unusual step of okaying Craig Hosmer's bill to create a National Wildlife Refuge at the Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station.

"Normally, the Commission, a strong advocate of states' rights, would have second thoughts," writes Executive Secretary Leslie Edgerton. "However, since the land is already Federal land and the salt water marshes are so in need of protection, we commend you for your farsightedness."

SOME DATA ON NOISE POLLUTION FROM LAKE AIRPORTS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to count among my constituents Prof. Stephen Berry of the University of Chicago. Professor Berry was recently in Copenhagen where he conferred with Danish scientists and engineers who are involved in the planning of a program airport which would be quite similar to the diked airport in Lake Michigan which has been proposed by certain interests in Chicago.

In a letter to me, Professor Berry raises some interesting and troubling questions about the relationship between noise pollution and an airport in a lake.

The relevant portion of the letter follows:

One of the major problems is clearly the noise transmitted across the water. (Recall how conversations on rafts can be heard clearly on shore.) According to Svane's experiments with a single airplane, one can expect a level of 85 decibels for the median of the high-intensity sound due to an airplane at their airport, about 6.5 kilometers (miles) from shore. A level of 97 decibels was the maximum observed. Some of the more serious problems arise when a temperature inversion causes a focusing of the sound waves. Under this condition, sometimes the shore can be relatively quiet, and points a mile or so inland can receive a very heavy dose of noise. Sometimes the shore would be at the focus of the sound. A point of considerable interest is the susceptibility of glass-walled buildings to noise transmission. At some times, the level of sound inside high-rise buildings would be pretty intolerable.

NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY—PART X

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Pottstown, Pa., Mercury published a supplement to its regular edition that was devoted entirely to the issue of nuclear energy. I consider it one of the best, most thoroughly researched, most balanced pieces of journalism I have ever seen. Any newspaper in the country would be proud to call it its own.

What strikes me most about the supplement entitled "Nuclear Power—Promise—Or Peril?" is that it reflects so accurately all the hopes and fears of a community faced with the possible location of a large nuclear powerplant in the immediate vicinity. Specifically, I am referring to the proposed construction of the 2.2 million killowatt Limerick Nuclear Power Station, which would be located on the banks of the Schuylkill River several miles downstream from Pottstown.

Here in the supplement are the views of the utility company, various environmentalists, doctors, technical experts, the man in the street, the State and Federal organizations. Some favor the construction of the plant, others oppose it, and still others do not know what to think or are unsure of their own views.

There are also articles on nuclear fuel supply, safety, the Price-Anderson Act, several related court decisions, the problems of pollution and aesthetics, and other interesting items.

Altogether, they reflect a responsible community's effort to come to grips with a situation which, one way or another, will dramatically affect its people's lives for the next several generations.

Mr. Speaker, I have never previously asked that so much material be included in the RECORD, but I feel in this case an exception must be made. What propels me to ask is the belief that the concerns which both interest and trouble the minds and consciences of citizens in Montgomery County, Pa., particularly in the Pottstown area, on the issue of nuclear power also may be the same concerns which interest and trouble other communities throughout the Nation faced, or about to be faced, with the same issue.

The wide range of a community's points of view reflected in these articles is a national phenomenon, not confined to Pottstown. But the Pottstown Mercury has done us all a great service by capturing the entire issue under one cover. It is for this reason that I ask that the material be included in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[From the Pottstown Mercury, Sept. 20, 1971]

MORE ENERGY NEEDED FOR OUR SURVIVAL

(By Glenn T. Seaborg, Former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: After a decade of heading the Atomic Energy Commission, Glenn T. Seaborg is resigning to return to his professorship at the University of California, Berkeley. In the following article written especially for the Associated Press, the Nobel prize winner discusses the future of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.)

WASHINGTON.—I have been asked what lies ahead for nuclear energy and what my concerns might be for its future development to meet our energy needs.

Let me begin by stressing those needs. Contrary to much that is being said today—and notwithstanding much that we might do to use our energy more efficiently and wisely—we are going to use an enormous amount of that energy in the years and decades ahead. In particular we are going to see an increasing demand for electricity which is our most versatile means of using energy and can be our cleanest.

The reasons for this continued growth of electric power are inevitably tied to our growing population, the rising expectation of that population—particularly those of it for whom the American Dream is still far from a reality—and the need of more, not less, power to clean up our environment and keep it that way.

NEED ESTABLISHED

I have no doubts that nuclear power will be needed to supply an increasing share of our electric power. For environmental, economic and energy resources reasons we simply will not be able to get along without this shift toward nuclear power. And it must be a well-planned and well-managed transition in which the highest priority is given to environmental and safety considerations.

I believe that at present we are pursuing such a transition.

Of course there has been criticism of the development of nuclear power—some of it justified—but all things considered, our advances in nuclear energy have been remarkable. And it is indeed unfortunate that many who are critical of the atom do not understand it better and do not evaluate it on a comparative basis with other sources of energy.

Future developments in the nuclear energy field will not be without much hard work to meet and master technical challenges. But I feel that at the moment the major problems facing the nuclear field are more sociological, psychological and economic than they are scientific or technical.

For one thing, recognition of our environmental problems has made us a nation of people overly suspicious of new growth, technical innovation and the need to develop any technology that carries with it a small potential risk. We have, as I have often stated recently, become "environmentally uptight" and we have failed to realize we must accept some risks to achieve the far greater benefits that will accrue to society as a result.

We must also take the positive approach of working towards the reduction of those risks

through constant upgrading of our work and innovations in our technologies, rather than merely letting the thoughts of those risks—all the "What if's" and disaster predictions we hear today—freeze us into paralyzing inaction.

DYNAMIC SOCIETY

Ours is a dynamic technological society in which inaction and lack of innovation are the worst risks of all. This does not mean we must have growth for growth's sake or change for change's sake. It does mean we must generate and apply the best rational thought and action to control and direct those forces already in motion due to human activity and its interaction with our environment.

In addition to the sociological and psychological problems involved in nuclear matters today we face the problem of a reorientation in our economic thinking—and this applies not only to nuclear power and electricity but to so many other aspects of our technological society.

History shows that few if any developments of importance to the human race were "economic" at their inception or for some time to follow. And today we realize that much of the costs of the social and industrial growth we have viewed as economic were taken out of the hide of the environment.

Today we know we must rectify this situation. We must, at considerable cost, buy back a health environment and we must do this at the same time that we advance our man-made, urban-industrial environment.

This is directly related to the cost of energy and particularly to the cost of electricity which has always been considered an energy "bargain."

If we are going to generate the large amounts of electricity we will need in the future—regardless of which resources we use—and do so with a minimum impact on our environment, the cost of electricity is bound to rise.

This will be true in order to clean up fossil fuels, to assure the safest and most efficient use of nuclear resources, to reduce the thermal effects of all power generation, to site plants in more acceptable locations and to manage the long-distance transmission of their electricity in a more efficient and aesthetic manner.

The public must realize that it is going to be expensive, for example, to desulphurize coal and oil, to gassify coal, to develop untapped energy sources such as geothermal heat and solar energy and new conversion systems such as MHD, to site plants at coastal "power parks" or on off-shore islands, if this proves feasible, and to place high-voltage transmission cable underground.

It is also going to be costly to carry out the necessary developments in the nuclear field to see the success of a commercial breeder reactor and eventually full-scale controlled fusion.

Our most immediate need is to move ahead rapidly to the commercial introduction of the Liquid metal-cooled Fast Breeder Reactor (LMFBR). Such a timely introduction of this type of nuclear system will have widespread advantages—in many ways it will be essential to our overall energy picture.

The LMFBR will effect tremendous efficiencies in the use of our natural nuclear fuels, it will reduce the environment of our natural nuclear fuels, it will reduce the environmental and thermal effects of nuclear power and it will significantly reduce the cost of nuclear power as we approach an era—the turn of the century—when supplies of fossils fuels will be much tighter and perhaps more than half of the nation's primary energy sources will be going into the generation of electricity.

The government and private industry will have to share the cost of breeder development—to bring our breeder program, already making great strides, to its successful fruition.

Beyond this, of course, is the hope that we will eventually see controlled fusion first be proved feasible and then be advanced through the necessary development stages to become a full-scale commercial source of power.

When this happens we will have achieved the ultimate source of power able to supply man's needs for millions of years. But unfortunately, this achievement is not "just around the corner" as some would have us believe.

In my opinion it may be 30 years or more before controlled fusion will be developed to the point where it is our major source of power. And this is one reason why we must have breeder reactors on the line. To gamble either on the major use of fossil fuels or the full-scale success of controlled fusion could lead us into a global energy crisis of incredible proportions.

In the years to come, we must move ahead wisely with an overall energy plan that considers all aspects of energy growth—natural resources, technological possibilities, social and economic factors, environmental demands and human needs.

Energy—an enormous amount of it—is going to be essential to our survival and we are going to have to devote our best talent and considerable effort and resources to making it available where and when we need it and in ways compatible with other needs of life. I am confident that we can—and will—be able to succeed in this difficult task.

I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to play a small role in the development of nuclear energy. I will look forward to—and continue to work toward—its future development, for I think we have seen only the beginning of the Nuclear Age.

AN EDITORIAL: NUCLEAR POWER?

The progress of man has always been feared by some men.

But never have so many been concerned as there are now about nuclear power.

When locomotives first came on the scene there were warnings that only evil could come from men "leaving their homes at 15 miles per hour."

At one time it was thought that man's lungs would burst if he reached a speed of 20 miles an hour. Prior to man achieving the speed of sound, some thought that he would be turned into an idiot if he surpassed this speed.

But today's fear of nuclear power can't be equated with those fears of the past.

A steam engine never could eliminate mankind.

Nuclear power could.

Initially a steam engine could only affect the lives of a few people.

Nuclear power can affect the lives of everyone.

An explosion in a steam engine could only stop a train.

An explosion in a nuclear plant could kill thousands and tens of thousands.

So the concern by many is justified. They are entitled to their views, their fears and their opposition.

This special edition of The Mercury on nuclear power is designed to inform the public of the fears, the safeguards, the need of it.

The stories are many and varied. Some are complex. All should be informative.

The Mercury's study of nuclear power took more than six months. Reporter Thomas Geyer is responsible for the majority of research and contents of this edition.

During the long research both pro and con were heard and studied.

Environmentalists shared their beliefs that thermal pollution in addition to radiation might be a problem.

Officials of Philadelphia Electric shared their views that safeguards are more than adequate.

If the study proved anything it was that there are no quick answers, no simple solutions and no authorities that can be 100 percent positive of their positions.

Should we proceed with nuclear power?

The answer is yes, proceed.

But proceed with caution.

PENNSYLVANIA MAY EARN TITLE AS "NUCLEAR STATE"

Pennsylvania is on its way to becoming the "Nuclear State." More nuclear power plants have been announced for construction by private utilities in Pennsylvania than in any other state—13 being the most recent total.

Pennsylvania also was the first state to have a nuclear power plant. The small pressurized water reactor at Shippingport in western Pennsylvania, a joint project of the Atomic Energy Commision and Duquesne Power and Light Co., went into operation in 1957.

It was modeled after power plants used in nuclear submarines.

Most recently, Philadelphia Electric Co. announced plans to build the world's most efficient nuclear power plant, a large high temperature gas-cooled reactor, at an undisclosed site by 1980.

AVERAGE CITIZEN FEELS HELPLESS IN NUCLEAR EVALUATION

A man and woman, fortyish, stood with a small child at the corner of * * * streets, waiting for the walk signal. It was hot and the child looked ready to cry. The father wiped his brow.

"Sir. what do you think of the atomic power plant they're building in Limerick?"

The man turned, nervously blew his cheeks full of air, and sighed.

"Well, I don't know. I've heard things about it. Pretty complicated I guess. But if it isn't okay I don't know what I can do about it.

"It's too scientific for me."

The light changed. The child wailed. The couple pulled him on to the crosswalk and they disappeared into the crowed.

The response was typical—and understandable.

WISDOM QUESTIONED

The wisdom of Philadelphia Electric's plans for Limerick, and of the nationwide push toward nuclear power in general, is a question inevitably tied to a vast number of complex and highly technical problems.

The average citizen feels helpless when he tries to add up all the pluses and minuses for himself and arrive at a simple answer.

But the cry for "public participation" in decisions surrounding nuclear power has been taken up by environmentalists throughout the country.

"Weighing the risks against the benefits of nuclear power means making a moral decision," says Dr. Harry Blanchard, head of the science program at Kimberton Farms School.

"Moral decisions should not be left to a technical elite. In a Democracy, moral decisions regarding their own welfare should be left to the people."

LIFE AND DEATH

The opposition feels nuclear power may be a life and death issue.

As nuclear plants and fuel processing facilities sprout like mushrooms around the nation and the problem of radioactive waste disposal grows more acute, more and more members of the public become the potential victims of nuclear accidents or whatever harmful effects routinely released radiation might have.

Now those who live in the vicinity of Limerick joined that small minority of the public.

"Why us?" local citizens ask. "The Limerick plant might have been more economical closer to Philadelphia where most of its customers are."

But the Atomic Energy Commission doesn't want big reactors too close to big cities. Too many people . . . what if there were an accident? So nuclear power plants have to be built in the country where there is nothing nearby but farms and small towns.

Those who live near the Limerick plant, say within 10 miles or so, so far had nothing to say about it. Philadelphia Electric secretly began buying land for the Limerick plant in 1964 and didn't let the cat out of the bag until October, 1969, when it made the announcement at a cocktail party at Collegeville Inn.

CONCRETE POURED

Now the excavations are complete and concrete is being poured. Still the public had no voice.

So say the opponents.

Naturally the Philadelphia Electric Co. takes a very different point of view.

Secrecy in purchasing the site, its spokesmen say, was simply standard business practice to prevent landowners from jacking up prices unreasonably.

And far from singling out country dwellers to bear most of the risk from the plant, they say, the company is taking a sensibly conservative approach by locating generally outside of large population centers.

But there is no real danger no matter where they put the plant, according to company officials, who feel their opponents take unreasonable advantage of the fact that very cautious safety measures are taken by concluding that precautions must mean danger.

"We're damned if we do and damned if we don't," said one PE engineer, pointing out that if the company tried to put the plant in the middle of Philadelphia it would be criticized for taking needless risks.

OTHER CRITICS

Dr. Blanchard and other critics of the nuclear program do not deny that decisions about plant location and the growth of nuclear power in general might have turned out the same way even if they somehow were left up to the public at large.

But, they argue, that doesn't justify keeping citizens in the background when such decisions are made.

As far as the oppenents are concerned, both the public and the utilities were "sold a bill of goods" by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in Congress which were set up to promote the "peaceful atom."

They are convinced that nuclear power is neither safe nor economical, a fact which they say the "elitists" in the Atomic Energy Commission managed to cover up until recently by involving its powers of censorship to conceal not only strategic secrets but its own mistakes and miscalculations.

These security privileges were diminished considerably in the early 1960s but the opposition still feels the AEC makes little effort to be forthright with the public or to publish possibly embarrassing information in a form the public can understand.

RIGHT DIRECTIONS

"If the people are appraised of the facts they will react in the right direction," insists Nora Natof, president of Limerick Ecology Action.

"If not, then our Democracy might as well close up shop."

But even the states were barred from setting their own rules controlling radiation emissions from power plants on the ground that they would be pre-empting powers reserved to the federal government.

Minnesota currently is fighting that ruling before the U.S. Supreme Court and few observers within the AEC are rooting for Minnesota to win.

The states, the AEC argues, are not competent to take such responsibility. It looks with even more jaundiced eyes on proposals that states be given complete authority to regulate nuclear power plants within their own boundaries.

"The idea is so horrifying I refuse to discuss it," declared Craig Hosmer, a member of the AEC, before a Minnesota audience in 1969.

Who stands guard over reactor safety now? And if the problem is too technical for the state governments to handle, how can the general public be directly involved?

SWEEPING POWERS

When the AEC was set up in 1945 it was given sweeping and unprecedented powers to regulate and own all reactors and fissionable materials in the United States.

In 1954 private enterprise was given the right to own nuclear reactors under strict supervision of the AEC's division of licensing and regulation.

But as far as radiation is concerned, the AEC's only responsibility is to see that federal standards are met. The AEC has no authority to see that federal standards are met.

The AEC has no authority to set these standards itself—though many of its employees and consultants undoubtedly influence what the standards will be.

Who does set the standards? Radiation protection guidelines are laid down by the International Commission on Radiation Protection, the National Commission on Radiation Protection and the Federal Radiation Council, whose functions now have been taken over by the Environmental Protection Agency.

REACTOR LICENSE

There also is an Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety that studies applications for each reactor license and hands down recommendations to the AEC.

Speaking of these regulatory and standard setting bodies in sum, Hosmer said:

"No where in the world today or at any previous time has been a more meticulous, detailed and scrupulously unbiased machinery for assuring public protection against any hazard."

He added, "The AEC is not a nuclear Mafia conspiring to cram unsafe and unneeded nuclear plants down the throat of an unwilling but helpless nation . . ."

Concerning scientists who raise objections to nuclear power, Hosmer said, "This should be done in a technical meeting where scientists can discuss these matters with their fellow scientists.

"The public rally, the cardboard placard and the licensing board hearing are inefficient vehicles for communication and should not be used for that purpose."

Hosmer's argument is that the functions of the AEC are primarily technical and that complaints about standards or broad policies affecting the public interest should be directed to Congress or the standard-setting bodies.

His sentiments are echoed by J. L. Everett, president of PE.

MOB RULE

"Public participation through orderly government is fine, but when you let any Tom, Dick and Harry step in and try to convince everybody something is wrong, you have mob rule. They want to substitute mob action for orderly government."

Where does all this leave a worried citizen whose confidence in orderly government has been exhausted by the political debacles of the last decade?

Dr. Blanchard feels strongly that the public must assert its right to know and to make decisions about risks and goals. He admits that purely technical questions must ultimately be resolved by scientists, but believes an "adversary" system—a kind of scientific judiciary—could be set up within the scientific community designed to separate the guardians from the promoters whenever a conflict arises between progress and safety.

Mrs. Natof adds, "Sure the Democratic system is messy. It guarantees the right of any citizen to stand up in the public forum and make a fool of himself. But we always have gone on the assumption that the public should prevail and that any other kind of thinking means tyranny."

WITHOUT EXPERTS

Perhaps the final question is whether traditional representative Democracy can exist when it is no longer possible to govern intelligently without relying on experts.

Dr. Blanchard insists it is but only with great public effort. Broad education of the people in the dilemmas of technology, he believes, is the only way to prevent the takeover of a scientific priesthood in any technically sophisticated society that aspires to be just.

DOCTORS' VIEWS, ATTITUDES DIFFER ON NUCLEAR POWER

What do area doctors think about the plans for Limerick? Singling them out as generally well-informed members of the community, The Mercury took a poll that showed a remarkable mixture of emotions and attitudes among local physicians about nuclear power.

Dr. Robert O'Connell, a Pottstown general practitioner, is one doctor who is against the Limerick project.

He is aware of Limerick and very concerned—concerned because no one knows the long range effects of radiation.

"We are dealing with something that is hazardous and I think it is time to slow down. I'd be willing to do without all the extra electrical conveniences while further studies are made," he said.

"Unfortunately it is difficult to get good statistics on the topic and arguments presented by both sides are extremely convincing."

NO INTERPRETATION

Dr. O'Connell added that there doesn't seem to be anyone who is giving out figures that the public can interpret "because no one has figures over 30 years or more—over a generation of people."

"I don't trust the government because I don't think it really knows. It hasn't had enough studies and most figures are projected," Dr. O'Connell said.

"If in the long run there is an increase in leukemia, which radiation is said to cause, it won't affect my life but what of my children and their children?"

O'Connell added that not only is he against the project because of a danger from radiation and pollution, but Limerick will be a gigantic occular pollutant with cooling towers seen for miles.

"We won't be able to stop the plant from going up but I feel there definitely should be more studies made. This takes maybe 30 to 40 years and Limerick now will make Pottstonians the guinea pigs. They will be studying us in another generation."

PROVE WRONG

O'Connell concluded that statistics may prove him wrong. "But at this point I have seen no such facts that will change my mind."

Dr. Nicholas Chapis, a Pottstown gynecologist, doesn't feel Limerick is necessary.

I don't think the extra power is needed for a good standard of living, especially before further studies. I'm sure most people would be willing to cut down and could live comfortably without the additional power of the nuclear plant," Dr. Chapis said.

Dr. Chapis is worried about the prospect of hundreds of nuclear reactors generating power across the countryside. Worried and concerned especially since the closing of a nuclear plant near Detroit last year.

"We may not always be so fortunate to discover the danger areas before a catastrophe occurs. What it boils down to is human lives versus human luxuries.

There is a certain amount of background radiation that everyone knows is present. This may be from natural radiation (occurring through explosions and tests throughout

the world) or possible from color television, Dr. Chapis noted.

FATAL STRAW

"Even though the radiation from a plant such as Limerick may be small," he said, "it adds to the already current degree of radiation and this may be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

"The effects of radiation are cumulative, so the effect from any one source may not be harmful but the total effect is what may be dangerous," he added.

Dr. Chapis does strongly feel that if nuclear power plants are going to be built that it should be a public service venture rather than a private enterprise.

"No private individual should profit monetarily from a project which is potentially hazardous to the community and which can possibly have such a detrimental effect on a large number of persons," he concluded.

Dr. Fred Winter, a radiologist at Pottstown Memorial Medical Center, also is interested and concerned with the Limerick project.

"Concerned to some may, however, mean worried and I am not worried about Limerick," he said.

"I am a lot more worried about the power going off in the hospital; the lights failing in the operating room or the X-ray machines not functioning properly," Dr. Winter said.

Dr. Winter added that he feels Limerick and other such nuclear plants will play an important part in the future of the country and this is something that the public is going to have to accept regardless of the possible harmful effects.

Dr. James Guthrie, an internist, also is aware of the Limerick project. He is not worried and has no great fear of the nuclear plant, adding, "I suspect it will pollute the atmosphere much less than some of the local plants."

"I'm sure that there is strong feeling in the country that these projects should be tried before being built, but in general I feel they can be programmed to be operated safely.

CONSERVATIVE AEC

Dr. Guthrie said he trusts the government and thinks the Atomic Energy Commission is conservative and very strict in its criteria of safety.

Dr. Daniel Gross, Pottstown orthopedic surgeon, said he has followed the Limerick project from its beginning and is personally concerned about the possibility of contamination in the area.

"The facts are, however, very confusing to me because both sides are very convincing, one group says one thing, another something else. It's difficult to evaluate just whom do you believe?"

COUGHLIN QUESTIONNAIRE FAVORS NUCLEAR PLANTS

Almost six out of 10 responding to the questionnaire poll of U.S. Representative Lawrence Coughlin (R-Pa.) gave nuclear generating plants a qualified endorsement.

In final results, the Montgomery County Congressman said 59 percent checked "Potentially good: proceed with caution" in assessing the role of the nuclear facilities in meeting increasing demands for sources of energy.

Coughlin said the results were based on a total of 28,858 responses received before the Aug. 1 deadline. First results of the mail poll were disclosed last week.

Twenty three percent of those answering the questionnaires sent to every household in the 13th Congressional District, including the Pottstown area, agreed with the statement on nuclear plans, "Satisfactory: move ahead as is."

MORATORIUM

Twelve percent termed the nuclear facilities, "Unsatisfactory: stop and call moratorium." Six percent wrote in answers ranging from accelerating construction of the plants to abandoning them for traditional fossil-fuel facilities.

Coughlin said the nuclear question generated much interest in parts of the county near Limerick Township where Philadelphia Electric Co. plans to construct an atom-power plant. Hearings on construction permits for the controversial project tentatively are scheduled this fall.

In a far-ranging question on domestic spending, Coughlin asked constituents to choose whether "more," "less" or the "same" Federal tax dollars should be spent on various programs.

Coughlin said that more than 50 percent of those responding called for more spending on five of the eight programs.

MOST SUPPORT

Environmental protection got the most support with 76 percent favoring expenditure of more funds. Only five percent said spend less while 19 percent wants about the same expenditures.

Coughlin said the program that received the least support was defense other than for Vietnam. Thirteen percent wants more spending on defense while 55 percent favors less expenditures. Thirty-two percent approves of current spending.

Space exploration drew 15 percent favoring increased expenditures as opposed to 54 percent seeking less spending. Current expenditure receive approval of 31 percent.

Thirty-six percent favors increased spending to aid the poor as compared with 29 percent wanting less funding. Thirty-five percent indicated support for current expenditures.

In a key question on environmental protection, Coughlin said 71 percent still feels the federal government is not placing enough emphasis on this issue. Twenty-three percent is satisfied with the government's current role while six percent marked undecided.

Coughlin asked a two-part question on the FBI and found that two-thirds of those responding are satisfied with the FBI's general performance. Twenty-five percent was not satisfied and nine percent was undecided.

Fifty-six percent indicated FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover should retire now. Thirty-three percent opposes his retirement now. Eleven percent was undecided.

Coughlin asked, "Without regard to the relative merits of various proposals, do you feel we need a system of national health insurance?" Fifty-five percent said "yes" while 32 percent said "no." Thirteen percent checked the undecided column.

LONG RESEARCH PRECEDES EDITION

Mercury Reporter Thomas P. Geyer is responsible for most of the articles in this special nuclear edition of The Mercury.

He spent the past five months on research, development and writing. He interviewed scores of engineers, radiation biologists, environmentalists, government officials, lawyers and citizens.

In the course of research Geyer consulted representatives of Philadelphia Electric Co., the Atomic Energy Commission, the Pennsylvania Offices of Radiological Health and Biostatistics, the Department of Environmental Resources, the Franklin Institute Laboratories, the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power and other organizations. All cooperated fully in this effort.

His work reflects the pros and cons, the fears and assurances of nuclear power.

In the final stages he was assisted by Reporters Charles H. Pitchford and Joseph E. Dougherty. Editors who helped in the preparation were Dollie Smith, Robert J. Urban and Robert J. Boyle.

ENORMOUS COOLING TOWERS—LANDMARKS OR EYESCORES?

Most nuclear power plants inspire some alarm and protest among neighboring citizens when they are announced and while they're under construction but are destined to be virtually forgotten and ignored once they begin their silent and smokeless operations.

"We don't even know it's here," a York County neighbor of PE's Peachbottom reactor station said recently.

But the presence of the Limerick plant, whatever your feelings about it, will be hard to ignore.

In fact the Limerick plant will rank among Pennsylvania's most spectacular landmarks—or worst eyesores—depending on your point of view.

The conspicuous feature of the installation will be its two enormous cooling towers—the largest in the world—perched on high ground above the generating plant.

Each of these leviathans will be more than 500 feet high, measuring from ground level.

On a clear day they should be visible for 15 miles.

The base of each tower will be 450 feet in diameter and cover an area equal to 30 football fields. At the top they will be 220 feet in diameter.

On an average day 35 million gallons of evaporated water mixed with warm air will billow from the tops of the towers, forming "wisps" of white vapor that will become invisible a few hundred feet above the towers as evaporation is completed.

But on some cold days in winter the plumes will remain white and visible for miles, forming cumulus clouds several thousand feet high and many miles long.

Experts insist the towers will have no significant effects on the environment, but they and PE officials admit concern over the looks of the giants.

They hope some residents of the area will see an element of majesty in the sight.

"They're not unattractive looking," suggested Dr. Charles Hosler, Dean of the College of Earth and Mineral Science at Penn State and one of the consultants in their design.

"If an artist built them they probably would be regarded as great works of art."

Dr. Hosler added jokingly he had suggested to the company that it sell advertising space on their vast curving sides.

TOWERS NEEDED

Without the towers there could be no Limerick plant. From the beginning the great drawback of the site was the lack of a large water source to supply cooling to the plant's huge reactors.

The lazy Schuylkill can't begin to fill the bill. Without cooling towers, rivers the size of the Delaware or Susquehanna or cooling ponds with several square miles of surface area are needed.

Even with the cooling towers, water will have to be piped from the Delaware to make up the water lost by evaporation.

All fuel-burning power plants need tremendous amounts of cooling. The reason is simply that such plants waste more than half of the heat they produce and turn only 40 per cent at most into electricity.

Because they operate at relatively low temperatures nuclear plants are even more inefficient and make use of only 30 to 35 per cent of the heat they generate.

HEAT DISPOSAL

The rest of the heat must be disposed of continuously if the plants are to operate. More specifically, the heat must be removed from used steam after it passes through the turbines. At this point the steam has done its work and has to be condensed to water again in order to create a vacuum beneath the turbine for more steam to flow into.

Without the continuous cooling and condensation of the used steam the turbines would stop turning.

In all steam generating plants cooling is accomplished by pumping cold water in pipes through the steam. This takes place in a "condenser."

As the cold water flows through the condenser it picks up heat and carries it outside of the plant.

Then where does it go? At most plants the warmed water is simply released into an adjoining river, lake or bay. But this practice can cause problems even in large bodies of water because waste heat raises the water temperature and upsets the balance of life among the bacteria, algea and fish.

Ecologists call the problem "thermal pollution."

At Limerick the cooling water from the condensers will be circulated through the cooling towers, where it will release its heat to the atmosphere and then return to the condensers.

The towers will supply cooling in much the same way the human body cools itself by the evaporation of perspiration from the skin. When warm water from the condensers reaches the base of one of the towers it will be splashed over obstacles while a strong draft of air generated by the chimney effect of the tower blows through the droplets.

As a result the water is cooled and the air becomes warm and saturated with vapors. The warm, moist air rises up the inside of the tower and pours out the top at a speed of about 15 feet per second.

The cool water returns to the condensers to pick up more heat. But a little of it has been evaporated into the air in the cooling tower and this amount, about 54 cubic feet per second or 35 million gallons a day, must be made up from the Delaware.

PLUME RISES

What happens meanwhile to the heat and moisture released into the atmosphere?

According to Dr. Hosler, a meteorologist, the plume will rise like a hot air ballon to as high as two miles in the air and disperse, adding its moisture to the moisture of the surrounding atmosphere.

The latent heat carried in the water vapor will be released and radiated into outer space when the vapor eventually condenses into rain.

Does this mean the area will have more rain than before? The answer to that question is essentially no, Dr. Hosler says. The amount of water evaporated into the atmosphere from the cooler towers seems great by human standards but is really very small compared with what is already there.

To put it another way, 35 million of way water is about equal to the daily natural evaporation from 10 square miles of cornfield.

CUMULUS CLOUDS

The cooling towers probably will contribute to the formation of cumulus clouds downwind, possibly causing slightly heavier rainfalls on rainy days.

But it won't rain more often than usual, Hosler says, and extra precipitation on days when it does rain will be too small to measure.

What about fogging, ice and frost on the ground? Dr. Hosler is certain none of these effects will occur around Limerick because the size of the towers will make it impossible for the plumes to reach the ground.

The large, buoyant volumes of warm air will rise with enough force to puncture through even the kind of strong inversion layers that trap smog near the ground, he says.

Dr. Hosler has observed smaller cooling towers at the Keystone generating plant in western Pennsylvania and says the plumes there reached the ground only once in several years of operation.

At Limerick he recommended the four towers originally planned be replaced by two larger towers to guarantee it won't happen here at all.

"Observations and calculations show clearly that the tower installation proposed will minimize visible plumes and eliminate surface effects," he told the Public Utility Commission last year.

"There is no possibility of a change in climate as a result of moisture addition (to the air)" he added.

"Since the moisture pattern will not reach the ground, there will be no possibility of an impact on the ecosystem."

FEARS

Some local critics have expressed fears that the moisture from Limerick will help form sulfuric acid in the air that could be harmful to health or property.

This has been somewhat of a problem with cooling towers in use at fossil-fueled plants where smokestacks beside the towers spew out tons of sulfur dioxide pollution. The sulfur dissolves in water to form highly corrosive sulfuric acid and falls to the ground as slightly acid rain.

But the sulphur content of the air around Limerick is negligible according to the Philadelphia Electric Co. In fact Hosler says the towers may serve to diminish any local acidity in rain.

His theory is that humidity from the towers will slow evaporation of raindrops as they fall so that their acid content will be more dilute when it reaches the ground.

In any case, Hosler says, no more acid will be formed than is formed by natural precipitation.

LIMERICK STATION TO BE ONE OF WORLD'S LARGEST—AREA WILL JOIN AGE OF ATOM

Suddenly the Atomic Age has reached our back yards.

Some are afraid, more are indifferent and many agree that neither we nor the nation has much choice about nuclear power.

Peril or promise, it is with us.

Limerick Nuclear Power Station is rising on the banks of the Schuylkill River barely two miles from Pottstown. It will be one of the largest atomic power plants in the world, larger than any now operating.

The Philadelphia Electric Co. believes it will generate cheaper, cleaner electricity than any other kind of plant it could build.

The utility also stands firm in its belief that more power must become available on demand if the Delaware Valley is to prosper over the coming decades.

Cheap electricity is the lifeblood of our industrial economy. Not only does it run our lights, subways, televisions, elevators and electric toothbrushes but it is needed to manufacture them.

BEER CAN

The electricity needed to make a car would run an average home for several years. Most of the cost of an aluminum beer can pays for electricity used to manufacture it.

Before the age of the atom, all electricity came from the sun. The sun in ages past stored energy in plants which decayed to form oil and coal and natural gas—the fossil fuels. Burning these fuels releases heat to generate power.

The sun makes the rivers flow by evaporating rain. It drives our hydroelectric plants. It is even the energy from the sun that moves the winds.

But most of the good sites for hydroelectric dams have been put to use.

And it took 600 million years to make the earth's limited supply of fossil fuels. In a single century, man has used so much coal and oil that already we must begin to search for other means to feed our growing appetite for energy.

AIR POISONED

Meanwhile the earth, water and air are being poisoned by soot and toxic fumes from the ravenous furnaces of industry and homes. The wilderness and the oceans are falling victims to vast strip mining operations and spilled oil.

"Turn back," say the friends of the earth. "The environment came first. We must come to terms with it or risk our own survival."

But the rich rarely have given up their wealth without a struggle to the death. The American consumer doesn't seem inclined to change his ways either.

"Clean up," say the friends of the earth. "Give us time," industry replies.

Into this conflict stepped our infant hero, the peaceful atom.

Hiroshima showed the world the atom's power. Two decades later, possibly spurred as much by guilt as by the need for a new power source, the Atomic Energy Commission and private industry produced the first truly commercial nuclear power plant at Oyster Creek, N.J.

NO SMOKE

The Oyster Creek plant produced no smoke, soot or ash. It made no noise. It consumed no oil, coal or gas. Futurists envisioned a nation spotted with gleaming power plants, surrounded by parks, silently pouring out all the electricity man could ever use.

Sure enough, dozens of formerly skeptical utilities quickly jumped on the nuclear bandwagon. Scores of nuclear plants were ordered and started since the late 1960s.

Now 21 are operating and more than 60 are in various stages of construction. The mushrooming of nuclear power plants was stimulated by the soaring costs of fossil fuels which have doubled in price in this area since 1970.

Nuclear fuels cost only a fraction of the delivered price of low-sulfur coal or oil per megawatt of heat they produce, which helps offset the high initial costs of nuclear power plants.

This was a factor in PE's decision to "go nuclear" at Limerick instead of building the fossil fuel plant it originally planned for the site.

BRIGHT FUTURE

The nuclear future looked bright after Oyster Creek.

But meanwhile the doubts of environmentalists were growing rather than diminishing. At the very time nuclear power first became a commercial proposition, concern for the environment was growing into a broad-based popular movement.

To the dismay of industry and the AEC, nuclear power was not by any means exempt from the environmentalists' scrutiny. Despite the widely heralded ecological benefits of nuclear power, the local resistance that usually came with the construction of early plants began to spread into a national concern.

Even scientists began to bolt the fold and join in the public hand-wringing over the proliferation of atomic reactors across the landscape.

The potential hazards of nuclear power were obvious. A reactor contains hundreds of tons of uranium and radioactive decay products under heat and pressure.

After two years of operation, the Limerick reactors will hold more radioactivity than would be produced by 1,000 Hiroshima-size bombs.

CATASTROPHE

The escape of any sizable fraction of these materials into the air and water would be a catastrophe beyond imagination, possibly killing thousands and contaminating hundreds of square miles of land.

The safety of nuclear power depends upon insuring that this will never happen at any of the dozens of nuclear plants to be built in this country in the next 30 years.

All these reactors will produce tons of intensely radioactive, long-lived wastes that must be processed, transported, buried and possibly guarded continuously for several hundred thousand years.

Furthermore, nuclear plants waste nearly two thirds of the heat they produce. The heat must be disposed of, usually into rivers, lakes or bays.

More recently, as at Limerick, cooling towers were designed to dispose of waste heat into the atmosphere by evaporation.

Environmentalists point out that the burdan of proof rests with the utilities and the government to show that both radiation and heat pollution will be controlled without danger to the public or the environment.

COMPLEX PROBLEMS

But the problems are so complex and the hazards potentially so great, that the doubters find it hard to be satisfied.

Their fears were aggravated by recent news of the test failure of one the major reactor safety systems and they feel their criticisms of the AEC's regulatory procedures were justified this summer when a federal court rapped the AEC for "foot-dragging" in environmental matters.

A local groups, Limerick Ecology Action, called for an indefinite halt to the nuclear power program until all questions can be thoroughly answered by independent experts.

They will seek to stop or delay the Limerick project at public hearings this winter on the construction license for its two reactors.

PE says that if the Limerick plant is not completed on schedule, its peak power loads will begin to exceed the company's capacity to supply electricity by 1974.

The opposition's solution is for the company to build a fossil-fueled plant instead that would burn clean gas made from coal. The environmentalists also believe that some way must be found to curb the spiralling consumption of electricity—even if it means changes in our standard of living.

DIFFICULT BATTLE

The controversy over nuclear power is one of the most complex and technically difficult public battles ever waged.

The dispute has profound social, economic and political implications that are important far beyond the neighborhood of Limerick.

The full story is far too vast to tell here. Some may even secretly feel that laymen can never know more than half the truth about so technical a subject and would be better off in total ignorance.

Maybe so. But The Mercury hopes the time has not yet arrived when public concern transcend in complexity the limits of public education.

ARE REACTORS A THREAT TO PUBLIC? EXPERTS DISAGREE

The basic goal of reactor safety is to insure that virtually all the radioactive materials in the fuel core be kept isolated from the public— always and no matter what happens.

Not one millionth of the radioactivity inside a large reactor can be allowed to escape because of mechanical failure, a technician's error or attempts to sabotage the plant.

A nuclear power plant also must be proof against earthquakes, tornadoes, plane crashes, industrial accidents or any other remotely likely disaster.

The problems are staggering, which only makes it more remarkable that nuclear engineers seem to have succeeded in assuring this kind of containment—a feat that proved more difficult than getting reactors to work.

Hundreds of millions of dollars were spent on the safety problem during the past 20 years and improvements have come steadily. But the technical difficulties also increase as reactors grow larger, and controversy over their safety persists.

Public clamor has increased to a low roar in the past few months since the AEC revealed that tests conducted on one of the key reactor safeguard systems indicated the system might not work if needed. (See story on emergency cooling.)

Why do reactor engineers insist they can assure safety?

Reactor safeguards can be divided into two categories: systems designed to prevent mishaps and systems designed to mitigate their consequences if they do occur.

The preventive safeguards are supposed to make the others unnecessary except under very rare circumstances. But just in case, both Limerick reactors will be encased in a building designed like a fortress and sealed like a tomb.

The 1½ foot thick roof of this enormous building will be constructed of concrete and reinforced steel strong enough to withstand the impact of a Boeing 727 jetliner.

Surrounding ground will be lighted and the doors monitored to guard against intruders. Its three foot thick walls will protect the reactors from tornado-borne missiles, mild earthquakes, nearby railroad accidents and other upheavals outside.

Inside, the building will be maintained at a slightly lower air pressure than the outside atmosphere. Thus air leaks in the building will be from the outside inward and in the event of a radiation leak from the reactor, contamination in the air inside the building will have to pass through filters before the air is vented into the outdoors.

The designers of Limerick and the Atomic Energy Commission which regulates reactor safety feel that even if there is a serious accident and all other safeguards fail, ("impossible," they say), the reactor building and its ventilation system will be able to protect the public.

"We've got Fort Knox containment here," says R. A. Mulford, supervisor of the Limerick project.

But opponents of the plant are quick to point out that such assurances rely heavily on mathematical predictions and that the emergency safeguards have not been, for the most part, tested under actual operating conditions.

In a sense this lack of firsthand experience is something to be thankful for—the only way to obtain it would be from real accidents or by destructive testing of reactors, which is extremely expensive and could be dangerous.

Nuclear engineers counter criticism by insisting that their calculations are based on experiments that accurately simulate operating conditions and that any uncertainities are compensated for by generous safety margins.

What could go wrong in a nuclear power plant? What is done to guard against mishaps?

The main point of concern is the reactor itself. The core of a nuclear reactor is relatively fragile compared with the tremendous amounts of heat it generates, and it is within the core that most of the plant's radioactivity lies.

Theoretically, two kinds of accidents could happen.

First, if the control rods dropped out of the core or inadvertently were withdrawn too far the chain reaction could accelerate and overheat the reactor.

Second, the flow of cooling water could be interrupted for some reason. This is the most worrisome possibility because without a constant flow of coolant the core will begin to melt within seconds—even if the chain reaction is shut down instantly.

The first type of accident is called an "excursion"—an uncontrolled jump in the heat output of the fuel.

The first line of defense against heat excursions—in fact against any kind of accident—is a crew of highly trained operators and very careful design and construction of all control equipment.

But if anything does go wrong deep inside the reactor its operators have to know about it immediately. To insure that they will electronic monitoring systems feed information constantly into the control room concerning temperatures, pressures and coolant levels in the nuclear furnace.

Vital information is recorded by three different measuring instruments simultaneously and fed to the control room by separate cables. If one malfunctions it can be checked against the other two.

In the middle of the control room a prominent red button—marked "scram" and protected against accidental triggering by a metal hood—is ready in an emergency to slam the control rods all the way into the core and shut down the chain reaction in less than a second.

But if something caused the reactor to overheat suddenly the operators probably wouldn't get a chance to do anything about it themselves. Automatic devices would "scram" the reactor immediately.

All these safeguards necessarily are extremely complicated, a fact that leads some engineers to ask if this intricacy might not itself bring on failures.

But reactor engineers worry the other way around. They say the safety mechanisms are so sensitive and primed for action that great care must be taken not to trigger them unnecessarily.

In some reactors, for instance, a set of control rods hangs poised over the core ready to drop by gravity whenever overheating melts a mechanical latch.

If the latch is released accidentally and the rods drop into the core the reactor will shut down and stay shut down until each of the rods is painstakingly withdrawn with a crane.

On top of all this there are a number of natural safeguards against excursions in water cooled reactors. In the Limerick reactors, for instance, the cooling water in the core also acts as a "moderator" to increase the efficiency of neutron capture by slowing neutrons down.

As water gets hotter it becomes a poorer moderator, tending to slow the chain reaction that is causing overheating. If it gets hot enough to flash into steam the chain reaction is snuffed out.

But none of this helps overcome what is probably the biggest safety problem with large fission reactors—residual heat.

Residual heat is heat that keeps pouring out of radioactive fuel even after the chain reaction has been stopped. It is emitted by the radioactive "decay products" of split uranium atoms—the "ashes" of the nuclear fire.

After a reactor has been running for some time there is enough residual heat in the fuel to melt the core if cooling water is not supplied continuously for several hours after shutdown.

This is the problem that makes a "loss of coolant" accident potentially very serious.

A pipe break, pump failure or an obstruction that interrupted normal coolant flow could quickly turn the core into an intensely hot, radioactive and chemically explosive mass of molten material which some engineers say could not be contained in the reactor building by any methods now employed.

Some even claim that a completely melted fuel core would burn through the reactor vessel, through the earth's crust.

PE engineers call these claims "science fiction" and say the molten fuel probably wouldn't even get out of the reactor, let alone out of the building.

In any case such horror stories are purely alarmist speculation so far as they are concerned. They are satisfied that the safeguards provided for Limerick give absolute insurance against large-scale melting of the core after any accident.

Again, the first defense against loss of coolant accidents is strict quality control and ultra-conservative design of equipment.

This includes installation of "redundant" systems with backup equipment ready to take over if the primary systems fail.

But if the normal flow of water through the fuel stops for some reason, emergency cooling systems are provided to spray water into the core until the reactor has stopped producing dangerous quantities of heat.

Each of the Limerick reactors will have four such cooling systems and PE engineers are certain they'll work if they're ever needed.

But emergency core cooling systems have been the subject of loud controversy recently, a topic discussed in another story in this edition.

The ultimate line of defense against reactor accidents is the series of steel and concrete systems surrounding the reactor vessel.

They are designed to contain within the reactor building virtually all the radioactive materials that conceivably could be released in an accident.

Containment begins in the fuel itself. The fuel pellets are made of porcelain-like material that hold in almost all radioactive fragments of split uranium atoms. Some of these fission products are gases, however, which find their way out of the fuel.

To prevent these gases from leaking into the cooling water the fuel pellets are sealed in their metal fuel rods—the next stage of containment. Unfortunately the thin-walled fuel rods are prone to developing pinhole leaks that can allow some of the gaseous and volatile fission products to escape.

This is one way the cooling water becomes contaminated. Other sources of coolant contamination is the water's tendency to dissolve trace quantities of material from solid parts of the core, and the ability of hydrogen atoms in water to capture neutrons to form radioactive hydrogen isotopes.

In a boiling-water reactor the cooling water becomes the steam that drives the turbine generator. As the cooling water becomes contaminated with radioactivity, so does the steam, the turbine, the condenser and the circulating pumps.

Therefore the water-steam cycle and its associated equipment must be designed as a closed, sealed system surrounded by radiation shielding to protect plant workers.

Most of the contamination in the water-steam cycle is removed continuously by elaborate cleaning systems. Radioactive gases are separated from the steam when it reaches the condenser. The gases are passed through chemical filters that capture most of the contaminants except for the chemically inert isotopes of noble gases such as krypton, xenon and radon.

In most power plants these small quantities of inert gas are released into the outside air after being held up for half an hour or so in a delay line to let their radioactivity die down somewhat.

But at Limerick a new refinement has been added. Gases removed from the steam will be liquified at extremely low temperatures and bottled. Releases of radioactivity into the air will be too small to measure beyond the plant boundaries, and thousands of times less than the maximum the AEC allows.

A small stream also is continuously diverted from the cooling water and cleansed of dissolved contaminants.

These measures protect the environment from radioactive contamination during normal operation of the power plant, but much more elaborate precautions must be taken to ensure protection in event of an accident.

The reactor itself is the first line of defense. Immediately after any event that might cause damage to the core and release large amounts of radioactive matter into the cooling system, valves come into play to seal off all inlet and outlet pipes. This helps keep contamination from getting out of the reactor and spreading to other parts of the generating cycle.

At the same time the emergency core cooling systems flood the core with water to prevent dangerous overheating and the control rods are instantly inserted to stop the chain reaction.

To protect against explosive release of steam from the reactor a secondary containment is provided.

Secondary containment at Limerick will consist of steel and concrete shields many feet thick surrounding the reactor to form a "drywell."

The drywell is vented through large pipes into a wetwell" so that vapors released from the reactor in an explosion or melt-through are allowed to expand and bubble through pools of water. This process condenses the vapors harmlessly and relieves pressure within the containment.

Enclosing the secondary containment is the reactor building itself.

The Atomic Energy Commission and private reactor manufacturers point with pride to the enormous care and meticulous attention given to the safety of nuclear power plants and clearly they feel they have succeeded in virtually guaranteeing the safety of the public from radiation hazards.

They point out the near perfect safety record of the nuclear power program to date. No one ever has been killed as a result of a commercial reactor accident.

Lee Everett, president of PE and one of the nation's first nuclear engineers, said, "No doubt serious accidents can and will occur in nuclear power plants. But their effects will be minimized and contained within the plant.

"It is unrealistic to talk in terms of a major accident that could harm the public."

Nuclear proponents also point out that the builders, buyers and licensors of nuclear reactors have a big stake in ensuring safety. Nuclear power plants represent huge investments in money and in public confidence. The nuclear industry cannot afford a major catastrophe that would reawaken the public's slumbering memories of the horrors of Hiroshima.

Nevertheless, the adequacy of the reactor safety program guided, regulated and largely financed by the Atomic Energy Commission has been seriously questioned.

Edward Teller, one of the chief developers of the H bomb and a strong advocate of the "peaceful atom," has said repeatedly that nuclear reactors belong underground.

"So far we have been extremely lucky," Dr. Teller stated.

"But with the spread of industrialization, with the greater number of simians monkeying around with things they do not understand, sooner or later a fool will prove greater than the proof even in a foolproof system."

But nuclear power plants are not put underground for the simple reason that it would be very expensive. Underground reactors would not be commercially feasible and experts feel above ground reactors are safe enough.

Critics also point out the embarrassing fact that some research remains to be done on the reliability of various safety systems and on earthquake protection, yet the Atomic Energy Commissions safety research budget has been cut back during the past year and appropriations were only about half the $60 million requested.

The government says it wants private industry to take on more of this burden so the AEC can concentrate on its crash program to develop the fast breeder reactor.

Meanwhile a full-blown controversy has blossomed over the important problem of emergency core cooling systems, a safety question outlined in another article.

Concerned Scientists Call Reactors Too Hazardous

The Union of Concerned Scientists—the Boston chapter of the American Federation of Scientists—the past July recommended "a total halt to the issuance of operating licenses for nuclear power reactors currently under construction."

In its report, the UCS said it believes nuclear power can be made clean and safe but concluded that "critical flaws" in current large reactors make them "unacceptable risks."

Until the risks can be corrected, it said, nuclear power plants are too hazardous for commercial use.

The principal target of the scientists criticism was emergency core cooling, one of the most vital safeguards against a major catastrophe following a reactor accident.

Emergency core cooling systems have been a source of public concern and controversy since the past winter when the AEC revealed that scale model testing of the emergency cooling system now used in large pressurized water reactors had failed.

THORN IN SIDE

But the problem of emergency cooling was somewhat of a thorn in the AEC's side for several years. A 1968 report by one of its own scientists identified testing of ECC systems as a "very urgent, key problem area" in the AEC's reactor safety program.

Meanwhile, a testing program designed to confirm that the systems would perform as predicted dragged on through years of delay, suffering budget cuts and poor management.

The importance of emergency core cooling stems from the "residual heat" problem described in the reactor safety story in this edition. In the event of a "loss of coolant" accident inside a large reactor, hundreds of tons of uranium fuel and metal fuel cladding would begin to melt within seconds unless emergency cooling water was supplied immediately.

Emergency cooling is necessary even if the nuclear chain reaction is shut down immediately because the fuel will continue to pour large amounts of heat for days.

PREVENTION VITAL

And prevention of fuel melting is vital.

If cooling water suddenly stopped flowing through the core of a large reactor and no emergency cooling were applied the entire core would melt quickly into a liquid mass of intensely radioactive metal at temperatures high enough to melt concrete and steel.

Within 30 to 60 minutes, the UCS scientists estimated, the molten core would melt its way through the 6-inch steel wall of the reactor vessel and begin eating away at the concrete foundations of the reactor building.

Within a few hours it would pass through "any man-made structures" and start melting into the bedrock beneath the building, continuing to sink for as long as a week, according to the report.

Meanwhile vast quantities of radioactive gases could be released into the atmosphere and the molten core could contaminate the water table.

Such a disaster could render the Schuylkill Valley uninhabitable if it happened at Limerick.

NOBODY KNOWS

PE engineers say they "don't think" a melted core would get through the reactor vessel but nobody really knows. It's never been tried.

Reactor engineers don't ponder such possibilities much because they believe they have made total meltdowns virtually impossible.

That's what emergency core cooling systems are for.

But in tests in Idaho last December, virtually no emergency cooling water reached the hot reactor core in a simulated loss-of-coolant accident with a small mock-up reactor.

Steam pressure inside the reactor prevented the water from reaching its electrically heated fuel rods.

The AEC tried to play down the significance of this result and told the public that the mock-up reactor didn't accurately simulate "real" operating conditions.

But it ordered several operating plants to "backfit" their emergency systems with new equipment by 1974 and to step up inspections and reduce operating temperatures meanwhile.

BOILING WATER

PE was notified that its reactor license application should not be affected because its reactors are of the boiling water type rather than pressurized water.

PE engineers insist they are "certain" the ECC systems on their reactors will work if they ever are needed.

But after the Union of Concerned Scientists reviewed the test data independently, they reported they were "astonished at the gaps in basic knowledge concerning the effectiveness of the safety features of large power reactors, the surprising scarcity of adequate tests, amounting nearly to a total lack."

The Idaho group is going ahead with its ECC tests and plans the destructive testing of an actual reactor by 1974. By then scores of nuclear power plants are expected to be in operation.

A utility engineer who says he is sure the current systems will work confided that he thinks these tests may be "too late."

Sophisticated computer techniques, he believes, give adequate predictions of safety system performance.

In fact, he is worried that if the tests are not rigorously conducted they will do more harm than good. Failure in such tests would not mean much but would further alarm the public, he says.

But a study group of the American Society of Engineers recommended the AEC go ahead with the tests as rapidly as possible, feeling that public confidence already is so eroded that mathematical abstractions alone won't do.

NUCLEAR POWER STATIONS DIFFER FROM OTHER PLANTS IN FUEL SOURCE

The only difference between the working principles of a nuclear power plant and those of any other type of fuel-burning power plant is the source of heat it uses.

Heat in a nuclear power plant comes from the fissioning of uranium or plutonium atoms in a reactor, which replaces the usual coal- or oil-fired boiler.

As in all plants that use heat as the original source of energy for the generation of electricity, the heat energy boils water and is transformed to steam pressure which turns the blades of a huge rotating turbine.

The turbine turns the rotor of an electrical generator.

After passing through the turbine the steam is condensed back to water by a separate stream of cold water and pumped back to the heat source to become steam again.

The reactions that take place in nuclear fission are less familiar than the chemical reactions that make fire, but in concept they may be simpler.

Nuclear fission is the splitting of heavy atoms, such as uranium, into lighter atoms, releasing heat, radiation and particles called neutrons.

The neutrons fly away from the split atom and strike other uranium atoms, splitting those. Once started this process is self-sustaining provided the neutrons are free to go where they like and there are enough uranium atoms around.

ENRICHED

The continuous splitting of atoms in this fashion is called a "chain reaction."

In a reactor of the Limerick type, fuel pellets of enriched uranium dioxide are placed in hollow metal rods 12 feet long. The rods are assembled in bundles which are carefully arranged in a large steel tank—the reactor vessel.

When the reactor is operating neutrons fly among the rods, pentrating the fuel and splitting uranium atoms. The heat thus released boils water pumped into the bottom of the reactor and through the bundles of fuel rods.

HEAVY

In this kind of nuclear furnace the reactor itself acts as the boiler—hence the term "boiling water reactor."

Each of Limerick's two large boiling water reactors will be about 70 feet high and 20 feet in diameter and hold thousands of fuel rods weighing altogether 800 tons.

Water flowing through these reactors by the millions of gallons will be heated to 550 degrees to make steam at a pressure of 1000 pounds per square inch.

The steam will be piped to the turbines and then cooled in a condenser by a separate stream of cold water circulated through the cooling towers.

There is another common type of water-cooled reactor called a "pressurized water reactor" which is used in most nuclear ships and submarines and some power plants.

A pressurized water reactor adds another step to the process of generating steam.

The water pumped through the reactor is kept under high pressure so that it doesn't boil when heated. The pressurized water carries heat away from the fuel rods into a heat exchanger, where it is circulated in pipes to heat and boil a separate stream of water to make steam.

CLEANER

This system is more complicated but cleaner than a boiling water reactor because the radioactively contaminated water passing through the reactor never reaches the turbines and other equipment.

Still other types of reactor still in development use helium gas, liquid metals such as sodium or organic compounds to carry heat from the reactor.

Any substance used for that purpose is called a "coolant."

In a water-cooled reactor the water also acts as a "moderator." In other words it slows down the neutrons in the reactor, which increases their effectiveness in causing fission.

The reactivity, or rate of nuclear fission and heat production in a reactor, is controlled by movable rods of neutron-absorbing material that can be inserted among the fuel rods. The same thing can be accomplished in pressurized water reactors by adding soluble neutron blotters such as boron to the cooling water.

Thus the basic parts of a reactor are:

A core of fissionable fuel.

A moderator.

A cooling system to carry heat away from the reactor core.

A control system to regulate the speed of the chain reaction.

DECAY PRODUCTS OF URANIUM CAUSE ENGINEERING HEADACHES

Nuclear fission is a messy process.

In addition to useful heat the splitting of uranium produces intense gamma radiation from which plant workers must be shielded.

Even more of a problem is the material left over after uranium has fissioned. A uranium atom can split in about 40 different ways, producing two lighter atoms that usually are unstable (radioactive.)

This means that at some point in time each of the new atoms will spontaneously relieve the tensions in its nucleus by throwing off some kind of radiation, transforming itself into still another kind of atom.

These radioactive "ashes" of the nuclear fire are called "fission decay products" or "daughter products" of uranium.

Chemically the decay products are identical to familiar elements such as iodine, cesium, iron, strontium, cobalt or the inert gas krypton, for instance. But because these atoms are radioactive they are called radioactive "isotopes" of these elements.

CAUSE HEADACHES

As quantities of decay products build up inside fuel pellets they cause a number of headaches for engineers.

For one thing the concentration of unused uranium atoms decreases, slowing the chain reaction and making replacement of the fuel necessary every two years or so.

Next, as was pointed out in the story on reactor safety, the decay products give off heat on their own initiative, which means that the fuel stays hot and radioative even after fission has been stopped. This creates serious problems in handling, storing and disposing of spent fuel.

For the most part it is the decay products in nuclear fuel that post potential dangers to the public. If through accident or carelessness they should escape from the reactor, transportation cask, reprocessing plant or disposal site they could get into the atmosphere and water supplies, plants, fish and animal life and ultimately to human beings.

Most decay products are no real hazard to the public because they are extremely short-lived and transform themselves into stable, nonradioactive atoms within a fraction of a second after their creation.

But others lose their radioactivity slowly over a period of hours, days, years or even centuries. The artificial radioactive element plutomium, for example, loses half its radioactivity every 24,000 years.

The dangers presented by these longer lived isotopes vary tremendously according to the type of radiation they emit and their chemical properties.

The isotope of iodine I–131 is one of the most worrisome because iodine is a "thyroid seeker." That means that when ingested by mammals almost all iodine becomes concentrated in the thyroid gland. If the iodine is radioactive, the thyroid can become highly radioactive.

Likewise, strontium-90 and radium are "bone seekers." Concentrated in the bone they can induce leukemia in the sensitive blood-producing cells of the bone marrow.

Plutonium can be extremely dangerous. Not only is it radioactive and chemically poisonous, but it readily burns in air to form a radioactive "smoke" that humans can breathe or ingest in food.

It takes only a few thousands of a gram of plutonium inhaled into the lungs to cause death or lung cancer.

Other radioactive decay products are gases. Chemically active gases that routinely escape from the fuel of a reactor can be captured in filters inside the plant. But others are inert gases such as krypton and xenon which are difficult to capture and are simply released into the outside air at most plants.

Fortunately, the fact that they are chemically inert means that they are not readily absorbed by living things. But they can be inhaled. They also expose people to external radiation as they mix with the air.

Though the Atomic Energy Commission insists that public exposure to released inert radioisotopes is too slight to be dangerous, public pressure to make exposures "as low as practicable" prompted the Philadelphia Electric Co. to design special systems costing about $7 million to capture essentially all radioactive gases that will leak from the fuel of the Limerick reactors.

PE expects exposures to people living at the boundary of its plant site to be only a few thousandths at most of the maximum permitted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

URANIUM FUEL IS EXPENSIVE TO PRODUCE

Nature provides only one substance capable of sustaining a chain reaction by nuclear fission—an isotope of uranium called U–235.

But the bulk of natural uranium consists of another isotope, U–238, with a concentration of less than 1 percent of useful U–235. While it is possible to sustain a chain reaction with natural uranium containing this low concentration of U–235, most reactors use "enriched" fuel in which the concentration of fissionable uranium has been increased to several percent.

The enrichment process, originally developed for production of fissionable materials for atomic bombs, is extremely expensive and complicated because various isotopes to a given element, such as uranium, are chemically identical and difficult to separate.

The method used in this country is to convert mined uranium into a gas in the form of uranium hexafluoride, which is forced through ceramic filters in hundreds of successive stages called a "cascade."

HEAVIER

As the U–235 atoms are slightly heavier than the U–238 atoms, the fissionable atoms move slightly faster through the "gaseous diffusion" process, increasing their concentration in the gas.

The gaseous diffusion plants in this country cost about $24 billion to build and they consume about 4 per cent of the nation's electrical output. All are owned by the Atomic Energy Commission.

A complete fuel core for one of the Limerick reactors, for instance, will cost in the neighborhood of $100 million—a huge initial investment.

But one pound of fissionable fuel produces as much heat as 3 million pounds of coal.

At today's coal prices, that makes uranium fuel almost three times cheaper than fossil fuels in this part of the country.

After enrichment the uranium hexafluoride gas is shipped to fuel fabrication plants, now privately owned, and converted to solid uranium dioxide and processed into heat-resistant ceramic pellets.

Encapsulated in rods made of thin zirconium-aluminum alloy, these pellets are the fuel of a reactor. Before use they are not highly radioactive and can be handled without shielding.

But care must be taken to insure that the fuel material is not stored or allowed to accumulate in one container in sufficient amounts to let a chain reaction get started. (The amount of fissionable material required to sustain a chain reaction is called a "critical mass" of that material.)

The bundles of fuel rods are lowered into the reactor in a carefully arranged geometrical configuration designed to prevent a chain reaction while the control rods are fully inserted in the core, and to allow fission to begin and proceed at controlled rates as the control rods are slowly drawn out and neutrons start to move through the core.

LIMERICK PLANT CONTRACTOR IS VETERAN IN FIELD

The generation of electricity through atomic fission is an art which didn't begin, like many other art forms, in ancient Egypt or the Middle Ages.

It's virtually new, with few in the country able to boast any term of experience in the field.

But if the label "getting in on the ground floor" can be applied to any it must be affixed to a San Francisco-based firm known as the Bechtel Organization, the prime contractor on this area's nuclear power station.

The organization (actually it's a corporation) has been engaged in work with nuclear power for peaceful purposes since 1948 when it designed the buildings for one of history's first particle accelerators at the Atomic Energy Commission's Van de Graaff facility at Los Alamos, N. Mex.

DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Since then the Bechtel Organization has been responsible for the engineering, design or construction of nine commercially operational nuclear plants housing 11 generating units in the United States and overseas.

Additionally, the firm currently is engaged in the design or construction of 18 new plants encompassing 33 atomic reactor units which ultimately will produce, altogether, 31,500,000 kilowatts of electricity.

Officials of the firm say one of the "most significant" of these is the Philadelphia Electric Company's Limerick generating station.

Bechtels's Power and Industrial Division began preliminary site work on the Limerick station during July, 1970. Of the two boiling-water type reactor units to be constructed, the first is scheduled to be operational in 1975 and the second in 1977.

Each of the units will produce 1,065 megawatts of electric power.

ALTER SUBJECT

Whenever company officials are asked to speak about Bechtel's history they quickly alter the subject to the safety they say they are building into the Limerick generating station.

It becomes obvious that rather than speak about themselves, officers of Bechtel rather would talk about what they already have produced in the area of nuclear reactors and what they currently are producing.

During any conversation, however, it is disclosed that the man in charge of the overall design, engineering and construction of everything at Limerick except the nuclear reactor and turbines is R. A. Bowman, senior vice president of Bechtel and head of its Power and Industrial Division.

He, too, would rather talk about the elaborate safety features being built into the Limerick generating station than the history of his firm.

And that construction project, he said, will involve a tremendous number of men. He estimated that when operations are at their peak more than 2,500 men will be employed in various phases of construction at the site.

During Bechtel's 23 years experience with nuclear power it has worked on such "historic" projects as Commonwealth Edison's Dresden Nuclear Power Station in Morris, Ill., completed in 1959, and America's first privately-owned nuclear fuel reprocessing plant at Ashford Hollow, N.Y.

It has additional experience working on virtually all types of nuclear reactors currently available, including:

Boiling water reactors at Peach Bottom for Philadelphia Electric, the Government of India's Tarapur plant, Boston Edison's Pilgrim Station, and Consumers Power Company's Big Rock Point plant.

Pressurized water reactors for Florida Power and Light Company's Turkey Point; Duke Power Company's Oconee plant in Seneca, S.C., and Wisconsin Michigan Power's Point Beach plant.

High temperature gas-cooled reactor for Philadelphia Electric's Peach Bottom unit.

Bechtel Corporation has been busy. It could be called a leader in the field of nuclear power station design engineering and construction.

It's also been so busy, in fact, officials of the firm speak of accomplishments and current projects rather than the corporate structure, history of, or plans for the Bechtel Organization.

PROJECT HEAD STRESSES BEAUTY OF COMPLEX

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Last year R. A. Mulford, PE supervisor of the Limerick project, testified to the Public Utility Commission concerning the design and appearance of the power station. Here is his testimony.)

PUC: Please describe in detail the generating station building, substation control buildings and their auxiliary appurtenances proposed to be constructed by Philadelphia Electric Co. in Limerick Township.

PE: The major portion of the generating station building, which I shall refer to as the turbine hall, will be rectangular in shape, 620 feet in length, 175 feet in width and 130 feet in height, with the longest side perpendicular to the Schuylkill River. The superstructure will be of structural steel.

Exterior walls of the turbine hall will be concrete panels or metal siding of a color compatible with the surroundings. This section of the building will house the turbine generators and the heat cycle equipment.

Along the length of the turbine hall there will be a rectangular wing housing the reactor and auxiliary equipment which will be 326 feet in length, 163 feet in width and 180 feet in height. It will be constructed of reinforced concrete. Exterior walls of this portion will be of finished concrete to a height of 130 feet and above this point the exterior walls will match the exterior walls of the turbine hall.

Parallel to the opposite side of the turbine hall there will be a rectangular wing which will be 350 feet in length, 50 feet in width and with a height which is stepped from a minimum of 20 feet to a maximum of 75 feet. This wing will be connected to the turbine hall by another wing perpendicular to the turbine hall, which will be elevated and which will be 150 feet in length, 50 feet in width and 30 feet in height.

The exterior walls of this combined L shaped wing will match the exterior walls of the turbine hall. This L shaped wing will house administrative and maintenance facilities.

Approximately 750 feet due north of the turbine hall there will be located two cooling towers. These towers will be hyperbolic in shape and will be approximately 475 feet in diameter at the base, 220 feet in diameter at the top and 500 feet high. The towers will be constructed of reinforced concrete and will be approximately 400 feet apart at the base.

The circulating water pump structure will be located immediately north of the main building. Approximately 450 feet southwest of the main building will be the river water intake and pumping facility.

The Reading Railroad runs through the plant site adjacent to the Schuylkill River. A service rail spur will be constructed connecting the plant area to the Reading Railroad.

The control houses for the two adjacent substations will be one-story, prefabricated metal buildings. Each building will be 36 feet wide, 64 feet long and 16 feet high. These buildings are of the rigid-frame, gable roof type.

Summer green has been selected for the color of the two substation control buildings so as to harmonize with the surroundings.

PUC: Describe in detail the aesthetic features of the entire project.

PE: The Limerick Generating Station will be located on a site consisting of approximately 400 acres in Limerick Township and 90 acres in Lower Pottsgrove Township on the east bank of the Schuylkill River, and approximately 100 acres in Chester County on the west bank of the river. Most of the 590 acre area currently is owned by Philadelphia Electric Company.

The generating station building and the two cooling towers will be situated in the approximate center of this 590-acre area, thus maintaining a distance of about a half mile between the plant and its nearest neighbors.

The land within the 590-acre area is primarily woodland and farmland. Practically all of the woodland will be preserved with the station facilities being constructed in open areas. The plant facilities will be so located as to take maximum advantage of the screening effect of existing woodland on the site.

In addition, a landscaping program will be undertaken in the area of the entrance to the station site, along both sides of the access

road to the plant itself and in the immediate area of the plant. Open areas in the vicinity of the plant will be graded and seeded.

The generating station building, with its clean architectural form extensively employing color-coordinated, decorative exterior wall panels, will be one of the most attractive buildings ever constructed for a power generating station.

Transmission towers in the area of the plant will be of modern design for aesthetic purposes and will blend with the advanced design of the main building.

PE PRESIDENT SEES BRIGHT FUTURE FOR ATOMIC ENERGY

Few executives in the utility industry have enjoyed more spectacular careers than James Lee Everett, who was named president of Philadelphia Electric Co. the past April at the age of 43.

During his two decades with the company, which he joined in 1950 as a novice mechanical engineer fresh out of Penn State, the quiet, clear-spoken native of North Carolina came to be regarded with an unmistakable tinge of awe even by the older men who became his subordinates.

Everett's rise to the top was bound up with the development of peaceful nuclear power almost from the beginning.

When PE joined a group of other utilities in the early 1950s in an effort to study the possibilities of the infant atom, Everett was assigned to participate in the development of a sodium-cooled fast breeder reactor with a working group in Detroit.

Still in his mid-20s, he became one of the world's first nuclear engineers.

In 1955 he returned to PE and the next year was named engineer in charge of mechanical research where he continued his association with the company's nuclear power plans.

From June, 1958, to June, 1959, Everett attended Massachusetts Institute of Technology as a Sloan Fellow and earned a master's degree in Industrial Management.

In October, 1960, he was named director of research and through the next eight years continued his steady rise in the research and engineering department. In 1968 he was appointed executive vice president of PE.

Since the early 50s Everett has been a part of PE's pioneering efforts to help make nuclear power commercially feasible. The company participated in the construction of the Enrico Fermi fast breeder plant near Detroit, the first commercial fast breeder in the world.

In the late 1950s PE decided to build a small demonstration high-temperature gas cooled reactor at Peach Bottom, again the first commercial reactor of its kind in the world.

Now two large boiling water reactors are nearing completion at the Peach Bottom site and two more are under construction at Limerick.

Just this month, PE announced it will build a large reactor similar to the first one at Peach Bottom by 1980. It is expected to be the most efficient nuclear power plant ever built.

Everett was named "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" in 1961 by the Philadelphia Jaycees. He is a member of the boards of directors of Philadelphia National Bank, Power Reactor Development Co., and Atomic Power Development Associates.

He is chairman of the board of Radiation Management Corp. and a director of the Urban Coalition, Chester County Council of Boy Scouts of America and the Philadelphia YMCA, of which he is president.

Everett was a charter member of the American Nuclear Society.

ON POWER AND PROGESS

Question: According to published estimates you expect the demand for electricity to double by 1980 and double again by 1990, and you plan to build enough nuclear and fossil fueled plants to meet this demand. But the Environmental Protection Administration of New York City has recommended: "Government must take immediate steps to decrease overall demand for . . . electricity in particular. If permitted to continue unchecked, industry's effort to expand the use of electricity will inevitably result in irreparable damage to public health and environment, and in crisis rationing of power."

Do you agree that steps should be taken to curb the growth of power use, or should you continue your effort to meet any demand that arises?

Answer: We can continue to expand and must if the environment is to be improved. We will need power for the recycling of glass and metal, to run sewage treatment plants, to run anti-air pollution devices.

The improvement of our standard of living also is tied to electricity. My kids have the same right to improve their standard of living as I had.

I think the balance between power needs and environmental needs will be achieved economically rather than by government. We will pay the cost of clean power.

As far as power rationing is concerned, I don't see that as the answer. Who gets rationed? If its the home consumer then his standard of living will be lessened and the use of electricity will not have the same chance to grow.

If industry is rationed then general economic growth will be limited. With power rationing we would be living in a government-controlled economy like Russia, China, Hitler's Germany or Mussolini's Italy. The government would have to decide what is built, what is produced, what is used. I don't think that's what we want.

Question: Your critics complain that you are spending $7 million a year on advertising electricity compared with only $1 million a year for research into such problems as pollution control. Is this accurate?

Answer: We never spent anything like $7 million a year on advertising—between $1 million and $2 million is more like it. This year our advertising budget is way down—we aren't spending anything to sell a single kilowatt hour to the general public. We still would like to sell more electric heating, though, to balance the summer air conditioning load.

But I don't see why it's a crime to spend more on advertising than research. If the government wants us to do research we will, but people seem to think research is free if you get the utilities to do it. The fact is that the cost always comes back to the public no matter who does it.

Question: Do you advertise to attract industry to your area?

Answer: Utilities traditionally are interested in the economic health of their areas. We need more industry to prosper and grow, and we're fighting to do that.

Question: You believe then that economic and industrial expansion means having more material wealth per person which means progress?

Answer: Yes. If the American public doesn't want that kind of life it can show it by not buying. We would have to change direction. But as I see it the overall economy is a way for people to contribute to the overall good, hopefully by doing something they're happy at. One person makes shoes for many people, and so forth.

Question: Even if there were signs of changes in the public attitude, is it possible for a corporation committed to earning profits to change direction and cease to promote its own expansion?

Answer: For us to change we would have to see a clear change on the part of the public. It's hard to read what the public wants. I think our company is big enough to respond to a clearly discernible change in attitude.

We are going through a lot of soul-searching in our society but I don't see any radical shift. When this is all sorted out there may be a reordering of values, of priorities, but everything isn't going to stop.

Question: You would agree, then, with this statement from the 1970 stockholders report of the Arizona Public Service Co.: "The no-growth or slow growth philosophy is a concept that could threaten our entire economic system. It would magnify rather than alleviate poverty and unemployment. And it is a direct contradiction of those fundamental instincts that motivate people to complete, to acquire and to improve their way of giving"?

Answer: I think I agree. A steady-state society? Who has enough? Everybody wants more of something. We've got built into the human mechanism the motivation to strive for more. I haven't seen any public reaction that suggests any change.

ON THE OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR POWER . . .

Question: What will you do to counteract public opposition to nuclear power?

Answer: We must educate people to the benefits—and risks—of nuclear power. A tremendous amount of misinformation is getting to the public on this subject.

Telling it like it is very important in refuting the erroneous claims of those who run around claiming the sky is falling. Nuclear power is safe and clean. . . . We're not saying this because we have any stake in nuclear manufacturing—we have none. Our job is simply to pick the best kind of generating facility to provide power to the public.

Our confidence in nuclear power comes from decades of experience in the operation of reactors. The nuclear power plant at Oyster Creek has proven to be one of the most reliable plants in the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnection. The big new coal fueled plants at Keystone and Connemaugh look bad by comparison.

Question: Has opposition from environmental groups delayed PE's program in nuclear power?

Answer: I can't say the groups have delayed us yet. But the opposition of one group did delay for a while the decision of the Delaware River Basin Commission to allot us the water we need for Limerick from the Delaware.

Question: An executive of your company has said that delays and interference from such groups could make nuclear power uneconomical. Do you agree?

Answer: If opposition causes delay after delay we might have to go ahead with fossil plants to meet the power demand. It seems kind of foolish to me.

Question: Are you worried by the rash of bills concerning nuclear power plants and power plants in general that have been introduced by congressmen and senators lately?

Answer: Most of these bills expedite the process of choosing sites for power plants and provide more public participation in choosing sites. Other than ensuring proper siting, they expedite the selection process.

Actually it would help us if the people or the government would tell us where to put our plants—it would relieve us of an unwelcome responsibility.

Question: How do you feel about more public participation in decisions concerning utility management. Isn't this what the environmentalists are demanding?

Answer: It depends on what you mean by public participation. Public participation through government is fine, but when you let any Tom Dick and Harry step in and try to persuade everybody that something is wrong, you have mob rule. They want to substitute mob action for orderly government.

Question: But the public seems to be losing its faith in the government as well as big business. Some people claim, for instance,

that the Atomic Energy Commission has tried to hide the dangers of nuclear power from the public. What do you say to them?

Answer: There is a lot of mistrust of the government. But the AEC has given out the straight dope. I don't think the AEC can hide anything—the whole machine down there is one that spills the beans immediately.

In fact most of the criticism of the AEC has come from AEC employees. Dr. Gofman and Dr. Tamplin (authors of "Population Control through Nuclear Pollution" and "Poisoned Power") are the chief critics of the AEC and they still draw their paychecks from the AEC.

Question: How can PE convince the doubters that its statements are frank and honest?

Answer: We'll just have to keep telling our story the best way we can.

Question: What do you say to people who think nuclear power plants are dangerous?

Answer: In its own self-interest PE will ensure safety. A man once asked how we could be sure our nuclear plants would be safe. I asked him if he realized that one of Philadelphia's water treatment plants keeps 100,000 pounds of liquid chlorine on hand in tanks to treat water. That's enough chlorine to kill everyone in Philadelphia if it all got out and the wind were right. But the public doesn't worry because it has accepted the idea that it is possible to handle dangerous materials safely if the proper care is taken.

We're not a Johnny-Come-Lately in the nuclear field. People don't seem to realize there are nearly 100 nuclear reactors running around the oceans and moving in and out of harbors right now.

Accidents can happen—but facilities must and can be designed to contain accidents and minimize their effects.

ON POLLUTION

Question: But what about the pollution problem? Won't it get worse as you generate more and more electricity?

Answer. I think the tide has turned as far as pollution is concerned. A lot of people in industry hoped during the first few years of the environmental movement that it would all blow over and go away. But now I think the idea has been accepted that pollution must be controlled. We are more regulated now and we have a much more pro-environmental attitude.

PE, for instance, will spend $2 billion all told over the next five years and $120 million of that will go for environmental improvement. Industry-wide, that's not unusual.

We are trying to do our part to reduce the impact of our facilities on the environment. But it's like shooting at a moving target. Every time we meet one set of regulations something new crops up—there are many more regulatory agencies to satisfy these days.

We have tremendously reduced our sulfur emissions.

Question: Your critics charge that you are spending practically nothing for research into pollution control despite the fact that power plants contribute a great deal of the sulfur dioxide pollution in the nation's atmosphere and no proven means to control it exists. Do you think your efforts in this direction are adequate?

Answer: The electric utility industry has never been called upon for the design of such equipment. But we have supported the efforts of companies like General Electric and Westinghouse which manufacture generating equipment and do research into pollution control.

Lately there has been a good deal of work in this field and we will be taking a bigger and bigger role in it. Our new oil burning plant at Eddystone will have devices for sulfur removal—we hope they work. It's a tough thing to accomplish. You have to make sure new processes for controlling air pollution don't increase water pollution.

Actually nobody has really analyzed whether sulfur dioxide is very harmful. In fact the Edison Electric Institute did some tests with monkeys and found they did better with some sulfur dioxide in the air than without it.

More work needs to be done on this instead of simply setting arbitrary standards to control emissions.

Question: Will the wider use of nuclear power plants reduce the consumption of fossil fuels below present levels?

Answer: I believe it will.

Question: It has been estimated that if all nuclear power plants projected for construction by the year 2000 are built, they will need half the natural water runoff of the United States for cooling. Do you see this as a problem?

Answer: I haven't seen that figure. But water will be one of the major restraints if we continue to build evaporative cooling towers. Nuclear plants are proliferating faster than we expected 10 years ago.

One solution with a good bit of promise is dry cooling towers and they should become economically feasible in a few years. Dry cooling will have its place.

Another good possibility is a hybrid tower that will operate as a dry tower during the winter and as an evaporative tower during the summer.

Question: The towers you plan for Limerick will evaporate 35 to 40 million gallons of water a day. Will this be a burden to the atmosphere or the rest of the environment?

Answer: No. That sounds like a lot of water but we have estimated it is the amount evaporated naturally on an average day from ten square miles of cornfield. That's a space approximately equal to the paved areas around Pottstown.

Question: Then to sum up you don't agree with the New York City report that doubling your power output will irreparably harm the environment?

Answer: In our own case I can safely say that if we double our power output in the next decade it will not irreparably harm the environment. In fact the environment will improve.

We can't afford to jeopardize the public in our business and we can't move our operations elsewhere. We have to stay right here and live with what we create.

ON THE PROBLEMS OF THE PRESENT

Question: What do you see as the biggest problems facing PE during the near future?

Answer: We're up against a rapid increase in power demand for air conditioning and we're desperately trying to meet this growth. Air conditioning has grown much faster than expected. But I think we're succeeding. We met the load today without much problem. (It was 95 degrees and humid outside.)

As far as economic problems are concerned, we're facing a tremendous rise in fuel costs and interest rates. Half of our operating cost is fuel. In the past year or so this cost has about doubled from 30 cents to 59 cents per million B.T.U. (a measure of the heat produced by fuel. Nuclear fuels, by comparison, cost 18 cents per million BTU.)

The rising cost of oil is a result of new regulations requiring low sulfur fuel, and low sulfur oil is in short supply. Coal has gone up partly because of new mining regulations that have shut down marginal operators and increased the costs of the big operators.

Mine wages have gone up too. It's hard to find people to work in the mines—it's not the most attractive kind of thing to do.

Interest rates are another problem. Half of our funds to build Limerick (which could cost $1 billion or more) come from borrowed money which costs us 7 to 9 per cent interest now. We used to get it for 3 to 5 per cent.

Question: Some investigators claim most of the coal reserves in this country are owned by "competing" oil companies and that high prices are the results of artificially created shortages designed to drive up prices.

Answer: I honestly don't believe price management is behind fuel prices.

RELEASE RADIOACTIVITY

Researchers have found that coal-burning power plants release more radioactivity from naturally radioactive elements in their smoke and soot than is emitted routinely by most nuclear power plants.

THE PRICE-ANDERSON ACT: A GUARANTEE OR GIVEAWAY?

Last May Mike Gravel, a U.S. Senator from Alaska, introduced a bill to repeal major portions of the Price-Anderson Act of 1957.

The Price-Anderson Act provides federal liability insurance for damage from radiation accidents at privately owned nuclear power plants—coverage up to a maximum of $560 million for each plant.

In a public statement that accompanied his bill to cancel federal insurance on nuclear power plants, Sen. Gravel said, "I believe anyone who uses nuclear material should accept the financial liability for damage with which that nuclear activity may cause to the public.

"My belief is based on the simple observation that, in our economic system, public liability is the principal restraint on reckless activity."

"I fundamentally question the wisdom of the Price-Anderson Act," he continued, "which 'in order to encourage the development of the atomic energy industry . . .'" stipulates that "the United States may make funds available for a portion of the damages suffered by the public from nuclear incidents, and may limit the liability of those persons liable for such losses."

Many critics of nuclear power cheered Sen. Gravel's bill.

"Repeal Price-Anderson" has been one of their rallying cries for several years.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As far as the opposition is concerned, the act is an official acknowledgement that nuclear accidents can happen.

Worse, it allows utilities to build nuclear power plants without responsibility for the possible consequences, despite the fact that private insurance companies will not carry full coverage.

And still further, the act limits the total liability for an accident to a sum which might not cover the damages.

The opposition bases this last claim on a report written by scientists at Brookhaven National Laboratory in 1957 at the request of Congress which estimated the maximum theoretical damage from a reactor accident.

The worst result the report came up with—for a 1957 size reactor—was 3,500 deaths, 45,000 injured and property damage amounting to $7 billion.

This report, often quoted by nuclear critics, was labeled WASH-740 and until relatively recently was classified by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The same critics say that the bill was necessary because private insurance companies refused to insure nuclear power plants, and the utilities refused to buy them unless they were relieved of liability for accidents.

If nuclear plants are really so safe, said Sen. Gravel, let the utilities "put their money where their mouths are."

The power companies and the AEC, for their parts, point to all the fuss over Price-Anderson as a prime example of the distortion, misinterpretation and misuse of facts they say is behind much of the opposition to nuclear power.

J. L. Everett, president of the Philadelphia Electric Co., likens the purpose of Price-Anderson to that of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp.

The FDIC was set up following the Great Depression to reassure depositors that the government stood behind the new banking system. It guarantees deposits of up to $15,000 in the nation's banks.

"That guarantee today runs into billions of dollars," says PE. Should all banks fail the government would be liable for all this money. Even though the risk of this is vanishingly small, the FDIC is considered essential to assure the public that the government stands behind the banking system."

The Price-Anderson Act serves essentially the same purpose, its defenders say.

"It demonstrated both to the public and to the utility industry that the government had confidence in nuclear power and would take all necessary steps, including regulation, to assure safety and to protect the public," says PE.

"It is highly improbable that a nuclear accident could occur that would create a major liability under the Price-Anderson Act.

Private insurance companies did not refuse to provide coverage to nuclear reactors. In 1957 no data of any kind was available to indicate what the statistical financial risks might be, but insurance companies did agree to put up $60 million in coverage for each reactor.

This coverage was to be used first if needed, then the government insurance.

Gradually private coverage has increased to $82 million per reactor, and will be $100 million within a few years.

Meanwhile both the government and private insurance firms have reduced premiums paid by utilities for coverage.

Defenders of the industry also claim that the maximum theoretical damage estimates in the Brookhaven Report were vastly exaggerated, even for today's huge reactors.

Thomas Gerusky, Director of the Pennsylvania Office of Radiological Health, was a member of the Brookhaven staff in 1957 when the report was written.

As he describes the study, it was based on "entirely theoretical" assumptions.

The scientists who wrote it were instructed to assume that by unspecified means, all the radioactive gases, half the volatile compounds and half the solid fuel materials inside the reactor were somehow released to the atmosphere in aerosol form.

When the report was updated in 1965, they were instructed to use the same assumptions, despite the fact that experiments had by then shown that less than 2 per cent of the solid radioactive materials would be released even if by some inconceivable catastrophe a reactor were broken open like an egg, Gerusky says.

The writers of the report chaffed under these "unrealistic" standards. Gerusky has no explanation for why they were imposed except that Washington officials apparently wanted to know the worst that could happen, no ifs, ands or buts.

The AEC complains that all these limitations of the Brookhaven Report should be obvious to anyone who reads it carefully. The fact that it has been so often misread and misinterpreted, in its opinion, illustrates the reasons for the AEC's much-criticized hesitancy to release some kinds of information.

Should Price-Anderson be repealed?

Everett says his company hasn't given it much thought.

"But we could get along without it," he said.

Cooling Tower Water To Travel 36 Miles

Makeup water for Limerick's cooling towers will come 36 miles from the Delaware River at Point Pleasant. It will be pumped through an 8-mile pipeline to the east branch of Perkiomen Creek and flow downstream in the open for 20 miles.

Where the creek crosses PE's right-of-way for its 500,000 volt transmission lines, the water will be pumped into a 36-inch pipeline once again for the final 8-mile leg of the journey to Limerick along the right-of-way.

Condenser Cooling

Cooling water for Limerick's steam condensers will be circulated between the condensers and the two cooling towers through steel pipes 9 feet in diameter at a rate of 900,000 gallons per minute.

Limerick Ecology Action—10 Reasons Why Area Group Opposes Nuclear Plant

(Editor's Note.—The following is Limerick Ecology Action's official statement of opposition to Limerick Nuclear Power Station.)

We the membership of Limerick Ecology Action believe we are obligated to oppose the construction and operation of the Limerick nuclear power plant proposed for this area.

Our judgment is based on the following:

1. We feel that the evaporation of 35 million gallons of heated vapor per day into the atmosphere may adversely affect climate, vegetation and animal life in the area.

2. The ability to transport, reprocess and store radioactive wastes has yet to be demonstrated as being safe to life and property.

3. We cannot condone the logic which advocates siting reactors the size of Limerick (2,200 megawatts total) in a heavily populated area when there has been no previous operating experience with reactors this size. We further submit that the risk we would be expected to tolerate is an indignity no citizen of the United States should have to endure.

4. Until the scientific community acknowledges a safe threshold of radiation to the human body and other forms of life—taking into consideration the concentration factor and the possible contamination of the food chain—no citizen should be subjected to constant and deliberate low level emissions of radiation from nuclear power plants, let alone run the risk of overexposure because of the all too frequent malfunctions experienced by existing plants.

5. Studies by Dr. John Gofman and Dr. Arthur Tamplin of the Atomic Energy Commission's Livermore Laboratory in California and by Dr. Ernest Sternglass of the University of Pittsburgh, among others, suggest a link between atomic power plant emissions and increased rates of cancer, leukemia, lung disease, infant mortality and genetic defects within a 50-mile radius of such plants. Until these studies can be disproved a moratorium should be declared on the construction of nuclear power plants. During this time an independently financed study should be conducted to ascertain the safety of nuclear power plants and the advisability of continuing with further development and extension of such plants.

6. We maintain that with the current state of technology other means of power can be developed and employed without endangering the environment and present and future generations. A few alternatives may be fusion power, solar power, geothermal, natural gas or the conversion of coal (coal is still one of Pennsylvania's leading industries) into a pollution-free gaseous form.

7. The supply of uranium is limited and is expected to expire by the year 2000. There is enough fossil fuel to last for several hundred years and, since uranium is becoming increasingly scarce, utility companies will have to turn to the more dangerous breeder reactor in order to continue with the nuclear program. (The breeder reactor has as a by-product plutonium and is capable of an uncontrolled reaction able to damage and permanently contaminate a wide area.)

8. Since uranium is becoming scarce and more expensive, the turn to nuclear power will not keep utility prices down. To the contrary, the price of the fuel and the high cost of construction of atomic plants will necessitate further increases in utility rates.

9. The Price-Anderson Act, which is government insurance paid for by taxpayer's money, pays only a few cents on the dollar in the event of a nuclear accident. The utility companies are not liable at all.

10. The utility companies receive their money from the public. In effect, then the public is expected to pay for costly and potentially dangerous atomic power plants and bear the full burden, both physically and economically, in event of a disaster.

Couple's Indifference to Plant Grows to Fierce Opposition

From Stuart and Nora Natof's comfortable farmhouse on Linfield Road in Limerick Township the huge steel towers that carry high voltage lines majestically toward the Schuylkill loom prominently on the horizon.

Just a mile away where the lines meet the river, work has begun on Limerick Nuclear Power Station.

The Natofs don't want to live that close to a nuclear power plant. If and when Limerick begins to run in 1975 as scheduled, they probably will move away.

But Nora and Stuart Natof are convinced the plant will never operate.

"Within two years Congress will have halted the nuclear power program in this country," Natof, a mechanical engineer in the research department of Union Camp Corps., declares.

But the Natofs also believe the nuclear tide will not be turned in the committee rooms of Capitol Hill unless the public realizes the dangers that lie, as they have come to see it, not only in nuclear power but in our national creed that "science is God and growth is good."

GROUP FOUNDED

During the past year the Natofs and other members of Limerick Ecology Action, a citizens group they founded, have circulated petitions, passed out brochures in shopping centers, sponsored public debates between scientists for and against nuclear power and testified before legislative committees of both the state and federal governments.

Meanwhile, Limerick Ecology Action (LEA) has joined the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power, a Philadelphia-based organization of 30 environmental groups across eastern Pennsylvania claiming a total membership of 11,000.

Interestingly enough, the Natof's passionate opposition to the nation's nuclear power program grew out of an initial feeling of relative indifference toward the Limerick project.

When the Philadelphia Electric Co. first announced in October 1969 it would build a nuclear power plant at Limerick, the Natofs, like most of the rest of the neighboring public, felt no particular alarm.

They knew next to nothing about nuclear power but assumed it must be all right.

The announcement served mostly to end local speculation about mysterious sales of large tracts of land along the river which had been going on for several years through a real estate agent.

"At first we had no real feeling one way or the other," says Mrs. Natof. "We were interested but didn't know where to get more information."

DEBATE

Their first chance to learn more came the following summer when the Environmental. Coalition on Nuclear Power sponsored a debate at Fellowship Farm between a PE engineer and a professor from Columbia University opposed to nuclear power.

"Most of the debate lulled me to sleep," Mrs. Natof remembers. "But the question and answer period afterward left me with more questions than answers.

"As an engineer my husband was interested in the design of the plant and I think he was satisfied with answers on that point

at the time. But Mr. Allen from PE said he didn't know much about the radioactive waste disposal problem or the effects of low-level radiation released from the plant—he told us the utility simply abides by Atomic Energy Commission standards as far as health hazards are concerned.

The first "real crack" in the Natof's confidence in the utility and the government came, ironically, several weeks later when they visited PE's public information trailer while it was parked at the Royersford A&P.

The elaborate traveling exhibit called "Nuclear Power—the Key to Your Future" is supposed to tell the public about "the constructive, beneficial and peaceful uses of energy liberated from the atom."

Inside was a map of the Limerick site, displays of colored lights showing how nuclear power plants work and a scale model of the Limerick plant.

CAREFUL LOOK

When you pushed a button above the model a taped commentary began to play, introduced by a surge of violins.

"We took a careful look at the exhibit," says Natof. "There was no mention anywhere of any pollution; no mention of the radioactive gases emitted from the plant, no mention of waste disposal problems.

"They didn't even show plumes of vapor coming out of the cooling towers."

From their experience in the trailer and after discussions with executives of the electric company, the Natofs became convinced PE is anxious to avoid public airing of such problems.

"The basic philosophy of the Philadelphia Electric Co. seems to be that these things should not be discussed in the public forum, that the public can't understand them, that these matters are very technical, that PE knows what it's doing and should be let alone," said Mrs. Natof.

Nevertheless the company reacted quickly when the Natofs wrote and asked questions. R. A. Mulford, project supervisor for Limerick, and Robert Logue, the company's chief nuclear engineer, were dispatched to the Natof house to spend an evening talking in person.

But the Natofs still were far from satisfied.

The PE men had to refer many of their questions to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Natofs were not convinced by "blanket statements" that evaporating 35 million gallons of water a day from the cooling towers would have no effect on the local environment.

So they decided to organize Limerick Ecology Action, a citizens group determined to bring about "full public disclosure and discussion of the hazards of the nuclear power program."

HEADQUARTERS

LEA's headquarters is the Natof's living room, where hundreds of documents from the Atomic Energy Commission and environmentalists across the country compete for space with two children, two dogs, a collection of Oriental antiques and some startling chairs made by Mrs. Natof's grandfather.

Nora Natof is the granddaughter of Frank Lloyd Wright. She never volunteers that information, but his ghost lingers in the Oriental heirlooms and furniture, and in her intense blue eyes and unabashed willingness to say what she thinks.

Her husband if anything is even more outspoken and confident of the outcome of his battle with the giants.

His big weakness, he admits, is his hopeless fascination with machines. An inveterate tinkerer, Natof spends much of his spare time in his shop behind the house making everything from remote controlled airplanes to camper attachments for his station wagon.

But Natof thinks his love of things mechanical helps him understand what he believes is the blind and dangerous love of nuclear engineers for their reactors.

During the past year the doubts that initiated the Natofs' opposition have grown into strong convictions.

They and their colleagues have been convinced by their research that nuclear technology has grown too fast to assure the kind of near-perfect reliability public safety demands.

Even if there are no accidents, the members of Limerick Ecology Action feel PE has not proved the environmental impact of Limerick Power Station will be as small as claimed.

They are further convinced that powerful factions within Congress and the Atomic Energy Commission are so anxious to push the development of commericial nuclear power that many of the hazards and uncertainties are deliberately concealed from the public.

BATTLE PUSHED

The Limerick group pushed forward its battle against the power plant on several fronts.

The members began collecting signatures on a petition drawn up by local Attorney Henry Markofsky, a member of LEA, calling for an independent government study of the need for nuclear power plants.

The petition also asked for study "of the effects that nuclear radiation in any amount will have on the children, both born and unborn, and adults living in the area of nuclear operation, as well as thermal effects on the environment and other ecological factors" with recommendations of priorities, safeguards and controls.

Finally the petition requested a government-imposed moratorium on the construction of new nuclear power plants for at least five years until the independent studies are made.

In the past year LEA has obtained nearly 4,000 signatures from area residents to this petition.

The Natofs and Dr. Harry Blanchard, head of the science program at Kimberton Farms School and one of LEA's most effective spokesmen, have taken their message to church groups and civic organizations with talks accompanied by charts and diagrams.

In cocperation with the Environmental Coalition for Nuclear Power they also have gone to the powers that be in Harrisburg and Washington, testifying before Sen. Edwin G. Holl's nuclear investigative committee and others.

Dr. Blanchard, a chemist who worked as an executive research engineer for the General Electric Co. before turning to teaching, testified before the U.S. Congress Joint Committee on Atomic Energy recently against efforts to "streamline" reactor licensing procedures by reducing opportunities currently afforded for citizen intervention.

Last January LEA sponsored a public debate at Spring-Ford Junior High School between Dr. Ernest Sternglass, a physicist from the University of Pittsburgh, and Dr. Robert Linnemann, a radiologist from the University of Pennsylvania.

Dr. Sternglass believes routine radioactive emissions from nuclear power plants dramatically increase infant death rates in surrounding counties—a theory that has made him famous.

Dr. Linnemann was brought in by EPE to refute his claims.

The debate was something of a disaster for the electric Company, as even PE ruefully admits. Company representatives arrived to find the small auditorium packed to the seams with suspicious citizens fully prepared to discount the soothing assurances of big business and distinctly sympathetic to Dr. Sternglass, the underdog.

The electric company didn't help matters any by prefacing its presentation with a standard and rather boring speech about all-electric living and the good life.

The company was caught flat-footed when Dr. Sternglass presented graphs purporting to show that infant death rates rose 50 per cent near PE's small reactor at Peach Bottom—a surprise announcement PE was not specifically prepared to refute.

In some desperation Dr. Linnemann pointed out to the audience that not a single qualified scientist in the United States believes Dr. Sternglass is right—not even other severe critics of the nuclear power program.

The debate ended with loud charges of "personal attack" echoing back and forth across the stage.

AMBUSHED

"We were ambushed," commented the president of PE several months later. He wasn't there himself, but like ereyone else in the company he's heard about it.

Whatever the merits of his case, the presence of Dr. Sternglass in Royersford, the reaction of the audience and PE's display of naivete seemed to bring into focus the widening national war between friends and foes of nuclear power.

For indeed the fight is not limited to Limerick nor did it begin there.

Throughout the past decade, announcements of plans for nuclear power plants usually have resulted, after an initial period of bewilderment and apathy, in the formation of citizens groups and protest organizations in the affected areas.

But in the early days these groups rarely were well organized or very sophisticated about the technological problems, and applications for construction licenses often went unchallenged in local public hearings required by the AEC.

CHANGE

Gradually, that has changed. Respected and well-financed groups such as the Sierra Club began to enter the lists to do battle with large utilities and scored one decisive success in California when their opposition stopped construction of an atomic plant on top of an earthquake fault.

At the same time public attitudes toward environmental problems started to change fast as the pollution problem came to the fore. Some also began to question publicly the cherished American belief in the virtues of unlimited growth in the consumption of goods—a form of "progress" closely tied to the power industry—and perhaps most important of all, the man on the street's tacit trust in the integrity of government and the scientific establishment began to erode away.

This trust has been shaken deeply in the past few years by the sudden public awakening to the disastrous effects of DDT, for example, or the disclosure that cyclamate might produce cancer, or the tragic carelessness that led to birth of babies deformed by thalidomide.

In the political sphere, a disastrous war and the recent publication of the Pentagon Papers has done nothing to shore up the people's confidence in the competence of the federal government.

ADD FUEL

All these things add fuel to the fire when environmentalists claim the Atomic Energy Commission is trying to cover up the truth about its highly touted "peaceful atoms."

This distrust is intensified as the public begins to see scientists from many fields banding together to act as watchdogs on the very technologies they helped to create.

As early as 1962 a group of 10,000 scientists across the nation signed a letter calling for an end to atmospheric bomb testing, pointing out that fallout levels were rising alarmingly.

More recently the AEC has come under fire from a few of its own employes. Physicists John Gofman and Arthur Tamplin have published such books as "Population Control

through Nuclear Pollution" and "Poisoned Power" which argue that current radiation exposure standards for the public could allow tens of thousands of cancer and genetic deaths each year if public exposure reached the maximums allowed.

Other AEC scientists strongly disagree, but Drs. Gofman and Tamplin remain on the AEC payroll.

And just this summer the anthropologist Margaret Mead, president of the Scientist's Institute for Public Information, filed suit in federal court against the AEC demanding that alternatives to its fastbreeder reactor program be offered before proceeding.

Some observers see this phenomenon as part of a profound revolution of the national spirit that began in the last decade with the flower children and grew to influence all American art and culture.

The fear that technology has become a self-controlling force, an artificial monster beyond the wildest dreams of Dr. Frankenstein, seems to be plaguing even the technologists themselves.

"Arrogant technologists" Dr. Blanchard calls those who persist in the belief that growth must continue at all costs. Which may provide some clue as to why he left the research division of General Electric to become a teacher.

"I got tired of covering up for the organization," he explains simply.

Ironically, GE is one of the two largest manufacturers of nuclear reactors and another of the area's most dedicated opponents of nuclear power is former employe of that corporation.

Douglas Baker, Norristown, has been working full time for nearly a year—without pay—as one of the heads of the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power.

Baker, 31, who recently became a father for the first time, has been living on savings accumulated during Baker's eight years as a systems analyst and aerospace engineer for GE though he hopes to start earning a small income soon with a glass recycling project.

The young, soft-spoken engineer perhaps typifies a new breed of anti-establishment technologist emerging slowly from the ranks of the engineering professions

He grew up in a small Pennsylvania town and went on to Penn State to earn a degree in aerospace engineering. Then he joined GE and spent three years in an advanced engineering training program. As a systems analyst for the company he worked in the missile-space vehicle division, the large steam turbine division, in military electronics and spent a year in California with GE's technical-military planning operation working on the Anti-Ballistic Missile system.

DISILLUSIONED

But in 1969, his growing disillusionment with the corporation and his work led him to "drop out" and enter Drexel University where he earned a master's degree in Environmental Engineering. Since last year he has devoted all his energies to the battle against pollution and uncontrolled technological growth.

"I think a lot of the people I worked with at GE would have liked to do the same thing, but they were tied down with families and property," he says.

Despite his unpreposing manner, Baker has proven an able organizer and a formidable witness for his cause.

Recently, at a hearing before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission on a request by PE for a rate increase, Baker testified why he believes nuclear power is a poor investment for the rate-payers to have to support.

On cross-examination PE's experienced legal staff—which in the past has tripped up many an ill-prepared nuclear opponent—seemed to have met its match in Baker.

Every question they raised about his position was met with a torrent of words and data that suggested Baker was better prepared to defend himself than they were.

But the real showdown should come this fall or winter when the AEC finally holds public hearings in Norristown or Pottstown on the construction of the Limerick plant.

Public hearings are required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 before a commercial reactor construction permit can be issued—though more and more delays from citizen intervention at these hearings have prompted the AEC and the utilities to ask that they be eliminated.

The Natofs, Baker, the LEA and ECNP will be there—with a lawyer. And they have plenty of questions to ask.

RADIATION, THE ENEMY OF LIFE, MUST BE CONTAINED

The controversy over the use of nuclear power is hard to understand without some grasp of the nature of radiation and its effects on living things.

In general, radiation is an enemy of life. Radiation in its various forms can penetrate and disrupt the complex chemistry of living cells, killing them, mysteriously triggering cancer, working changes in the genes or interfering in other ways with the intricate processes of life.

A large nuclear reactor generates hundreds of tons of intensely radioactive materials, some of which rank among the deadliest and most persistent poisons known.

What if they get out? critics ask. Can radioactive wastes be disposed safely? Are the controlled amounts of radioactive matter released from nuclear installations really no threat to the health of the public?

ALTER MOLECULES

The word "radiation" is applied to a variety of familiar things—heat, for instance, which may come from a "radiator" or light, which is emitted by something that's "radiant."

But radiation in the more specific sense refers to ionizing radiation powerful enough to penetrate and alter the molecules in cells.

Ionizing radiation includes gamma rays, emitted by some radioactive atoms, and X-rays. Both gamma rays and X-rays, like light and radiant heat, are electromagnetic waves.

The term also includes fast-moving particles smaller than atoms which can damage living cells. Among these are alpha ray and beta rays emitted from radioactive atoms.

These forms of radiation must be distinguished for some purposes because some are more powerful than others.

Alpha rays, for instance, are relatively large, slow-moving particles that can be stopped by the skin or a few sheets of paper.

Beta rays are stronger—these particles can b stopped by a thin sheet of metal or a few feet of air.

PENETRATE STORY

X-rays, as everyone knows, can penetrate the human body completely and gamma rays can go through several feet of concrete.

The radioactive atoms inside a reactor emit alpha, beta and gamma rays in vast quantities. But radioactivity also is found in nature in tiny amounts.

In fact all living things including man evolved in a bath of weak radiation. It pours over us from the sun and is emitted by a few naturally radioactive elements dispersed in rocks, water, soil, the air and even our own bodies.

X-RAYS DISCOVERED

We are exposed to faint radiation from these sources every second of our lives. Scientists call it "background" radiation. They haven't yet been able to find out if background radiation has any significant effects on living things but if it does the effects are too slight to be measured easily.

In fact no one knew such radiation existed until about the turn of the century when William Roentgen discovered X-rays and Henri Becquerrel found that radiation is emitted naturally by some minerals.

These discoveries led rapidly to the artificial production of radiation far more intense than any found in nature. At this point the problem of over exposure first arose.

But scientists were slow to realize the dangers. Hundreds of researchers, unaware of the risks they were taking, died premature deaths for from over exposure to high energy radiation.

Marie Curie and her daughter died from prolonged contact with rays from radium; early medical radiologists died, on the average, five years earlier than other doctors.

During the 1930s at least 40 women employed as radium watch-dial painters died from radiation-related diseases because they wet their paint-brushes on their tongues.

GENERAL TONIC

Early discoveries about the dangers of radiation were slow to penetrate to the medical profession before World War II. The fact that radiation can cause genetic mutations was discovered in the early 1920s, but no warnings about genetic effects appeared in textbooks on the medical use of X-rays for more than a decade.

In those days radium was considered a general tonic by many doctors and X-rays were used to treat everything from tumors to acne. The medical profession was slow to adopt precise methods of measuring X-ray doses, a fact that makes serious radiation burns common.

The public first became acutely aware of the dangers of radiation after the detonation of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima and the cold war period that followed.

At this point the biological effects of radiation became a strategic question which helped funnel huge sums of money into research programs. The military had to know how effective atomic bombs would be in killing people and when the Soviet Union got the bomb, how much damage they could do to us.

Also in question was the safety of bomb testing programs in submarines and ships and the safety of the nuclear power program.

The study of the biological effects of radiation also promised to reveal a great deal about the nature of life itself.

MAJOR EFFORT

Thus began one of the major scientific efforts since the war. In the past 10 years the Atomic Energy Commission and other agencies around the world spent more than $1 billion on research into the effects of radiation in its many forms on living things.

Many mysteries remain. Radiation affects the most fundamental life processes which we are just beginning to understand.

But radiation biologists still say that radiation hazards have been adequately investigated.

"We are not groping with the unknown or mysterious to the extent that one might gather from the public clamor and from the multiplication of safety factors in radiation standards," said J. Newell Stannard, president of the Health Physics Society.

SMALL DOSES

Most biologists say radiation is by far the best understood environmental hazard. Enough is known, they say, to allow radiation standards for the public to be set with confidence.

But some aren't so sure.

They worry that the long-range effects of small doses of radiation accumulated over periods of years might be greater than expected.

They worry even more about the immense complexity of the pathways by which radioactive contamination moves into the environment and the difficulty of predicting how much of it will find its way into living things.

"I view the burgeoning nuclear power industry with great deal of anxiety," says Dr. Arthur Tamplin, an outspoken radiation physicist at the AE Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

"What is needed is a comprehensive study that takes into account both physical and biological concentrating mechanisms."

Radiation exposures can be discussed in terms of doses. To simplify things a little, biologists sometimes ignore the distinction between alpha, beta, gamma and X-rays and talk about "rads."

A rad is a unit dose of radiation energy absorbed by a gram of tissue regardless of the type or source.

A "millirad" is 1/1000 rad.

The average Pottstown resident receives a dose of about 100 millirads, or .1 rad, each year from the sun, air, the walls of his house and so forth.

HIGHER ALTITUDES

The dose increases slightly at higher altitudes because the thinner air provides less shielding against radiation from the sun. In isolated areas of Brazil and India, high concentrations of radioactive salts in the rocks and soil bring the annual background dose as high as 10,000 millirads.

The Pottstown background dose of 100 millirads can be doubled by a chest X-ray—another 100 millirads.

In treating a cancerous tumor, doses almost great enough to kill the patient may be given because the radiologist feels the risk is worthwhile if the dose might kill the cancer.

The lethal dose for humans, as determined from studies of X-ray patients and survivors of the Hiroshima blast, is about 500 rads (500,000 millirads).

This dose will kill 50 per cent of any group of adults within 90 days. But larger doses may be survived if absorbed over a long period of time.

A man who suddenly absorbs 500 rads develops acute radiation sickness. After 12 hours he begins to feel nauseated and tired. But this passes after a day or so and he feels all right for several weeks, though many of his blood cells are dying.

BECOMES SERIOUS

Finally the damage to his blood becomes serious. The victim may die of hemorrhage, anemia or infection encouraged by his low resistance.

But if these dangers pass, he may recover completely and live out a normal life.

A sudden whole-body dose of much more than 1,000 rads is always fatal and a really intense burst of 100,000 rads or more can kill instantly by destroying the cells of the central nervous system.

An exposure to the eyes of several hundred rads can induce cataracts; a similar dose to the genitals can cause temporary or permanent sterility.

Mutations producing birth defects in future generations probably can brought about by any amount of radiation, though the probability of such damage increases with the dose.

Studies of Hiroshima victims and thousands of patients who received rather high doses of radiation led to the conclusion that radiation can induce leukemia and other cancers.

One measure more or less accepted is that a dose of 200 rads triples an individual's chances of contracting leukemia within 10 years.

In sum, a great deal is known about the effects of high-level radiation delivered in sudden doses because they produce obvious and often immediate effects such as radiation sickness, burns, sterility, premature aging or a quick death, and occasionally cancer or genetic mutations.

LITTLE KNOWN

But much less is known for certain about what happens to large groups of people exposed to small amounts of radiation over long periods of time.

This is the kind of exposure one gets from nuclear plants (in normal operation), from minor fallout, routine X-rays and background.

It has been widely assumed that doses in the range of natural background levels are essentially harmless, and even doses of 50 rads produce such slight effects that they are very hard to measure directly.

But that doesn't mean that these effects are never serious.

It was estimated using pessimistic assumptions, for instance that for each rad received by every member of a group of 1 million people, one extra case of leukemia might occur per year.

Leukemia is a serious disease—usually fatal. But since 70 cases usually appear anyway each year in a group of a million people, it is nearly impossible to determine even with sophisticated statistical methods whether very small doses of radiation really have affected the incidence of leukemia.

The estimate given was derived from studies of the survivors of the Hiroshima explosion and of X-ray therapy patients who received high doses of radiation.

By studying to what extent high doses increase the occurrence of leukemia and assuming that low doses cause increases in the same proportions, the possible effects of low doses can be calculated.

Actually, many scientists believe that a "threshold" does exists below which no real damage is caused (except for occasional genetic mutations). But lack of proof, they assume to be on the safe side that no threshold exists and that any amount of radiation exposure can be harmful.

One scientist, Dr. Karl Morgan of the Atomic Energy Commission, estimated on this assumption that natural background radiation is responsible for 12,000 cancer deaths each year in the U.S.—several per cent of the total cancer deaths.

But most biologists believe doses on the order of background level are not harmful. In fact, studies on mice indicate that steady exposure to radiation at 10 to 30 times background level increases their life spans.

Another fact to consider is that a human infant in the womb, especially during the first three months after conception, is many times more sensitive to radiation than an adult.

CELL DIVIDE

At this stage in life the cells of the body are dividing and reproducing at tremendous rates and this is when cells are most vulnerable to radiation damage.

An embryo or fetus exposed to mild X-ray doses during the first three months of pregnancy (when the pregnancy often isn't known) can increase several times the child's chances of contracting leukemia, not to mention other cancers.

This is an important factor in determining radiation exposure limits for women of childbearing age.

How do these facts affect those who live near nuclear power plants?

Only an "incredible" accident that released considerable quantities of the radioactive matter inside a reactor could expose members of the public to doses high enough to kill or cause any immediately detectable effects.

J. L. Everett, president of the Philadelphia Electric Co., has said it "unrealistic" to think there is any significant chance such an accident could occur at Limerick.

But, as we've mentioned, the plant will routinely release tiny quantities of radioactive gas and liquid. New types of emission control systems should make these releases too small to be detected beyond the boundary of the plant, and the maximum possible dose to any member of the public has been estimated at .005 millirads per year—far less than the dose from a radium dial watch.

NO WORRIES

If these levels can be maintained area residents will have nothing to worry about.

But broad grounds for controversy on other aspects of the question remain. The legal limits set on public radiation exposure from nuclear installations are far higher than the releases actually predicted to occur. Many critics feel the standards are far from "safe."

Despite the rule that public exposure should be kept "as low as practicable," there are no guarantees that Limerick would be shut down if it began emitting far higher levels of radioactivity than are predicted now as long as the emissions were within the limits set by the government.

In the past, other reactors were permitted to release thousands of times more radioactive gas and liquid that Limerick is expected to emit simply because it was considered too expensive to keep them in, and the Atomic Energy Commission believes any emission within the limits set pose no threat to the public.

RADIOLOGIST PONDERS LONG RANGE GENETIC EFFECT

Dr. Fred S. Winter is a radiologist at Pottstown Memorial Medical Center. He has been involved in radiology since 1948, the past three and a half years at the local hospital.

As a radiologist, Dr. Winter is concerned with the effects the new Limerick nuclear plant will have on the Pottstown area and discusses the Limerick project and his own work with radiation.

According to Dr. Winter, the biological effects of radiation in general, such as the effects of radiation on cell structure and animals, is understood quite well.

This he said is because animals have been exposed in the laboratories.

"From these studies we know that the general biological effects of low-level radiation exposure are understood and proven safe."

"But the thing that scientists don't understand is the long range genetic effects," he said. "What will be handed down from generation to generation?"

The only statistics on human population, Winter said, are the results of mass exposure from those at Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

From laboratory tests, scientists believe they can correlate between animals and humans and predict what the biological effects will be.

"But the genetic effects are much more difficult to control and won't be known for some time," he said.

As far as the Limerick nuclear plant is concerned, Winter said he has no reason to feel that the government hasn't been frank with the public about the hazards of radiation.

"I believe it will try to keep the public fully informed because of the caliber of men working with the Atomic Energy Commission," he said.

"I don't think the government is out to get the people. If I were living in some foreign country I might be more suspicious, but I think we are pretty well protected. After all, look at the Food and Drug Administration and how far it carries some of their legislation for our protection.

Because of the dwindling reserves of oil and other sources of energy, Winter said we are going to have to accept energy from atomic sources despite potential hazards.

"Up to now, I feel that there isn't enough proof that small levels of radiations are harmful," he said, "and the added benefits from getting energy from atomic sources would far outweigh any possible harm that might occur."

Winter said he feels that the medical use of radiation is a far more serious problem than emissions from nuclear power plants.

"The medical use of the x-ray is one of the most important factors contributing to the

high quality of medical care in the present day," Winter said, "but certain abuses have sprung up."

In the United States it has become so necessary to x-ray a patient in a possible legal situation that there is an over use of medical radiation.

According to Winter, insurance companies insist that x-rays be taken of any injury because if there is a medical claim they must know about it.

"If the x-ray is not taken, there is the fear of being sued or being accused of neglecting the patient," Winter added.

Several other doctors agreed that they would order far fewer x-rays if there was not the fear of legal reprisal.

Winter said a number of the above mentioned tests for injuries is negative which adds to the excessive use of the x-ray machines. But at the same time he asked, "what is the substitute. What can be done to avoid using x-rays?"

He stressed that X-rays are not given indiscriminately, but "far too many are taken."

"As far as the value of medical X-rays for curing and treating patients, its value is very high and plays an important part in the medical field.

"We wouldn't cure nearly the number of patients we do without X-ray," he added.

It has been estimated that radiologists receive a lifetime dose of 200 rads from their work, hundreds of times more than other people get from all sources.

Winter, who was an assistant professor at Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital and a member of the radiology staff at the Guthrie Clinic prior to coming to Pottstown, agreed with these figures, but did not seem too concerned.

"Radiologists have learned to protect themselves from too much exposure and because of this, specific illnesses from overexposure have been prevented."

Winters was referring to leukemia, which used to appear more often among radiologists than other physicians.

"There is some feeling that a few months or even years of life shortening may occur to radiologists, but the average lifespan measures up agreeably well with other physicians," he noted.

Winter said he chose to be a radiologist, it's his job and he is aware of the effects and dangers of radiation. "I do however, feel that the contribution I make in my specialty far outweighs any minimal harmful effects that might occur to me."

CAN WASTE HEAT CREATE TROPICAL RESORT?

Isn't there some way to use the fantastic amounts of heat wasted in generating nuclear power? In current plants almost two thirds of the heat from the reactors winds up in rivers, lakes or the air.

Getting rid of the heat is a problem anyway. That's what Limerick's cooling towers will be for.

The problem with using it is that the waste heat is "low grade." That means there's lots of it but at low temperatures—110 degrees in water.

A town in Scandinavia uses the waste heat from a local reactor to heat its homes. But that's not practical unless ordinary heating is expensive and the houses are close by.

Some visionaries have come up with some wild ideas. If the heated water were piped beneath fields, for example, you might be able to grow crops all year round or even create a tropical environment.

Or how about starting a hot springs health resort? Limerick's giant condensers will produce enough heated water to supply several million people a day with warm baths.

How about a heated lake for swimming, water skiing and sailing all year round? Stocked with tropical fish, maybe.

It's something of Limerick businessmen to think about. The little village could become the Miami of the north with a little ingenuity.

URANIUM FUEL

Before use, uranium fuel for a reactor is not very radioactive and can be handled without shielding. But after fissioning in a reactor, the fragments of split uranium atoms are unstable and make the fuel material intensely radioactive.

ENERGY CRISIS LOOMS—ENVIRONMENT PAYING FOR POWER, BUT MORE ENERGY IS NEEDED NOW

"Power is too cheap!" the witness for the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power finally blurted out.

Laughter burst from the corner of the Public Utility Commission hearing room where Philadelphia Electric Co. representatives were sitting. The faces of half a dozen PE men lit up with gleeful smirks.

Even the examiner in charge roused himself from his heavy-lidded torpor behind his high bench and looked around.

"Power is too cheap," repeated the witness, Douglas Baker, who was supposed to be testifying in opposition to the $100 million rate increase PE is asking for.

Spurred by the laughter, Baker talked faster.

The consumer pays only a small part of the cost of power, he said. The rest is paid by the environment. Generating electricity pollutes the air, poisons waterways and is rapidly using up the world's fuel sources.

Only by letting the environment bear so much of the burden can electricity be sold cheaply, he said. Utilities got by for years without paying for expensive anti-pollution equipment or for research into pollution control and better ways to generate power.

Rates should be raised, he insisted, not to get money to build more and more power plants, but to stop the fouling of the environment and slow down the suicidal increase in power gobbling by American consumers and industry.

The stenographer wrote it all down. The examiner seemed to relapse into his trance while the PE men listened once again impassively.

They were not particularly disturbed by Baker's blast against their company. They were convinced he was wrong and reasonably sure from long experience that the PUC would see things their way.

Still, Baker was pleased. So was Lawrence Sager, a Pottstown attorney who represented the coalition at the hearings.

For the first time in the history of the PUC Sager had succeeded in getting permission for an environmental group to intervene and present testimony on environmental matters in a "rate case."

If the confrontation was only preliminary sparring, still it marked the first time a group has been allowed to go on record before the PUC in opposition to the one of the basic creeds of our industrialized society—that the unlimited expansion of manufacturing and power consumption is the only way to keep the economy healthy.

The local skirmish was a sign of the widening national war between conservationists determined to save mankind from ultimate destruction and energy enthusiasts who insist that electricity is the key to the future—a battle that sometimes seems touched with the religious fervor of the crusades.

There is a sense of urgency in this conflict partly because of the national "energy-crisis," as observers have tagged the pressing shortage of power in many parts of the country.

The demand for electricity has been rising astronomically. Consumption doubled during the 1960s and most utilities expect—and hope—power consumption will double again in this decade.

The phenomenal growth in the use of air conditioning and the advent of "all-electric living" as well as the spectacular industrial growth of the '60s caught many utilities unprepared despite the fact that they promoted it themselves.

Blackouts and brownouts became a constant threat during summer heatwaves as peak power loads occasionally soared beyond generating capacity.

As far as the utilities are concerned the problem they face is simply to meet the demand—just as in any other business.

The electric companies have pressed hard to build more and more power stations, an effort in which Limerick Nuclear Power plant is only a small part.

During the 1960s they built as much new generating capacity as had been installed since the birth of electric power. In the next 10 years the electric industry, like a budding amoeba, will completely reproduce itself once more.

Big business and most government officials see this trend as a sign of our fundamentally healthy economy. Cheap electricity is the lifeblood of industrial civilization and the source of many of the comforts and conveniences most of us enjoy in our private lives.

Unlimited supplies of cheap power are the key to prosperity, high employment and the continuing improvement in our material standard of living, according to traditional economic thinking.

But the environmentalists are pointing frantically to the dark side of this picture.

Some say that industrialized man has so far overstepped the limits of nature that he already is doomed, while others believe we can save ourselves only by radically rearranging our habits and thinking about man, his world, and "progress."

They are appalled by the fact that mankind has consumed more energy in the past 30 years than in all previous history before 1940, and that we will use far more during the next 30 years.

The United States currently consumes a third of the world's power output, though we represent only 6 per cent of the world's people.

More gas, oil, coal and nuclear power are used in this country than in the Soviet Union, Britain, West Germany and Japan combined.

And our rate of power consumption is rising far faster than the population.

This fantastic gluttony for power to run our television sets, electric can openers, heaters, humidifiers, factories, trains, lights—has been taking an even greater toll on the environment.

Electric power plants contribute half the sulfur dioxide pollution in this country's atmosphere. They pour vast quantities of heat into natural waterways and lakes, upsetting their delicate natural lifecycles.

They blacken the landscape and cities with soot and fly ash.

Power plants consume coal, oil and gas at incredible rates, by the hundreds of millions of tons a year, fed almost continuously by railroad tankers and boxcars.

Supplying fuel to these monstrous installations ravages wilderness areas with strip mines, oils the oceans and is ever more rapidly depleting the world's limited supply of fossil fuels.

The plants need fresh water in such huge quantities for cooling that the New York City Environmental Protection Administration has estimated they will need half the daily natural water runoff of the United States by the year 1990.

The same agency in a recent study said the projected growth of power output will begin to cause widespread deaths in populated areas from air pollution within a decade unless measures are taken to curb growth and clean up plant emissions.

"Government must take immediate steps to decrease overall demand for energy in general and electricity in particular, as well as to ensure that essential needs are supplied with the least possible harm to public health and the environment," the study recommended.

"If permitted to continue unchecked, industry's efforts to expand the use of electricity will inevitably result in irreparable damage to public health and environment, and in crisis-rationing of power."

The environmentalists are especially bitter about the indifference the utilities showed toward these problems until the government began to crack down.

No proven method of removing all sulfur dioxide from generating plant smoke has been demonstrated yet, but even today the utilities, including giant Philadelphia Electric, spend virtually nothing on research into the problem. Nor did they make much effort to find out how much damage they were doing and bring the problem to society's attention.

Now the utilities, and increasingly the public—feel themselves caught in a vise pressing from both sides.

From one side comes the economic pressure to generate more and more electricity to satisfy the insatiable appetites of consumers and industry.

From the other side the government, prodded by swelling public concern for the ecosphere, is piling on restraints and regulations that make expansion more difficult and costly than ever before.

The utilities are only the focal points of these pressures. Their dilemma is really a dilemma facing our entire society. Can we afford to continue in our traditional belief that growth without limit is possible? Are we nearing the end of our economic horizons on earth?

If so, how must society change?

Different groups offer different answers to these questions—even among environmentalists.

Radicals in the environmental movement insist we must change our most basic attitudes toward life if we are to survive. We must cease to think of better living in terms of wealth and material goods. We must slow our rate of consumption. The population must be controlled. Technology must be rigidly policed.

Man, they say, must learn to accept his restricted niche in the delicate balance of life on the skin of the earth.

Traditionalists see this approach to the problem as "sudden hysteria."

In practical terms, they say, these goals could only be accomplished by the total abolition of free enterprise and rigid control of all human production by a dictatorial government.

Such thinking is "alarmist" anyway, they say, because things are not so serious as they may seem. All we have to do is put technology to work more intelligently and responsibly.

A few decades of research, they predict, will give us electricity from nuclear fusion, fueled endlessly and cheaply by the oceans, generating no pollution.

Meanwhile fossil fueled plants can be cleaned up, they insist, and clean nuclear power can take over much of the load.

Even as PE doubles its power output during the 1970s, according to its president, "the environment will improve."

The urgency, as the energy enthusiasts see it, lies in the need to produce more power to keep things going and growing.

If we fail, the poor will get poorer and the economy will sag.

An Arizona utility even went so far as to publish a statement complaining that a "no-growth" economy would be against human nature.

The truth of the problem probably lies somewhere between these extremes of philosophy on a wide middle ground where more practical suggestions are being made by both sides.

Prodded by environmentalists, the utilities are burning low sulfur fuels, cutting back advertising for new ways to use electricity, and are slowly beginning to take second looks at their environmental and long-range growth policies.

The environmentalists have suggested a surtax on power to finance research into cleaner fuels and better anti-pollution devices. Many have advocated new rate structures that would make big users of power pay more—instead of the present system whereby industry pays less for power the more it uses.

Meanwhile the federal government this year began to take coordinated action to fit the outstretched hand of the consuming public into the environmental glove.

In June, President Nixon sent to Congress a message on "supply of Energy and Clean Air," the first comprehensive statement on energy policy to be issued by the chief executive.

He called for the formulation of a wide-ranging national energy policy designed to deal with energy needs and problems in a systematic way.

He also announced a program to insure "a sufficient supply of clean energy to sustain healthy economic growth and improve the quality of our national life."

To encourage research he announced:

—A program to operate a commercial fast breeder reactor that breeds more fuel than it burns by 1980.

—Accelerated research into converting coal into clean gas.

—More research into fusion, magnetohydrodynamics and high voltage transmission lines underground.

To increase the fossil fuel supply he said he would open federal lands for exploration and leasing to oil companies.

He also promised measures to help make the public use of power more efficient, national planning of power plant sites and power lines and incentives to help industry cut down on sulfur oxide emissions.

The utilities greeted the president's message with acclaim, feeling that their needs and problems finally had been recognized at the highest levels.

But many environmentalists were outraged.

They saw the message as a boost to the power industry with only a token bow to the needs of the environment.

Opponents of nuclear power were especially upset by the big push toward faster breeder reactors, which they regard as even more dangerous than ordinary fission reactors.

Conservationists envisioned the last preserves of virgin wilderness in federally-owned territory being handed over the oil and gas interests to be raped for private profit.

Still, most environmentalists were glad to see the federal government begin to show interest in centralized planning and control of energy production.

What they would like to see now is a willingness at the highest levels of government to consider a deliberate slowdown in our growth-based economy.

Critics of the slow-growth philosophy accuse environmentalists of ignoring the real needs of the poorer segments of our society.

An economic recession designed to help the environment would hit the poorest workers first and hardest, and probably would deny them the chance to acquire the comforts the rest of us already have, they say.

"This much is enough, let's stop here," is a slogan that middle and upper income people can adopt less reluctantly than those who still are working toward their first air conditioner, private home or car.

"It's hard to tell a man who earns $1.50 an hour that all-electric living isn't desirable," admits Nora Natof, president of the Limerick Ecology Action.

Meanwhile, leaders of industry feel that a balance between our energy needs and environmental limitations will be struck within what remains of the good old free enterprise system that helped them prosper.

Government regulations will protect and improve the environment and the consumer will pay the cost, they feel, without the need for power rationing.

Whatever economic curbs are necessary will be imposed automatically by the higher costs of electricity and fuel.

But neither side denies that public vigilance and universal recognition of the fact that the cornucopia of the earth is not inexhaustible will be essential to the continued improvement in the quality of our lives.

RADIANT HEAT ENERGY

The radiant heat energy falling on the earth from the sun at each moment equals 100,000 times the total world's present installed electric-power capacity. Most of this energy is reflected back into space directly or through evaporation of water.

Though some see solar power as the ultimate energy source, few engineers believe it is feasible to collect the greatly diffused energy from the sun for extensive use on earth.

CAN OPPONENTS STOP LIMERICK?—COURTS STRENGTHENING ENVIRONMENTAL COALITION'S POWER PLAY

On Sept. 9 the Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power formally notified Philadelphia Electric Co. and the Atomic Energy Commission that it will intervene against PE's application for a construction permit for Limerick Nuclear Power Station during public hearings this winter.

The group, of which Limerick Ecology Action is a member, hopes to persuade the AEC licensing board that the proposed reactors will be unsafe, unreliable, uneconomical and damaging to the environment.

It hopes to cancel or at least delay the huge project, which PE says it must construct immediately to meet the power needs of the mid-70s.

MATTER OF COURSE

Such interventions have become a matter of course at public hearings on new nuclear power plants across the country. So far, no application for a construction permit ever has been turned down by the AEC, but environmentalists have managed in many cases to delay construction, force tighter review of safety and environmental standards and even change the standards themselves.

Within the past six months the positions of environmental groups were greatly strengthened by court rulings and new AEC policies.

Utilities such as PE, on the other hand, are beginning to anticipate the opposition. The company feels it has covered its bets on Limerick by designing an irreproachable plant—except that it may be an eyesore to some, the company admits.

The prime example is the amount of radiation nuclear plants are allowed to release into the air and water.

Environmentalists argued for years that the permissible levels of radiation release were dangerously high.

In fact, two AEC physicists, Dr. John Gofman and Dr. Arthur Tamplin, published estimates that if the maximum permissible doses were received by the whole population, cancer deaths would increase by 32,000 a year.

REVISED STANDARDS

Though the AEC denied these figures, it revised its standards this year. New plants

have to be designed to release less than 1 per cent of the old limits.

"Because of the opposition, the AEC is treading with tender toes these days," admitted R. A. Mulford, project supervisor for Limerick.

But PE wasn't fazed by the new restrictions on plant design. It reacted to the public clamor even before the AEC officially revised its regulations by designing new equipment into the Limerick station that will capture virtually all radio active materials that escape from its two reactors.

As late as last June, J. L. Everett, president of PE, said the opposition had not caused any significant delays in the construction of the plant.

But the environmentalists won a major victory July 23 when a federal court ruled that AEC licensing procedures made a "mockery" of the National Environmental Protection Act of 1970 (NEPA) and ordered changes.

The ruling could delay not only Limerick but more than 60 other nuclear power stations now under construction in the U.S.

The court sharply criticized the AEC for its failure to take responsibility for the over-all environmental impact of the nuclear plants it regulates.

In the past the AEC insisted it had jurisdiction only over hazards related to radiation releases and safety. It refused to consider testimony on other environmental problems such as thermal pollution associated with nuclear power plants.

This policy was changed somewhat—after months of delay—when NEPA was passed by Congress.

NEPA required full consideration of all environmental problems connected with projects under the jurisdiction of all government agencies.

In what the court termed an inadequate effort to meet this provision, the AEC revised its procedures to allow environmentalists to present evidence at licensing hearings. It also required certification from other state and federal agencies that new plants met the provisions of all environmental protection laws.

Plants that already had received construction permits before March, 1971, were exempted from these rules in an effort to get them finished without delay.

MORE EXPECTED

But the federal court, ruling on a petition against Baltimore Gas & Electric's Calvert Cliffs plant in Maryland, said the AEC had to do more.

It is the duty of the AEC the court said, to study all aspects of each plant's environmental impact and balance its costs against its benefits before issuing a license.

The AEC protested that it lacked the staff and the time to perform this feat of research and paperwork but decided last week not to appeal the decision.

Not only has it begun to revise its rules once more to require utilities to submit extensive environmental reports, but recently it sent notices to 33 plants already licensed to "show cause" why they should not have the permits revoked.

Completing all the necessary reviews could delay some plants a year or more, according to some AEC officials.

PE says it is not worried about passing the environmental review. The major environmental problem with nuclear power plants—as in the Calvert Cliffs case—has been the huge quantities of wasted heat they pour into adjoining rivers, lakes and basins.

COOLING TOWERS

Since the Limerick plant will use cooling towers to dispose of waste heat into the atmosphere, thermal pollution should not be a problem.

But still it must go through the review process and this could mean months of delay.

At public hearings on Limerick's construction permit this winter the ECNP, represented by local Attorney Lawrence Sager, will question the wisdom of the Delaware River Basin Commission in allowing PE to take 35 million of gallons of water a day from the Delaware to cool the Limerick reactors.

This is only a tiny fraction of the total flow of the Delaware, but the group says no adequate studies were done to make sure the loss of water flow will not allow the salt water line Delaware Bay to creep closer to Philadelphia.

The ECNP also will question PE closely on the degree to which it can guarantee the safety of finance of the $725 million Limerick plant.

* * * its reactors from accidents, on the problem of nuclear fuel supplies in the decades to come and the problems of radioactive waste disposal.

But the first skirmishes between the area environmental group and PE already are over.

ECNP intervened this summer in hearings before the Public Utility Commission on a request by the electric company for a $100 million rate increase.

OBJECT TO INCREASE

The coalition, backed by Chester County Legislator Samuel Morris, objected to the increase on the ground that the money will be used to help finance the nuclear plant.

ECNP pointed out that the plant has not been finally approved thus far and claimed that future safety problems might make it useless anyway. Electric company customers, Sager argued, should not have to bear the financial risk of PE's nuclear venture until it is officially approved.

The PUC's decision on the rate increase should be in by mid-October.

COMPANY SAYS PLANT IS NECESSITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Vincent Boyer, vice president in charge of engineering and research at PE, explained the need for Limerick Nuclear Power Station from his company's point of view at Public Utility Commission hearings last year. He also testified about the decision to locate at Limerick and environmental factors. Here is some of what he said:)

PUC: Would you describe the applicant, Philadelphia Electric Co., in terms of its service area and customers?

PE: Philadelphia Electric Co. is a public utility corporation supplying electricity to the public in southeastern Pennsylvania, including all or substantially all of Philadelphia, Montgomery, Bucks, Delaware, and Chester Counties, and a portion of York County.

The total electric service area covers 2,400 square miles in which we serve a population of more than 3,900,000.

PUC: Explain the necessity for the proposed situation of the generating station building and substation control buildings at this particular location.

PE: As I previously indicated, the total service area of the Philadelphia Electric Co. covers 2,400 square miles, approximately 95 per cent of which is located in the suburban areas outside of Philadelphia where the rate of growth in power requirements doubled over the past 10 years.

Population projections for Montgomery and Bucks Counties during the decade of the 70s indicate an increase in population of from 25 to 35 per cent for the 10 year period. Increased power consumption will continue to accompany the increase in population.

To meet the increased usage on the part of our customers, it is necessary for Philadelphia Electric Co. to install additional generating capacity. The estimated peak load of our company in 1971 is 5,360 megawatts. This is expected to increase to 7,500 mw in 1975 and to 8,600 mw in 1977.

In order to reliably supply the requirements of our customers, our installed generating capacity must exceed our expected loads by a reasonable margin so that the contingencies of equipment outage, load forecasting deviations, weather changes, and other factors can be accommodated.

We currently are installing nuclear units in the southern part of our territory (at Peach Bottom) for service in the 1972-1973 period. The additional generating capacity required in the 1975-77 period should be installed in the northern part of our territory in order to maintain a geographic balance in area demands and power generation.

When completed, the Limerick Generating Station will serve as a main source of power for the needs of our customers, particularly those in the expanding suburban areas north of Philadelphia, including Montgomery and Bucks Counties.

Since the proposed Limerick Generating Station will be a major source of power to supply the predicted increasing requirements for electrical energy in the Philadelphia Electric Co. service area during the second half of this decade, it is essential that the units meet their planned service dates of March 1975 for Unit No. 1 and March 1977 for Unit No. 2.

Without the Limerick units, our production reserves will be at a critical value and the reliability of power supply to our service area will be at an all-time low.

Generating station site selection is based on a thorough analysis of many factors. The Limerick site was selected for the location of our next generating facility because of the availability of open land, the population characteristics of the area, the routing of transmission lines required to deliver the power generated to the high voltage transmission system of the Philadelphia Electric Co. and interconnected systems, the location in relation to load centers, rail and highway access, and the geology, hydrology, and other geographic aspects of a site.

All these considerations led to the selection of the Limerick site, with recognition that special provisions would be required to insure the availability of water to meet the plant service and cooling requirements.

Among the primary attractive features of the Limerick site is the existence of a 500,000 volt transmission line crossing the site and the access to railroad rights-of-way which greatly facilitate the installation of the necessary transmission facilities and minimize the environmental impact of these installations.

Furthermore, since recent generation facilities have been some distance from the load centers of our system, the overall system reliability will be enhanced by placing a plant at this location.

PUC: Is any other suitable location available for the situation of the proposed generating station building and substation control buildings outside of areas now subject to zoning restrictions.

PE: To the best of our knowledge, there are no other suitable locations not subject to zoning regulations and meeting our requirements. As I previously indicated, a number of factors must be considered in the selection of a generating station site.

After reviewing these factors, the choice came down to two locations. One site was on the Delaware River. This site had an adequate water supply, but would have required obtaining extensive new transmission line rights-of-way. The Limerick site, on the Schuylkill River, required no new transmission corridors even though it had a less than adequate water supply.

After consultation with Pennsylvania state agencies and the Delaware River Basin Commission, the company decided water from the Delaware River could be made available to the Limerick site. The fact that now new

rights-of-way were required to construct the necessary transmission lines to deliver the power to the load centers of our system significantly influenced the final selection of Limerick.

This site minimizes the use of Pennsylvania land resources, lessens the environmental impact, and keeps the capital investment at a reasonable level.

PUC: Will the proposed situation of the facilities involved create noises or other conditions objectionable to occupants of neighboring premises.

PE: The operation of a nuclear generating plant is safe, clean and essentially noiseless, and produces less of an effect on the environment than other thermal methods of producing electrical energy. This will also be true of the proposed Limerick Generating Station.

It will not have any need for coal stock piles, no ash handling equipment will be necessary and the station will also be free from large oil storage equipment and from coal and oil rail handling activities.

Air pollution associated with fossil fuel combustion is completely eliminated at nuclear generating stations such as Limerick.

In the operation of the proposed station liquid, solid and gaseous radioactive wastes will be produced within the plant but these wastes will be contained, controlled and handled in such a manner that they will have no deleterious effect upon the occupants of neighboring premises or upon the environment.

Liquid radioactive wastes will be collected as equipment drains, floor drains, chemical wastes and laundry drains, and will then be processed by methods of filtration, demineralization or evaporation. After treatment, all but the laundry drains will be recycled for reuse in the plant feedwater system. After treatment, the laundry drains will be sampled and released to the Schuylkill River under controlled conditions.

The radioactivity contained in such liquid releases will have a concentration at the point of discharge into the Schuylkill River equal to or less than 1 per cent of the regulatory limits for such discharges imposed by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and by the Sanitary Water Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Philadelphia Electric Company's license application to the Atomic Energy Commission is now pending and the company will shortly file an application for an industrial waste permit from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Solid radioactive wastes will consist of spent filter and demineralized resins, evaporator sludge and rags and miscellaneous material resulting from maintenance operations.

None of this material will be disposed of at the plant site or in the neighboring area.

This material, as well as spent fuel, will be shipped off-site by rail or truck in containers designed to meet the strict standards of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and Department of Transportation, and State regulations.

Gaseous radioactive wastes produced in the operation of the plant will be collected and processed so that the amount of radioactivity will be reduced to the point that the gases can be released to the atmosphere with a level of radioactivity which is well within the limits enforced by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission.

In fact, the gaseous releases from the Limerick Generating Station will be equal to or less than 1 per cent of the permissible limits of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the State of Pennsylvania.

As I previously indicated, the Company's license application is now pending before the Atomic Energy Commission. The Company will also shortly apply for a permit for the Limerick Generating Station from the Pennsylvania Air Pollution Commission.

PUC: Will you describe the thermal effects, if any, of the operation of the proposed plant upon the Schuylkill River?

PE: The rejection of the latent heat contained in the exhaust steam is associated with the generation of power generating station, whether it is fossil or nuclear fueled. This heat is released during the condensing process of the power generating cycle, and is removed by circulating cooling water through the condenser.

There are three methods of releasing this heat to the environment. These are first open loop direct river water cooling which has been employed by most generating stations in the past, and, which will impose a large heat load on the receiving body of water.

Second, a closed system using cooling ponds which for this facility would require as much as 4,000 acres of surface area.

Third, cooling towers, a modern system in which the heat is dispersed to the atmosphere. The least objectionable of these from an ecological viewpoint is cooling towers.

At Limerick, cooling towers will be used to dispose of the latent heat. As a result, during the normal operation of the station, the heat released to the Schuylkill River will be limited to the relatively small amount contained in the cooling tower blowdown water.

This blowdown water, about 20 cubic feet per second, is required to maintain proper water quality in the circulating water loop, and in the effluent to the river. The dispersion of this heat released into the Schuylkill River has been analyzed in accordance with regulations of the Pennsylvania Sanitary Water Board and the Delaware River Basin Commission for both summer and winter conditions, and has been found to be within applicable regulations.

The temperature rise in the river outside the commission's prescribed mixing zone is estimated to be, under low flow conditions, less than 1 degree during the summer and approximately 2 degrees during the winter.

In each instance, these temperatures are within regulatory limits. Under average river flow conditions, there will be no perceptible temperature rise outside the mixing zone.

PUC: When did the applicant acquire the tract of land designated in the application upon which the proposed generating station building and substation control buildings will be built?

PE: The property in Limerick Township upon which the proposed buildings will be built was acquired in eleven different parcels beginning on November 27, 1964, and with the latest parcel acquired May 21, 1970.

PUC: Has any protest been filed with Philadelphia Electric Co. objecting to the erection of the proposed facilities at the Limerick site?

PE: To my knowledge no such protests have been filed with Philadedphia Electric Company.

PUC: Please describe Philadelphia Electric Company's experiences in the field of nuclear power generation.

PE: Philadelphia Electric Co. was active in the development of atomic energy for electric generation for many years. In 1952 it became a charter member of the Dow Chemical—Detroit Edison Nuclear Power Development Project, which subsequently became Atomic Power Development Associates Inc. (APDA). This organization designed and developed a fast breeder power reactor for the Atomic Energy Commission's Power Demonstration Program.

The company also participated in the formation of Power Reactor Development Company (PRDC), which was organized to finance, construct, own and operate the fast breeder reactor designed by APDA for the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Station.

The company's engineers have been assigned at various times to full time duties in many phases of nuclear projects, including:

Assignments to APDA for design and development of core and fuel elements, shielding design, coordination of research at various levels on the metallurgical and chemical aspects of fuel elements.

Shift supervisor duties and pre-operational duties, including preparation of plant operation manuals, at the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Station.

Assignment to PRDC for coordination of control instrumentation and electrical features.

Assignments to the Nautilus nuclear submarine project for field engineering and mechanical operations during startup and initial operation.

Assignment to the nuclear-reactor at Shippingport, Pennsylvania for training and operational duties.

Assignment to the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory at Schenectady, New York, for participation in prototype design of a solium boiler for a submarine reactor.

Philadelphia Electric Co. gained additional nuclear experience through the construction and operation of its Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station's Unit No. 1, and through the construction of Units 2 and 3. Unit 1 is a 40,000 kilowatt, high temperature, gas-cooled reactor.

The Atomic Energy Commission authorized operation of this reactor at full power on January 12, 1967, and since that date it has operated very successfully, producing 458,170,000 kwhr of electric energy for the Philadelphia Electric Co. system.

The operation of this plant also established basic technical information to guide the power industry in the future design and operation of gas cooled reactors. Units 2 and 3 at Peach Bottom are boiling water reactors, and each is rated at 1100 mwe. These units are scheduled for service in 1972 and in 1973.

The company maintains an engineering and research department staffed by several hundred qualified engineers. This staff reviews and approves plant design features; conducts, with the aid of outside consultants, a quality assurance program; and follows field construction activity to plant completion.

The proposed Limerick units are essentially duplicates of the two Peach Bottom boiling water reactors.

Conservationists Fail To Halt Nuclear Plant

Cleveland.—A suit by two conservation groups against a land transfer involving part of the site of the Davis-Besse nuclear power station being built near Port Clinton was dismissed over the weekend by U.S. District Judge William K. Thomas.

The suit contended the transfer of 533 acres of the Navarre Marsh federal wildlife refuge to Toledo Edison Co., and the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co., for a 480-acres private preserve known as Darby Marsh had an adverse effect on the wildlife of the region, including migratory birds and fish.

Judge Thomas dismissed the suit with prejudice, meaning the issue could not be raised in another suit but Attorney Jerome S. Kalur of the Sierra Club said an appeal would be filed in the 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in Cincinnati.

The suit by the Sierra Club and Citizens for Clean Air and Water was similar to one they filed earlier that was dismissed in April by U.S. District Judge Ben C. Green. He ruled the doctrine of sovereign government can refuse to be sued, applied.

More Nuclear Reactors

Nuclear reactors now produce only about 1.4 percent of this nation's electricity. The figure is expected to be 25 percent by 1980

and as much as 50 percent by the turn of the century.

During the same period power consumption is expected to keep rising much faster than the population.

ARE RADIOACTIVE WASTES FROM PLANTS THE ULTIMATE PROBLEM OF POLLUTION?

Opponents of nuclear power call radioactive wastes from nuclear power plants "the ultimate pollution problem."

The hot, intensely radioactive by-products of uranium fission in nuclear reactors remain dangerous for thousands of years.

They are physically hot, often chemically corrosive and must stay sealed away from man and the living environment virtually forever.

Figuring out what to do with radioactive wastes has been one of the biggest and most controversial headaches plaguing the Atomic Energy Commission since the beginning of atomic power.

Today, with nuclear power growing into a booming industry across the U.S., the AEC admits it waited until the pressing need developed before pushing the waste disposal problem to top priority.

But it also feels it has the final solutions in sight—despite the strong doubts of environmentalists.

The AEC's answer is an abandoned salt mine 1,000 feet below the prairies near Lyons, Kansas.

Banking on salt's resistance to heat, radiation and erosion to keep high level wastes safe, the government hopes to transform the mine into the nation's first permanent burial site for atomic age "ashes."

PACKED INTO CRYPTS

The boiling-hot waste materials will be solidified by techniques only recently developed and packed into crypts drilled into the rock salt floor of the mine.

Salt beds are dry and extremely stable geological formations that underlie much of this country's land surface.

Rock salt is almost as good as concrete as a gamma ray shield and plastic enough under heat and pressure that cracks heal themselves.

The AEC believes that burial in salt deposits far beneath the earth offers plenty of protection for the fantastically radioactive materials they must dispose of.

By the time it is filled to capacity the mine at Lyons will hold more radioactivity than probably would result from a worldwide nuclear war.

To illustrate, it would take more than a trillion gallons of water to dilute one gallon of high-level liquid wastes to levels of radioactivity permissible in drinking water.

Solidifying these wastes for burial will concentrate their radioactivity at least six times.

At the rate nuclear plants are expected to be generating wastes, the Lyons site could be filled shortly after the end of the century.

CRUSHED SALT

Then the mine will be packed with crushed salt and sealed. The buried wastes inside could remain untouchable for as long as 500,000 years.

The bulk of the radioactive wastes the AEC is responsible for are "low—level" and relatively simple to dispose of. To date some four million cubic feet of contaminated materials—scrap from obsolete facilities, laboratory implements and aprons, containers, etc.—lie buried in trenches dug in the Idaho desert.

The AEC says these wastes are not an environmental problem, though one of its advisory committees has warned that in the long run, the practice of burying such refuse "in or above fresh water tables" will lead to "serious fouling of man's environment."

But it is the high-level wastes—leftover decay products from fissioned uranium or plutonium fuel—that are the real problem.

Though relatively small in volume, they represent more than 99 per cent of all the radioactivity in waste products.

Currently most of the high-level materials on hand are in liquid form—about 80 million gallons stored at a number of locations around the country.

The exact volume is secret. Most of the wastes come from the AEC's plutonium production facilities for manufacturing bomb materials.

Only about half of one per cent were produced by commercial power reactors.

But the balance will change rapidly as nuclear power grows. By the year 2000, commercial plants are expected to generate 60 million gallons of high level wastes from 10 to 30 times more radioactive than current weapons-related wastes.

STEEL TANKS

Right now, liquid wastes are stored in gigantic steel tanks shrouded in concrete. The problem is that the tanks wear out, eaten away by the heat and radiochemical action of their contents. The life expectancy of these tanks is only about 20 to 30 years, compared with a radioactive life span of perhaps 600 years for the wastes they hold.

Containers for highly corrosive fluorine wastes give out faster—one plan was to keep building new containers around the old ones as the older tanks wore out.

But that would mean active guardianship of the wastes for centuries rather than permanent disposal.

Such problems, and the danger of buried liquid wastes seeping through rock and mineral strata to contaminate water supplies, lead to solidification as the only safe technique for long-range disposal.

Processes have been developed that will concentrate hot, intensely radioactive liquids into a glassy sand-like material or ceramic substance with good heat resistance.

This technique seems to be a long step toward a final answer.

But it is relatively expensive. The AEC has simpler and cheaper ideas too. It has looked into the possibility of pumping liquid wastes into bedrock caves underground, for instance.

The AEC feels this method shows promise, but it appalls critics who feel that integrity of the caverns against leaks could never be guaranteed. Even many AEC scientists agree that this solution might be too controversial to experiment with.

Meanwhile, the governor of Kansas and a number of environmental and scientific groups have expressed doubts even about salt mine burial.

Though they agree it's "the safest choice available now," they feel the AEC has far from demonstrated its adequacy.

Some opponents of nuclear power point to the problem of high-level waste disposal as the strongest moral argument against the atom as a power source.

LEGACY OF DEATH

They see spreading nuclear power plants as the source of a legacy of death for future generations that we have no right to force upon them.

But J. L. Everett, president of the Philadelphia Electric Co. and a strong advocate of nuclear power, believes the "relatively low volume" of high level wastes means that ultimately disposing of them will not be an overwhelming problem.

"If we ever decide we don't want radioactive wastes on earth, we have a simple solution," he says.

We can load them in rockets and shoot them into the sun."

LIMERICK RESIDENTS ACCEPTING NUCLEAR NEIGHBOR

The $725 million nuclear power plant under construction in Limerick Township has been accepted with calm by most people who live within a mile of the site.

News of such nuclear plants in many cases sets off chain reaction protests, but the Limerick project hasn't upset too many residents of the immediate area, according to a Mercury survey.

David L. Gable, Fricks Lock Road, Pottstown RD 1, said he believes some people are discontented with the Limerick project and there is still some opposition, "but more and more people are beginning to accept it."

Gable, who lives in a home owned by Philadelphia Electric Co., has been informed of the project and said he isn't particularly worried.

"I don't feel that they would be allowed to build unless the entire project was ruled safe. I believe the government is imposing restraints now that wouldn't allow anything to be built and operated if it weren't safe."

"I'm an electrician and realize that we need more power and the only way to generate enough power and still live comfortably is through nuclear sources," he said. "I believe it is necessary and a thing of the future."

Gable moved to his Fricks Lock Road home two years ago and since that time has leased the building on a month to month basis.

NOT WORRIED

"I don't know when I'll be told to move, maybe next month or possibly not for a few years, but I'm not worried about nuclear power and don't think I'll move from the area."

John L. Piechota, Fricks Lock Road, Pottstown RD 1, lives across the Schuylkill River, about a half mile from the site. He owns his own home and has not been contacted by Philadelphia Electric Co.

Piechota said he is not against the nuclear plant and has no plans of moving.

"Despite all the talk about the dangers of the nuclear plant, I believe it is for the good of the country and this area," Piechota said. "People don't really know too much about such plants, but there hasn't been any real harm caused by the others across the nation."

Piechota said there is some opposition but it seems that it isn't coming from people in the immediate area of the plant site, that "most everyone here knows it's being built—we can't stop progress."

Nevin Youse, Sanatoga Road, Pottstown RD 1, has talked with people from the Atomic Energy Commission and read about similar plants. He said he has no worries, "as long as they keep the landscape in shape."

"They put a lot of research and work into the Limerick project and I'm sure they wouldn't go ahead unless it was proven safe," Youse said.

"As far as fish life in the Schuylkill River, it's so polluted from industry now that the nuclear plant's contribution won't make any difference," he added.

Youse said he doesn't know if the power will be transmitted out of the area or used here, but added if we want electricity we will have to accept this or do without.

Mrs. Mary Anne Keen, Sanatoga Road, Pottstown RD 1, has accepted the new nuclear plant since it was explained during a meeting of the Parker Ford women's club last year.

"Maybe I only heard one side of the story, but I'm not upset and have no fears of Limerick's nuclear plant," she said.

"Some people are upset about the Limerick project, but I've lived here 22 years and I'm planning to stay. I think the project is needed and I feel the government wouldn't let it be built if it weren't safe."

She added the new plant will be a cheap source of power and will eliminate any future power losses. "For me a power loss may cause some inconvenience, but for industry a loss of power means a loss of work and a loss of money—it could be a catastrophe."

Carl R. Shotwell's property on Sanatoga Road, Pottstown RD 3, borders the plant site.

He hasn't been contacted by Philadelphia Electric Co., but attended meetings when talk of the plant began.

"I am worried and concerned about the nuclear power plant being built in Limerick Township, but I'm not really in opposition," Shotwell said. "I believe it is a thing of the future and something that is needed."

"It definitely will boost the economy of the surrounding townships, will assist in decreasing unemployment and help draw more industry to the area," he said.

"As far as any accidents, it's just as easy to have an accident in a plant or a car. If we are worried about that we might as well not step out of our homes," he concluded.

Howard E. Rumler, Democratic candidate for the Lower Pottsgrove Township Board of Commissioners, lives a block from the plant site on Evergreen Road. He is concerned and last year toured a similar plant at Peach Bottom to learn more about what is taking place in Limerick.

He said he believes there is no real opposition from people in the immediate area of the plant and while most people might not support the project, they are accepting it.

"We in this area have already benefited from the project. The roads leading to the plant site have been widened and improved, everything that has been done has been done in an orderly fashion and there have been no problems," Rumler said.

"Some people are more concerned with the speeding on the new and wider roads than with the potential hazards of the plant," he added.

Rumler noted that the area surrounding the plant site is zoned for industrial use and with additional power supplied by the plant, new industries maybe drawn to the Pottstown area.

Mrs. Lillian Detwiler, Pottstown RD 1, is not afraid of the nuclear plant. She lives across the river and has been watching progress from her back yard.

She noted that there was some opposition in the area when news of the plant became public, "but one by one the people have been accepting the fact that the plant will be built."

"Some of my friends living in the lower end of Fricks Lock Road have had to sell their homes and property to the electric company. These people are worried—worried about losing their home or finding a new place to live, not about the dangers of the new plant," she concluded.

Nuclear Future Depends on Breeder Reactors

In June, President Nixon announced a major effort to develop a commercial "liquid metal fast breeder" reactor within this decade.

Such reactors, he said, will be vital if a supply of nuclear fuel for atomic power plants is to be assured for the future.

But the announcement set off widespread reaction, some at high levels.

Gov. Milton Shapp wrote a public letter to the President asking that no fast breeders be built in Pennsylvania. One had, in fact, been under consideration for the Tunkhannock region.

Earlier the anthropologist Margaret Mead, president of a union of scientists, wrote to the government spelling out objections and reservations about the fast breeder project.

Why the fears?

Breeder reactors are an alchemist's dream They produce more fuel than they consume. With an acute shortage of natural uranium fuels for conventional reactors expected within the next generation, fast breeders are a must if nuclear fission is to have a future.

Ordinarily fission reactors use little of the uranium in their fuel cores. Only the isotope U–235, which makes up only a few per cent of most enriched fuels, is fissionable.

The bulk of uranium consists of an isotope called U–238, which won't fission to produce useful heat.

But U–238 can be converted to fissionable plutonium by bombardment with neutrons, and thus becomes a useable fuel.

In a fast breeder reactor, U–238 is packed around the rector core. It absorbs unused neutrons reflected from the core while the fuel is fissioning, and becomes plutonium.

NO MODERATOR

This type of reactor is called a "fast" breeder because it uses no moderator to slow down the neutrons in its core as conventional reactors do. An unmoderated reactor produces more excess neutrons free to take part in the breeding process.

But the use of fast neutrons to carry on the fission process creates complex engineering problems.

The core of fuel must be denser than an ordinary reactor's; thus an extremely efficient liquid coolant is needed to carry heat rapidly away from the fuel.

The coolant cannot be water, as in most conventional reactors. Water is not a sufficiently effective coolant, for one thing, and water is a moderator, for another.

The answer most often suggested—and used—is liquid metal, namely sodium or potassium. These metals have high heat capacities and become liquid at a few hundred degrees fahrenheit.

But anyone who ever has experimented with these materials in high school chemistry class can see the engineering problems they present. Warm sodium burns fiercely on contact with air or water.

In a hot-sodium cooling system, any air or water leaks could spell disaster, and breakdowns are difficult to fix.

At the first large sodium-cooled reactor built in this country—the Enrico Fermi plant near Detroit, a metal plate inside the reactor broke loose and blocked a coolant outlet pipe.

Heat built up and partially melted a portion of the fuel. The reactor was shut down immediately, but it took months to find out what was wrong and longer to fix.

Even with optical probes, nothing could be seen inside the reactor because the sodium coolant was opaque and much heavier than water.

But as far as engineers are concerned, the mechanical difficulties presented by liquid metal coolants are simply problems to overcome. They will be overcome, say the professionals, and the reactors will be safe and reliable.

But those who fear fast breeders raise a stronger objection. Plutonium is the real nemesis haunting the breeder program, they feel.

Once the breeders get underway, plutonium gradually will replace natural uranium as the fuel in water-cooled reactors such as Limerick's.

It also will be used in the breeders themselves. Plutonium could become the nation's major source of energy.

The U.S. would become a "plutonium economy."

But plutonium is dangerous, too dangerous for any widespread use, so far as the opposition is concerned.

The "critical mass" of plutonium necessary to sustain a chain reaction is considerably smaller than that of U-235.

Critics fear that if a mishap caused overheating and melting of a fast breeder core, a pool of melted plutonium might collect, explode and break open the reactor.

Such an accident could be devastating to a wide area. Plutonium readily burns in air to form an intensely radioactive "smoke".

This gas is not too deadly to humans so long as contact was restricted to the skin, because plutonium's radioactivity is not very penetrating.

But a few thousandths of a gram inhaled into the lungs can bring death, either immediately or in the long run by inducing lung cancer.

Furthermore, plutonium is chemically poisonous.

Proponents of fast-breeders discount fears of plutonium accidents.

They say a large-scale meltdown of the core of such a reactor is just as unlikely as a similar accident in a conventional reactor, and maybe more unlikely.

But even if one did occur, they insist, it would be virtually impossible for a critical mass of plutonium to collect by chance.

And even if one did, it wouldn't blow open the reactor, they conclude.

In fact Chauncey Starr, dean of the engineering school at the University of California at Los Angeles, has stated that breeder reactors are in principle safer than water-cooled varieties, which have to store large amounts of extra fuel in their cores.

Nuclear power means plutonium power—at least until unlimited supplies of clean fusion energy become available in 20 or 30 years.

Even those who oppose fast breeders generally admit that only a full-scale return to coal to satisfy our energy needs in the coming decades could stop the rush to fast-breeders and plutonium.

Lawyers Want Nuclear Answers; Politicians' Feelings Mixed

The forthcoming debut of a nuclear power generating station in the Possum Hollow section of Limerick Township is generating mixed emotions among public officials and the borough's legal community, a Mercury survey disclosed.

Public officials, those who must respond to the wishes of voters and other elected officials, by and large favor advent of the Philadelphia Electric Co. facility, not only because it will fill a pressing need for increased electrical power, but because of a feeling it somehow will bring with it remarkable economic benefits.

Lawyers, on the other hand, expressed misgivings, not over the plant's coming to Limerick but because of a number of questions that haven't been answered, and the unknown factors concerning the facility's effect on the environment.

THREE QUESTIONS

Each person interviewed during the survey (all men) was asked three questions:

Do you generally favor the coming of a nuclear power station to Limerick, or does it cause you to worry?

Do you feel the public should have more to say concerning plant site selection when nuclear reactors are involved?

Do you believe Philadelphia Electric Co. and the responsible governmental agencies have been completely candid and open with information concerning the use of nuclear energy to create electricity?

Three of the four government officials responded that they welcomed the plant while a fourth said he had no feeling one way or the other.

Pottstown Borough Manager Joseph D. Banta said that because of the proximity of the plant in the area, he feels it will have a beneficial effect on the economy as well as being the catalyst for increased population growth.

He pointed out that while he is an engineer, it isn't in the field of nuclear energy and " . . . therefore I depend on the Atomic Energy Commission to oversee and regulate the operation of nuclear plants.

MANY FACTORS

"And lacking the technical knowledge I'd have to go along with whatever the AEC says. As far as the site selection there are dozens of economic and technical factors involved, factors which the utility and the AEC would

be in a position to know more about. I don't think site selection by others would be a good idea."

Stephen Ross, acting borough manager of Phoenixville, said he welcomes construction of the nuclear power plant in Limerick.

"I believe there's a dire need for additional electrical power in the area and on the basis of what I've read it's almost a necessity."

Ross said citizens have no alternative but to place their faith and trust in the federal government and the controls they set up not only to govern the operations of nuclear plants, but the selection of sites as well."

Pottstown Tax Collector Guy Sperat Jr., a former borough council president, said he also favors inception of the plant for economic reasons.

"As far as selection of the site, I believe the public should be kept informed of properties under consideration, but any selection should be up to the technical people. It's easy for a person not living near a potential site to favor it, whereas those in the immediate area without the proper information probably would be greatly concerned."

Sperat said he has close contacts with employes of other nuclear facilities and on the basis of conversations with them he believes the government is telling everything about the plants.

Royersford Mayor Ralph H. Landes said his initial thoughts on location of the Limerick power plant were ". . . neither pro or con just mediocre."

He does, however, have specific views on public involvement in site selection and on the government's policy of dispensing nuclear information.

"It is the utility which is building the facility and it should be up to it to decide where the plant shall be located."

Is the government being completely candid in dispensing information on nuclear power reactors?

"Hopefully so. If the government and the AEC think nuclear reactors are okay why should we be concerned? Look at Peach Bottom. It's been operating for years and there has been no reaction from the people living around it, so apparently there are no problems."

UNIQUE POSITION

State Rep. William H. Yohn, Jr. is in a unique position. Not only is he an elected public official, he's a lawyer as well, and his reception to the nuclear power plant is cautions.

"I am very conscious of the need for additional electrical power and the threat of pollution problems from fossil-fueled plants. But at the same time I am not yet convinced we received anything close to all the answers to the safety of such a plant or its effects on the environment in the Limerick area."

Yohn said while he believes the government may conduct itself candidly in providing information, "The concern of the public, and demand for more information is much greater than was anticipated. Consequently not enough people have gone deeply enough into the subject to provide all the answers."

On the matter of site selection, Yohn said he believes the public should have in hand in the process through appointment of a public agency."

In this regard the lawmaker last year submitted proposed legislation which would have created a state atomic energy council made up of people in the environmental field.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Before any land could be purchased in the state, under the bill, public hearings would be held if the land was to be used for construction of nuclear reactors.

On the basis of testimony delivered at the hearings the agency then would make a determination on whether or not the site was good enough. If not, permission would not be granted.

Yohn's bill never got out of committee. But there's a new one now being studied by the House Conservation Committee and he is predicting it will be reported out for House action sometime after the members return in October.

C. Edmund Wells, Pottstown lawyer and former borough solicitor, said he's concerned over construction of the Limerick power station.

"While I feel we are embarking on a necessary pursuit for the required power demanded by the increased population, I am not so sure that we currently have all the scientific and technical answers on the possible future impact of atomic power plants on the environment.

BIGGER ROLE

"I absolutely feel that the public should play a bigger role in site selection but with the qualification that sufficient information be made available to enable the public to make intelligent and reasonable decisions."

On the matter of disclosure of information Wells commented:

"I have my own personal reservations as to whether or not there have been full disclosures by those who currently are making the decisions."

Richard Spare, Pottstown lawyer and member of the Pottstown School Board, said he was pleased to learn of inception of the power plant because it will fill the continuing need for more electricity and at the same time will create less pollution than a new fossil-fuel plant.

"It's the lesser evil."

UP TO GOVERNMENT

And while Spare doesn't think nuclear power plants should be placed in residential areas, he said he doesn't think the public should have a role in site selection. "That's something which should be left up to the government and the power companies, but it shouldn't be done secretly."

Spare said he has faith in the government and in the electric companies and he feels they are disclosing all information concerning nuclear reactors.

"I know that some people are trying to scare the public regarding the dangers of a nuclear power plant. Nobody's completely candid when you get right down to it."

DICK BOSMAN

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I went to see the Washington Senators play their next-to-last game here in Washington last Wednesday night, September 29. Having the Washington Senators here has been a good thing and from my personal viewpoint, a very enjoyable thing. It is to be regretted that they are leaving.

Particularly rewarding for me this year has been the opportunity to get to know the Senators' star pitcher, Dick Bosman, who hails from Kenosha, Wis., in my congressional district. Dick has certainly been one of the pillars of the team and I am going to miss seeing him on the mound out in Kennedy Stadium.

I wish Dick every success with the team in Dallas-Fort Worth and hope that everything does work out for this fine sportsman.

FAIR TREATMENT FOR OUR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in February of 1968 I called to the attention of Congress the need for a fair and objective appeals procedure for Foreign Service officers in the State Department who have long been denied a vehicle to air their grievances such as is accorded employees in the civil service. I later introduced legislation aimed at corrective action and in May of this year reintroduced this proposal with some changes; namely, H.R. 8523. In the Foreign Service an FSO can be retired if he does not advance from grade to grade at a certain established rate or if he finds himself at the bottom 10 percent of the Foreign Service. He is then selected out and in most cases has no channel for appeal.

In 1968 I cited the case of Stephen Koczak, and FSO with high qualifications and prior commendable service, who made the mistake of reporting serious security violations on the part of one of his superiors. In 2 succeeding years Mr. Koczak's ratings dropped. He was selected the next year, 1963, while his superior was continued in service.

Later I called attention to the case of John Hemenway, another FSO who suffered the same fate after reporting abuses which he judged detrimental to the Foreign Service and the Nation's foreign policy. Mr. Hemenway fared better than Mr. Koczak in that he was the first FSO to be accorded a grievance hearing which is continuing at the present time.

But the case which brought public attention early this year was the unfortunate case of Charles W. Thomas, another FSO who, trying for 2 years after being selected out to gain a redress of grievances, committed suicide in despair. Shortly thereafter, statements began emanating from the State Department about proposals outlining a new appeals procedure approach.

Today, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the issue of fair treatment for Foreign Service officers came under discussion at the nomination hearing of Mr. Howard P. Mace, former personnel director of the State Department, who has been selected to be the next Ambassador to Sierra Leone. In opposition to Mr. Mace's confirmation was the above-mentioned John Hemenway who read a prepared statement after requesting to be placed under oath, a procedure not normally followed by the committee. In support of his charges Mr. Hemenway distributed to members of the committee a transcript of his grievance committee hearing of July 29, 1971, which involved Mr. Mace.

Preceding Mr. Hemenway in testifying was Mr. Xavier M. Vela, President of Local 1534 of the American Federation of Government Employees—AFL–CIO—who recommended that the Foreign Relations Committee thoroughly examine

the personnel practices of the Department and the role played in them by Howard P. Mace. The part of Mr. Vela's testimony which I found pertinent to H.R. 8523 was Mr. Mace's involvement in the Allison Palmer case. This further indicates the urgent need for a disinterested board of appeals and review, outside the State Department and USIA, which would make the final judgment. This is the crux of the H.R. 8523 proposal which includes a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee as members of the board.

Several days ago I called attention to a recent study by the Congressional Research Service of the Library of Congress entitled "The Senate Role in Foreign Affairs Appointments" which was made at the request of the Foreign Relations Committee. The study pointed out that there are at present some executive appointments, important in reference to the treaty-making process, which do not require Senate confirmation but which would improve executive-legislative relations if that body were consulted, thus involving the Senate more deeply in foreign policy matters. Likewise, the inclusion of two members of Congress in the appeals board proposal outlined in H.R. 8523 would involve Congress more meaningfully in the affairs of those who are the heart of our foreign policy implementation—our Foreign Service officers.

Much more than the suitability of an individual for an ambassadorial position was at issue in the hearing this morning before the Foreign Relations Committee. The charges raised were but a variation on an old theme—the unfair treatments of Foreign Service officers in the selection out process by the arbitrary manipulations of State Department officials safe, for the most part, from the overseeing eyes of Congress.

I insert at this point a short account of the hearing as it appeared in today's Washington Star under the byline of Phillip Shandler.

The second item is the prepared statement of Mr. Vela of AFGE, mentioned above.

The third insertion is the prepared statement of Mr. Hemenway followed by the transcript of his grievance hearing of July 29, 1971, which was distributed to members of the Committee and to which he refers in his statement:

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 30, 1971]

FIRED DIPLOMAT SAYS MACE IS UNFIT TO BE AMBASSADOR

(By Phillip Shandler)

An ambassadorial nomination was challenged at a Senate confirmation hearing today by a federal-employe union leader and a former foreign service officer who claims he was unfairly fired.

The target was President Nixon's nomination of Howard P. Mace, former personnel director of the State Department, to be U.S. ambassador to Sierra Leone.

REVIEW IS ASKED

The head of the American Federation of Government Employes local at the State Department asserted that Mace had "taken an active part" in personnel actions over the past few years which "denied scores of employees their most basic rights of due process."

The unionist, Xavier M. Vela, did not flatly oppose Mace's nomination, but rather asked the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to review Mace's role in the cases of several Foreign Service officers he said had been arbitrarily "selected out."

But one of those officers, John D. Hemenway, told the committee, "I do not believe that Mr. Mace is fit for the office for which he is being considered." Hemenway charged, under oath, that Mace "puts untruths in his letters . . . misrepresents his own policy positions to be all things to all men . . . and disregards regulations."

Mace, at the beginning of the hearing, had cited as an accomplishment of his tenure as State Department personnel officer, from October 1969 to last month, the granting to Hemenway of the first hearing for a Foreign Service officer protesting involuntarily retirement.

"OBSTRUCTIONISM" ALLEGED

But Hemenway accused Mace of "obstructionism" for two years since granting the hearing and still refuses to testify under oath.

"I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Mace violates regulations here in Washington, what will he do abroad unsupervised as an ambassador when he may find it inconvenient or disagreeable to follow certain instructions?" Hemenway asked Sen. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., who conducted the hearing.

Fulbright is planning hearings starting next week on legislation sought by some unionists and Foreign Service officers that would strengthen employe rights in State Department personnel actions.

Following today's testimony, the committee said there would be no action on the Mace nomination until further testimony is received next week.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND STATE DEPARTMENT MANAGERS

(A statement by Xavier M. Vela, President of Local 1534 of the American Federation of Government Employees (AFL–CIO) on the nomination of Howard P. Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone)

The Department of State has in the past few years denied scores of employees their most basic rights of due process. Mr. Howard P. Mace has taken an active part in these denials. We, therefore, would ask your Committee, Mr. Chairman, to look into the rationale for State's policy and examine Mr. Mace's part in its planning and execution.

Let me list the most recent State Department actions which, I believe, undermine the rights and morale of our dedicated, competent Foreign Service.

First, you should know, Mr. Chairman, that in October of last year Local 1534 of the American Federation of Government Employees petitioned for exclusive recognition as the collective bargaining agent for five groups of civil and foreign service employees in State and the Agency for International Development. Not only would management not recognize the appropriateness of these bargaining units but it asked for and received Presidential exemption of all Foreign Service employees from the Executive Order (11491) which spelled out these rights of due process. Furthermore, those rights of due process provided by other regulations, laws, executive orders can be and have been ignored.

Even when the legal Counsel of State knows these violations are occurring and advises the bureau concerned to take corrective action no change will necessarily be made. (See Exhibit A)

A "substitute" order has been in preparation for several months and meanwhile, Foreign Service employees have no bargaining rights whatsoever. The rationale according to the State Department is that all Foreign Service employees have an intimate relationship with the President of the United States which is incompatible with collective bargaining. Many FSO's believe this line of argument is invalid and, in fact, undermines efficiency and morale. (See Exhibit B)

Second, let me outline State's policy on discrimination toward women. Our union helped obtain the first formal grievance hearing ever held for a Foreign Service Officer on any kind of grievance. Upon realizing the threatening prospect of such a hearing with its verbatim transcript and possibility of public scrutiny, Mr. Macomber, with Mr. Mace's active concurrence, informed the Secretary of State that Foreign Service employees should be exempted from *this* Executive Order as well. (Executive Order 11478 which bans race and sex discrimination by the United States Government). The Department's plan, however, was overtaken by events and the hearing officer was appointed by the Civil Service Commission before the exemption was formally requested. Since then, the hearing examiner has found for the complainant but State has yet to grant any redress for the damage done her career. The Department has, instead concentrated on issuing *mea culpa* press releases admitting it discriminated but vowing it will never do so again. I repeat: State has yet to grant any relief in this, its first documented sex discrimination case which was concluded over three months ago.

State's only proposal is to rig the promotion board in the complainant's favor, a procedure which vitiates both the merit system of promotion and the E.E.O. program. The grievant has flatly rejected this proposal. (See Exhibits C and D)

Third, Mr. Chairman, despite repeated complaints of management intimidation of union representatives no effort has been made to remind senior officials of the unfair labor practices provisions of EO 11491. (See Exhibit E)

The latest incident unfortunately involves Mr. Mace's brusquely interrogating a Foreign Service Officer who happened to be a Union official and ordering him to immediately furnish a copy of the union resolution on Mr. Mace's nomination. Mr. Mace, of course, should have requested that the union give him the document through the appropriate management channels. We would have been happy to comply.

Fourth, Mr. Young's article of September 25, 1971 in the Evening Star and the attached cables (See Exhibit F) will illustrate the censorship used by State to inhibit the free flow of ideas between employee organizations and Department employees. Today an employee group can send an "interested party" telegram. Tomorrow this right is unilaterally suspended without prior consultation or notice because of the "administrative problems" that it would cause.

Is it that State fears the "administrative problems" which might arise or does it fear the class action suit against selection out which the cables discuss?

In this particular case the Ambassador to Rome refuses to distribute a cable in the usual fashion and accuses the sponsors of a legal defense fund of using tactics which are "revolting" and "nauseating". The Ambassador's statement is allowed to stand as State Department policy. Does this mean that Ambassadors are not under the control of the Department? That they cannot be reprimanded or made to comply with personnel or even security regulations? Not according to Mr. Mace and Mr. Burns. (See Exhibit G)

Fifth, let me say a word about the so-called new grievance procedures. The press has recently focused on the tragic suicide of Mr. Charles William Thomas and the Department's constant denial of hearing rights to complainants. Mr. Mace was unfortunately, an active party in many of these cases as Deputy Director and later Acting Director of the Foreign Service. His attitude of disapproval towards both grievance procedures *and* FSO's who try to use them is clear. He has au-

thorized only one such hearing and it is unresolved. He has tried to discourage several other hearings. Furthermore, in an official letter (drafted by his Special Assistant who confirmed under oath that the letter's content represented Mr. Mace's viewpoint) Mr. Mace is quoted as warning that a grievance procedure started by an FSO could adversely affect the decisions of the FSO Selection Boards (these boards determine not only promotion but also selection-out). (See Exhibit H)

State's response to this recently publicized practice has been to issue a new set of grievance procedures which have been characterized by Senator Humphrey as, in some respects, worse than the old regulations.

These procedures are clearly part of a public relations campaign to convince the Congress that there is no need whatsoever to legislate Foreign Service grievance procedures like those introduced by Senator Birch Bayh in the Senate and Congressman Ashbrook in the House.

We, of course, believe that this country desperately needs a "Little Wagner Act" for all Federal Employees but that in light of the Administration's denial of collective bargaining rights to Foreign Service employees under EO 11491 an interim legislated grievance procedure exclusively for Foreign Service employees is absolutely necessary. The Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund (Box 19443, Twentieth Street Station, Washington, D.C. 20036) will in the meantime sponsor a class action in Federal District Court against the selection out system as now practiced and thus try to gain more immediate relief for those in imminent danger of losing their jobs to the "up or out" juggernaut.

We, of course, believe that the demonstrably incompetent should be fired, whether supervisors or non-supervisors. But the arbitrary, capricious selection-out system is not the way to accomplish this. The weaknesses and lack of control in these Selection Board proceedings are vividly described in the attached transcript, by an official who provides staff assistance to the Boards. (See Exhibits I and J)

Collective bargaining agreements, enforceable in court, have for decades successfully coped with this and other fundamental employee-management problems.

I will end this statement by pointing out some of the attachments which I would like entered into the record and which, among other things, demonstrate the active part in State's personnel system played by Mr. Mace in the last years as Deputy Director and Acting Director of the Foreign Service.

Exhibit K is a series of documents from the Alison Palmer hearing mentioned earlier which indicate that Mr. Mace denies having seen in 1969 an important memorandum confirming Miss Palmer's charges of sex discrimination. The Director of the Office of Equal Employment later testified that he showed this memo to Mr. Mace and discussed it with him on several occasions.

Miss Palmer testified that Mr. Mace refused to accept the findings of the investigation, carried out by a Foreign Service Inspector. Mr. Mace later admitted that before rejecting these findings he had not read the investigation file on the case.

There is an important four-page memo which Mr. Mace showed to Miss Palmer almost two years ago. It included a fourth page with recommendations and a finding by the State Department Legal Office that she had been discriminated against. Weeks later she inspected her official file and found the memo. But it lacked the last page. At the hearing on June 23, 1971 Mr. Mace promised to insert the complete memo, signed by him, in her file. A check on June 30 revealed that the complete memo was now there, but still was not signed by him. It was finally signed on July 1, 1971.

Also included is an exchange between a union committee and Mr. Mace earlier this year regarding assignments for Foreign Service Officers to a para-military unit in Viet Nam. Even though an attempt was made simply to express the views of the union Mr. Mace refused to discuss how particular assignments were made and later wrote the union saying that "dispute or debate" on this subject was out of order.

Our attempt, Mr. Chairman, was not to debate, but to learn if the process by which FSO's are assigned to a military advisory group in Vietnam is free of favoritism. We still do not know. (See Exhibit L)

For example, Mr. Chairman, an FSO who expresses moral reservations about assignments to South Africa or Portuguese Angola may be given another assignment. Whereas many FSO's who express similar feelings about Vietnam are given a choice between going or resigning. The above exhibit demonstrates that such forced resignations have been submitted.

In brief, we believe that Mr. Mace has been an active part of a personnel policy which is based on two premises:

(1) Right or wrong, you don't question the boss.

(2) The policy is right because the Department of State's top staff says it's right.

This, I submit, is the same kind of tragic shortsightedness that has been revealed in this chamber by State Department spokesman in the past when discussing other matters of interest to this Committee.

Before allowing the Department of State's incipient employee-management conflict to deteriorate any further I request that this Committee, Mr. Chairman, thoroughly examine the personnel practices of the Department and the role played in them by Howard P. Mace. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOHN D. HEMENWAY

("Retired" Foreign Service Officer, formerly Chief of the Berlin Section, US Department of State)

Mr. Chairman, I request that you have the oath administered to me. My remarks today are properly made only under oath. (Pause for oath.)

My remarks concern Mr. Howard P. Mace, a man aspiring to the high rank of the President's personal representative in a foreign land. I do not believe that the President could possibly know of all the well-documented and legitimate complaints against Mr. Mace which bear on his qualifications for the office to which he aspires. I believe his name is before you today because persons promoting Mr. Mace's nomination have not fully informed you and others charged with the scrutiny of such appointments of the great weight of evidence showing that he is not qualified for such an office.

I have personal knowledge of Mr. Mace and I believe I am able to report honestly and authoritatively concerning his qualifications. I come here because I believe that the career in which I served for many years should have high standards of service; that only men of high integrity should be allowed to rise to commanding positions in that service. Mr. Mace is not such a man. I say this not from any personal malice, but actually with a heavy heart. I speak, however, with certainty because of knowledge I have gained by personal, first hand experience.

Mr. Chairman, you personally have made it a matter of public record that ". . . it is time for a searching look at the Senate's role in the confirmation of nominees to foreign affairs positions at home and abroad." You could not begin such a policy with a better candidate than Mr. Mace. As I said I do not believe that Mr. Mace is fit for the office for which he is being considered. Neither do I believe that Mr. Mace was properly executing his last office, that of Director of Personnel of the Department of State.

I asked to be put under oath because this Committee has a right to know that my testimony is the truth. As I stated, my name is John Hemenway and I reside at 4816 Rodman St., NW, in Washington, D.C. I am a graduate of the US Naval Academy at Annapolis, a Rhodes Scholar at Oxord and a doctoral candidate at Georgetown University.

I am also a "retired" Foreign Service Officer. I put quotation marks around the "retired" because, in fact, the Department of State's highest official, in official correspondence, has done just that. Actually, I was fired. I was fired after 24 years of honorable service for the United States Government with no blemish on my record. In the year I was fired, officers ranked in the bottom of my foreign service class were retained. The last position I held—which I had held for three years—was Chief of the Berlin Section of the Department of State. Except for my tenure, that position has always been held by an officer with a rank higher than I had, FSO–4. Despite commendable reports in my file from the US Ambassador to Germany, George C. McGhee, the US Minister to Berlin, Brewster Morris, the Chairman of the Berlin Task Force, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the State Walter Stoessel, and a Senior Foreign Service Inspector, Daniel Braddock, who inspected me while I was serving as Chief of the Berlin Section—despite all this, I was fired.

Why? Because, as an officer of the Department told me two days ago, the personnel system of the Department is "sick—sick—sick." The fact is that someone can invest 20 years of his life in the Foreign Service; yet such personal service can be snuffed out without reason or recourse. The Department's personnel system is more than sick, Mr. Chairman, it is corrupt. It is the Alice of Wonderland of Management and Personnel Administrators. The Director of Personnel during the period that I shall discuss with Mr. Howard Mace.

As I said, I am convinced Mr. Mace lacks essential qualities for the office of ambassador. He lacks them to such a degree that he does not merit your confirmation. To my own knowledge:

1. He does not make decisions, and when he does he makes poor judgments; he is guilty of latches, i.e., he is literally asleep at the switch.

2. He puts untruths in his letters and he clears official correspondence which he knows to be wrong and untrue.

3. He misrepresents his own policy positions to be all things to all men.

4. He uses his official position for his personal ends and disregards regulations, which he does not enforce uniformly.

5. When faced with a clear, unequivocal duty, he is capable of setting that duty aside, for reasons of expediency.

The list could be longer. And Mr. Mace is the Director of Personnel, a position he has held in one form or another for years. As my friend said, the Department's personnel system is sick.

I am now engaged in the first grievance hearing ever conducted by a Foreign Service officer. This hearing was granted under regulations that have since been abolished by Mr. Mace, in harness with the administrators of the Department of State. In that connection and the events that led up to the Hearing I have been forced to have many contacts with Mr. Mace as Director of Personnel. All my contacts with him indicate that he does not measure up to the standards I believe you would want the Foreign Service to require of its ambassadors.

Let me be quite specific.

On September 26, 1969, I asked—and received permission—from Mr. Mace to have a

Hearing. (I will not burden you with that matter because the Hearing is now in progress—after delays extending over two years!) I believe that Mr. Mace never intended actually to permit the Hearing he originally had authorized.

For two years documents directly relevant to the case have been withheld, either totally, or overclassified so as to make them unusable in a fair and open hearing. My hearing is open to the public—that in itself is a precedent the Department of State does not like—Mr. Mace and his legal advisor, who appeared yesterday at the Hearing prefer Hearings closed to the public. The Hearing Committee itself has been harassed by Mr. Mace. Thus, for example, on this particular point:

Mr. Mace willfully and illegally discharged the Chairman of my Hearing Committee in the middle of the procedures which he personally had authorized and knew were in progress.

On January 23 of this year, having been informed that I was tired of over one-year's delay and that I intended to press my right for a Hearing, Mr. Mace informed Hearing Chairman Toussaint that his services as an employee of the Department of State would be terminated effective February 28, 1971. (The first Hearing Session was scheduled for three days later, March 3.)

On February 22 I wrote Mr. Mace to inform him of what he already must have known, that his action was illegal and violated Foreign Service regulations. Thereupon the Chairman's dismissal notice was lifted and he was extended—by oral arrangement only—for one more month.

On March 13, after only the initial Hearing in which I indicated what I intended to prove and my means for proving this, Mr. Mace wrote the Hearing Chairman again to terminate his employment at the Department of State, as of 1 April, 1971. I feel this clearly violated Foreign Service Regulations. Again I pointed this out to Mr. Mace in writing. This had the effect of influencing the progress and process of my Hearing because the Hearing Chairman had to operate for the next three sessions under the threat of being terminated again at the end of the month. In fact, that happened. The Hearing Chairman was fired despite my appeal to the Civil Service Commission and to Mr. Mace, again in writing, and my own lawyer's appeal to Secretary Rogers. Mr. Mace knew the regulations and was reminded in writing that the regulations specifically forbade tampering with personnel connected with Hearings—but he again moved to fire the Chairman—and on April Fool's Day, to boot.

Thanks to the US Constitution and to the interest in the matter and in due process generally shown by your colleagues in the Senate, Mr. Chairman, the Hearing Chairman was re-hired as a "consultant" and put back on the roles so that he could continue as Chairman of the Grievance Committee, the first in the history of the Department.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Mace violates regulations here in Washington, what will he do abroad unsupervised as an ambassador when he may find it inconvenient or disagreeable to follow certain instructions?

Mr. Mace had a direct, clear unequivocal duty under the law and the regulations to provide my Hearing Committee with guidance. No such guidance was received during the entire period that Mr. Mace was Director of Personnel. In fact, his contribution has been two years of obstruction.

Mr. Mace apparently has a proven record of acting arbitrarily and capriciously—giving different officers varied treatment under the law. Shifting personnel policies implemented and directed by him personally have wrought havoc to the careers of dedicated officers, some of whom I have known personally who now are dead—the names of Warren Blumberg and Charles Thomas come to mind.

In my own affairs I know Mr. Mace is a man capable of deception. He does not stop merely at losing files, misinforming the Congress, concealing facts and practicing nepotism. Yet he actually is being considered for the high post of ambassador.

While I do not wish to involve you unduly in my affairs—and I know that some ill-informed persons may question my motives—I would like to call to your attention a Transcript of my Hearing of July 29, 1971 (no. 8 in a series that has now reached 10, over two years—two painful years.) At that one Hearing Mr. Mace was requested to appear—but refused. From a perusal of this one document you will be given some insights into what is wrong with the U.S. Department of State Personnel System as administered by Mr. Mace.

You may wish to glance through a summary of the principal contents of that Hearing transcript.

(Read the contents of the copy, attached.)

It is not my role here to delve into Mr. Mace's motivation for his conduct in these matters. Nor is it my duty to examine the pressures on him. (I would reject the defense that he was "only following orders.") It is also not my role to speculate on how widespread such evidence or corruption is in the Foreign Service—though I suggest it is much wider than even you suspect. Surely a service must be in trouble that requires more than 500 reforms as proposed by the present Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management. It is clear that many of these proposed reforms bear on personnel procedures. This can be no ringing endorsement for the Director of Personne. And the Director of Personnel has been Howard Mace.

Ambassador Loy Henderson once told me—and I believed him—that the Foreign Service system was the finest in the world, *provided it was properly administered.*

Who has been administering the Foreign Service—in significant part, the personnel system, *Mr. Howard Mace.*

We wonder about the "generation gap" and the "distrust of government." We wonder how it comes to pass. Could the appointment of such officials as Howard Mace have any bearing on this problem?

Mr. Chairman, if it is legerdemain this Committee is after you want Howard Mace. Look at his record. His expertise is said to be personnel administration. Then look at the wreckage that is the personnel system of the Foreign Service. No doubt a few men who have prospered under it even during its time of troubles or need the favor of the Personsonel system for an assignment will be deaf to any criticism of the Service or blind to the faults of its Director of Personnel. Such people should have attended my Hearing of yesterday at which perjury was committed.

Bumbling, maladroit ambassadors are nothing new to our diplomatic service. But if this kind of man becomes the model for our career diplomatic service, then I weep for that service—and I weep for our country.

Mr. Chairman, I have one personal request to make of this Committee. For the fourth time Mr. Howard Mace has been requested to appear at my Hearing to testify under oath. Previously he has refused to come. This time the Hearing Committee Chairman has asked him to come on October 6. Would you please hold open the Hearing record of this committee for 10 days so that I may submit additional material after October 6?

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE HEARING, THURSDAY, JULY 29, 1971, IN THE MATTER OF: JOHN D. HEMENWAY COMPLAINANT

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I think we are ready to begin. The record will show that the eighth meeting of the Grievance Committee in the matter of John D. Hemenway is being held in Room 3H15, Civil Service Commission Building, 19th and E Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C., on July 29, 1971, at 10:00 A.M.

Present are the members of the committee; the complainant; counsel, Mr. Joyce; and employee representative, Mr. Hite. Representing the German desk, Bureau of European Affairs, is Mr. Ellwood Williams. Also present are Mrs. Thomas, and Mr. Clark Mollenhoff. As observer for the American Foreign Service Association present, Miss Marian Nash.

I had thought at our meeting last week I had picked up all the loose threads, but I had not. But before I pick up two more, I would like to submit, and will include in the record at W–2 a letter dated July 28, 1971, addressed to me from Mr. Hemenway, in which Mr. Hemenway calls attention to the transcript of the July 23 meeting. Mr. Hemenway also calls attention to the fact that Mr. Mace, who had been invited to appear on July 23, had not appeared. Mr. Hemenway resubmitted the request that Mr. Mace be invited to appear at today's meeting.

This was hand carried to me by Mr. Hemenway yesterday, and I immediately hand carried a copy to Mr. Mace and one to Mr. Lyerly. I have not heard from either Mr. Mace or Mr. Lyerly. That will be at W–2.

I believe I gave you (Mr. Burris) a copy, or left a copy at your office for you yesterday. And I gave you one, General, this morning.

Mr. HAGAN. Yes, I have it.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I have a few extra copies if anyone would like to see it. Did you give copies, Mr. Hemenway, to Mr. Joyce?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I have no objection to anyone present interested in the hearing receiving one. Just pass them down.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. First loose thread concerns my approach to the Bureau of European Affairs with a request that a telegram be sent to Ambassador Puhan calling attention to the hearings held up to the date of my memorandum, which was May 3, and calling further attention to the fact that Ambassador Puhan had been identified in the initial memorandum from Mr. Hemenway to Mr. Mace calling for a grievance committee as one of the officers alleged to have caused to have inserted into the official records of the Department of State false, untrue, slanderous statements.

Ambassador Puhan, I was told by the desk officer for the Hungarian Desk, was on his way back to the United States for consultation and leave, and it was felt that the telegram I suggested be communicated to him might cross Mr. Puhan on his way west with a telegram going east. The telegram was not sent. However, when Ambassador Puhan was in Washington, the memorandum, my memorandum of May 3, as well as the draft telegram, were shown to the Ambassador. On May 18 I received a memorandum from Mr. John Baker of the Hungarian Desk referring to my May 3 memorandum, stating—quote—"I handed your memo of May 3, 1971 and the attached telegram to Ambassador Puhan on May 17, 1971, and he read it in my presence." Unquote.

I think to keep some chronology, or at least facsimile of chronology, of events, copies of my memorandum, my suggested telegram, and Mr. Baker's reply will be inserted in the exhibits at X–2.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, would you be good enough to read your offer to Mr. Puhan? Or perhaps you wanted to read the whole thing, I don't know. Did you want to say what your plan was—what you suggested Mr. Puhan do?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. The telegram would have come from the Department. It has been slugged for Ambassador Puhan. I will quote from the text.

Paragraph 1. "Paul A. Toussaint, Chairman subject committee, has requested that the following be communicated to you; 'At request John D. Hemenway and pursuant provisions of 3FAM1820 grievance committee created October 1969 hearings not initiated until March 1971. To date committee has

held five hearings during course of which Hemenway alleged his grievance to be that false untrue slanderous statements were introduced into Department's official records by Ambassador Puhan/ConGen Johnpoll. Verbatim transcript has been maintained of each hearing."

Paragraph 2. "In view your imminent return the U.S. you may wish avail yourself opportunity examine five transcripts now in existence (and such documentary evidence thus far introduced into the record) and such other additional transcripts as may then be in existence."

Paragraph 3. "Whether you wish to comment in any way on transcripts then in existence or defer comment or comment at all is your decision."

Paragraph 4. "Mr. Toussaint may be reached in the Department on extension 29442 or at home Bethesda, Maryland area code 301 540-3558." Period, end of telegram.

Mr. JOYCE. Did Mr. Puhan comment?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Mr. Puhan did not comment.

Mr. JOYCE. Did he offer to come testify and put on rebuttal testimony?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. He made no such offer. In fact, I never heard from Amabssador Puhan, directly or indirectly, orally or in writing.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Just for the record, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that I too took an interest in your efforts to contact Mr. Puhan at the time you drafted this telegram. I want it established in the record that I called Mr. Baker at the time you were being told that Mr. Puhan was out of country. I was told the same thing and I told Mr. Baker in response that I had that very morning a telegram in my hands from Hungary signed Puhan. Now, anyone familiar with the Foreign Service regulations knows that if a telegram is signed by the Ambassador he is in country.

That is all I have.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Okay. The only other item I have refers to the General's suggestion at the last meeting that an effort be made to reach someone in the White House with the authority to, in effect, instruct the Department of State to release the portion of the Parsons-Penfield report which was wiped out or excised; namely, paragraph c of Tab A.

Mr. HEMENWAY. You mean paragraph, Mr. Chairman, or section? Is there just one paragraph?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Well, all right, let's call it section then. Section c of Tab A. That Section c is entitled "Others," and below that appears, "Deleted—refers to privileged communications between a high level officer of the Department with the White House upon request of the latter."

I think I have been able to identify someone at the White House who would be in position at least to listen to me and listen to the request suggested by General Hagan; to wit, that this portion be released and that the White House take the steps necessary to effect its release. I have phoned the gentleman three times. Once he was out; twice he was in meetings. I left my office phone and my home phone. I have not heard from him. I did not try this morning because I didn't think I would have the time over the phone to give him the background of this case of the past nearly two years then go into the real details of the problem raised by the Department in its refusal to release this particular section. I will continue to telephone him at the White House, and, hopefully, between now and the end of work tomorrow have at least an opportunity to discuss it and arrange to meet with him.

That brings us up to this point.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that another loose end that I noted last time was the fact that we are proceeding under the procedures prescribed by our own intuition and intelligence. Have you had occasion to again address this vital problem to the attention of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Personnel?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I called his attention to it in this manner: When I received the copies of the transcript, I left a copy with Mr. Mace's secretary and told her to call his attention to certain pages. One of them, I believe, is page 25, which refers to your request for something in writing which would serve as a cloak for immunity in the event we reach that quicksand, and to other pages where specific requests are made. And I did the same thing with Mr. Lyerly's office. He was not in, so I left the transcript, a copy, with his secretary with a similar notation. I have not heard from either party with respect to the transcript or to any request or point raised in the transcript.

Mr. HAGAN. I do not want to press the point unduly at this time, but I am sure, I am confident, that you are of a similar mind, that here is a tremendous gap with which we were first faced at the first time of our hearing, by what would we be guided? I also would like to ask the question, am I alone in thinking that under the FAM regulations that there is a clear duty, or affirmative duty, on the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel to provide this committee, his own committee, with procedures for conducting a hearing of this character? Am I the only one who, in our group, feels that way? If so, Mr. Chairman, I will propose at the next hearing session to heal the problem, cure the problem, and to heal the situation by certain recommendations that I will then make. Before I do move in this fashion, I would like to know if you gentlemen on the committee have the feeling this is a requirement laid on the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel. Have either one of you looked at this in the FAM again, referring to the only guiding document we have left on the hearing procedures?

Mr. BURRIS. This being the first of these proceedings, I believe that is accurate. In way of a Foreign Service Officer having filed a request for and granted a request for a grievance proceeding, I think we have all been aware from the beginning that there is a—detailed and specific procedures have been very difficult to identify and get at. I think this is something that we as a committee have to take under advisement and discuss very carefully.

Mr. HAGAN. Well.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Well, I personally don't think that we have to take it under advisement, because 3FAM1826—I don't remember the subsection—is very clear that the responsibility rests upon the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Personnel to provide the necessary guidance and procedures to the committee. It's there. Now, he can read it as well as we can. His legal adviser can read it and counsel him. And I don't think it is up to us, this committee, or any member of the committee, to call attention, or call Mr. Mace's attention, to something which is in regulations that his own office has to enforce.

Mr. HAGAN. Well, I'm glad to hear——

Mr. TOUSSAINT. And in the absence of specific guidance, we just proceed as we have and hope that the procedures we do adopt are fair and lend themselves to a fair hearing. The only thing that I might mention which could be construed as guidance offered the committee by Mr. Mace was the suggestion made by Mr. Mace to me very early in the life of this committee, in addition to calling my attention to the Foreign Affairs Manual, that these hearings he expected, and consistent with 3FAM1826, would not be open to the press and the public. At that time I told him that I thought it was up to the committee to make that decision.

Mr. HAGAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, that answers my question as to the provisions of the FAM. I don't happen to have that particular——

Mr. HEMENWAY. Maybe I could help, General. I can only use common sense in interpreting this. But 3FAM1821.6, among other things, says he, that is, "the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel, or his representative (whom he has never designated you recall), gives instructions on the procedure to be followed to the grievance committee, to the officials designated to make an administrative review, or to the employees desiring to appeal a grievance." I don't think there is any possibility of misinterpretation. Two years ago this committee should have had in its hands essential guidance. For two years you have been without guidance, and the Deputy Assistant Secretary, who has been the same person all this time, has a positive duty required by the regulations.

Now, as I say, that is a common sense interpretation, but would any member of the committee not agree with that interpretation?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. No, I won't quarrel with it.

Mr. HAGAN. Well, I wanted to get the text.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Would you like to read it?

Mr. HAGAN. No, this is quite all right.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. It is in the exhibit book.

Mr. HEMENWAY. It is Tab A.

Mr. HAGAN. Thank you very much. That answers my question. And then what we do about it we can discuss.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Do you have anything, Mr. Burris? Mr. Joyce?

Mr. JOYCE. No comment at this time. I believe Mr. Hemenway would like to make a statement.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, our lack of progress, except on intricate discussion of administrative details, has concerned me, of course, as I know it has members of the committee. I wonder if you would permit me to reflect on a few principles for just a moment. I confess to being puzzled, and it is the application of these principles to my affairs and my grievance that troubles me.

I would like to set out two principles for your consideration. The first principle is due process and a fair hearing. Nearly two years ago Mr. Mace promised me a fair and equitable hearing under the regulations. This was not a casual act. It was the first grievance hearing in the history of the Foreign Service, and he knew that. He was aware of the regulations. He must have been aware of their implications when he granted that hearing. He granted me the hearing in writing. It was Mr. Mace who promised me the hearing, and 3FAM1821.6 provides Mr. Mace with the authority to see to it that I got the fair hearing that I had requested and that he had granted. Yet, two years has gone by and he has done nothing to see that I receive a fair hearing. In fact, we introduced into the hearing record on April 16—for your reference, if you want to study it, it is on page 44 and 45—a brief summary of the positive acts of obstruction directly attributable to Mr. Mace in connection with this hearing.

At the July 23 hearing last week, my attorney, Mr. Joyce, cited the press to establish that Mr. Mace admits publicly that he doesn't know what it is all about—or perhaps I should really say that he knows too well what it is all about. The comment attributed to Mr. Mace in the Washington Star of Monday June 7 is that "we are all babes in the woods." He "never heard of a grievance hearing until two years ago." You know why he heard of it two years ago. It was this hearing that he heard about. In fact, that entire remark by Mr. Mace seems incredulous to me. I refer to page 22 and 23 of the transcript of July 23.

Well, reflecting on those facts, we then come to the 22nd of July in a note penned on top of your memorandum, Mr. Chairman, which requested his appearance at this hearing committee. Mr. Mace had the temerity to declare that he will not answer any questions because he intends to be my judge, my jury, and my appeal court all in one. Mr. Mace was aware when he wrote you this, Mr. Chairman, that he could not be held accountable for this pettifoggery. He knew at that time that plans were afoot to send him overseas as Ambassador. He also knew that I, advised

by my counsel, Mr. Joyce, would never permit him to take such a role, that we would object to Mr. Mace reviewing this committee's work.

As we already pointed out in the April 16 hearing, within the Department of State it was rumored that whether Mr. Mace actually received his Ambassadorial post would depend on the outcome of the Hemenway case. Our hearing record subsequent to that time has been replete with delays, objections, all traceable to the man responsible for this hearing, or responsible for advising this hearing committee—Mr. Mace.

Those are comments I would like to make on the first principle, due process and a fair hearing.

The second principle follows logically. And it is, I think, common sense that we will object, and that we ought to object, to any Director of Personnel participating in the review of these matters or otherwise exercising any role in influencing the affairs of this hearing committee who has been involved in prior events pertaining to me and leading up to my grievance.

Specifically, I have in mind such a person as Robert Brewster, who is rumored to be the next Director of Personnel if Mr. Mace is confirmed as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. Now, it is the fact that Mr. Brewster was contacted by Ambassador Parsons and Ambassador Penfield, and considerable material is attributed to this contact in the Parsons-Penfield report, which, as I have noted in an earlier hearing, is a distorted, rigged effort that clumsily achieves its end by selective use of some facts and by inventing others. It is a disgrace to its authors, Parsons and Penfield, and no doubt that is why it is falsely classified confidential and why a section of that report is withheld even from the scrutiny of people at this table who are cleared for top secret.

Therefore, I would like to say here today at this hearing, even if he becomes Director of Personnel, Mr. Brewster, like Mr. Mace, should appear before this hearing committee under oath. I think you will find his name in my first list of witnesses, Mr. Chairman. (I am not certain of that without looking it up.)

No doubt, if Mr. Brewster wished to avoid such a confrontation he might, like Mr. Mace, put forward the argument that—quote—"because he is required to make a decision after considering the evidence, he feels it would be inappropriate to appear before this committee." I want to state now before Mr. Brewster becomes the Director of Personnel that he is needed as a witness, and because of his earlier involvement in this case, and with Mr. Puhan in his office—that is, Mr. Brewster's office—as Executive Director of European Personnel, he is disqualified from making any judgments in this case. Any honorable man would disqualify himself under these circumstances. I am sure that Mr. Brewster will if the circumstances present themselves. If, however, he does not, we shall challenge his impartiality as we have been forced by Mr. Mace to challenge his.

Well, those are the two principles and some facts surrounding them. I said I was confused as to the application of these principles, Mr. Chairman. And the source of my confusion, frankly, is that yesterday, July 28, 1971, I read in the official Department of State Newsletter, Number 123, of July 1971, under the following rubric—and I quote—"Development of a Grievance System for the Foreign Service: A Status Report"—end of quote. This article discusses as an event for the future a project in which Mr. Macomber, Deputy Secretary of State for Administration, is said to be—quote—"on public record as favoring an amendment to the Foreign Service Act which would insure that all members of the Foreign Service have access to a grievance procedure." End of quote. I think members of the committee are familiar with this periodical, Mr. Chairman. That same issue has on its front cover, by the way, "180-Day Progress Report" (concerning "reform") and is filled with talk of reform. But, Mr. Chairman, hasn't anyone told Mr. Macomber—he has a very large staff—that he has a grievance procedure for Foreign Service Officers? No new laws are needed; just fairly administer the existing regulations. Does Mr. Macomber not even read the letters he signs to Mr. Fulbright? On June 3, 1971, he signed a six-page letter which mentioned me by name four times.

It mentions two other Foreign Service Officers by the way, among them Charles Thomas. I am just going to confine my remarks today to things I know first hand, so I want to limit myself to just one paragraph of that letter. We would be delighted to, if the committee wanted us to, to go into it in detail. In that June 3 letter Mr. Macomber conveys the impression that the Foreign Service under his administration is honorably following its own regulations in the matter of John Hemenway and others.

Let me read this one paragraph, Mr. Chairman. It is on page 4 of the letter signed by Mr. Macomber, William B. Macomber, Jr.—actually signed Bill M.—dated June 3, 1971, to the Honorable J. W. Fulbright, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I quote: "Just prior to leaving the service Mr. Hemenway submitted a memorandum requesting a formal hearing before an impartial grievance committee. In accordance with the regulations, the specific nature of the complaint and the specific action sought was set forth. (It should be noted that Mr. Hemenway's specific complaint did not concern the question of his failure to achieve promotion, as such questions are specifically excluded from the grievance procedures applicable to Foreign Service Officers.) A grievance committee was established, and the hearings are currently being held at intervals suitable to all the parties concerned. The fifth session was held on April 16, 1971."

Well, we could, as I think you are aware, tear that paragraph to shreds. I will just address myself to one of the statements. "A grievance committee was established." That is true. And "hearings currently are being held at intervals suitable to all the parties concerned." That is not a true statement, and anyone who has even lightly perused the transcripts should have known it wasn't a true statement. If Mr. Macomber wasn't told this by the people who drafted the letter or people who briefed him before he signed the letter, he has been misled. We are not satisfied with the frequency of these hearings; we never have been. My lawyer, Mr. Joyce, has told this hearing committee repeatedly that we want to move forward. But you can't move forward, unless you want to move forward into a star chamber, without the witnesses, without the documents, and without fair administration which would give me what I was promised, a fair and equitable hearing.

I wonder if at this moment I could just ask you, Mr. Chairman, why it is you were not given a copy of this letter. Is it not your understanding of our request that we have requested all materials concerning John Hemenway and all files concerning John Hemenway?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Would you please request this letter (handing paper to the Chairman). I will not give it to the committee because I think it should be provided you by the Department of State. But that will let you have some idea of its authenticity.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I have several copies.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I see.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. That I obtained through other sources, not the standard Department source.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I don't feel, and I know you agree—you didn't get these from me?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. No.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I want that just for the record, Mr. Chairman. And may I say for the record that the source of this letter was not you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. That is correct.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I think you will agree, and I think members of the committee will agree, that we should not have to resort to unofficial sources for the materials that should be freely provided by an administration interested, it says, in reform, which is, in any event, bound by regulations to provide us with all the materials necessary for a full and fair hearing. Would that be the sense of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that we should get these materials?

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Speaking for myself, certainly I agree.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Well, let me make just one or two other points that are germane to these two principles that concern me. And I know they have concerned you. And I think to the extent that anyone on the outside looks at these procedures they would concern any American who believes that the first ten amendments to the Constitution are a reality. I am concerned that whoever writes these letters that are then signed by Mr. Macomber and Mr. Mace must have a different scale of values than I have—than most Americans have.

I am reminded of a speech made in the Senate two days ago by Senator Case concerning a former colleague of mine. Senator Case said, and I quote, "When Miss Palmer requested that Deputy Under Secretary of State Macomber be called as a witness in her case, he declined on the grounds that 'it would not be appropriate for Mr. Macomber to be a witness in a case in which he has responsibility for the final decision'." End of quote. Now, does that piece of pettifoggery sound familiar? It should, because Mr. Mace wrote this committee—and I quote—"I feel it would be inappropriate for me to appear before the committee. Pursuant to the regulations, the committee is required to report to me, and I am required, after considering the evidence, to make a decision." End of quote. Signed by Howard P. Mace, 7/22/71.

If you believe, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I do, that these phrases stem from the same basic pattern or formula of evasion, I submit that it is because Mr. Mace's decision not to appear before this hearing and Mr. Macomber's decision not to appear in the other matter emanate from the same source, J. Edward Lyerly, legal adviser to both men. You will recall Mr. Lyerly from document G–2 in our hearing record. And that document G–2 is a letter which I wrote to Mr. Mace on the 22nd of February 1971, to point out that Mr. Lyerly has no role under the regulations for injecting himself into the procedures. Yet he seems to have done that at that point and again and again. And I might add he still seems to be interfering.

I cannot advise Mr. Mace and Mr. Macomber from whom they should take legal advice, but I can remind this hearing committee of what I wrote to Mr. Mace in that letter, and I quote—"Moreover, Mr. Lyerly is a party to certain highly important aspects of my grievance. His participation in any way in decisions adverse to me or contrary to my expressed requests under regulations is improper because of his conflict of interest in this matter. Mr. Lyerly will be called by me as a witness during the proceedings. It is possible that he would prefer that the proceedings never take place. Based on aspects of my grievance which he knows first-hand and of information about which he has personal knowledge, his appearance will be important to several major aspects of my case. I mentioned this to you now"—this is written to Mr. Mace—"because it seems evident that

Mr. Lyerly may have neglected fully to inform you." End of quote.

Now, this committee will recall the context of that letter. We had not yet had a single hearing session at that time, after one and a-half years of delay. When we did, my designee, General Hagan, was contested. He wasn't immediately allowed to take his place in the hearing committee. And the Chairman was under threat of imminent dismissal in a reprisal action by this same Mr. Mace, acting within the knowledge of Mr. Macomber's office, with legal advice again provided by Mr. Lyerly. And these are the people, Mr. Chairman, who, according to the most recent *Newsletter*, are in charge of reform.

I think in this context I won't hold you much longer with this narration of details, but I think it is important to raise one more matter at this time concerning Mr. Lyerly. I think it is important because Mr. Mace seemingly relies so heavily on his guidance. I am reliably informed that on July 13, 1971 Mr. J. Edward Lyerly told Foreign Service Officer John J. Harter the following: I quote from a memorandum of conversation dated July 13, 1971, written by Mr. Harter. Quote—"Mr. Lyerly said it is now generally recognized that there is a need for some form of grievance procedure in the Foreign Service. He expected that such procedures will be developed and approved during the months ahead. However, he would be strongly opposed to the development of grievance procedures that would apply to such circumstances as those which I described regarding my own case"—that's the Harter case—"He believed there had recently been much loose talk of 'due process' in the Foreign Service, appearing to imply concepts which he considered incompatible with the essential precepts of the Foreign Service."

Let me repeat that one phrase. "He—Mr. Lyerly—"believed there had recently been much loose talk of 'due process' in the Foreign Service."

Let me quote one more phrase from a lower paragraph on page 3 of that memorandum written by Mr. Harter. Quote—"He also thought I should not seek to have my name associated with that of Charles Thomas, who clearly was a mediocre Officer unable to meet Foreign Service competition. He frankly urged me to cease and desist forthwith from my continued pressure for a hearing." End of quote.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is this lesson to be learned from all these closely related events I have been reciting today, which you have been so patient to hear. Does Mr. Mace share the attitudes of Mr. Lyerly concerning due process? We don't know. He isn't here. We can't ask him the questions. We are talking to an empty chair. That is just one of the questions we would like to have him answer. How closely does he associate himself with the concept that there is too much loose talk of "due process" in the Foreign Service? I submit this does have a bearing on the fact that, contrary to regulations, this committee has not been provided with the guidance Mr. Mace, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel is required, has a duty, an obligation, to provide you with. At any rate, there is an empty chair. We can't get any answers from it; we can only pose questions. We will pose more questions as time goes on, in their proper order.

I do note one thing. Mr. Mace promised me a full and fair hearing on October 3, 1969, when he designated Mr. Burris as a member of the committee. That you will find in document B of the file. However, with the sophisticated advice of Mr. Lyerly, the record ever since has been one of delays and interference. Is Hemenway in the mind of Mr. Mace and others in the hierarchy just like Charles Thomas, a—quote—"mediocre officer unable to meet Foreign Service competition"?

I wish Mr. Mace would come here, sit in that empty chair, and see what competition is like in the Foreign Service. What is the caliber of the man who gets designated as an Amabassador who refuses to come to hearings to address junior Officers, Officers who can't meet the competition? I will tell you something about that competition. If the actions of the PER seen at this hearing are representative of the results of—quote—"competition"—unquote, it does indeed tell you something about the need for reform in the Foreign Service. Since nearly two years ago, the individuals who were alerted to their positive duty in providing our guidance for this hearing have ever since been in the midst of literally hundreds of so-called reforms. And a recent newsletter establishes that they have yet to address the specific needs of grievance hearing procedures. That tells you something about the speed and efficiency of the thrust of these intended reforms. It also tells you a great deal about the reformers.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Mr. Hemenway, do you have many more?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, that is all I have on that point. Thank you for your patience.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I was going to suggest probably a five- or ten-minute recess to give Mr. Eubank a respite.

Mr. HEMENWAY. My side would welcome that in any event.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. We will recess for ten minutes. [Recess]

Mr. TOUSSAINT. The hearing will resume, after a ten-minute recess. Mr. Hemenway.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, you will recall when we were in your room examining documents the other day something came to our attention which we had not seen. And, surprisingly enough, just like the report of the Special Panel, the report of Ambassadors Parsons and Penfield, we have been provided with large portions of this document and other portions are denied us so far. It might be an oversight, but, at the risk of showing some impatience, this kind of oversight seems to be prevalent in our contact with the archivists of the State Department in this hearing.

Specifically, I refer to a document, memorandum from Howard P. Mace to the Secretary of State. It has an SS number on it of 12880. It is labeled "confidential." But under that label "confidential" there is the notation: Unclassified without attachments. I have here a copy you provided me that hasn't got the attachments; therefore, it is an unclassified document. We have this document. We also have—or I have from earlier sources, and I know you have in your files; I have never bothered you for them—a letter to Mr. Shipley. You may have even given that to me. It is in the record, is it? And a letter from Mr. Shipley. That is Tab A and Tab B, respectively, of SS document no. 12880.

What we do not have is Tab C, copy of suggested reply Harlow to Senator Thurmond. This memo is undated, but it was drafted August 19, 1969. Now, in our conversation in your room you will recall that we raised the question of obtaining Tab C. It occurred to me then, and no doubt to you, Mr. Chairman, that Tab C has to be directly pertinent to all of the documents we requested concerning the Thurmond correspondence.

You will recall two sessions ago in this hearing I provided the Committee with my half of this correspondence. This was in response to Mr. Burris' question on denial of employment. And I asked you to inquire into obtaining for us the other half of that correspondence, which I presumed at that time emanated from the State Department. Well, from this we know now that it must have emanated from the State Department, and here is a cross reference to it in SS document 12880.

I would respectfully request that we be provided with this tab. It seems to me that, since I have a copy, and I have already provided the hearing committee with the copy of the final reply, which is unclassified, that the draft reply, the suggested reply, must also be unclassified. And since the other two tabs are, I know, unclassified, we have the curious anomaly of all three tabs being unclassified, and yet the covering memo is confidential unless the attachments, which are unclassified, are detached.

So you have again this wonderful alchemy of bureaucracy. In my left hand I could hold a memo which is unclassified, and in my right hand three attachments, all unclassified. If however, I touched them together, according to this, they become confidential. I can't understand that. Maybe the mystery will solve itself when we receive a copy of Tab C, which says here, "Copy of suggested reply, Harlow to Senator Thurmond." In fact, you will recall it was not Mr. Harlow who signed it, it was Mr. Cowen, I think.

Mr. JOYCE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the newspapers have carried a report that the Department has set up a separate council to attack this problem peculiar to the State Department and to execute the policy after the present positions have been made. And here they have set up this smaller council which was intended to consider specific requests for declassification and publication of documents previously unavailable to the public, and I was wondering whether the committee might have made some motions in connection with this new procedure that has been outlined by the Department to have these documents declassified that we have asked for that have been classified.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. It is my understanding, Mr. Joyce, that this committee, special group, is still searching for the proper basis and proper regulations to implement whatever the decision is, that they have not yet reached that stage—the special council.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Perhaps you could alert them, Mr. Chairman, that since our classification problem has had a chronology of two years behind it, and it is a small task, we could be considered first when they do resolve this. We, after all, have played within the rules, and the larger problem they are seized with, as I understand it, is the Ellsberg papers. I find it strange that the Department of State would give Ellsberg's actions priority over the actions of this committee which was established two years ago. Surely that couldn't be the White House wish, even if we are assured it might be by the officials in the State Department.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I don't believe that the State Department committee's mandate stems totally from the Ellsberg case. I think the Ellsberg case sort of blew up in their faces and they had a raft of papers in the files of the Department of State which might be subject to declassification, and in anticipation of requests for political type documents this group was created.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I see. We might then, at our request, if you would be good enough to address such a communication to them, enjoy some kind of priority because we have an active need for the declassification.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. I will be glad to do it.

Mr. JOYCE. Just one further point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, along the lines that Mr. Hemenway had commented, that it would seem to suggest to one's mind that the procedures we are following here that we have an empty chair such as we have seen in political campaigns where the opponent refuses to debate, not only refuses to debate but won't even answer questions.

I am further concerned by the statement by Mr. Lyerly related by you in the last hearing, that Mr. Lyerly would defy court

orders or requests of Congress for documents, and particularly this Parsons-Penfield report. And I would just like the record to note that Mr. Lyerly may have his chance. It is very easy to say this behind his plush mahogany desk; it is a different thing for a lawyer to stand up in front of an open court room, United States District Court of the District of Columbia, and to say that to a district judge. He may have that opportunity in this case.

And the last request I have to make is that when the hearings resume I would like to have present here as our first witness Mr. Penfield, and I request that he bring with him all documents, memoranda, papers that he utilized in his part in preparing the document we refer to as the Parsons-Penfield report. I would appreciate your advising me when he may be available so we can set a date for the next hearing.

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Very well. Is there anything else? It is, therefore, not possible to set a definite date obviously for the next hearing.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Chairman, just a point of information. On the preliminary list of witnesses that I handed in to the committee on March 3rd I had done some research on where these people were, and my last lead on retired Ambassador Penfield was that he was in the State of Washington.

Mr. JOYCE. I think that is closer than Finland. [Note: reference is to Amb. Parsons, coauthor of the Parsons/Penfield report on Hemenway's "Notes to the Secretary" who was in Helsinki, with the SALT talks, at the time of this Hearing session.]

Mr. TOUSSAINT. Considerably. Very well, the committee will adjourn subject to call when we have the opportunity and wherewithall to set a definite date. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Thank you gentlemen.

[The hearing adjourned at 11:00 A.M.]

LET US TEACH OUR CHILDREN TO PRAY

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I greatly enjoyed hearing an address of the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii this morning at breakfast and I am, therefore, sharing it with others by including it here:

LET US TEACH OUR CHILDREN TO PRAY

(An address of the Honorable SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, before the Congressional Prayer Group, Thursday, September 30, 1971)

Thank you, President Floyd Hicks, for the generous introduction.

My friends, I am glad to start this day right, not only by joining you in prayer this morning, but also in being introduced by your president who can pronounce my name correctly.

For some strange reason, easy to pronounce as my name is, most non-Orientals have difficulty with it. For example, in my freshman term, when I asked Doc Morgan, Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee to yield me time so I could speak in support of his foreign aid bill, he consented, but before yielding he asked me, "Sparky, how do you pronounce your last name?" I said, "Matsunaga." He repeated, "Matsunaga," and asked me to repeat it once more. I said, "Matsunaga." He repeated "Matsunaga," and said, "Okay, fine." But when the time to yield arrived, he stood up and said, "I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii, Mr. Matsu, Matsu—Sparky."

And when I appeared to testify before a subcommittee chaired by the late Fats Everett—some of you no doubt remember him—he started out by saying, "And now we shall hear from the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii, Mr. Spark Matsonga." I immediately corrected him by saying, "Matsunaga." "Oh yes, I'm sorry," he said, "Mr. Matsugana." I repeated very slowly, "Matsunaga." Trying real hard this time, he said, "Matsugun—Damn it, Sparky, I'll never learn to pronounce your name right." "I don't blame you, Mr. Chairman,' I said, "for it's a little more difficult than 'Fats'."

Then there was the time when President Kennedy arrived in Hawaii in June of 1963 to deliver his first major civil rights address before the National Conference of Mayors. There were more than 10,000 people at the airport to greet him. And as he addressed the crowd from a temporary platform which was built for this special occasion, he started out by recognizing those on the platform with him: "Governor Burns, Senator Fong, Senator Inouye, Congressman Gill;" then he looked at me standing to his extreme right and said, "and my good friend Sparky."

This went over so big with my constituents that I just didn't have the heart to tell them that the great President could not pronounce my last name.

My name is not the only thing that has caused me problems. There must be something about my face which confuses people, for when I visited Alaska I was mistaken for an Eskimo, when I visited Okinawa I was taken for an Okinawan, when I was in Tokyo they mistook me for a Japanese, in Taipei as a Taiwanese, in Hong Kong as a Chinese, and in Korea as a Korean.

I must tell you of the experience I encountered in Pakistan. It happened in December of 1965 when Pakistan and India were engaged in a shooting war. I was a member of a Congressional study group headed by Clem Zablocki. There were nine of us Congressmen, eight of whom were white.

The Pakistani officials were leading us to a refugee camp which they claimed was made necessary because the Indians had driven the young children and the aged from Ahzard Kashmere.

As we approached the Camp on foot, I suddenly realized I had forgotten my camera in the car and returned to get it. In the meantime, my colleagues were greeted by student demonstrators, numbering well over a thousand, who had lined themselves alongside the narrow dirt roadway leading to the Camp. They were holding picket signs, reading, "Go home, Yankee," "Stop genocide in Vietnam," "Stop genocide in Kashmere," and "Up with China—Down with U.S." You will recall that this was at a time when the Pakistani were charging that the United States was aiding India while Red China was assisting Pakistan.

As my colleagues, preceding me by 50 or 60 yards walked between the two rows of demonstrators, they started yelling in unison, "Go Home, Yankee! Go Home, Yankee," and made ugly hand signs and let out jeers and boohs.

When I appeared on the scene, one of the student leaders spotted me and mistook me for a Chinese Communist. "Ah, Chinese!" he said, and the word went down, "Chinese, Chinese." As I walked between the two rows of demonstrators, they cheered and they applauded me. I was not about to let this great show of friendship for an American go to waste, so I waved at them as I walked past them, with a great big smile on my face. Then when I got to the end of the line, out of sheer curiosity I raised my hand high over my head, just to see what would happen.

They cheered, and then as I raised both hands there was a sudden quiet. Here was my chance to propagandize for good old U.S.A., I thought, and started out, "I am not a Chinese, I am not a Chinese Communist. I am an American—I am of Asian ancestry, just like you. But although I am of Asian ancestry, just like you, I serve in the highest legislative body in the United States—the Congress of the United States on equal terms with those white Americans whom you just jeered and boohed, and I repeat, despite the fact that I am of Asian ancestry just like you," I said pointing at them.

The response was something unbelievable. They merely raised their index finger at me and said, "Uh-huh, huh huh!" They wouldn't believe me. They just refused to believe that one of Asian ancestry could be serving as a United States Congressman. So I turned to the nearest student leader and said, "Don't you believe me? I spoke the truth!" He laughingly looked at me and replied, "Oh, No, no! You're just making fun of the Americans!"

They absolutely refused to believe me.

I relate this actual experience of mine to illustrate the point that people believe only what they want to believe, or what they are taught to believe.

When I was asked to head the discussion this morning, I was a bit hesitant because I felt I could not speak of God and prayer without revealing my innermost feelings and personal experiences. Religion, I believe we can all agree, is a very personal matter. Each of us makes his own choice on the basis of what he believes is the best approach to fostering his relationship with God. But what we need to remember, particularly if we have children of our own, is that much of what we believe, we believe because we were taught to believe.

It has been my long conviction that if I succeeded in teaching my own children to believe in God and to seek Him in prayer regularly, I would have succeeded as a father to them.

The *choice* of religion is not the all-important thing. I consider myself a Christian, a lowly Episcopalian. But my father was a preacher of the Nichiren sect of Buddhism.

It was he, however, who sent me to live with a Christian minister for four years during my student years, with the advice, "America is a Christian nation. You're an American—You should be a Christian."

His philosophy on religion was put into verse which I translated:

"When I think of the foolish fight
That men o'er religious differences make,
I can see mortals in blind plight
Headed towards one goal whatever path they take
As waters seek the easiest routes
And ferret rivers to one great sea,
So do men make different rites
And found religions to one great Deity."

Regardless of what one's choice of religion may be, whether it be one of the established and recognized religions or not, he maintains his own personal relationship with God through prayer. Prayer, therefore, is the very means by which we keep alive our faith in God.

Yet, how difficult it is for so many of us who profess to be Christians to offer even a simple prayer. I have known many a church goer respond with awkward embarrassment when unexpectedly called upon to lead a group in prayer.

Even at the battlefront, where I learned there are no atheists in the foxhole, men close to death found themselves fumbling for a way to communicate with the Almighty.

It is as important to teach a child to pray, therefore, as it is to teach him that there is a God.

"Ogamu koto wa, osanai toki ni oshie"—so goes an old Japanese adage which I was

taught as a child. It means "Teach one to pray when he is but an infant."

If, after my decease, I am to be remembered at all I would like to be remembered as a man who taught his children to pray. To me, the greatest thing which my own father taught me was to bow in reverence before God every night to offer a prayer, for in this nightly ritual I have found the greatest source of comfort and a constant reaffirmation of my own convictions. Through this means of communication with my Creator I have found a real purpose in life.

Several years ago, when Dr. Dana Farnsworth of Harvard University researched into the question of why so many of the youngsters of America were turning to crime and delinquency, he concluded that the principal reason was that they lacked a purpose in life. The overwhelming majority of the young men and women in America, Dr. Farnsworth discovered, did not know what they were living for.

Fortunate indeed is the man who early in his life has asked himself, "What am I living for? What is my purpose in life?" And discovered it. Rich is a Nation whose people have learned their purpose in life.

I may sound more like a preacher than a lawmaker when I say this, but what greater purpose in life can we have than to work for the betterment of one's fellowman.

We can help our children to find this purpose in life and keep them from turning to delinquncy and criminality, if we but teach them to pray—to communicate with Him from whom cometh all wisdom and good.

Thank you very much.

THE FACTS ABOUT THE PRISON RIOTS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker. I think it is about time we recognized that most inmates of prisons are there because they committed crimes against society; that they are not romantic Robin Hoods and Friar Tucks or that misplaced justice put them where they should not be.

The facts behind prison riots and the ethics and ethos of those who lead and participate in them are effectively portrayed, in my judgment, in two recent newspaper columns, Mr. William F. Buckley's column, titled, "The Real Line on George Jackson," that appeared in the Washington Star of September 22 paints a somewhat different picture than some that have been portrayed of this young man. The handkerchief sobbers who have been told that Jackson was in jail for life for a $70 robbery may want to put away their handkerchiefs.

The second column by Kevin Phillips appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, titled, "On Romanticizing the Criminals." While I am not an unstinted follower of Mr. Phillips' line of political logic, I am impressed with his even-handed attempt to make clear that all the prisoners are not noble and all the guards are not evil and most importantly, that we face a serious problem that is not solved by the laments of the hand-wringers for convicted criminals.

I insert the text of the two columns in the RECORD:

ON ROMANTICIZING THE CRIMINALS

(By Kevin P. Phillips)

The bloodstained prison town of Attica lies in upstate New York's "Classical Belt" of towns and cities named for Greek and Roman heroes, places, and battles. Nowhere else in the United States can you easily travel from Troy to Rome, Utica, Pompey, Apulia, Syracuse, Cicero, Marcellus, Lyander, Cato, Scipio, Ithaca, and Ovid. Ironically, Attica itself is named for the peninsula on which Athens is located—the sunny Aegean locale of Greek culture at its fullest bloom.

Hardly coincidental, these names reflect the influence of the "Classical" and "Romantic" era upon the culture of the early decades of the 19th Century. One prominent New Yorker closely identified with this romanticism was author James Fenimore Cooper. He loathed the American business ethic and wrote scathingly of contemporary teamsters, tavernkeepers and peddlers. In contrast, he praised the "noble savage"—the heroic Redman (remember Uncas and Chingachgook of "The Last of the Mohicans"?) whose native virtues transcended the commercial cheapness of the frontier.

Much of the same overblown romanticism is being practiced today—i.e., Tom Wickerish laments for the noble prisoners persecuted by Attica in particular and American society in general. Pity the poor muggers, bombers and arsonists; shed nary a tear for guards and law officers whose deaths just take another beer-guzzling Agnew voter from the bosom of his unstylish family.

Kindred attitudes doubtless played a role in triggering the Attica episode. After all, when enough guilty upper-middle class whites romanticize mugging, rape and assault into the almost excusable "political" response of the downtrodden, then minority group prisoners will also grab onto this exculpatory psychology. People always look for an excuse not to blame themselves. Spurning the individual realizations of guilt and regret that must generally precede rehabilitation, the prisoners turn to group militance—the sort of clearly in evidence at Attica and elsewhere in U.S. prison systems.

Contemporary jurisprudence is aiding and abetting these psychologies. Court decisions aimed at reshaping U.S. education and housing patterns on behalf of minority groups must find a basis for action in past official discrimination, however remotely related to the problem in question (usually residential concentration). And if the media and the courts link discrimination-cum-persecution to virtually every circumstance of minority group life, then why shouldn't prisoners excuse themselves in the same way—as victims of society rather than perpetrators of offenses against it?

Obviously, U.S. society has laid the groundwork with injustices too obvious to dispute. But unfortunately, affluent liberal guilt and romanticism have inflated these injustices into a dangerous mystique—hostile to middle-class values while servile toward the violent poor—that can only increase national tension. So long as current romanticism is unchecked, flattering the "political" pretense of slashers and thugs, there are bound to be more Atticas and more urban guerrillas.

Who knows what the answer is? At this point in time, it obviously does not lie in mere "law and order" rhetoric unencumbered by reform and sociological awareness. President Nixon and his Justice Department are sometimes too prone to minimize the sociological roots of crime. "Sociology" goes beyond the leftist blatherings of the Ramsey Clarks. It is not something to be dismissed out of hand; otherwise there may be nothing between our society and civil war but the further passage of time.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 22, 1971]

THE REAL LINE ON GEORGE JACKSON

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The line is that George Jackson, who was killed a month ago at San Quentin after he had killed, or caused to be killed, five guards, was a victim of America—or of Amerika, as he used to put it. A typical formulation is Tom Wicker's to wit, "George Jackson, sentenced at 19 for one year to life for confessing to a $70 robbery. . . ." That does sound excessive, does it not?

The Los Angeles Times has done a superb job of digging, and we have now a systematic account of what went on before the sentencing, and after it.

On Jan. 5, 1957, 15-year-old George Jackson was 6 feet tall and weighed nearly 200 pounds. He was arrested for stealing a motorcycle. The judge released him to the custody of his parents.

On Jan. 22, the police picked him up again, this time for stealing motor bicycle equipment. Young George's behavior on this occasion was unusual. When the juvenile officer began to search him, Jackson flailed out with his fists, throwing the officer off balance, and bruising a woman officer who tried to intervene.

Disposing of her, Jackson took the officer and bent him over a desk, "slowly forcing him toward a long, steel filing spike sitting atop a blotter. "This guy would have put that spike through my back," the official recalls. Other guards arrived in time. The incident, by the way, was the cause of local reform. Thenceforward, all spikes were bent L-shape. Jackson was briefly detained, then released on probation.

On March 5, 1957, Jackson broke a skylight, but retreated on hearing a burglar alarm which brought the police out in force. He ignored an order to surrender, and a policeman fired four shots, one of which caused a superficial wound. Jackson was sent to a reform school for boys, from which he was paroled a year and a half later, on Dec. 20, 1958.

The succeeding May, he was picked up for following a woman late at night under extraordinary circumstances. The police found a screwdriver concealed in his belt; but he was let go.

On Aug. 20 he became angry with his employer and slashed the seats of a bus, and answered the ensuing complaint by threatening him with a knife. He was arrested. He lied about his age, was treated as an adult and sentenced to 10 days in jail.

On Sept. 24, he and two other youths held up a service station. He was caught and sent to the Youth Authority, but escaped Oct. 21 and made his way to Illinois.

There, in November, he got into trouble, was picked up by the police and sent back to California to the Youth Authority. But, on Dec. 30, he escaped yet again—from a hospital to which he had been taken for treatment of minor injuries during a fight.

He was recaptured the next morning and served under the Youth Authority from February 1959 to June 1960, when he was paroled.

On Sept. 19, 1960, back with a friend from a trip to Tijuana, he stuck up a service station and took the fabled $70. He pleaded guilty and, this being the third conviction, he was given the fabled one-year to life sentence.

He was denied parole 10 times between February 1962 and June 1970, having collected 47 entries in his disciplinary file. "Not a record number," writes the Times, "but not too far behind."

There were the minor infractions of the rules, but the curve was toward violence and explicit insubordination. On April 4, 1965, he stabbed a prisoner. Another prisoner claimed on Sept. 17, 1966, that Jackson had tried to stab him during a fight. On Jan. 17,

1967, he came out of a cellblock gang fight carrying a length of pipe. On June 8, 1967, he refused to obey an order, then assaulted the guard who gave it. On Oct. 17, 1969, guards caught him in possession of a simulated gun, made from a coat hanger and masking tape.

On Jan. 16, 1970, he and two other prisoners beat a guard to death: Or so it was alleged. (There is no doubt that the guard was beaten to death.) On being led back to his cellblock, he smashed a guard in the rib cage, shouting, "I'm going to kill you."

And then, of course, the next gun he was caught with, on Aug. 23, of this year, was a real gun, not a false one. That gun allegedly was given to him by a young man I used to know, the kind of man who takes seriously the allocations of blame according to Tom Wicker.

CONGRESSMEN CHARLES B. RANGEL AND FRANK J. BRASCO DISCUSS ATTICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, September 26, my friend and colleague from Brooklyn, N.Y., Representative FRANK BRASCO, and I appeared on WNBC–TV's "Newslight" program to discuss the situation at Attica with members of the working press.

Congressman BRASCO and I serve together on the Select Committee on Crime and were part of the investigating team from the committee which visited the Attica correctional facility. Last Wednesday, September 29, I returned to Attica myself in an attempt to clear up some of the many questions still unanswered.

Because of the significance of Attica in light of our history of failure to recognize and deal humanely with the problems of prisoners in our society, I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading our remarks, based on our first-hand investigation.

The remarks follow:

NEWSLIGHT

Guests: U.S. Representative Frank J. Brasco (Dem.-N.Y.), U.S. Representative Charles B. Rangel (Dem.-N.Y.).

Moderator: Ben Grauer.

Panel: Gabe Pressman, NBC News, Jay Levin, New York Post, Jack Newfield, The Village Voice.

ANNOUNCER. WNBC-TV invites you to join the working press in action here on Newslight. To introduce our guests and our panel here is the moderator of our program, Ben Grauer.

BEN GRAUER. Good morning, and welcome to Newslight. We have two guests on Newslight today, Representative Charles Rangel, Democrat, from New York's Eighteenth Congressional District in Harlem, and Representative Frank Brasco, Democrat, from New York's Eleventh Congressional District in Brooklyn. Both these gentlemen are members of the Congressional Committee investigating the insurrection at the Attica Prison which led to the death of forty people, and the death of George Jackson is also part of their investigation. Jackson, one of the so-called Soledad Brothers at San Quentin Prison in California. Here to question Congressmen Rangel and Brasco is a panel which includes Gabe Pressman of NBC News, Jack Newfield of The Village Voice and our panel is completed with Jay Levin of the New York Post. We'd like to give you a reminder that questions presented by members of our panel do not necessarily reflect their personal point of view, but are put forward to elicit information and comment from our guests.

Mr. Pressman, will you begin the questioning?

GABE PRESSMAN. Congressman Rangel, you have been investigating—that is, your Congressional Committee has been investigating the Attica and San Quentin uprising for several weeks. Do you think anything will come out of this investigation in concrete form?

Congressman CHARLES B. RANGEL. There's no question in my mind that things will come out. We have the responsibility of bringing forth suggestions that would minimize the possibility of these tragedies recurring. Some of those things are to have a minimum standard in the protection of the rights of human beings who are in prison. Others would include breaking down the prison system so that it could be closer to society and not exclude people, keeping a fellow out of a cell for some part of the day in order to rehabilitate himself. But in answer to your question as to whether or not society and state and federal legislative bodies are prepared to accept these reform measures, I believe the answer is "no". We are about to stretch out a rubber band until it pops.

PRESSMAN. You mean that whatever you come up with will not be passed by Congress, will not be passed by the legislatures, for instance, of New York and California?

RANGEL. That's correct. Instead of trying to find out the facts and circumstances that caused these things to happen, we are now witnessing one of the biggest news blackouts in history. And it's not new to our country. It happened with Kent State. It happened in Jackson. It happened in Chicago with the Black Panthers. It's happening all over this country. And instead of coming in and saying "what can we do to avoid it," what America is saying, through Governor Reagan, through Governor Rockefeller and through President Nixon is "that we must have more law and order, even if we have to break the law to achieve it."

GRAUER. Before you get into details, Congressman, I presume, Mr. Pressman, you'd like to have——

PRESSMAN. You concur, Representative Brasco?

Congressman FRANK J. BRASCO. No, I do not, Gabe. I think that previously society's attitude with respect to those who commit criminal acts was that you apprehend them, you convict them, you put them in jail and that's the end of our problem. But I think the tragedy at Attica and San Quentin has told us very clearly that that is not the end of our problem, but only the beginning. I think that psychologically we are approaching the area where reform to society will be acceptable. I want to just add that one week prior to the Attica rioting, Commissioner Oswald who has been in office only eight months, and put in office because he was considered to be a liberal reformer, had been at Attica after he had just received some four million dollars in a grant from the federal government, and was talking about a whole host of reforms with the prison inmates and some of them had already been instituted. The one that was instituted was that at that time inmates could send out sealed letters to their legislators, both in the congress, the state, and the city, and received sealed returns. They were talking about work release programs, and as a matter of fact, not too many people know this, at Attica, during the time of the rioting, there were still six inmates who were involved in work release programs going to and from the localities of Batavia, I believe, and Attica itself working; during the day and coming back to the prison at night.

PRESSMAN. Well, very briefly, you disagree with Congressman Rangel.

BRASCO. Yes.

PRESSMAN. You think something good will come of it.

BRASCO. Yes, I think in the nature of reform, it will.

GRAUER. Mr. Newfield.

JACK NEWFIELD. I'd like to address my question to both Congressmen. Assemblyman Eve of Buffalo, and Assemblyman Beatty of Bedford Stuyvesant have both suggested that a grand jury be convened to consider an indictment for murder of Governor Rockefeller. Do you think that's crazy rhetoric, or do you think if your investigation leads in that direction, that the governor might be indicted?

BRASCO. The governor wasn't there. That's the unfortunate fact. I believe sincerely that . . .

NEWFIELD. Angela Davis wasn't there either.

BRASCO. We should have a grand jury investigation; I think it should be a federal grand jury panel immediately, to determine what violations of the criminal law occurred on either side of the cellblock in the institution. I don't think that, that identifying a potential defendant prior to the time that this constitution has had an opportunity to work, because we're living now in a society that there's very little to believe that this constitution works for all people. I think it's not just the question of prison reform. You know, it's no mistake that eighty five per cent of those inmates are black and Puerto Rican. And I don't think this is genetic. And I think we have to look further and see what happened in Chicago. We have now placed such little value on the life, not only of prisoners, but also of white low-income people who are relegated at positions of being guard, and this is something for America to look at. And I'd just like to say this, that because it's been so difficult for you in the news media to get news there, I think that you grab any and everything you could get without looking for a very large segment of this jig-saw puzzle and no one has demanded his appearance. And I suggest that he is being kept incommunicado, because.

NEWFIELD. Who are you referring to?

BRASCO. Once he is interviewed, you may find out what ninety per cent of the problems are in Attica, New York. And I refer to Warden Vincent Mancusi. This is a man that nobody had asked for. How can you possibly have an investigation without asking to talk with the warden of the institution, who was brought to Attica six years ago in order to maintain law and order at Attica, and he's kept the hot—the pot really boiling right there. I'd like to say that when the Congressional Committee on Crime met with him, when we visited Attica, and the response to one of my questions as to what caused it; it is the belief of the warden that as a result of him instituting the liberal reform policy of allowing inmates to send out uncensored mail to "politicians and lawyers," that this allowed an outside conspiracy to be grown in connection with aiding and abetting the colored communists Maoists. Now this is the man that's the warden.

GRAUER. This is a quote that you're giving us, sir?

BRASCO. No question about it. This is his belief as to why we had this tragedy. . . .

NEWFIELD. Colored communists what, I didn't hear.

BRASCO. Maoists.

(Crosstalk.)

BRASCO. So, what I'm saying is, that if we can have someone like this. . . .

NEWFIELD. Does the warden come from the civil service list, or was he appointed by the governor or the commissioner?

BRASCO. I don't know how he got there, but . . .

(Crosstalk.)

BRASCO. He made this perfectly clear; that he came up through the ranks; he just received his bachelors degree and that he knows prison reform inside and out. And that's the extent of it. And you have to recognize that there was no movement made on any of the twenty eight legitimate demands of those inmates; among those included a baseball field; the opportunity to wash one's behind more than once a week and the opportunity to have clean food, if not decent food.

GRAUER. Mr. Newfield asked for Congressman Brasco's opinion also on the possible grand jury. . . .

BRASCO. Well, with respect to your question, Mr. Newfield, an indictment of the governor, I think that's more rhetoric than anything else. I . . .

NEWFIELD. Why?

BRASCO. I think it's probably an effort to lock the issues if they're not already locked, to a deeper extent. I think that from my own personal observation of what had occurred, you might disagree with the governor's judgment or Commissioner Oswald's judgment, but when you talk about criminal prosecution, you talk about a question of intent and as far as I'm concerned, from my own limited observation, I don't perceive any intent to commit any wrongdoing. I think there was a serious concern about what was going on in the prison. I might say this, if I may. I think that what the commisioner had to work with at the time, and I personally believe that in consultation with the governor, that the commissioner made the decision, he had fact; he had rumor, and obviously fear.

GRAUER. Decision what, to attack?

BRASCO. To assault or storm the prison. There was at least one guard killed at that point. There were inmates who were coming out injured, one we were told had been practically sodomized to death by other inmates; another one had gasoline poured down his throat; and these inmates who came out all told, some thirty of them, were giving stories about other inmates being killed. And the proof was in the pudding. They found four inmates killed. As a matter of fact, when we went around and spoke to inmates, they told us that they were afraid themselves; that many of them didn't want to be in the yard, and I believe them because some of them were to be paroled within a matter of weeks; some of them were to be unconditionally released, one on a Friday and we spoke to ten or twelve of them. So there was a combination of circumstances that led to a judgment, and the question of malice aforethought in connection with that judgment. I don't think is realistic. You may disagree with the judgment, but in criminal intent I don't think that there's any there.

GRAUER. Now Mr. Levin.

JAY LEVIN. Well, you spoke to more than prisoners; you spoke to officials and you were among the first to pierce the news blackout. Did you get the sense that the decision at that moment was absolutely unnecessary; that the governor should have honored the negotiating committee's weeping appeal to come there; to hold off on any kind of use of force; that they felt something could be resolved if he came there and talked to them, not to the prisoners?

GRAUER. You're asking Congressman Bra . . .

NEWFIELD. I'll ask Congressman Rangel first, and then Congressman Brasco.

RANGEL. From those that were there, and you'd have to recognize Governor Rockefeller was not there and neither was I. It seems to me that the negotiating committee and everyone else thought that his presence might have brought about a different ending. Of course, we never know and therefore, the indictment won't come from me there. But I have spent most of my time at Attica—and I'm going back on Wednesday—trying to find out what facts were available to those who made the decision that might indicate that this attack, and especially the attack orders as given, would minimize the loss of life. I can't see how those instructions being carried out as we found them to be could lead to the conclusion that less life could have been lost than if they went in with their immobilizing gas, or if they went in without arms as we know has happened in the Tombs.

GRAUER. Congressman Brasco.

BRASCO. Well, in connection with that question Jay, from our investigation it was clear that in the closing hours, just prior to the storming of the prison, conditions had deteriorated inside the yard. We had been shown a video tape that was taken, at which time, and the last time that Commissioner Oswald went in himself, and we had gone in on three occasions, the prisoners asked for him, and I might add that after the rioting when we spoke to the prisoners they all thought very well of him. And I think Mr. Rangel can verify that; the point is that the commissioner could not get out the last time; there was someone on the microphone yelling, "Let's hold him as hostage", and indeed he was held I understand, close to two hours. Some of the people on the negotiating committee, who we spoke to found it very difficult in terms of personal fears, returning to the cellblock "D" area themselves. So that in that deteriorating confused situation, in which the last demands were for amnesty, and there seems to be a question as to whether or not one of the negotiators allowed the prisoners to believe that there were members of "Third World" organizations outside ready to take them to foreign countries, "non imperialistic countries"—these were the last two demands which the governor said he could not grant. The twenty eight demands which had been forgotten about, they were agreed too, and I think rather forward looking, were already agreed to in writing by the commissioner. And at that point I don't know what the governor could have done, if anything.

(Crosstalk.)

BRASCO. There is a fact though, that some of the members of the negotiating committee felt that he at least should have shown his face. Whether or not that would have changed things I honestly don't know.

RANGEL. But that's just not so as far as the demand to go to a "Third World" country. That was dropped by the inmates and the two demands were the firing of the unseen and locked up Warden Mancus; and the amnesty question. But since you touched on the video tape, which I understand that the press has not had the opportunity to review, it would also indicate, as we viewed it, that on the eve of the orders of attack the inmates were still building their negotiating position to protect the mediators. They had every reason to believe they would return and talk to them. In addition to that, we were very anxious to see those tapes to find out what happened during the attack. And while the administration was very cooperative, the entire film is blurred after the orders were given to attack. We saw the tear gas and after that we saw nothing.

GRAUER. Mr. Pressman.

PRESSMAN. You said earlier that you didn't think anything would come of any of these investigations, or at least the congressional investigations. . . .

GRAUER. Congressman Rangel.

RANGEL. I believe that legislation will come out of this. It will come to the floor, but I think what the President has done was an attempt to formulate public opinion against it.

PRESSMAN. Do you think public opinion is against prison reform?

RANGEL. Think about the order of priorities, those people who are concerned with medical attention, those people who are concerned with the heavy tax burden that we have. What we normally do, and I say society normally does, is to find out where can we cut the fat away from the budget. And, normally, who's selected? The least powerful people in this society. And I think you would have to agree that in this society, cutting funds for the powerless inmates is the first money knocked off. So I don't see this nation coming forward now, saying "Why can't we avoid . . ."

PRESSMAN. Do you think this nation is on the side of the guards or on the side of the prisoners?

RANGEL. It's tragic, and I sincerely hope that I'm wrong. But in leaving Attica and finding the people in that town even refusing to believe their doctor's reports, that the inmates and the hostages died by gunfire, I believe that this country is on the side of the guards, even if in fact the grand jury did prove that there were violations of the law on both sides of the cellblock.

PRESSMAN. Do you think Congressman Rangel, that there is going to be greater repression of prisoners now than there was before?

RANGEL. Well, there's no question in my mind. I don't think Congressman Brasco disagrees that we saw evidence of greater repression in Attica, where so-called. . . .

PRESSMAN. As permanent by-product of what's happened, or as a. . . .

(Crosstalk.)

RANGEL. There's talk right now from the governor's office right on down, that prisoners now will be labeled as to whether or not they're rebellious, they're revolutionists, or they're moderate, and they will be systematically segregated or removed from the general prison population.

GRAUER. Congressman Brasco.

BRASCO. I wanted to add to that. I don't think that the general public is against prison reform. I think really what happens Gabe, is that as we talk in terms of trying to assess blame, we sort of have sort of the kids game of choosing up sides, are you on the sides of the prisoners or the guards? But obviously both sides were hurt. This is a kind of problem that affected all people. And one thing that was very glaring to me, is that I don't care what kind of a prison you construct, you cannot—you cannot prevent inmates from taking hostages. So with that in mind, and with the fact in mind that some of these prisoners that we spoke to had very fine minds; minds that were capable of being saved and should be saved. I think that if we put this thing in its proper perspective, and learn the lesson, mainly that . . .

(Crosstalk.)

PRESSMAN. . . . of human beings and of voters to think that now the public will chose up sides, and that they will be on one side or the other?

BRASCO. I think that if we continue in some of the empty kinds of rhetoric, you know, that have been tossed around, in charges and countercharges that we're going to cause further polarization. I think that society on its own is ready to make the determination that we must go forward. And again I must point out that just prior to this, Commissioner Oswald received four million dollars with another million dollars in abeyance from the federal government, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act, specifically to improve prison conditions. I think we're on the way to doing this. And obviously the sooner the better. But I think that society is ready to accept it.

GRAUER. Mr. Levin.

LEVIN. The governor said the other night that he just can't deal with these radical revolutionaries, indicating that in the future we might have the same decisions from him on a similar situation. I wonder if you feel that it was a matter of radical revolutionaries, or do you think that these people could

have been negotiated with? And in light of your being there also, what do you think retaliation was taken by the guards or by the state troopers afterwards? Those beatings and wanton shootings against those radical revolutionaries who they seem to think had led. . . .

GRAUER. Who is your question directed to?

LEVIN. Both gentlemen.

BRASCO. All right. In connection with that, let me say this. I think that you have, and we have to face up to some very serious problems. I think it's—from what I've seen, we interviewed a young man who was, I think, twenty one years old, who had been convicted of stealing a motorcycle; going out into the street, violation of parole, and back again. And then you have people convicted of murder in the first degree. Sixty per cent of the inmates population are people who have been convicted of murder, manslaughter, felonious assault, robbery and burglary. So that there has to be, in my opinion, a separation of inmates by virtue of age, crimes committed, and of course sentences that have to be served. And I think that in that context, what happened was, is that the leaders in the uprising at Attica were the same people, or some of the same people who were involved as leaders in the uprising in the Tombs; who were involved as leaders in the uprising in the Auburn situation. Now in a correctional institution, as I was led to believe by the Commissioner of Corrections, security is determined by the individual who is most apt to cause trouble. Now when you determine security for those individuals, this young fellow here who is no security problem—the motorcycle case, is stuck with that extra and additional security which means that he and others like him spend sixty per cent of the time in the cells because of a security problem.

Obviously there has to be some separation of prisoners. Obviously we have to have smaller prisons, so that security and vocational programs and recreational programs can be completed with safety. And I think that this is a hard fact that we have to look at. And I don't see that that's particularly pointing people out and, you know, punishing them in any way. I think the facilities all ought to be equal, but you have to understand that there are different problems with different inmates. And I think in one of the demands that the prisoners pointed out themselves, that different inmates have different problems by virtue of the crimes they committed, and their backgrounds, and they wanted to see something done along those lines so they don't all get hung with the problems of any one individual.

RANGEL. Let me say this in answer to your question. Asking for a baseball diamond or the opportunity to shower more than once a week does not to be epitomize a radical revolutionary. Those twenty eight demands were conceded by Commissioner Oswald to be just a minimum standard of common decency, regardless of what crime the person had been convicted of. What frightens me is that the governor is using a lot of labels. He's talking about a conspiracy and there has been no evidence submitted to anybody that would give rise to this conclusion. And he's also talking about rebellious radicals and revolutionists. And I submit that if he walked the streets of central Harlem, south Bronx, south Jamaica, where black folks are, you'll be unable to distinguish between the black folks—the militant blacks, the revolutionary blacks, because I think that black folks now are concerned about the loss of life: white, Puerto Rican and black. And we are not going to minimize our standards of human dignity attached to the value of life. We'll have to get rid of these labels. I told the governor that once you start segregating the revolutionists who are you going to select to put a label on me?

GRAUER. Mr. Newfield.

NEWFIELD. I'd like to ask Congressman Rangel a few questions about what may be the next Attica, Dannemora Prison. Two months ago Commissioner Oswald announced that he was passing a new ruling where inmates can communicate with journalists if they wished. This week I got a letter from—which I'll pass to you—an inmate in Dannemora which the warden wrote during this prohibited—and I got this from his lawyer, this inmate says that the inmates in Dannemora are being force fed Thorazine to dope them up; that they are not given toilet paper—this week Senator Dunne was not allowed in Dannemora State Prison. I understand that the warden of Dannemora, Mr. Lavalier, has been given a hundred thousand dollar home, paid for by the state, and these inmates can't get toilet paper. And I can't get into Dannemora and Senator Dunne can't get into Dannemora.

BRASCO. Well you just stand in line, because Senator Dunne and other legislators have a statutory right to go into any state penal institution, and in addition to this, Senator Dunne has been one of the most outstanding reformers in this area. To exclude him just widens the credibility gap, as we attempt to search for the truth.

NEWFIELD. Do you intend to try to get in this week?

BRASCO. I will be there on Wednesday.

NEWFIELD. Will you see that inmate

BRASCO. But I'm saying this, that this is consistent, every time people are shot down. State governments come forth with facts which later found out are just not true. So that as they keep trying to put the lid on, I'm afraid that what we're doing is just stretching the rubber band a little too far.

GRAUER. We have three minutes. The next question, Mr. Levin.

LEVIN. I'd like to get back to something I asked before—the second part. Did you feel that there were wanton shootings by the state police and that the leaders were singled out; that anybody was singled out to be killed after the police moved in, based on your interviews in the prison?

RANGEL. I have no information that would lead me to believe that this unorganized, frustrating chaotic attack was intended to single out individuals for death. I believe it so strongly because even the lives of the hostages could not possibly have been considered during this attack. I do believe also, as a fact, that after the administration took control of Attica that certain inmates were selected and segregated for systematic beatings. We saw evidence of that when we were there last.

LEVIN. There is now a contention by some of the lawyers that at least one inmate was singled out and shot. They have his name; they released it yesterday. Did you hear anything to that effect?

RANGEL. I have been forced to receive only the wildest type of rumors because of the seal that has been placed on information by the governor.

(Crosstalk.)

NEWFIELD. How do we get . . .

GRAUER. Just a moment Mr. Newfield, Congressman Brasco, on that letter from Dannemora, do you want to comment?

BRASCO. Well, on the letter from Dannemora, I think that obviously this is—you just can't agree with this, and it's one of the reasons why all of our attention should be directed towards one objective—reform. I think one of the interesting things that's going on in Attica right now is the Goldman Commission, in which Mr. Clarence Jones, the editor of the Amsterdam News is a participant. One of the twenty eight demands was for a permanent ombudsman, in connection with the community. I think this is a worthwhile objective in all prisoners, or I should say all prisons should institute this kind of procedure so that Dannemora letter is done away with as soon as possible.

NEWFIELD. Well how do we . . .

GRAUER. Just a moment Jack. We have one moment. Mr. Pressman.

PRESSMAN. Congressman Rangel. You're a member of the black caucus in congress. Did Senator Muskie's recent statement that he didn't believe the country was ready for a black vice-presidential candidate sour the black caucus on supporting Senator Muskie?

RANGEL. I don't know whether he was ever considered the candidate by the black caucus, but I do know we were seriously studying the—the problem is whether the country is ready for a Polish Catholic for President.

GRAUER. We've gone far uphill from the area we've been discussing up to this moment and now I'm afraid our time is up. And we won't be able to continue. So we express our thanks to our two guests today, Congressman Frank Brasco and Congressman Charles Rangel.

Until next Sunday for Newslight, this is Ben Grauer bidding you goodbye.

PUBLIC HAS RIGHT TO KNOW HOW ITS MONEY IS SPENT

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to guarantee the public's right to know how its money is being spent. This measure would close a serious loophole in the present Freedom of Information Act—section 552 of title 5, United States Code—which requires public disclosure by Federal agencies, but fails to include recipients of Federal grants.

The American people provide the funds to run our Government, and they are entitled to a full accounting of how the funds are spent. Any person or agency, public or private, receiving Federal funds for a public purpose, would have to make such an accounting. The only exceptions would be in areas of national defense, foreign affairs or cases involving a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.

This bill requires that a willingness to provide full public disclosure be made a condition to receiving a Federal grant; that complete records must be kept on how the funds are spent, and that refusal to make these records public will result in the grant being withdrawn.

At present, a recipient of public funds through a grant need not open his books to public inspection. He is only held accountable through a Federal agency administering the grant, or through the General Accounting Office. This can often be a long, cumbersome procedure at a time when prompt information is required.

Democracy thrives in the clear, bright light of full public disclosure; it withers and dies in the closed, dark atmosphere of secrecy. Only a fully informed citizenry can make the meaningful judgments required if our form of government is to work.

The American taxpayer has a right to know how his tax money is being spent.

PENNSYLVANIA RECLAIMING STRIP MINED AREAS

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, rich in valuable coal resources, for years has suffered from the consequences of past strip mining practices. Pennsylvania has had more land areas scarred by this type of mining than any other State in the Union.

In recent year, significant changes have been made, both in the concern about remedying the problem on the part of the State government and in the attitudes of the mining companies themselves. Citizens have demanded that something be done and have supported tough enforcement of strict new laws by State officials.

In large part, the credit for what Pennsylvania is accomplishing must go to one man who has led the fight and refused to back down—William E. Guckert. I have known Bill Guckert for years, and he has done a tremendous job which has set an example for the entire Nation.

The most recent issue of Life magazine includes an article entitled "Taming the Strip-Mine Monster" which highlights the work that Bill Guckert and Pennsylvania have been doing. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

TAMING THE STRIP-MINE MONSTER

(By Edmund Faltermayer)

I have long loathed the very idea of strip mining. When men tear open the land to a depth of a hundred feet or more to get at a seam of coal and then abandon the site in a naked condition, the devastation can take millennia to heal. Nearby streams become murky with silt and toxic with acid. The huge, ugly spoil banks—the rocky material dumped to the side to expose the coal—support little vegetative cover and are prone to landslides. And when machines chew into the side of a mountain they leave steep "highwalls," or manmade cliffs, on the uphill side of the cut. Not long ago I saw hundreds of miles of these cliffs that have been slashed across the slopes of Appalachia, and it was a sickening sight.

Spurred by the shortage of coal for generating electricity, strip mining is expanding at a fearsome rate and now produces 40% of the nation's coal. Angry voices are calling for a halt to the practice. In West Virginia, young John D. Rockefeller IV, running for governor, demands that stripping be outlawed in his state "completely and forever." Another West Virginian, Representative Ken Hechler, has 90 cosponsors for his bill in the U.S. Congress to outlaw it nationwide. Abolition is the only solution, argues Hechler, because the various state laws requiring companies to restore strip-mined sites are weak, or have been sabotaged by lax enforcement. Furthermore, say the abolitionists, good reclamation—assuming companies could be compelled to do it—is so costly that it would wipe out the economic advantages of strip mining.

Yet the consequences of a total ban on strip mining—which would mean more reliance on nuclear power, and sending more men down to underground mines—are pretty unattractive too. Besides, the abolitionists haven't made a case that good reclamation of strip mines is prohibitively expensive. It costs $1.50 a ton less, on the average, to strip coal than to send men into the bowels of the earth for it. That cost advantage is so great that strip-mining companies can afford to do some pretty fancy regrooming if they are made to do it. I know this is so, because I've been to Pennsylvania, a state which rigorously enforces its reclamation law, the toughest in the land. A lot of Pennsylvania companies are now going beyond what the law requires—replacing topsoil, for example. "They've really got religion on reclamation now," says William E. Guckert, who runs the state's enforcement program. "But," he quickly adds, "they didn't get religion until we put the screws to them."

Cynics will greet with disbelief the news that there is a state government anywhere that puts the screws to the strip-mining industry. How it happened is worth telling. With more scarred acreage than any other state, Pennsylvania also has the country's biggest constituency of outdoorsmen to notice all the ruined terrain—1.1 million licensed hunters and 800,000 fishermen—and they know how to lobby. Pennsylvania also has Bill Guckert, a powerhouse of a man at 63 who got into the strip-mine fight in the 1950s.

The outdoorsmen fought hard to get a tough law on the books, Guckert recalls, and when some legislators sat on the bill "we beat the living H out of them" at the polls. A good law finally passed in 1963, and Guckert took over the enforcement agency four years later. Almost immediately, he was pressured by a political boss to go easy on a strip miner who was violating the rules. But Guckert, who had the full backing of then Governor Raymond Shafer (as well as his successor, Milton Shapp), angrily refused. From that day, he says, he has operated without political interference.

In the four years that Guckert and his 20 inspectors have been riding herd on 360 bituminous strip-mine operators, the results have begun to show. At 16 different locations I saw the land completely "backfilled" by law to approximately its original contours. This means that all the material in spoil banks has been bulldozed back into the deep trenches where the coal lay, in a manner that completely buries those ugly "highwalls." In Pennsylvania they not only backfill completely, but do it promptly, in order to minimize the exposure of acid-forming strata to air and water. Even temporary water pollution is prohibited. Water that collects while mining is under way must be treated in settlement basins.

We came to Emerson Bowser's farm in Jefferson County. His rolling cropland was literally turned upside down for coal—with vast spoil banks and 80-foot-high walls at one point—but today you'd never know it. Tall corn grows in the replaced topsoil, and the fertility is coming back. In five years, says Bowser, "there won't be any difference" in his crop yields.

Pennsylvania in fact is getting an extra dividend from its law: vast tracts of land damaged in bygone days, when laws were lenient, are being restored. With today's bigger machines, companies can return to formerly strip-mined sites to work seams that were too deep to be stripped profitably in the past; and when they do, they must put the whole thing back together. In a mountainous area near Clearfield, in the center of the state, the improvement is breathtaking. On one side you can see an "active" site with spoil banks and highwalls from the past, newly churned up for deeper coal—a lunar landscape if there ever was one. On the other side the land is regraded and planted as far as the eye can see. Companies returning to old sites are restoring "thousands of acres at no cost to the taxpayer," Guckert says. That is why he doesn't want to ban all strip mining now, for then the state itself would have to restore these "orphan" lands at enormous cost.

In the early 1960s, when trying to prevent passage of the Pennsylvania law, strip-mine companies warned that the cost of elaborate reclamation would put them out of business. As it turns out, strip-mine production of soft coal has increased somewhat under the new law, and reclamation adds an amazingly low 15¢ to the average cost of getting a ton of coal out of the ground.

The foes of strip mining take little comfort from the Pennsylvania experience, which to them comes from a unique combination of broad public concern and honest enforcement. Meanwhile, they say, the damage goes on. Stripping is just getting under way on a large scale in such western states as Montana, Idaho and Wyoming. To appreciate the free-booting atmosphere that stil prevails in most states, cross from Pennsylvania into Ohio as I recently did. There, under a reclamation law that is an insult to the intelligence of that state's citizenry, companies are leaving sheer vertical highwalls, some of them 150 feet high and close to busy roads.

Obviously something has to be done, and quickly. Pennsylvania's reclamation standards, which may soon be tightened further, should become the minimum for the whole nation. The Nixon administration has proposed that Congress set federal standards for reclamation, to be applied within two years if states don't enact sufficiently strong rules in the meantime. But the states should not need a prod from Washington. Public indignation is rising, and a whole industry is, in a sense, on trial for its life.

PRAYER IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, on August 1, 1966, I had the honor to testify before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee regarding a proposal made by Senator Everett Dirksen to amend the Constitution to allow prayer in public schools. Because this issue has once again come before the Congress I thought that my testimony at that time might be of interest to my colleagues. My testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBERT F. DRINAN BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, AUGUST 1, 1966

Father DRINAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Distinguished Senators, ladies and gentlemen, I speak in opposition to the proposal on which hearings are being held this morning.

It is difficult to overstate the significance of the fact that the Bill of Rights has never been amended in all of American history. The 10 amendments to the Constitution which spell out the fundamental guarantees have existed there now in a remarkably durable way under the oldest written operative constitution in the world.

The one partially successful attempt in American history to change the first amendment's provisions was the Blaine amendment in 1896, and that proposal, which all but passed the Senate except for one vote, which had been passed by the House of Representatives, would have simultaneously done two things. It would have required Bible reading in the public schools while simul-

taneously denying any Federal aid or State support for church-related schools. The Blaine amendment reflected the mood at that time and sought somehow to capture the mood and seek the apothesosis of a public school with Bible reading.

Justification therefore for amending the Bill of Rights in the nature of things should be very, very serious. And especially it seems to me, should it be grave when we consider that the 16 words about religion in the first amendment have served us well in this country and that they have gone unchallenged, really undefined, in the period from 1791 until at least 1947. We should say, therefore, that in the long range we have had only 20 years of constitutional construction and only seven decisions at most in which the establishment clause, which is in issue here today, has been defined.

We therefore should say that before we change the substance of the first amendment that we should be very certain that the changed version is more advantageous to today's religiously pluralistic nation than the wording of that amendment can be.

I wish to speak therefore about three distinct but closely related subjects: First, the problem of the secularization of the public school; secondly, the impossibility of any "voluntary" prayer being the answer to this problem; and, third, I want to speak about the infirmities, the inconsistencies, and the contradictions which are implicit in Senate Joint Resolution 148 which is being discussed here today.

Let me speak first about the secularization of the public schools.

Since the end of World War II the student population in church-related elementary and secondary schools has more than doubled. These schools—operated by Catholic, Lutheran, Orthodox Jewish, and other groups—now enroll every seventh child who goes to school in America. The unprecedented growth of these institutions in the last 20 years is both the cause and the effect of the secularizing process which has been going on over a long period of time in the public schools.

The private sectarian school seeks to create a religious orientation within its curriculum which will combine with secular learning the essential elements of the Scriptural, sacred, and spiritual values of the Judaeo-Christian culture. The nonpublic church-related school is built on the premise that the orientation of the public school is and must continue to be secular; some advocates of denominational schools would in fact claim that the public school is secularistic—even to the point of unconstitutionally "establishing" a secular or nonreligious philosophy of education.

Whatever one might think about the need or wisdom of private, church-related schools, it is undeniable that the public school has become an institution where religious values may be referred to or taught only in the most general way. It is a school whose only religious orientation is that it has no religious orientation.

The public school has in fact been an institution of this character for a long time; the banning of Bible reading and of prayer by the Supreme Court in 1963 merely stripped away the widespread illusion that the American public school somehow combined piety and learning in an eminently satisfactory way. The various constitutional amendments proposed by Congressmen and Senators to restore to the public schools the last vestiges of their piety—Bible reading and prayer—constitute an almost irrational refusal to surrender one of the most persistent myths in American life—the illusion that the public school can train future citizens in morality and piety.

Every attempt to restore religion to the public school is an endorsement of a philosophy of education that maintains that piety should be encouraged as a most helpful and possibly an indispensable means to inculcate moral and spiritual ideals. And I say, repeating a bit, that this is but an echo of that illusory hope that prompted the Congress of the United States almost a century ago to pass the Blaine amendment. The hope at that time was that they would freeze the status quo, keep the Bible in the public schools and downgrade and possibly eliminate church-related private schools.

Now, as a Catholic and as an educator, I more than most Americans concede and lament the thunderous silence about religion in the public schools. Along with an ever-increasing number of critics of the public schools, I note with regret that virtually all public school administrators have failed to give any leadership or exercise any initiative in establishing courses about religion or any programs dealing with the history of religion and its impact in world events. And I say categorically that the absence of objective teaching about religion in the public school is one of the most serious educational limitations of public education in this country. Now no one pretends that the structuring of courses about religion or the selection of personnel to teach these courses are easy tasks. But educators would concur that religion should have its place in a public school curriculum which teaches every subject from art to zoology.

There are several feasible and constitutional ways by which the secularization of the public school can be lessened. No one pretends that any of these methods is entirely satisfactory but clearly they offer a more realistic way by which students can actually learn about religion than is offered by the so-called voluntary prayer. Among the clearly available and perfectly constitutional options open to the public school are the following:

1. Released or dismissed time off the school premises, clearly validated in 1952 by the *Zorach* opinion.

2. Teaching about religion. The U.S. Supreme Court went out of its way in the majority and concurring opinions to point out that the Supreme Court in its 1962 and 1963 opinions was not saying anything against the constitutionality of teaching about religion.

3. A study of the Bible. Once again the Court expressly stated that the Bible as literature, the Bible as one of the world's most influential books, certainly can and should be studied.

In view, therefore, of the options that are available to public school educators, which to be sure they have neglected, but why is it that anyone can think that a "voluntary" prayer can have any significant effect in neutralizing the impact of 30 hours every week of religionless teaching on the mind and heart of a child? It seems to me that the solution for the problems that arise from a secular or a secularistic school will not be a simple one. But I feel certain that it will not be found in the introduction of the so-called voluntary prayer into the daily routine of children in the public school.

Let me come to my second point. The impossibility of this so-called voluntary prayer being a solution to the secularized school.

The gentlemen here are familiar with the hearings that were conducted by the House of Representatives 3 years ago, and I have here 1 volume of the 3 volumes of the 2,774 pages of testimony which were elicited in the spring of 1964, and it seems to me that that testimony demonstrates overwhelmingly that the reaction of Congress at that time was not responsive to any professional body of educators or any organized or unorganized religious body. It seems to me that the 2,700 pages of testimony manifest rather the obvious and sometimes truly pathetic desire of Congresmen to be identified in the popular mind with those individuals who want more godliness in our schools and more fervor in our public piety.

We might have hoped that this nostalgia for the past that erupted in June 1963 when the Bible and prayers were banned by the Supreme Court—we might have hoped that that might have subsided by August 1, 1966. Clearly, educators and religious leaders have come to a broadly based consensus that the sectarian practices that were struck down by the Supreme Court had at best minimal educational or religious values.

The piety of Congress continues, however, and, gentlemen, piety is most commendable, but I must say that the piety of the Senate seems to have receded from the more fervent devotion of the House of Representatives 2 years ago, because the House of Representatives had 146 proposals; most of these proposals wanted both Bible reading and prayers in the public schools, and Senate Resolution 148 is going to settle for voluntary prayers without even a pious affirmation that the Bible is worthy of reading.

Well, if congressional piety has been on the wane, then perhaps it may be that soon it will not be a problem.

It is distressing to me—I say, with great candor, and with great regret—it is distressing for me to have to say that I was requested and strongly urged to testify here today by Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish individuals and organizations, and the overwhelming majority of leaders in all of these three religious bodies is strongly opposed to any constitutional change in the first amendment which would permit voluntary prayers in the public school. Why is it then, I ask, that 40 Members of the U.S. Senate introduced in March 1966 a resolution seeking to do that which is directly opposed to the best judgment of virtually all of the religious leaders and denominational groups in the Nation? Why have these 40 Senators subscribed to a resolution seeking to accomplish an objective which the leading churches and synagogues of America have vehemently repudiated as unwise and unconstitutional? For what reasons do 40 Senators seek to appear more pious than the churches and more righteous than the Supreme Court?

It is also distressing to me to note that no professional organization of educators, to my knowledge, would endorse an amendment to the Constitution which would permit the recitation of prayers. By what process of reasoning, therefore, do 40 Senators think that they can or should propose an addition to the curriculum of the public schools of this Nation which has not been requested and indeed has been rejected by the vast majority of public school educators in America?

Experts on constitutional law who will support Senate Resolution 148 are as scarce as the religionists and educators who will endorse it. The vast legal literature about the *Engel* and *Schempp* decisions has in general tended to join the consensus among religionists and educators to the effect that an amendment of the Bill of Rights is not the way to bring religion into the public schools.

However, I repeat again that I am not minimizing in any way the problem to which Senate Resolution 148 is directed. I think that it is very clear that the problem of furnishing academically adequate instruction about religion and morality in the public school is a problem which is much more acute than most educators will admit and more crucial than most parents and even churchmen realize. The public school, furthermore, has as one of its tasks the advancement of community understanding in the face of serious and substantial religious differences in our population. The public school cannot carry out that task unless it can teach children to learn to understand and appreciate and respect the religious differences around them, and that cannot be done by a blackout of discussion of religious differences in the school where these future

American citizens attend for the first 17 years of their lives.

If I may make an analogy which I think is appropriate: The nontreatment of the Negro which has characterized American public education until the recent past has clearly added to and deepened the prejudice of the white majority toward the Negro about whom they have learned virtually nothing in the public school. Similarly, nontreatment of religion in the public school can only result in the perpetuation into the next generation of existing misunderstanding over religious differences.

It seems clear to me beyond dispute that the proposal in Resolution 148 offers no solution whatsoever to the religious vacuum in the public school. And I think that the ineptness and the undesirability of the proposals contained in 148 become even more evident when we examine the unbelievably amorphous and ambiguous language of this resolution, and I come, therefore, to my third and final point.

One of the things proposed in Senate Resolution 148 is the "permitting" of "voluntary participation by students * * * in prayers." No amendment to the Constitution is necessary to permit prayers. It is very clear that if children want to voluntarily participate in a prayer which does not interfere with the academic program of the school, they may do so.

The basic contradiction, as I see it, in Senate Resolution 148 comes from the removal of the prohibition from "the authority administering any school" "from providing for * * * the voluntary participation by students * * * in prayer." However you read that, it gives to any school official the broadest power to "provide for" prayers by pupils, and if a school official provides for prayers, can this prayer be said to be voluntary? In every definition of the term, in every dictionary, "provide for" includes the idea of a person or institution arranging beforehand for some services which will be received by individuals at least on a quasi-involuntary basis. Consequently, it is difficult to understand how providing for prayers by school officials can result in voluntary participation.

The inherent contradiction is so baffling that I, for one, conclude that the purposes and intent of this resolution are simply not clear.

It is more obscure when you read that there is withdrawn from school officials who can provide for prayers the power to prescribe the form or content of any prayer, and I, for one, cannot imagine a school official who, on the one hand, has the power to provide for the recitation of prayer, but, on the other hand, has no authority to prescribe the form or content of a prayer for which he has authorization to provide.

The incredible obscurity of this thing is further compounded by the shadowy reference to people in a public building for whom "voluntary participation * * * in prayer" is also guaranteed. The reference apparently is to citizens in a "public building" such as a courthouse where "the authority administering * * *" such "public building" may provide for the "voluntary participation in prayer."

The amorphous aims of this resolution do not stop with public institutions. Every public building which is "supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds" will be under the jurisdiction of an official authorized to "provide for" prayers "by students or others." No definition of "in part" is supplied—thus permitting the inference that a private school which receives Federal subsidies for children's lunches may be sufficiently "supported * * * in part" to be subject to any public official who desires to "provide for" prayers for the students.

Two conclusions. Whatever may be said above is not intended in any way to minimize the enormous problems which the secularization of the public school has created in America. As a Catholic, I am fully aware of this problem since at least half of all the Catholic children go to church-related elementary and secondary schools. Educators and religious leaders with the help of Congress and State legislatures should resolutely confront the problem and seek to overcome as far as possible the neglect and nontreatment of religion in the public schools. But surely an almost incredible amendment to the first amendment can only make more unresolvable this problem which some have called intractable.

If the Senate and the House ever approved resolution 148 and sent it to the States for ratification by three-fourths of them within a period of 7 years, the entire Nation would be profoundly confused by reason of the basic ambiguities in the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This confusion could and would lead to division and to disunity and I say this in conclusion, that the passage of this Joint Resolution No. 148 would, in my judgment, be a profound mistake.

Thank you very much.

Senator BAYH. Thank you very much, Dean Drinan, for taking the time to come and let us have the benefit of your wisdom.

Do you have time to subject yourself to questions?

Father DRINAN. Yes; certainly, Senator.

Senator BAYH. Obviously, in your position as a leading educator, and as a leading Catholic scholar, you must feel that religious training in schools or a religious-oriented education is beneficial to the student; is that correct?

Father DRINAN. Very much so, Senator. I think that it is a profound problem how the public school can teach about religion, teach the religious dimensions of our culture without in any way indoctrinating, and I think that has been a dimension which is seriously overlooked.

Senator BAYH. Then in your statement you emphasize that you are not making light of the value of religious training, but rather that a mere voluntary prayer does not really provide the morality and the piety which you feel can be accomplished by a more thorough religious training.

Father DRINAN. I think, as a matter of fact, Senator, that this would be taken as the outer limit of what the public school could do in the area of religious education.

If this ever passed, this would be taken as the one thing that the public school could do, and it would inhibit further attempts by educators to give courses about the Bible, about the history of religion, because that would be under a cloud of unconstitutionality.

This, therefore, might seriously inhibit very fine efforts that are now being made by public educators everywhere to introduce the religious dimensions into the courses, such as history and literature, where they properly belong.

Senator BAYH. Your church, and a few other churches, take advantage of the exchange time or the release time in which students are permitted to absent themselves from classrooms and get religious training within the church. Are there other suggestions that you can make, which you feel would do a better job of bringing the type of morality and beneficial aspects of religious training to a student which is not presently being utilized by the school because the churches have not taken the initiative that is necessary?

Father DRINAN. I think this, Senator: that the public schools should say, "We have an obligation to teach about religion just as we have an obligation to teach about everything from art to zoology; we are not going to give children moral values which they are just going to accept. We are going to explain the options to them. We are going to tell them the enormous impact of religion in the history of Western culture, what religion has meant in the history of mankind, and tell them what religion has been in the history of mankind."

That is what a public school should do.

It seems to me that moral and spiritual values should be communicated, but they should also be validated, and that if you want to tell the child not to cheat or lie, you have to give him a reason why that is so.

Senator BAYH. Let me yield before some further questioning to some of my colleagues on the committee.

Senator DIRKSEN. I have just got one observation to make, Mr. Chairman. This is a very sophisticated argument that Dean Drinan makes. He alludes to the hearings in the 88th Congress in the House of Representatives. I have the whole set here.

Among those who testified were archbishops, church administrators, priests, ministers, rabbis, professors, lawyers, the American School for Democratic Action, church foundations, church councils, veterans' organizations, and the Civil Liberties Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, professors of theology, labor leaders, divinity schools, religious institutes.

As I went through that, it occurred to me that somehow we had had every sophisticated argument except an argument from the common man of this country, who was defined as one who works and prays and pays his bills and goes to church, rears a family in decency as law-abiding children. Strange, in all this, we have not heard from any of those, and we are beginning to hear from him by the millions, and he is going to have his say.

What is said here about the ambiguity of this amendment is just tortured interpretation, in my judgment. What is said about secularization is just going around Robin Hood's barn. I am interested in the people who own this country, for if I can read the Constitution correctly, it says, "We the people, do ordain and establish this Constitution," and because the Supreme Court in *Engel* v. *Vitale* has left a situation whereby everybody now interprets the decisions to suit themselves, and we are getting some rather interesting results, because as I see the commissioner of education in New York has refused to permit the school authorities at Hempstead to use one verse in "My Country 'Tis of Thee" for school purposes, and in another school district up there they have refused to let the school authorities use the fourth stanza of "The Star-Spangled Banner," oddly enough because it mentions God.

I see in one section of the country they are going to start fooling with the pledge of allegiance to the flag since the Congress itself authorized the inclusion of the words "under God."

I am going—I hope I live to see just what the people of this country have to say. Petitions and names have come in by the millions, and I have here a list of 4,000 people who are interested in a little freedom of choice which is the foundation of the country itself. They are going to bring another 20,000 names of ministers before they get through. People mean business this time, and I am not going to be dissuaded by what I think is a little sophisticated reasoning assigned when somehow we do not take account of the proper drive of the American people. That is basically it. That is all I have. I will make my statement later.

Senator BAYH. Fine, we look forward to it.

Senator Hruska, do you have any question to address to Dean Drinan?

Senator HRUSKA. Yes, I have one, Dean.

I noted with some interest your statement that the Bill of Rights has never been amended in all of American history. In its very first sentence article I reads: "Congress shall make no law respecting any establishment of religion or prohibiting of the free exercise thereof."

If it is true that that article has not been amended to date, I presume Congress is the only legislative body that is prohibited from making such a law; is that true today?

Father DRINAN. I think, Senator, at least since the *Cantwell* decision in the thirties, that the guarantees of the 1st amendment have been transferred to the States by way of the 14th amendment.

Senator HRUSKA. How did the 14th amendment get adopted?

Father DRINAN. Professor Freund teaches constitutional law, and I am certain he would be much more expert in answering that than I.

Senator HRUSKA. We know, don't we, it was subjected to the regular amendment process prescribed in article V of the Constitution. Everyone knows that. It was passed as a resolution by Congress, and then it had to meet the approval of three-fourths of the States. From the time it was promulgated as the 14th amendment it applied to the 1st amendment, did it not?

Father DRINAN. The Bill of Rights has never been amended, Senator. I stand on my statement.

Senator HRUSKA. Very well. It is a highly legalistic argument, and does not touch upon the practicalities of the situation, does it? It has been amended because it no longer means just the Congress, it means not Congress, not any legislature, nor any public body shall make such a law.

Father DRINAN. I think it is just one sentence in my argument, Senator. I am not saying it should not be amended in a proper case.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, apparently, a great deal of reliance is placed upon it. It is the first point that you make. The statement seeks thereby to make this a sacrosanct area never before breached. We know better than that because of the practical effect of an amendment adopted some 100 years ago.

In a part of your statement, I believe it is on page 6 of the version which I have, you raise many questions as to why it is that 40 Members of the U.S. Senate introduced this resolution. You say, "Why have they subscribed to a resolution? For what reason do 40 Senators seek to appear more pious than churches and more righteous than the Supreme Court?"

Senator DIRKSEN. Will you amend it and make it 48?

Senator HRUSKA. Forty-eight.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, 48.

Senator HRUSKA. Yes, I would be happy to amend it.

Let me ask you, Why do you think they did it? You have studied the hearings, and you have read many of the speeches, you have become a known spokesman for those who oppose this resolution.

Why do you think 48 Members of the U.S. Senate subscribed to this resolution?

Father DRINAN. I am not doubting, Senator, that they have the highest motives. I just wonder, and I make no assertion in the text, no assertion as to why they, with no substantial support from the leading churches or synagogues, or from any professional educators, why they would prescribe something for the curriculum of the public schools.

Senator HRUSKA. You have no idea then why we have done it?

Father DRINAN. I am just a poor lawyer, I am not a psychologist.

Senator HRUSKA. What is the implication which caused the posing of those questions? For what impression do you seek to lay a foundation? What is the purpose of putting it that way? Certainly, to ask a question is not to answer it.

Father DRINAN. I put it that way because I think that it is quite anomalous that the U.S. Senate should be recommending something which the overwhelming majority of churches and synagogues oppose, and which all professional educational groups in this country also oppose, and if the U.S. Senate desires to assist the schools of this country, as it does, why then, it seems to me that it would be appropriate to listen to the two groups involved in this particular area.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, there is one suggestion that you make in regard to the other body. I was hoping, perhaps, that you might associate this body with the other body of the U.S. Congress. But on page 5 of your statement, you refer to the 3 volumes, and almost 3,000 pages of testimony collected in 1964. You testify as follows:

"The 2774 pages of testimony taken in 1964 manifest rather the obvious and somewhat truly pathetic desire of Congresmen to be identified in the popular mind with those individuals who want more Godliness in our schools and more fervor in our public piety."

Would you elaborate on this "truly pathetic desire" of the elected representatives to reflect the thinking and the voices and the desires of those who are responsible for their being in public office?

Father DRINAN. It seems to me that Congressmen should decide this on basic constitutional principles, regardless of what the masses or the vast majority or people who write letters say, that they should decide this on educational, religious, constitutional grounds, regardless of how many individuals want more godliness in the schools.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, that is an anomaly, really, when you suggest that these elected representatives of the people should decide this on the basis of truly constitutional principles. You see, this is one step of remaking the Constitution. This is not a matter of interpreting the Constitution. This is one of the many steps necessary to change the Constitution.

Now, to what source should these representatives repair in that desire to represent their people? Should they go to the Founding Fathers who said, "Congress shall make no law," should they go back that far or should they go to the present interpretation and say, "No, we will make no change," or should they go to the people? That is the question, should they go to the people they represent?

Father DRINAN. You are assuming, Senator, that the people, according to a scientific Gallup poll, are opposed to *Schempp* and *Murray*, and I do not think that that is so. That was a 6-to-1 decision, you know, and there was a good deal of controversy about it. But the dust has settled, and I would say that individuals who understand the issues more and more feel that those decisions were correctly decided.

Senator HRUSKA. Of course, I have every respect for the clergy and for men of religion. I think my life and my career as a citizen have demonstrated that pretty well. Maybe not well enough, and I am humble enough to say so. On the other hand, you know politicians are in the business of assessing the popular mind. We are very close to that situation because every 6 years we have to march before the people of our State and say, "Ladies and gentlemen, how did I do? Did I do well enough to go back for another 6 years?"

In view of the fact that we are experts in that field, some lesser and some greater experts, would it not seem reasonable that since we have a problem for which there might be a solution to the rather harsh impact of the decision of the Supreme Court thus causing it to be a controverted issue to a degree that would render it wise for this Congress to submit that issue to the people? They must govern themselves.

Does that answer some of the many questions that you ask on page 6, such as, why did 48 Senators join in this resolution?

Father DRINAN. Senator, I am more aware than most Americans about the problem of nonreligion in the public schools. I think that there is a very serious vacuum about religion in the public schools. But this resolution is no answer to that problem. It misstates the problem, and it gives a false, erroneous, illusory solution.

Senator HRUSKA. Now, Dean, I have the highest respect for your intelligence and for the long experience and study that you have devoted to this subject. But, you see, neither you nor I, nor the officials of the church organizations, nor even the Members of Congress should tell them what to do. They are self-governed.

If there is a substantial difference of opinion, why not let the people decide whether they agree with your view or Senator Dirksen's view as subscribed to by 47 other Senators, and resolve it in that way? Is that an unreasonable request?

Father DRINAN. Senator, it can be resolved by litigation. They can bring subsequent cases, as they did in *Stein*—in the *Stein* case in New York.

Whenever a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court comes down it sets guidelines, but further cases can erode that guideline or even eventually change the whole thing.

I would think—I would say that if people are seriously concerned about having this, then they can have a law enacted or a regulation promulgated, and they can litigate it, and I would say that that is what the courts are for.

But I do not think that this particular resolution will assist in the problem to which it is directed.

Senator HRUSKA. Of course, they can litigate and they have litigated, and each time the line gets pushed farther and farther back. But they can also amend the Constitution, can they not?

Father DRINAN. Yes, Senator.

Senator HRUSKA. Yes, they can. But you still have not answered my question. Do you see anything too implausible in the situation that I have described where there is a vast and substantial difference of opinion on this subject, do you see anything wrong with referring that to the people and let the people who govern themselves make that decision? What is wrong with that?

Father DRINAN. Senator, I do not know, I cannot understand what is being proposed.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, I know you say you cannot. I think I can. I know that 46 other Senators, besides the 2 of us who are here, who are cosponsors, they think they can. But why not let the people decide. If they do not understand, they won't approve. If they do understand and approve, then it will become a part of the Constitution.

I still say one's own conclusion about a matter is not conclusive as an answer to my question. What is wrong with referring this to the people for their decision?

Father DRINAN. The least the people can expect of the Congress of the United States is a proposed amendment to the Constitution which is clear about the objective that it is seeking, and this is not clear, Senator, with all due deference.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, again, I say I have the highest regard for your having arrived at that decision. There are some, including 48 Senators who feel it is clear enough that it should be referred to the people of America, so that they can decide.

If you have any suggestion to improve its clarity, please do so, and we might see fit to amend it.

Father DRINAN. The basic concept of the first amendment is not to have majority rule, is not to have a Gallup poll on a thing like this. It is to say that the basic liberties of our people shall be interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court, and if somebody thinks that *Murray* and *Schempp* and *Engel* are wrongly decided, they have the privilege of doing that.

But to say that therefore we have to take this resolution to the people and let the majority rule—this is directly contrary to the basic reason why we have the Bill of Rights.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, Dean, there is a provision made for the amendment of the Constitution. It requires a two-thirds vote in the Senate, a two-thirds vote in the House, and a three-fourths vote of all the States. That is not a Gallup poll. That is an official registration of the thinking and desires of the people as to how they want to be governed.

Now, do you know of a higher law than that? Will it be another guess by the Supreme Court? What higher law is there than the people in a matter of determining what Constitution they will be governed by?

Father DRINAN. Senator, I just do not think that this proposed amendment would achieve or would resolve the problem that it is supposed to resolve.

First of all, it leaves out Bible reading, which many people are more deeply concerned about, frankly, than the so-called voluntary prayer, and it is totally uncertain to me what would be permitted if this, in fact, were ratified by three-fourths of the States.

Senator HRUSKA. Well, those are good reasons to address to people when the time comes for them to act for their part in determining whether the Constitution should be one thing or another.

There are those who do not want to give them that opportunity and that is, I think, quite clear.

You do suggest in your testimony, I believe it is in the last full paragraph, if this amendment were submitted, that the entire Nation, would be profoundly confused by reason of the basic ambiguities in the proposed amendment to the Constitution. This Constitution could and would lead to division and to disunity.

What is wrong with division and disunity on a political issue when expressed in a proper legal and constitutional way?

Father DRINAN. Because that division and disunity would come by reason of the fact that the Congress of the United States would not have given the people an amendment to the Constitution which would not be clear to anyone.

Senator HRUSKA. In whose mind?

Father DRINAN. In the minds of educators, in the minds of lawyers, in the minds of religious leaders, and I have talked, Senator, with a number of people about the language that is contained here, and no one understands what is intended.

When a school official can provide for prayers which, however, are going to be voluntary——

Senator HRUSKA. I won't get into that.

Father DRINAN (continuing). That is the essence of the whole thing.

Senator HRUSKA. There is no language in the resolution that says "providing for prayers." The language more truly set out is "providing for or permitting the voluntary participation," yet repeatedly in your testimony there is mention of the public body providing for prayers. There is no such language here. It is the participation that they can provide for. I do not care to get involved in that unless you have some particular comment on it.

But again I say where will the disunity and the confusion be if there is a chance for the people to speak on this issue and they decide one way or the other? The people of America have that tradition for accepting with dignity and with satisfaction the ruling of the Supreme Court on those things.

Will it be said that they will not accept the will of the people on an issue of this kind? Isn't it a fact that if and when the 7 years for ratification have come and gone, and there is not ratification that it will be accepted as unqualifiedly as the decision of the Supreme Court?

On the other hand, if within the 7 years the amendment is approved, they will accept that.

Father DRINAN. And, Senator, the people will have received the concept, and it will be in the public mind that voluntary participation by students in prayer is forbidden, and the Supreme Court has never said that.

Senator HRUSKA. At that time we go to the courts, don't we, Dean? At that time, if we have a new constitutional provision, and if it is not as clear as you say it is, that is when we have recourse to the courts. It is for them to say they will construe it in this way.

I come back to my fundamental proposition that the people of this Nation ought to have a chance to say whether they want their kind of Constitution or not.

Senator Dirksen is right. The first three words of the Constitution do not say "We, the Supreme Court," not "We, the Council of Churches," or not "a predominance of religious leaders," not even "We, the Congress," it is "We, the people."

Father DRINAN. Are you suggesting, Senator, that the National Council of Churches, which represents virtually all Protestant bodies is not actually speaking for the constituency?

Senator HRUSKA. I am suggesting that they are speaking as well as they know. I give them every fair intendment for being sincere and motivated by the highest of religious and civic duties. The kind of life and the activity in which I have participated show that on a sustained basis. But I say again if we want to follow the process of amending the Constitution, we go to the people, and that is what I feel should be in the thinking of many who consider this resolution.

Those are all the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Senator Hruska.

Dean, may I address one or two other questions to you please?

Father DRINAN. Yes.

Senator BAYH. I want to make absolutely certain that we dissipate all the misunderstanding as we can on the impact of the Court's decision. At least, we want to make sure that we do not have a misunderstanding as to what you think the impact of it is.

It is my understanding, according to what I have heard in your original testimony and the colloquy which followed it, that you feel that the Supreme Court decision is correct. At least you do not object to it?

Father DRINAN. I agree with it in principle.

Senator BAYH. Could you tell me, please, what do you think is permissible in Public School No. 58 or whatever number, in light of the present Supreme Court decision?

Father DRINAN. If students wanted really to participate voluntarily in prayer, there is no reason why they cannot gather together in the courtyard, in the playroom beforehand and participate voluntarily. That is not forbidden, even though it is on the school premises.

However, the moment that you say "provide for," that means that the school can provide for a time or a place or a particular arrangement, and then you collide with the decision.

So I say that you intermingle, or that the resolution intermingles, two things, and that there is no need of a resolution, of an amendment, to permit the voluntary participation. But I think this is somewhat of an illusion that children are going to voluntarily participate in a prayer, and I think that the intermingling is bad, and when you bring in the "providing for" you obviously have to overturn *Murray* and *Schempp* and *Engel* because that brings in a State-sponsored or a State-arranged or State-provided for.

Senator BAYH. Suppose, at initiation of the first class in the morning, Mrs. Brown, the teacher in Public School 58, says, "All right, now, children, for the next 5 minutes you may meditate, you may pray, you may think for yourself on whatever subject you want. Does that come within the province——

Father DRINAN. Yes; 5 minutes sounds a bit too long.

Senator BAYH. Two minutes.

Father DRINAN. But a moment of silence, a minute of silence, where the teacher would make it clear——

Senator BAYH. Why would 5 minutes be too long?

Father DRINAN. You can think about anything you want to that is permissible.

Senator BAYH. The time she permits is not important, is it?

Father DRINAN. Well, if it were a substantial amount of time from their academic studies a question could arise, I think.

Senator BAYH. It seems to me that if 1 minute is a violation of the Court ruling, and it is as violative as 5 minutes.

Father DRINAN. No. You see, this would be a voluntary thing on their part in the sense that they do not have to pray, they can think about anything that they want to think about or, I suppose, that they could read. In other words, it is a moment of reflective silence, and we do not have any law on the thing.

Furthermore, why is this desirable and why should the Congress of the United States go on record that this is desirable at the beginning of the day? This is a ritual which has been denomination and sectarian, and which has now been declared by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. Why is it so important?

Senator BAYH. We might also ask, on the other side of the coin, why is it undesirable? If it is voluntary and does not specify that the child has to pray, apparently it comes under the three categories of the decision, according to your opinion. Can she do this? I think if we say why it is necessary we also have to say why it is bad.

Father DRINAN. It is true she can do what she wants to, and if she thinks this helps them as children to form their character, this is her privilege.

Senator BAYH. But you feel this is possible for her to do this under the present decision?

Father DRINAN. Yes.

Senator BAYH. One concern that I have heard voiced in opposition to the Court decision, and it has been talked about here, is just how far the decision might go.

I would like to read for the record, to give us some idea of what the Court said in the *Engel* v. *Vitale* decision, the following. It pertains to the Court's view of the use of God and reference to Deity in the school. The Court said:

"There is, of course, nothing in the decision reached here that is inconsistent with the fact that school children and others are officially encouraged to express love for country by reciting historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence which contains references to the diety or by singing officially espoused anthems which include the composer's profession of faith in a supreme being or with the fact that there are many manifestations in our public life of the belief in God. Such patriotic or ceremonial occasions bear no true resemblance to the unquestioned religious exercise that the State of New York has sponsored in this instance."

So I think we have had the Court speaking to their thought that it is still possible to refer to the Deity and to God.

I would like to ask one last question.

The language of Senate Joint Resolution 148 reads:

"Nothing contained in this Constitution shall prohibit the authority of administering any school, school system, educational institution or other public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of the public funds from providing for or permitting the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer."

It would seem to me that if this were passed we would be dealing with only one aspect of religious training—namely, prayer—is that correct?

Father DRINAN. Voluntary prayer?

Senator BAYH. Voluntary prayer.

Father DRINAN. Yes.

Senator BAYH. It would do nothing to change the other aspects of religious teaching.

Father DRINAN. No. Senators do not believe in Bible reading, I guess.

Senator BAYH. I——

Father DRINAN. That does not follow.

Senator BAYH. I do not believe that is true, really with all due deference to my colleagues, I would take exception to that.

Father DRINAN. No; I am sorry.

Senator BAYH. In your criticism of this amendment, you indicated concern about the words "providing for." I have heard some of our colleagues also express concern about that.

Suppose we struck the "providing for," and just retained the word "permitting." That would deny permission to provide for but would enable the school administrator or teacher to permit the voluntary participation by students or others in prayer. What would be your thoughts about that?

Father DRINAN. Unnecessary.

Senator BAYH. Unnecessary? Why?

Father DRINAN. Because it seems to me that if the first amendment means anything it means that the free exercise clause and the establishment clause taken together clearly mean that there can be voluntary participation by citizens in prayer.

This cannot be done at every time, at every place, but certainly they can do it.

Senator BAYH. You see what we are talking about, sir? I do not mean to try to interpret the thinking of the 48 Members who signed this resolution. The two who are here can more than adequately speak for themselves, as to their thinking, but I have heard it expressed that they are concerned about the opportunity for voluntary prayer in schools. They are concerned about the fact that in many cases the family unit, where this should be done, is falling down on the job. They are looking for some saving measure, and that is this. Even as inadequate as this may be, it is a gesture in that direction.

They are concerned that, perhaps, a future Court decision may rule that the voluntary prayer which you and I consider now permissible is prohibited. This resolution would say to the Court and to all our citizens that we do not believe a further restriction is wise. It would make it clear that we think it always wise to permit or provide for voluntary prayers in school. Perhaps this brings in something else.

Father DRINAN. Well, Senator, assuming that the "providing for" were deleted, and the amendment would propose only that no public official in a school system could or that he would be required to permit the voluntary participation, this assumes that they are now forbidding voluntary participation by students in prayer, and I think that that is an illusion.

Children do not get together and pray voluntarily. If they do that, it is arranged or provided for by a church, some religious organization, or by the school. I think that the proposal that you suggest omitting "providing for" would be even more meaningless and needless than the present article.

Senator BAYH. Well, thank you. I have no further questions.

I think that you can understand that, inappropriate as it may seem in a hearing in which we are discussing prayer, that if we are going to really get the full benefit of your thoughts, we have to play the devil's advocate from time to time.

Father DRINAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator BAYH. Senator Hruska, do you have anything further?

Senator HRUSKA. No, thank you very much.

THE SHARPSTOWN FOLLIES—XL

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have written two letters to the Attorney General outlining the Sharpstown Follies, and especially my serious questions as to the fitness of Assistant Attorney General Wilson. Weeks have passed, and I have received no reply, nor even a note saying that my letters had been received.

These are serious questions, and they deserve a reply, not mere contemptible silence. In the absence of any reply, all I can presume is that the Attorney General agrees with me. I assure him that I will continue to raise these questions.

Mr. Speaker, for the edification of my colleagues, I append to the RECORD a copy of my latest letter to Mr. Mitchell:

SEPTEMBER 22, 1971.

Hon. JOHN MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: On August 27, I wrote you a letter expressing my belief that Assistant Attorney General Will Wilson is unfit for office and should be asked to resign.

Since that time a number of prominent publications, including three nationally circulated magazines, have raised similar questions.

There is, for example, the record of a large number of questionable deals Mr. Wilson participated in, or had knowledge of, during his six year association with Mr. Frank Sharp, who may well be the biggest swindler of our time. Mr. Wilson has stated variously that these deals took place after he left Sharp, that he knew nothing of them, or that he was a "patsy." None of these explanations is adequate, and none dispels the doubt that has been cast over his integrity and fitness.

Mr. Wilson admits to having accepted a $30,000 loan from Mr. Sharp's interests at a time when Mr. Sharp was under investigation, an investigation which Mr. Wilson had every reason to know of, since it had been discussed with him by a Sharp associate.

Mr. Wilson admits to having paid a bill for the electronic surveillance of rooms used by Federal bank examiners at the Sharpstown State Bank, but claims that he did not know at the time that the bill was for that purpose. His professed ignorance is astonishing, in view of the fact that at the time this transaction took place, he had long known the Sharpstown bank was under increasing criticism from Federal bank examiners, and in view of his self-professed sharpness of wit.

Mr. Wilson admits that his brokerage account was used to buy stocks for a Federal bank examiner, an illegal transaction. He says that he did not know at the time who the examiner was, again astonishing, in view of Mr. Wilson's position in the bank heirarchy.

Mr. Wilson claims that he knows nothing about how Sharp financed the purchase of National Bankers Life Insurance Company, although he had negotiated the deal himself. Mr. Sharp claims that Wilson did advise him on this, and did so under oath. Since Sharp has been given total immunity by the government, he has no reason to lie. Either he is a reliable witness or not, and if he is not, he should not enjoy your continued protection. Naturally if he is telling the truth, Mr. Wilson is not. It seems important to me that you find out which man is the liar.

Reports indicate that Mr. Wilson has a very poor record of attendance in his office, poorest of all the Assistant Attorneys General. By his own account he maintains a very active investment program, which might well conflict with his official duties. Certainly while in elective office, he felt free to carry out any number of ventures, though he excoriated others who did likewise. I personally feel that a public official has no business taking fliers in the stock market or otherwise undertaking ventures that have any possibility of raising a conflict of interest.

Any member of observers have commented on the situation involving Mr. Wilson. There have been editorial calls for his resignation. There is no doubt that a great many people besides myself have grave doubts about the fitness of Mr. Wilson to serve.

This entire situation calls into doubt the integrity of the Department of Justice. That is to me an intolerable situation. I would think that you would be sensitive to a growing scandal of this kind. Yet I have not received so much as an acknowledgment to my letter.

I think that the public is entitled to know the truth, even if you do not feel inclined to answer any questions. It seems to me that if you cannot or will not respond, I would be left with no alternative but to suggest impeachment proceedings, which would at least enable the truth to be fully known.

Sincerely,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ,
Member of Congress.

BLACK POPULATION AND BLACK JUDGES IN 50 LARGEST CITIES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, more than 1,000 black lawyers and judges attended the 46th annual meeting of the National Bar Association in Atlanta last August. At that meeting,the Honorable Edward B. Toles, referee in bankruptcy in the U.S. district court for the northern district of Illinois and chairman of the NBA's judiciary committee submitted a report demonstrating the relationship between black population and the number of black judges in the Nation's 50 largest cities.

As the report shows, there has been some improvement over the past year, but we still have a long way to go before minority citizens achieve full representation in the legal profession and in the judicial system.

The report follows:

BLACK POPULATION AND BLACK JUDGES IN 50 LARGEST CITIES

The 1970 Census reveals that the black population of the nation's 50 largest cities continued to grow during the decade of the 1960s. Black electoral strength is rising rapidly too. More black Judges are being elected and appointed to Federal, State and Municipal posts.

But of the reported 50 cities with the largest black populations, only 38 had elected or appointed black Judges while eleven

Southern cities and one Northern City, Gary, Indiana, had no black Judges.

Blacks constitute about 11 per cent of the population; nearly half the nation's black population is now concentrated in 50 cities, and a third of the total is in 15 cities, according to a Census Bureau compilation.

The 1970 Census Report of the 50 cities with the largest black populations and the National Bar Association's Report of the number of black Judges in each city is listed as follows:

POPULATION BREAKDOWN FOR THE 50 CITIES WITH THE LARGEST BLACK POPULATIONS—1970

Rank	City and State	Total population (number)	Total black population (number)	Percent black	Black judges
1	New York City, N.Y	7,867,760	1,666,636	21.2	42
2	Chicago, Ill	3,366,957	1,102,620	32.7	24
3	Detroit, Mich	1,511,482	660,428	43.7	10
4	Philadelphia, Pa	1,948,609	653,791	33.6	12
5	Washington, D.C	756,510	537,712	71.1	19
6	Los Angeles, Calif	2,816,061	503,606	17.9	10
7	Baltimore, Md	905,759	420,210	46.4	7
8	Houston, Tex	1,232,802	316,551	25.7	2
9	Cleveland, Ohio	750,903	287,841	38.3	11
10	New Orleans, La	593,471	267,308	45.0	2
11	Atlanta, Ga	496,973	255,061	51.3	2
12	St. Louis, Mo	622,236	254,191	40.9	6
13	Memphis, Tenn	623,530	242,513	38.9	1
14	Dallas, Tex	844,401	210,238	24.9	1
15	Newark, N.J	382,417	207,458	54.2	6
16	Indianapolis, Ind	744,624	134,320	18.0	3
17	Birmingham, Ala	300,910	126,388	42.0	0
18	Cincinnati, Ohio	452,524	125,070	27.6	1
19	Oakland, Calif	361,561	124,710	34.5	2
20	Jacksonville, Fla	528,865	118,158	22.3	0
21	Kansas City, Mo	507,087	112,005	22.1	2
22	Milwaukee, Wis	717,099	105,088	14.7	1
23	Pittsburgh, Pa	520,117	104,904	20.2	2
24	Richmond, Va	249,621	104,766	42.0	0
25	Boston, Mass	641,071	104,707	16.3	3
26	Columbus, Ohio	539,677	99,627	18.5	2
27	San Francisco, Calif	715,674	96,078	13.4	3
28	Buffalo, N.Y	462,768	94,329	20.4	1
29	Gary, Ind	175,415	92,695	52.8	0
30	Nashville-Davidson, Tenn	448,003	87,851	19.6	2
31	Norfolk, Va	307,951	87,261	28.3	0
32	Louisville, Ky	361,472	86,040	23.8	4
33	Fort Worth, Tex	393,476	78,324	19.9	0
34	Miami, Fla	334,859	76,156	22.7	2
35	Dayton, Ohio	243,601	74,284	30.5	1
36	Charlotte, N.C	241,178	72,972	30.3	1
37	Mobile, Ala	190,026	67,356	35.4	0
38	Shreveport, La	182,064	62,152	34.1	0
39	Jackson, Miss	153,968	61,063	39.7	0
40	Compton, Calif	78,611	55,781	71.0	2
41	Tampa, Fla	277,767	54,720	19.7	0
42	Jersey City, N.J	260,545	54,595	21.0	1
43	Flint, Mich	193,317	54,237	28.1	1
44	Savannah, Ga	118,349	53,111	44.9	0
45	San Diego, Calif	696,769	52,961	7.6	1
46	Toledo, Ohio	383,818	52,915	13.8	1
47	Oklahoma City, Okla	366,481	50,103	13.7	1
48	San Antonio, Tex	654,153	50,041	7.6	0
49	Rochester, N.Y	296,233	49,647	16.8	1
50	East St. Louis, Ill	69,996	48,368	69.1	2

In the legal profession in the United States, there are more than 300,000 lawyers. Of these, a few more than 4,000 are black, a National Bar Association report reveals. The Black Bar association has estimated that there is one lawyer for every 637 persons in the United States, but only one black lawyer for every 7,000 blacks. A 1970 National Bar Association Report lists 240 black Judges among Federal, State and Municipal Judges in the 50 States of the United States.

Estimates of the total number of all Judges in the United States vary. However, Past Chairman of the American Bar Association's National Conference of Special Court Judges, Judge Robert Beresford, writing on this subject in the February 1971 issue of *Oyez! Oyez!*, the Bulletin of the ABA Section of Judicial Administration (Vol. 14, No. 1, Page 3), stated: "using statistics compiled by the *American Judicature Society*, Judge James A. Noe disclosed that the number of full time Judges of special courts comprise 10,761 of a total of 16,294 full time state court Judges;—(there are) "approximately 5,000 part time Judges in this country";—and an "estimated 15,000 special court Judges" in the nation."

A May 1971 Report of the ABA Appellate Judges Conference lists 565 Appellate Court Judges as members of the Conference and notes that there are still 330 Appellate Judges who are not Conference Members. (*Oyez! Oyez!*, Vol. 14, No. 2, Page 2)

Black Judges, Federal, State and Municipal, number only 240. Federal Judges, appointed by United States Presidents since the first black Judge was appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1901, total 30 Judges from an Associate Supreme Court Justice to Judges of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

The first black lawyer in the U.S. licensed to practice law was Macon B. Allen, born free in Indiana in 1814 and admitted to the bar of the State of Maine in Portland on July 3, 1844. (State of Maine Supreme Court of Cumberland County Roll of Attorneys, July 3, 1844)

Since Allen's admission in 1844, some 300 black Judges have been appointed or elected to judicial office in the U.S. (Allen himself was later elected a Judge by the South Carolina Assembly in 1873.)

A list of the first black Judges during the first century holding judicial office since the first black Judge was appointed in 1852 is as follows:

1852. Robert Morris, Magistrates Court, Boston and Chelsea, Mass., Appointed by Mass. Governor George N. Briggs.

1870. Jonathan Jasper Wright, Associate Justice of South Carolina Supreme Court. Resigned in 1877. First black lawyer admitted to Pennsylvania bar in 1866. Elected by South Carolina General Assembly for six year term.

1872. George Lee, Judge, Inferior Court of Charleston, South Carolina., Elected Mar. 13, 1872 by General Assembly of South Carolina.

1873. Macon B. Allen, Judge, Inferior Court of Charleston, South Carolina. First black lawyer admitted to American State Court., Elected Feb. 26, 1873 by South Carolina Assembly to succeed Judge George Lee.

1873. Mifflin Wister Gibbs, Judge, Municipal Court, Little Rock, Arkansas., Elected Municipal Court of Little Rock, Arkansas.

1883. George Lewis Ruffin, Judge, Municipal Court, Charlestown, Mass., First black graduate Harvard Law School in 1869—elected member Boston Common Council 1875–76., Appointed Judge Municipal Court, Charlestown, Mass., by Governor Benjamin F. Butler, Nov. 7, 1883.

1901. Robert H. Terrell, Justice of the Peace for District of Columbia; upon Congressional creation of Municipal Court in 1909, became Judge of Municipal Court and served until death, Dec. 20, 1925. Appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt, Dec. 17, 1901 for 4 years as one of 10 Justices of the Peace of District of Columbia. Reappointed 1909.

1924. Albert B. George, Judge, Municipal Court of Chicago. First black Judge elected in the North since Reconstruction. Elected Chicago Municipal Court, Chicago, Ill.

1930. Charles E. Toney, James S. Watson, First two black Judges elected to Municipal Court. New York Assembly created new Municipal Court Districts in 1930 in New York City.

1936. Myles A. Paige, Magistrate, Judge, Court of Special Sessions, Judge, Court of Domestic Relations, now retired, oldest living black Judge. First appointed by Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia, New York City.

1937. William H. Hastie, Judge, District Court for the Virgin Islands. First black U.S. Judge of U.S. District Court. Appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, 4 year term.

1939. Jane Bolin, Judge, Domestic Relations Court. First black woman Judge in the U.S. at age 31. Still sitting in New York's Family Court. Appointed by Mayor Fiorella LaGuardia for 10 years.

1942. Patrick B. Prescott, Judge, Municipal Court of Chicago. Wendell Green, elected Judge, Municipal Court of Chicago, appointed 1950 Circuit Court of Cook County. Appointed by Governor, Dwight H. Green of Illinois, Dec. 10, 1941. First Elected black Judge since 1924, in Chicago, Ill. Served until death, Aug. 23, 1959.

1945. Irvin C. Mollison, Judge of United States Customs Court. First black lifetime Judge of U.S. Court. Appointed by President Harry S. Truman. Served until death, May 5, 1962.

1949. William H. Hastie, Judge of Circuit Court of Appeals, Third Circuit. First black lifetime Judge, appointed to Circuit Court of Appeals. Appointed by President Harry S. Truman. First black Chief Judge, retired to Senior Judge 1971.

1952 to 1970. Black Judges in most of the 50 States have been appointed and elected to State and Municipal Courts, from an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court (Ohio) and Appellate Courts in the District of Columbia, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Washington, and California to Presiding Judges of Municipal Courts.

Federal Judges have been appointed to all courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States, Circuit Courts of Appeals, the Customs Courts, United States District Courts, the Court of Military Appeals, Referees in Bankruptcy, and Magistrates of the U.S. District Courts.

EVENTS IN SAIGON

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I was wondering, in view of the events of the past few weeks in Saigon, if any Member of Congress or any member of the executive branch would care to say he or she is willing, from this day forward, to give his or her life, limb, sanity, or freedom—

POW even for another day—further to prop up the Saigon dictatorship.

Other Americans are being ordered to do so today.

OEO IGNORES RURAL POOR

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last evening as we debated amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, I planned to introduce an amendment to correct what I consider to be a serious situation regarding the distribution of antipoverty funds. Simply put, that serious situation is the heavy bias in favor of funding programs to assist the urban poor while shortchanging programs to assist poor people living in rural areas. This maldistribution, ignoring the location and residence of poor people, gravely imperils the central purpose of the act; namely, to provide assistance and opportunities to all our economically deprived citizens.

A poor person should have equal access to the program benefits of the OEO program regardless of the location of his residence, whether he lives in a big city, a smaller town or in a rural area. Unfortunately, there is every indication that this is not now the case. A poor person living in a rural area is denied equal assistance in rising above his poverty status. Our policy should be to provide equal assistance to needy persons wherever they might reside.

Last year, an estimated 80 percent of OEO assistance was directed to residents of urban places. This contrasts sharply, and unfavorably, with the fact that 43 percent of our Nation's poor people live in rural areas. In Wisconsin, 45 percent of the OEO budget was devoted to the two largest cities which comprise only 20 percent of the population. We must better direct our funds to areas of high poverty incidence.

My amendment would have required that the Office of Economic Opportunity apportion its funds within each State to those areas where poor people live. This would have assured equality of access among poor people to the governmental services designed to lift them out of poverty. It is hypocritical to administer an act designed to help all the poor in such a way as to discriminate against the rural poor.

The House was obviously set against such a reasonable amendment. A similar attempt to amend one portion of the act to require apportionment of funds to rural and urban areas in accordance to the needs of each was unsympathetically and overwhelmingly defeated. I am hopeful that increased recognition of the burdens placed on the large cities by rural inmigration to them will convince some of my colleagues representing urban areas to support this reasonable and equitable amendment in the future.

ALASKA RESOLUTIONS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 30, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Village Council Presidents of southwest Alaska has recently passed several resolutions which pertain to the concerns of its membership. The association, which has been organized for the past decade, is comprised of at least 50 communities and represents almost one-fourth of all the rural communities of Alaska.

The resolutions express and illustrate many of the concerns I share with the members of AVCP and other communities of Alaska. For your information, I wish to include the resolutions in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION No. 71–3

Whereas, there is a need to be funded an Adult Basic Education program using associate VISTA Volunteers who are from the villages; and

Whereas, there is a need for ABE classes in the villages to teach classes for adults; and

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents passed a resolution preventing VISTA Volunteers from working in the Bethel area unless the programs are approved by the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc.,

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Association of Village Presidents approves the associate VISTA program for sixty Adult Basic Education teachers in rural Alaska.

RESOLUTION No. 71–7

Whereas, the Village of Akiachak does not have an AVEC power in the village; and

Whereas, the Village people desire to have electricity in the village; and

Whereas, a lot of the families now have freezers, and other electrical equipment; and

Whereas, the people of Akiachak have discussed the desirability of receiving electricity from the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

Now be it resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs provide electricity to the Village of Akiachak.

RESOLUTION No. 71–8

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has given the Association of Village Council Residents, Inc. opportunity to contract for Social Services and improve its services to the people; and

Whereas, the Board of Directors has determined the proposed contract and plan of organization will accomplish its purpose;

Now be it resolved that the President of the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. is authorized to execute the proposed contract and proceed with its implementation according to policies set by the Board of Directors and the Administration Committee.

RESOLUTION No. 71–14

Whereas, the Outreach Program is designed to help those who need further education to qualify for jobs in our American society; and

Whereas, the major portion of this program is needed in the Bethel rural area; and

Whereas, the way the program is now structured causes great problems for those that it was designed to help; and

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents know that the Outreach Program is not helping the people of the Bethel rural area in an efficient manner at great expense to the public,

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Association of Village Council Presidents request our Governor and Alaska Delegation in Washington, D.C. to move as quickly as possible to transfer the offices of the Outreach Program to Bethel and advertise for qualified Natives to administrate the Program.

RESOLUTION No. 71–17

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. was established to secure the interest of its memberships; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk is member of the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. in good standing; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs school at the Village of Mekoryuk has faulty sewage disposal system; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel have been contacted and informed of their faulty sewage disposal area at Mekoryuk; and

Whereas, the children have been found playing in and around the seeping deposit area; and

Whereas, fish caught in the bay for subsistence have been known to have consumed untreated human waste and other harmful effluents; and

Whereas, the people of Mekoryuk can no longer tolerate the unhealthy, seeping, and odorous sewage located in front of the city; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk has City Ordinance prohibiting the disposal of human waste within the City Site; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk will take legal actions against the Bureau of Indian Affairs if and when immediate steps are not taken to correct their faulty sewage disposal area,

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs take immediate steps to make their sewage disposal area and surrounding a clean and healthy area,

Now let it be resolved that the honorable members of the Association of Village Council Presidents endorse and support this resolution.

RESOLUTION No. 71–18

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. was established to secure the interests of its membership; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk is a member of the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. in good standing; and

Whereas, over population of musk ox on Nunivak Island is physically eminent; and

Whereas, the Federal and State of Alaska wildlife game biologists concur on the over population of musk ox on Nunivak Island; and

Whereas, old adult bulls are biologically unsuitable for reproduction and transplant operations; and

Whereas, older animals die of old age and these animals represent unrealized potential sources of benefit to the residents of Nunivak Island; and

Whereas, Federal and State of Alaska wildlife game biologists are in favor of controlled hunt of older animals; and

Whereas, the final authority to authorize the hunt of musk ox lies with the powers of the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas, State of Alaska, through its legislative body passed a law authorizing hunt of musk ox,

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Secretary of the Interior take precautionary measures to preserve the rare animals from self-destruction by practicing good sound game management,

Now let it be resolved, that the honorable members of the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. endorse and support the controlled hunt of older animals (musk ox) on Nunivak Island.

ASSOCIATION OF VILLAGE COUNCIL RESIDENTS
RESOLUTION NO. 71–20

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. was established to secure interest of its membership; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk is member of the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc. in good standing; and

Whereas, life and property have been lost at Mekoryuk due to lack of proper fire fighting equipment; and

Whereas, Federal Government has multimillion dollar buildings at Mekoryuk with no means of quelling fires; and

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs have been approached for purchase of proper suppressing apparatus, however, to no avail; and

Whereas, the Villages of Mekoryuk has organized a Fire Department soon to be registered with the State Fire Marshal; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk is held responsible for the proper training of its Fire Department personnel; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk is lacking the necessary funds to purchase adequate fire fighting equipment; and

Whereas, the City of Mekoryuk through its legislative body has introduced City Ordinance establishing Fire Department,

Therefore, let it be resolved that the Bureau of Indian Affairs make fire fighting equipment available to the City of Mekoryuk; and

Now, let it be further resolved that the honorable members of the Association of Village Council Presidents endorse and support this resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 71–22

Whereas, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has advised its policy to contract with Native organizations for assistance in carrying out its work; and

Whereas, the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc., qualifies and is ready, willing, and able to assume responsibility for administration of the Bethel Area General Assistance, Child Welfare, and Institutional Care Programs;

Be it resolved, That the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc., requests the Bureau of Indian Affairs to contract with the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc., for conduct of Bethel Area General Assistance, Child Welfare, and Institutional Care Program.

RESOLUTION NO. 71–23

Whereas, the housing conditions of Pitkas Point are substandard; and

Whereas, BIA Housing is preferred by the residents of Pitkas Point; and

Whereas, Housing project is much needed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of Village Council Presidents, Inc., requests Bethel Bureau of Indian Affairs Housing to consider the needs of Pitkas Point: Now be it

Resolved, That construction of houses be built immediately.

THE NEW FOREIGN AID MEASURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that the Legislative Reorganization Act has passed, and we deal in speculation and dreams rather than in actuality, Congress learns that foreign aid over the next 5 years is limited to run $51 billion for an approximate average of $10 billion per year.

Some Members were so upset with the new manner of business that they even voted against the last Exim-Bank Act which provided that the obligations of the Bank not be listed in the Federal budget.

By continuing to operate on guesses and theories, it will eventually be possible to balance the budget by just not including the Government debts.

I include the following:

FOREIGN AID 5-YEAR TOTAL IS PROJECTED

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff has projected that the United States will provide about $51 billion in foreign assistance over the next five years, with the possibility that the total could go higher under Nixon administration foreign aid policies.

Of the estimated $51 billion total—roughly the same amount spent in the last five years—the study predicted that $24 billion would be for development and humanitarian assistance and $27 billion for military assistance.

The committee, which is writing up the foreign aid authorization bill for the current fiscal year, took the unusual step of drafting its own projections of foreign aid spending after the Nixon administration, on grounds of executive privilege, refused to supply the panel with Pentagon's five-year plans for military aid.

Similarly, the State Department has not supplied the committee with any estimates of future spending on economic aid.

The committee contends that it is entitled to such information because under the Legislative Reorganization Act passed last year, committees are obligated to estimate the five-year cost of any legislation they send to the House or Senate floor.

COMMENDATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DOCTORS

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, in time of need there is nobody who is more important than the doctor. This is equally as true with regard to our doctors in the Veterans' Administration as elsewhere—perhaps even more so, for they are responsible for the treatment of those to whom we owe a special obligation, our veterans.

Recently Mr. Joseph Capsin, of Honolulu, Hawaii, put his appreciation of two Veterans' Administration doctors into a thoughtful and sincere letter.

Because in this hurried world all too few of us pause long enough for such personal courtesies, I would like to give wider recognition to this kind gesture of tribute. I enclose Mr. Capsin's letter at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

CAPSIN,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dr. C. E. GANTENBEIN,
Director, Outpatient Clinic, Regional Office, V.A., P.O. Box 3198, Honolulu.

DEAR DOCTOR GANTENBEIN: I have just learned that you are to be reassigned, and I want you to know how deeply grateful I am to you for having Doctor Harold H. Deabler check me once a month. You could not have assigned a finer doctor or person—Never, in all my experience with the Veterans Administration, [from 1919] have I known more conscientious and better medically qualified medical practitioners than yourself and Doctor Deabler. Thank you for assigning this fine doctor to my case. I am sorry you are leaving Hawaii, but hoping you will enjoy your new assignment.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH CAPSIN.

EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have a bill reported from the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means which would extend to American businesses an investment tax credit. While the bill will probably not be exactly what the President has requested of the Congress, it will in principle be the same.

The argument made by the President for such a tax credit is that it will stimulate greater employment and thus help to alleviate the Nation's now critical unemployment problem. While such a purpose obviously is beyond reproach, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members of the House to consider carefully whether the proposed tax credit offers us any real assurance that the objective will, in fact, be realized. I suggest to my colleagues that a corporation may, as a result of the tax credit, automate their production and thus put people out of work. At a time of high national unemployment, I question whether the U.S. Government should subsidize the replacement of workers with machines.

This is not to say that the tax credit is not an appropriate device by which the Federal Government should endeavor to meet its responsibilities under the Full Employment Act of 1946. I am suggesting that the tax credit ought to be applied in such a way as to better insure that the result will be more jobs for people.

A proposal has been brought to the attention of the California delegation by two economists at the University of California. Messrs. B. F. Roberts and Richard N. Thunen suggest that instead of offering a tax credit to business on money spent for new equipment, give them a tax credit on money spent on wages for new employees. In this way we could be assured of achieving the objective of lessening unemployment in return for reducing the tax burden on business.

Mr. Speaker, it is possible that any tax credit we may enact will be a shift of the tax burden from corporate taxpayers to personal income taxpayers. In order to justify such a move, we must insure that there is sufficient benefit to outweigh the disadvantages. The investment tax credit holds out no such guarantee. An employment tax credit, on the other hand, would have such an assurance.

I am enclosing the text of the proposal by Messrs. Roberts and Thunen for review and consideration by my colleagues in the House and I invite their careful attention to it:

EMPLOYMENT TAX CREDITS PROPOSAL FOR STABILIZATION POLICY [1]

(By B. F. Roberts, Richard N. Thunen, University of California, Berkeley)

This paper suggests a fiscal policy instrument—employment tax credit—which in the current economic situation could significantly stimulate employment and production, increase both labor income and profits, reduce the federal deficit, and diminish inflationary pressures.

It is estimated that a modest application of this instrument as a supplement to the President's new economic program could, by fourth quarter 1972, increase employment by 1.9 million workers, GNP by $23.7 billion, real GNP by $17.0 billion, wages by $24.3 billion, and profits by $3.7 billion; and reduce the unemployment rate by .7 percent, and the federal deficit by $5.9 billion, more than can be obtained by the President's program alone. Also, it is expected that implementation of the employment tax credit will improve the unemployment-inflation trade-off and permit the phasing out of wage-price controls as early as 1972. In addition, this fiscal instrument can easily be structured as an automatic stabilizer which once implemented will not need adjustment, and can be administered by the Internal Revenue Service in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics without additional bureaucracy.

The proposed policy instrument is a tax credit granted to employers for net additions to employment. The tax credit associated with each net new employee would be calculated as a fraction of the wages paid to the employee during a specified period of time.[2] The magnitude of the credit fraction, or credit rate, granted the employer can be structured to depend progressively upon the unemployment rate, such that when the unemployment rate is high, the credit would be relatively large, but when the unemployment rate is low (at a level reflecting only transitional or frictional unemployment and generally regarded for practical purposes as "full employment"), the credit rate would go to zero. The employment tax credit would thus provide a progressive inducement, through labor cost reduction, to hire additional employees when labor markets are slack but would eliminate the inducement when labor markets are tight to avoid upward pressure on wage rates.[3] Structured this way, the employment tax credit has the character of an automatic stabilizer.

The presumption that the employment tax credit will induce additional employment rests on the plausible notion that entrepreneurs will find the utilization of additional factor inputs more profitable if the cost of additional input units is reduced. This notion has been the basis for numerous incentive schemes to promote local industry.[4] It is also the basis for belief in the effectiveness of the investment tax credit toward promoting expenditures for capital goods.[5]

While the employment tax credit shares the same conceptual foundation as the investment tax credit, and is in some ways symmetric with it, there are important distinctions relevant to the design of economic policy. The employment tax credit is tied to a primary factor of production (labor), provides a direct inducement to increase the productive employment of labor and thus increases the aggregate supply of goods and services and, subsequently, by increasing total wage income, stimulates demand. The investment tax credit is tied to a produced factor of production (capital), provides a direct inducement to order new capital stock and thus increase aggregate demand, and subsequently stimulates increased production of capital goods and the employment of labor.

The alternative channels of supply-demand versus demand-supply, through which the two instruments are routed, are of crucial importance for designing stabilization policies under the current circumstances of high unemployment and strong inflationary pressures (price rises are being confined by the freeze but inflationary pressures persist). The conventional monetary and fiscal instruments, including the investment tax credit, operate through the demand-supply channel and are currently thought to face an unfavorable trade-off between attainable unemployment and inflation.[6] By supplementing the conventional instruments by others, such as the employment tax credit, which operate through the supply-demand channel, the terms of the apparent unemployment-inflation trade-off might be substantially approved.[7] A crucial effect expected from the employment tax credit is an expansion of the aggregate supply of goods and services relatively faster than aggregate demand, thus shifting the unemployment-inflation trade-off.

Whether the employment tax credit will actually work is, of course, an empirical matter that can be verified only if implemented. Reasoned estimates of the effects can, however, be derived from simulation experiments with econometric models. The numerical results of two such experiments, using the California Economic Forecasting Project national econometric model, are reported here.[8] The two cases reported are:

Case I—President's New Economic Program: The principal assumptions of this simulation are: the President's program of August 14 is enacted, wage-price control will be implemented after the freeze to restrict inflation to three percent annual rate, the import surcharge is converted to a five percent revaluation of the dollar, and monetary expansion is gradually slowed to seven percent annual rate.

Case II—President's New Economic Program Plus Employment Tax Credit: The principal assumptions of this simulation are identical with those of Case I plus a modest application of the employment tax credit. The credit rates and dollar amounts of the credits for this simulation are:

Quarters	1971 IV	1971 I	1971 II	1971 III	1971 IV	1973 I	1973 II
Credit rate (percent)	26.0	23.8	20.0	16.6	12.2	8.2	5.0
Credit (billions)	$2.1	$4.0	$5.5	$6.6	$5.2	$3.7	$2.5

The credit rates shown here have been calculated as an increasing function of the unemployment rate of the preceding quarter. This formulation permits the credit rate which will apply for any specific period to be calculated and announced at the beginning of that period. These credit rates represent the percent of wages paid to net new employees (at wage rates prevailing when hired) for a period of one year. Employers must maintain or increase the level of their employment for a one year period in order to receive the full credit. Numerous other formulas, giving various degrees of employment incentive, are possible.

The simulation results of Cases I and II for selected variables are summarized in the following tables:

	1971 III	1971 IV	1972 I	1972 II	1972 III	1972 IV	1973 I	1973 II
Total civilian employment (millions of dollars, seasonally adjusted):								
Case I	78.9	79.3	79.8	80.5	81.2	82.0	82.8	83.7
Case II	78.9	79.9	80.9	81.9	82.9	83.9	84.9	85.9
Unemployment rate (percent, seasonally adjusted):								
Case I	6.1	6.0	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.3	5.1	5.0
Case II	6.1	5.9	5.6	5.3	4.9	4.6	4.4	4.2
Gross national product (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	1,056.3	1,079.7	1,106.1	1,131.0	1,155.8	1,180.6	1,205.5	1,230.5
Case II	1,056.3	1,085.5	1,117.7	1,147.7	1,176.7	1,204.3	1,230.9	1,256.4
Real gross national product (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	742.3	754.7	768.1	780.2	792.3	804.1	815.9	827.6
Case II	742.3	759.1	776.7	792.6	807.5	821.1	833.8	845.7
Wages and salaries (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	580.7	587.0	597.6	608.3	622.0	635.2	648.6	662.1
Case II	580.7	592.3	609.5	625.4	643.5	659.5	673.9	687.5
Corporate profits and inventory valuation adjustment (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	77.0	82.7	87.5	91.6	94.4	97.4	100.4	103.4
Case II	77.0	84.3	90.0	95.1	98.6	101.1	103.8	106.3
Change in business inventories (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	1.1	5.2	8.5	10.2	11.4	11.7	11.7	11.4
Case II	1.1	7.5	11.8	13.6	14.4	13.9	13.1	12.1
Federal deficit (billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted annual rate):								
Case I	22.3	24.2	29.5	27.6	26.1	21.2	18.5	14.6
Case II	22.3	24.9	29.2	25.8	23.0	15.3	10.3	5.1

Footnotes at end of article.

The simulation results for Case I, the President's program, represent a moderately optimistic view. Some forecasters are suggesting greater optimism based largely on greater consumer and investor enthusiasm than is suggested here. Regardless which view of the President's program is used, the employment tax credit supplements that program and the relative improvement represented by Case II is of the greatest importance for estimating the impact of the employment tax credit.

The Case II results show an immediate response to the fourth quarter 1971 introduction of the employment tax credit. Employment, output, inventories, wages, and profits all show substantial gains. With the pace of activity increased, the federal deficit is gradually decreased suggesting that the employment tax credit more than pays its way.

The employment tax credit rates used for the Case II simulation may actually be higher than required to induce these levels of hiring. The model's response to the credit was intentionally dampened to minimize the possibilities of overstatement in favor of the tax instrument. Even if the initial rate is higher than necessary, the automatic stabilization feature of the proposal would make the system self correcting during subsequent periods and there would be little if any federal revenue loss due to the initial high rate.

The assumption of wage-price control has been maintained for both simulations. All indications to date are that phase II of the President's program will include some form of wage-price controls so this assumption is probably realistic. However, it is interesting to question whether controls are actually necessary to contain inflation. The reasoning developed above suggests that the employment tax credit could be an inflation dampening force. To investigate this, simulations of Cases I and II with price controls removed mid-year 1972 have been run. For Case I (the President's program) the simulation suggested that the economy tends toward a stable situation characterized by a 5 percent unemployment rate and a 3.3 percent annual inflation rate, in terms of the consumer price index. For Case II (Case I plus employment tax credit) the economy tends toward a stable situation characterized by a 4.2 percent unemployment rate and a 3.7 percent annual inflation rate. Case II has a substantially lower unemployment rate but a higher inflation rate, but this combination seems to represent a favorable shift in the unemployment-inflation trade-off.[9]

The tentative nature of the estimates given in this paper should be recognized and their use in contemplating policy implications should be tempered with caution. They are estimates obtained through experiments with a specific econometric model and our judgments. Our work is continuing and we hope that the issuing of these estimates, while the nation is searching for effective new economic programs, will prompt other investigators to conduct independent experiments with the employment tax credit to evaluate its probable impact.

FOOTNOTES

[1] This revises and extends an earlier draft given limited circulation dated April 26, 1971.

[2] The employment tax credit is similar to the negative wage bill tax discussed by Ragnar Frisch, *Price-Wage-Tax-Subsidy Policies as Instruments in Maintaining Optimal Employment,* Economic and Employment Commission, Economic and Social Council, United Nations, April 14, 1949.

[3] Locational variations in the credit rate to preferentially promote employment in high unemployment areas could be obtained by calculating the credit rate as a function of the local unemployment rate.

[4] See John E. Moes, *Local Subsidies for Industry,* University of North Carolina Press, 1962, and Harry Richardson, *Regional Economics,* Praeger, 1969, for discussions of local incentives to industry.

[5] See Robert E. Hall and Dale W. Jorgenson, "Tax Policy and Investment Behavior," *American Economic Review,* June 1967, and subsequent related communications by Robert M. Coen; Robert Eisner; and Robert E. Hall and Dale W. Jorgenson, *American Economic Review,* June 1969, for detailed examination of the investment tax credit.

[6] It is widely believed that low unemployment and stable prices are competing objectives and that the unemployment-inflation trade-off is such that high inflation must be accepted to maintain relatively full employment or, high unemployment must be accepted to maintain stable prices. This topic has received considerable recent discussion. See for example: *Economic Report of the President 1971,* Government Printing Office; Milton Friedman, "The Role of Monetary Policy," *American Economic Review,* March 1968; Arthur M. Okun, *The Political Economy of Prosperity,* Norton, 1969; George L. Perry, "Changing Labor Markets and Inflation," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 3,* 1970; Robert J. Gordon, "Inflation in Recession and Recovery," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1,* 1971.

[7] A reminder of this possibility was given by Professor Stefan Robock in the *Wall Street Journal,* May 18, 1970: . . . strategy should shift to one of increasing supply rather than reducing demand. Inflation is most frequently described as an excess of demand over the supply of goods and services. But it is equally valid to consider inflation as a shortage of supply in relation to demand. In other words, inflationary pressures can be reduced by expanding supply faster than demand.

[8] A technical description of the CEFP national econometric model is in preparation.

[9] Estimated unemployment-inflation trade-off curves for the U.S. economy have been constructed by Robert J. Gordon, "Inflation in Recession and Recovery," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1,* 1971. The unemployment-inflation combination of 5 percent, 3.3 percent, respectively, of the President's program is compatible with these trade-off curves. The combination 4.2 percent, 3.7 percent of the President's program supplemented by the employment tax credit falls below Gordon's trade-off curves.

HONESTY IN GOVERNMENT—THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Ronald L. Ziegler, the White House Press Secretary, may not get a raise in pay or commendation for his recent news report, but there are many who admire him for his truth and honesty.

At the President's meeting with the Soviet Ambassador, Mr. Ziegler introduced Henry A. Kissinger as Secretary of State Kissinger and later introduced Kissinger as head of the National Security Council.

Many are inclined to agree that his announcements are correct in reality though anomalous in protocol.

[From the Evening Star, Sept. 30, 1971]

HERE'S SECRETARY KISSINGER "OR WHATEVER HIS TITLE IS"

In a series of slips, White House Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler elevated national security adviser Henry A. Kissinger first to Secretary of State and then to President.

Briefing reporters yesterday on President Nixon's meeting with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, Ziegler declared that the participants included "Secretary of State Kissinger."

The reporters, reflecting the widespread impression here that Kissinger, not Secretary of State William P. Rogers, is Nixon's chief foreign policy adviser, broke into laughter.

Embarrassed, Ziegler sought to put his remarks off the record, but the reporter's shouted back: "Oh, no!"

Ziegler stepped down from the podium and then back up, commenting with a smile that he did not know who it was who had preceded him and appealing: "Let's start again."

On the second go-around Ziegler described Kissinger as "head of the National Security Council," a position that is held by the President.

When the reporters again broke into laughter, Ziegler amended: "Or whatever his title is."

A TRIBUTE TO GEORGE SEFERIS: A LIFE FULL OF NOBLE MOMENTS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, a giant passed from the midst of civilized society last week. His passing should not go unnoticed in the halls of Congress.

George Seferis, poet, diplomat, man of nobility, and the only Greek of this century to win a Nobel prize, died at 71. Along with the physical ailments which burdened his last days, he was saddened by the fact that Greece with living "in a state of enforced torpor," because of the military dictatorship.

Last Thursday, Seferis was buried. A throng estimated at 20,000 followed the casket from the church to the cemetery. Most were university students and young men and women. This was a significant demonstration in view of the martial law which continues in full force after 4½ years.

The mourners chanted, "Athanatos. Athanatos."—"Immortal. Immortal." They did so honor him, I am informed, for two reasons. First, he was the national poet and his achievements as a poet will live for ages. Second, he had the courage to publicly issue a powerful statement against the regime in March 1969, and this, too, will live.

When Seferis made his statement, the dictatorship, in the style of the Soviets, branded him as insane.

In his recent book, "Five Men—Five Centuries," Panayiotis Kanellopoulos, the former Prime Minister, a man of wide literary achievement himself, wrote, in discussing Sophocles:

Life is full of great noble moments . . . And we also have experienced such moments around us. And those which neither Sophocles nor we have perceived, those that have occurred in his time and at all times in what for us are invisible corners of life, are without number. . . . In our time terrible things have happened on the earth, and are still happening in one way or another. Those things have not provoked in man only fear or malice or cowardice. They have also impelled the nobility of the soul, the spirit of human solidarity and self-sacrifice, to rise to a height in no way less exalted than the height of no-

bility in those human beings that Sophocles created. Had those heights been "unapproachable", the human race would have disappeared.

Seferis reached heights of nobility. So has Mr. Kanellopoulos, who was the foremost figure to walk in that final march of tribute. The British Ambassador also marched, perhaps out of personal friendship, perhaps out of admiration, perhaps out of recognition of Seferis's outstanding performance as Greek Ambassador to Great Britain during the most turbulent years of the Cyprus controversy.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I set forth below the New York Times obituary of George Seferis, the 1969 Seferis statement on the tragedy of the Greek dictatorship, and a Seferis poem, "The Return of the Exile," written in March 1938, when Greece was last under a dictatorship:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 21, 1971]

POET WON 1963 NOBEL PRIZE

ATHENS, Sept. 20.—George Seferis, Nobel Prize-winning poet, died tonight in a hospital here. He was 71 years old.

According to the hospital director, the immediate cause of death was pneumonia aggravated by a second stroke following surgery for a bleeding duodenal ulcer seven weeks ago.

George Seferiadis, the veteran Greek diplomat and scholar who as George Seferis the poet won the Nobel Prize for literature in 1963, was a liberal thinker who inherited a strong democratic tradition from his family.

For the last four years under the Greek military rule, Mr. Seferis felt oppressed and refused to publish poetry under what he considered censorship. His last poem, "The Cats of St. Nicholas," was contributed to an anthology of anti-dictorial prose and verse published by a group of anti-regime intellectuals.

In a statement issued in March 1969, Mr. Seferis said the military junta had caused a "state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values are being submerged in a swamp."

"MY OWN VOYAGES"

To those who asked him the message of his poetry, Mr. Seferis would reply:

"What is the central point in Homer's Odyssey? Ulysses' travels in the world. Well, my poems are my own voyages over the world."

And, he said, "because there is nothing human which is pure" there are no pure poets.

An example of Mr. Seferis's work, taken from "The Collected Poems of George Seferis, 1924–1955," as translated by Edmund Keeley and Philip Sherrard and published by Princeton University Press, follows:

Three years
We waited intently for the herald closely watching
The pines the shores and the stars.
One with the plough's blade or the keel of the ship,
We were searching to rediscover the first seed
So that the ancient drama could begin again.
We returned to our homes broken,
Limbs incapable, mouths cracked
By the taste of rust and brine.
When we woke we traveled towards the north, strangers
Plunged into mists by the spotless wings of swans that wounded us.
On winter nights the strong wind from the east maddened us,
In the summers we were lost in the agony of the day that couldn't die.
We brought back
These carved reliefs of a humble art.

Educated in Athens and Paris, where he studied law "and a lot of literature," Mr. Seferis wrote his first verse at the age of 14. In 1931, after publishing translations of French poetry in Athens and composing his own verse, he won his place among Greece's leading poets when the critics acclaimed his collection "Stofe" ("The Turning Point.")

A consular assignment to London influenced the evolution of his work and marked the beginning of a lifelong friendship and association with T. S. Eliot, whose works he translated into Greek. He also translated the works of Ezra Pound.

In the mid-thirties, Mr. Seferis composed "Epiphany," a collection of poetry from which the Greek composer Mikis Theodorakis was 20 years later to cull songs that became among the country's most popular.

Among American poets, Mr. Seferis reserved his greatest admiration for Archibald MacLeish, whose "Letter From America" Mr. Seferis also translated. Mr. MacLeish dedicated to Mr. Seferis his "Hercules." Mr. Seferis also admired the work of Richard Lowell and Theodore Roethke, a friend.

Through all the years of shifting diplomatic assignments and wartime upheaval, Mr. Seferis continued to compose his own works and to record his experiences.

PUBLIC RECOGNITION

The first public recognition of his outstanding contribution to Greek poetry came in 1947, when he was awarded the Palamas Prize. While in London in 1960, he was awarded an honorary degree in philosophy at Cambridge.

The announcement of the Nobel Prize for his poetry was made in October, 1963, and Mr. Seferis received the prize personally in Athens that December. A year later, he was made an honorary Doctor of Literature at Oxford, and the following year Princeton awarded him an honorary degree.

In 1966, Mr. Seferis became a foreign honorary member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In December, 1966, he published a new collection of poetry under the cryptic title "Three Secret Poems," which was soon translated into Italian and Spanish. His poetry has been translated into most European languages and into Chinese.

Mr. Seferis began his diplomatic career in 1926 as an attaché in the Greek Foreign Ministry. In 1931 he was posted to London as a consul, and in 1936 was serving in Albania.

Two years later, his work took him to Athens as press chief for the Foreign Ministry. An early foe of dictators, Mr. Seferis reacted against the dictatorship of Gen. Ioannis Metaxes in 1930 by printing what then seemed to be subversive poetry, and distributing it only * * *.

When the Nazis invaded Greece in 1941, Mr. Seferis and his wife Maria, fled with the Greek Government to exile in the Middle East. After the war, he was assigned to Ankara, and then to London.

Becoming a minister in 1953, Mr. Seferis was posted to Arab countries and became involved in the Cyprus problem. This special knowledge weighed on his appointment as Greek Ambassador to London in 1957, during the most crucial phase of the dispute. When agreement was finally reached in 1959, it fell to him to try to mend cracks in traditional Anglo-Greek friendship; he did well.

AN HONORARY ENVOY

After leaving the Foreign Service, Mr. Seferis was named an honorary ambassador for life. He and his wife lived in a beautiful island-style home behind the all-marble stadium of Athens.

To his frequent visitors he would say, "I am tired of traveling; I have had too much of it." But when the Athens regime refused to grant him a diplomatic passport he was entitled to as an honorary ambassador, he put up a fight and won. The ban on his exit lifted, he went on a trip last year to western Europe. The ban had been a reprisal for his public declaration against the regime in March, 1968, when he said:

"We all know that in dictatorial regimes, the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy awaits, inescapably, at the end. It is this tragic ending that consciously or unconsciously torments us, as in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus."

Mr. Seferis, son of a French trained lawyer, was born in Smyrna (Kizmir), Turkey, on a date that exists no more: Feb. 29, 1900. When the switch from the Julian to the present Gregorian calendar took place in the 1920's, this extra day on the century's first leap year, was eliminated. The poet, who was amused by this, celebrated his birthday anniversary once every four years.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 10, 1969]

THIS ANOMALY MUST STOP

(By a staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor)

WASHINGTON.—The following statement by George Seferis, Greek poet who received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963, has been received in Washington from Athens. The Greek Government recently published an answer to Mr. Seferis but did not permit publication of his statement in Greece.

The text follows:

"It is now some time since I took the decision to stay out of my country's politics I have tried in the past to explain my decision but this does not mean that I am indifferent to our political life.

"From that time until now I have abstained from touching upon such matters. In any case, from what I had published up to the beginning of 1967 and from my subsequent position (I have published nothing in Greece from the time liberty was silenced) I believe that I have clearly shown my thoughts.

"In spite of this, for some months I have felt within me and around me that more and more it is becoming imperative for me to speak out on our present situation. With all possible brevity, this is what I would say:

"It is almost two years since a regime was imposed upon us, utterly contrary to the ideals for which our world—and so magnificently our people—fought in the last world war. It is a state of enforced torpor in which all the intellectual values that we have succeeded in keeping alive with toil and effort are being submerged in a swamp, in stagnant waters. It would not be difficult for me to understand that such catastrophes do not count very much for some people. Unfortunately that is not the only danger.

"We have all learned, we all know, that in dictatorial regimes the beginning may seem easy, yet tragedy waits at the end inescapably. It is this tragic ending that consciously or unconsciously torments us in the ancient choruses of Aeschylus. As long as this anomalous situation continues, so long does evil progress.

"I am a person with absolutely no political bond and I can say that I speak without fear or passion. I see in front of me the abyss to which we are being led by the oppression which has engulfed our country. This anomaly must stop. It is a national demand.

"Now I resume my silence. I pray to God that never again may I find myself under such compulsion to speak.

"GEORGE SEFERIS."

THE RETURN OF THE EXILE

My old friend, what are you looking for?
After years abroad you've come back
With images nourished
Under foreign skies
Far from your own country.

I'm looking for my old garden;
The trees come to my waist
And the hills resemble terraces
Yet as a child
I used to play on the grass
Under great shadows
And I would run for hours
Breathless over the slopes.

My old friend, rest
You'll get used to it little by little;
Together we will climb
The paths you once knew
We will sit together
Under the plane-trees' dome.
They'll come back to you little by little,
Your garden and your slopes.

I'm looking for my old house,
The tall windows
Darkened by ivy;
I'm looking for the ancient column
Known to sailors.
How can I get into this coop?
The roof comes to my shoulders
And however far I look
I see men on their knees
As though saying their prayers.

My old friend, don't you hear me?
You'll get used to it little by little.
Your house is the one you see
And soon friends and relatives
Will come knocking at the door
To welcome you back tenderly.

Why is your voice so distant?
Raise your head a little
So that I understand you.
As you speak you grow
Gradually smaller
As though you're sinking into the ground.

My old friend, stop a moment and think:
You'll get used to it little by little.
Your nostalgia has created
A non-existent country, with laws
Alien to earth and man.

Now I can't hear a sound.
My last friend has sunk.
Strange how from time to time
They level everything down.
Here a thousand scythe-bearing chariots go past
And mow everything down.

DR. WALTER DRZEWIENIECKI

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, more than 200 friends gathered last weekend to honor one of Buffalo's distinguished citizens, Dr. Walter Drzewieniecki, Polish community leader.

The affair was in recognition of Dr. Drzewieniecki's outstanding work over the years as an American citizen of Polish extraction, who has been given credit for initiating an ethnic revolution in western New York State.

Dr. Drzewieniecki was selected from our community for recognition by the State University of New York at Buffalo, the first individual with a Polish name to be so honored.

As part of my remarks I am including a newspaper article and a summary of Dr. Drzewieniecki's background:

[From Buffalo (N.Y. Evening News, Sept. 25, 1971]

POLISH SCHOLAR HAILED FOR ETHNIC CONTRIBUTION

Dr. Walter Drzewieniecki, Polish community leader, was serenaded Friday evening with the song "Sto Lat" (May He Live 100 Years) by about 200 friends in the Adam Mickiewicz Library and Dramatic Circle, 612 Fillmore Ave.

Dr. Drzewieniecki, professor of history and chairman of the Soviet and East Central European studies program at Buffalo State University College, received the 125th anniversary award of the State University of Buffalo last May.

Friday evening's program, which featured a traditional Polish style meal of golabki (stuffed cabbage) and pierogi (stuffed dough with cheese), was for the many friends who "did not have the opportunity to be at the May ceremony," according to John M. Frysiak, assistant state attorney general and president of the Polish Cultural Foundation.

Dr. Drzewieniecki's achievements include the establishment of the Polish Cultural Foundation in 1965 and the East European Studies Program in 1966.

Mr. Frysiak, in a short after dinner speech, said of the Polish leader: "In the days when the merit of the existence of the ethnic Pole was challenged, he rose in the role of defense. Where others, perhaps better equipped, perhaps in a more advantageous position floundered, he acted."

"It is my belief that history will credit Dr. Drzewieniecki with initiating an ethnic revolution in Western New York."

Other accolades to Dr. Drzewieniecki came from Fillmore District Councilman Gus Franczyk, who presented him with a gold bison on behalf of Mayor Sedita.

Prof. Joseph Ertavy, assistant professor of Modern Languages at Buffalo State College, added that the 125th anniversary award was the "first time in the history of the State University of Buffalo that such high honors were presented to a man with a Polish name and—more importantly—for his unceasing work on behalf of the ethnic community."

Dr. Drzewieniecki, an "I am proud to be a Polish American" button on his lapel, outlined his past and future endeavors, saying: "This movement for the dignity and betterment of the Polonia (Poles who no longer live in Poland) for a well-deserved place in American society is rapidly gaining the dimensions of a revolution, of an avalanche, which must include all Polish Americans."

Wallace Boguszewski, president of the Polanie Club, presented a $500 check to the Polish Central Foundation to be used for scholarships for Polish studies.

CITATION TO DR. DRZEWIENIECKI

Dr. Walter Drzewieniecki, Professor of History and chairman of the Soviet and East Central European Studies Program at the State University College was one of the few outstanding individuals who received the 125th Anniversary Award of the State University of New York at Buffalo "in recognition of distinguished services which have contributed to the benefit of mankind."

The citation of the award, signed by Dr. Robert Ketter, president of the University, and Mr. William Baird, chairman of the University Council reads as follows:

"Your efforts on behalf of the 300,000 Western New Yorkers of Polish descent have been myriad. Within the academic community, you have won recognition for the cultural contribution of your people through the establishment of the East European studies program at State University College at Buffalo. To insure community involvement in this and other programs, you spearheaded the formation of numerous Polish-American citizens groups, most notably, the Polish Cultural Foundation. Your lectures, your exhibits, your encouragement to others interested in the field, and most of all, your personal example are a continuing source of inspiration to Polish-Americans in Western New York and, indeed, throughout the nation. In recognition of your service, the State University of New York at Buffalo is honored to present you with its 125th Anniversary Award."

As these glowing words indicate, an eminent Polish American had been recognized for his untiring efforts to help maintain the cultural inheritance of Americans with East European background.

It is the first time in the history of the University of Buffalo that such high honors were presented to a man with a Polish name and—more importantly—for his unceasing work on behalf of the ethnic community. This fact reflects a marked change in the old myth of America being an all dissolving melting pot.

A new ethnicity is developing and the changing attitude toward the component cultures of this great nation puts more and more emphasis on cultural maintenance, thus the danger of extinction no longer looms darkly over ethnic America.

It is now widely recognized that unity shall be attained by the people of our country not through the elimination of the color and substance of each national heritage but rather by the gradual blending of the highest cultural achievements each of these nationalities are capable of reaching within the framework of our national life.

The resurgence of ethnic awareness in America may seem, to some, as a force of division, the sensitive observer, however, will interpret this movement as the final and necessary stage in the emancipation process of the immigrant masses and their descendants and a belated attempt on their part to make real use of the unique opportunities, rights and privileges available to all the people of this land.

In fact, in this new ethnicity one can see the manifestation of the final maturity of fifty million Americans who were free all along but did not quite know how to live with all the blessings of freedom.

After this gentle ethnic "revolution" will be over we are going to witness a new America with more purposeful patriotism, with greater degree of brotherhood among its people, with wider cultural horizons, with an equal and more dignified citizenry.

Dr. Drzewieniecki is one of those amply qualified leaders whose participation in this great endeavor will help make it a success. May God give him a long and fruitful life!

THE CASE FOR A CEILING ON IMPORTS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Mr. O. R. Strackbein, a very close friend and constituent of mine is president of the Nation-Wide Committee on Import-Export Policy. He has been very active in the field of foreign trade products for many years and is recognized as an authority on the subject.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by Mr. Strackbein which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Friday, September 24, 1971, together with a comment in the Review and Outlook column which appeared in the same edition of the Journal:

THE CASE FOR A CEILING ON IMPORTS

(By O. R. Strackbein)

The need for a new trade policy has been borne in upon us in recent months by the successive monthly trade deficits we have suffered since last spring.

The harsh reality of our weak competitive position in the world, including our own market, was recognized in August when the President proclaimed a supplemental duty of 10% on roughly half of our total imports, and cut the dollar loose from gold internationally.

In our trade, neither the action taken, nor anything so far contemplated by the administration in the form of trade legislation, has thus far reflected recognition of a far more basic affliction that plagues our economy. This is the changed competitive position of American industry in relation to imports, and the far-reaching implications of this change. To understand this change will require a review of our economic history of the past century.

TWO IMPORTANT CONDITIONS

Mass production had its origin in this country. Its economic potential depended on two important conditions: (1) fair competition as an antidote to monopoly and as assurance of passing reduced costs attributable to technology to the consumers, and (2) increasing mass purchasing power.

Our inventiveness and energy assured technological progress if incentive beckoned. The efficacy of fair competition was clearly perceived and resulted in the Sherman Anti-Trust Act (1890) and later in the Clayton and Federal Trade Commission Acts and yet later in the Robinson-Patman Act.

The automobile industry, especially as represented by Henry Ford, provides the classical example in the development in this country of the uniquely productive system that brought us to world industrial leadership. Ford's insight led him to tie the fortunes of mass-production to the mass-market or consumer purchasing power. He introduced the $5-a-day wage as an earnest fee of his faith.

A third element for the success of the vision was selection of products that were likely to enjoy an elastic demand, i.e., products so far acceptable to potential consumers that these would buy more and more of them as the price came down. Essential goods do not answer to this description. The demand for them is inelastic. Food is an example. The number of stomachs is limited by the population. Nonessential goods that cater to human needs and desires (especially to ease, comfort, convenience, beauty and social prestige) once discovered or invented, are prime candidates for mass consumption if the price is sufficiently reduced.

After the unbelievable success of the automobile, a vast array of other products followed suit. Household appliances of all kinds, washers, driers, refrigerators, the telephone, radio, television; luxury wearing apparel, sports and recreational items, proliferated over the land to the point of saturation. The great moving power in this phenomenal process was the rich mass market that could be reached if the price was progressively brought down. We needed no imports to develop our mass market for goods of all varieties. Our enterprising manufacturers had only to behold what the mass market had meant to one product after another and then go and do likewise.

Indeed, we depended on new products and their conquest of the mass market to absorb the annual crop of new workers. If a new product initially cost $5,000 few customers would be found and little new employment would be generated. If the price was cut in half, or to a quarter, many more units could be sold. Sales were better yet if the price could be brought down to $500, and still better if it dropped to $100. A jackpot awaited the successful industrial genius.

Employe compensation, as recognized by Henry Ford, provides the great bulk of purchasing power if it keeps pace with rising productivity. Thus instead of looking upon wages as a necessary evil, to be kept as low as possible, as the early British economists saw it (Ricardo, Mill and others), American economists began to see them as the greatest of market constituents. Our laws began to reflect this recognition—so much so, in fact, that, with the addition of social welfare and other burdens (such as national defense) industrial costs of production became highly inflexible in this country except on the upward slope. Almost no competitive maneuverability remained. Great pressure developed for automation and worker displacement.

This process, indeed, was relied upon to strike additional layers of income on the way to the mass market. Such is the nature of a truly elastic demand that consumption will grow distinctly faster than job displacement if prices are brought down within reach of the income levels of potential customers.

MILLIONS OF JOBS GENERATED

Without being explicitly conscious of it our enterprising product developers and merchandisers generated millions upon millions of jobs in this country by finding likely products and awakening the latent demand for them, reducing costs by mass production and then reaping the monetary reward.

Thus did our unique system come to lead the world. After World War II the other leading industrial nations, having seen the magic of our technology and business methods, embraced the system and adopted it with generous help from us.

Before long we were faced with an unpalatable fact: The other countries embraced our mass production but were reluctant to put into effect Ford's vision, namely rising wages as an absorbent of the volume of goods produced. While foreign wages did rise, they did not close the gap between them and us. Thus with lower wages and soaring productivity, foreign producers came to enjoy a widening gap between their unit costs and ours. Because their home purchasing power was inadequate they looked abroad for a market. We offered the most attractive of all.

The response of our industries was natural. They began heavy direct foreign investment—up to some $75 billion by now. Thus they enjoy the low foreign wage levels and rapidly rising productivity. Beyond that, many industries licensed use of their patents by foreign producers.

As a result any prospective new industry in this country has in the past few years come to stand before a wholly different prospect from the past. No longer does a mass market beckon—not because the potential is not there but because the new industry can no longer call it its own. Outsiders can beat it in any race to the mass consumer market.

What then of the expansion and the new jobs that previously could be anticipated with confidence? How readily will our capital venture into so uncertain a future?

The accustomed climate of 1910–1955 is gone. It will not return of its own account.

INFLEXIBLE BURDENS

Trussed in the inflexible burdens imposed by legislation and other factors in this country, thus making labor-displacement as a means of becoming or remaining competitive the only alternative, willing capital sees the foreign scene as a beckoning alternative. The mass market (consumers) characteristically smiles on merchandisers who offer the more attractive bargains. These are less and less of the native variety and more and more the foreign. Our mass market is diverted to serve as an outlet, not for innovaters and entrepreneurs at home, but the foreign based.

Our economy is being outflanked, upset and consumed by the very forces to which it gave birth and by ironic generosity handed over to other countries. We are driven to ever greater dependence on service activities rather than production even though we still have the most productive machine in the world.

Is there an alternative? If we can restore the former climate we can hope to reopen the doors to expanding employment. The restoration can be assured if we set a ceiling on the share of our market imports may supply and thus prevent their heading us off at the pass that leads to the mass market. This share might differ from product to product and provide reasonable flexibility.

In such a restored climate our industry could resume the course of cost and price reductions with both new and old products that enjoy an elastic demand, and thus restore to our system its employment-generating motivation.

Failure to understand the dilemma posed by the silent reversal of the international competitive tide which in time will leave our economy beached, will bedevil and even embitter our international relations, while an understanding of it will open the way to fruitful adjustment.

OUR OVER-THE-HILL ECONOMY

In adjoining columns O. R. Strackbein paints a dreary picture of the U.S. economy, a view that may seem to be confirmed by recent events. Business has been sputtering along well below capacity, unemployment has been discouragingly high, and the U.S. has been having growing troubles with foreign competition.

Mr. Strackbein, an ardent spokesman for the new protectionism, feels that this country has simply encouraged and permitted too much of that foreign competition. In the process, he says, American industry has lost a major asset: domination of a huge domestic market.

It's certainly true that the domestic mass market has had much to do with the rapid growth of American industry. (In passing, it should be noted that free trade within the United States has made possible both the mass market and the industrial growth.)

We would concede, too, that other nations have made vast strides in technology, frequently with U.S. help. As President Nixon has been stressing lately, moreover, other countries seek unfair advantage over America by clinging to artificial exchange rates that favor their exports and discourage imports from the U.S.

When all that has been said, though, we still think Mr. Strackbein's solution smacks of defeatism. What he is saying, essentially, is that the U.S. should rope off much of its domestic market solely for domestic producers since, in his view, American companies will never again be able to compete on equal terms with foreign firms. Implicit in this plan, of course, is a renunciation of all foreign markets in favor of foreign companies.

This sounds quite a lot like the stagnation arguments of the 1930s: there's not much hope for much more expansion, so we had better content ourselves with dividing what we have.

The argument was wrong in the 1930s, and it's wrong now. Many of the U.S. companies that have been going abroad have gone not so much in search of cheap labor as in pursuit of what they see as a greatly expanding international market. Gradually, often painfully, the economic nationalism that has served the world so badly for several centuries has been giving way to a new internationalism.

Common Market countries discovered that, once they lowered the trade barriers among themselves, they had a huge domestic mass market of their own. After they made the discovery and began to profit from it, they unfortunately became rather protective about it, taking a tack somewhat similar to the one Mr. Strackbein now urges for the U.S.

The U.S., for its own selfish interest if nothing else, needs to encourage the rest of the world to continue to find and benefit from the virtues of freedom. To do so it will have to show the rest of the world that the 10% import surcharge is only temporary, that this country does not intend to reverse the progress toward freer trade that has been made over the past four decades.

Looking toward the increased competition that would ensue, the U.S. does indeed have some problems extending beyond unrealistic exchange rates, problems that need correction. Careless financial policies have permitted inflation to boost prices of exports and make imports more attractive. Government policies overly friendly to unions have made it difficult, if not impossible, for American producers to keep labor costs under control.

A significant part of the problem, finally, is that great American industrial asset: the domestic mass market. Many American producers came to take that market almost for granted. As a result, they relaxed—in research and development, in salesmanship, in simple management techniques. And foreign companies began to clobber them.

Around the world there is an enormous mass market opening up, one that can aid and abet many thousands of producers, both in this country and abroad. If less-developed countries get easier access to the world market for their raw materials and other products, they will also become bigger customers in the market.

Given reasonable federal financial and labor policy, we're convinced that many American companies can compete quite successfully in a swiftly expanding world market. Unlike the protectionists, in other words, we still aren't persuaded that the American economy is irretrievably over the hill.

COMMENDATION TO ARCHBISHOP ECKARDT AND PHILATHEA COLLEGE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring attention to a milestone in Canadian-United States relationship and pay particular honor to a distinguished man of the cloth, Archbishop Benjamin C. Eckardt. He has helped foster this fine and lasting friendship between two nations whose borders remain clear of armament, forts and guard stations. An example for all the world to note and emulate.

On June 19, 1971, Philathea College, located in London, Ontario, Canada, celebrated its 25th anniversary as a college and at the commencement exercise held in the Church of Christ, Elizabeth Street and Dundas in London, it was announced that Philathea College was granted full accreditation as a 4-year college by the American Association of Specialized Colleges. Philathea College has joined such noted schools of higher learning as Drake College, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla., Hussan College, Bangor, Maine, Benjamin Franklin University, Washington, D.C., Cleary College, Ypsilanti, Mich., Aero-Space Institute, Chicago, Ill., Belknap College, Center Harbor, N.H., Bliss College, Columbus, Ohio, and Indiana Northern University, Gas City, Ind., to name but a few.

Following the graduation ceremonies, three bishops were consecrated by Dr. Eckardt. Elevated to the bishopry were Rev. Russel G. Fry, Jr., Schwenkeville, Pa., who becomes bishop of Pennsylvania. Rev. William Carson Thompson, of Indianapolis, who becomes archbishop of Indiana. Rev. Gordon A. Da Costa, president of Indiana Northern University, was named Indiana's auxiliary bishop.

Archbishop Benjamin Eckardt, of the Free Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of Christ, is president of Philathea College and as its founder, is to be congratulated on his accomplishments and tireless work in bringing together the several church organizations, schools, and colleges representing so many thousands of parishioners, students, and missionary workers throughout the world.

Archbishop Eckardt is to be congratulated on his work in law enforcement, padre with the rank of inspector in the Royal Canadian Police and as a member of Interpol, for his outstanding work in education and for his worldwide service to mankind through the church and many civic organizations. We wish to thank Archbishop Eckardt for helping to bring the peoples of these two great nations closer together through understanding, education, fellowship, and church.

We recognize Philathea College as a fully accredited 4-year college and pay particular note and credit to its outstanding graduate school. We wish this institution of higher learning continued success in bringing all the peoples of the world, peace through understanding.

THE NEW ROYALTY AT COURT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the international aristocracy of the world banking community were received at court last evening here in Washington.

Reportedly, the World Bank president and his wife, Mrs. Robert Strange McNamara, and the International Monetary Fund's managing director rented the John F. Kennedy Center of the Performing Arts to wine and dine the visiting financial nobility.

The rental tab alone is reported to have run $18,622, and the $11-a-bottle imported champagne ran like water for the estimated 2,000 guests from 118 national banking houses.

Who picks up the tab is a predetermined conclusion, that is, the U.S. taxpayer. The gala affair is comparable to the missionary blessing the cannibals before being put in the pot to be eaten. The purpose of the IMF's international banking convention is to force the U.S. Government into further destruction of the purchasing price of the U.S. dollar.

I include the newsclipping of this social event:

SOMETHING OTHER THAN THE "PEDESTRIAN"

(By Margaret Crimmins)

The administration's economic mutations haven't exactly been warming the cockles of the hearts of world financiers, but a party last night at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts probably helped.

World Bank President and Mrs. Robert S. McNamara and International Monetary Fund Managing Director and Mrs. Pierre-Paul Schweitzer bought out the Opera House and treated economic leaders from 118 nations meeting here to a champagne reception and performance by the American Ballet Theatre, a departure from the usual dinner at a hotel.

The tab for the seats alone would run to about $18,622. And then there were the bottles and bottles of champagne and sherry. "They're being uncorked like water," said one of the white-gloved waiters. "It's all imported; I think it has to be for a crowd like this." (The champagne was Moet & Chandon Brut Imperial which sells for about $11 a bottle in supper clubs.)

McNamara, who was Secretary of Defense under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, looked down the massive, red-carpeted Grand Foyer and said, "It's great, just great."

The idea to entertain world financiers at the memorial to President Kennedy was Mrs. McNamara's, he said. "She started working on it months ago."

As McNamara and others explained, Washington has never been known for its ambience in entertaining delegates to IMF and World Bank conferences. "We've had some very pedestrian dinners in the past," said McNamara. "Small rooms in hotels; the size of this place is great."

His approximately 2,000 guests, sipping the Moet and nibbling at shrimp, steak tartar and avocado canapes, agreed that Washington looked much better this time around. (The IMF and World Bank meet here every other year.)

"This is much more dignified and more elegant, suitable for an international crowd like this," said a Britisher, now with the World Bank, who did not want to be identified.

"This is quite a different atmosphere from what we have been accustomed to in Washington," said N. V. Lough, deputy secretary of the treasury of New Zealand. "In the past there has always been so much noise in rooms with low ceilings and no culture."

Karl A. Schiller, West Germany's minister for economic affairs and finances and chairman of the conference, pronounced the center "magnificent, I do not understand all of the criticism." Standing close beside Schiller was his bride of four months, in a gold dress cut low at the neckline and slashed high from the bottom. She was feeding him appetizers because he did not have time for dinner.

"This was a very good idea to let all of us see this center," said S. R. Sen, executive director for the World Bank in India. "This is one of the best parties given in Washington."

He said the American embassy in New Delhi, also by architect Edward Durrell Stone, looks "very much" like the Kennedy Center from the outside. But never have I seen anything this large."

Mrs. J. Dewey Daane, whose husband is governor of the Federal Reserve district in Washington, admitted she has been "embarrassed at the lack of glamour in Washington" when international monetary figures met here.

"I used to feel rather sorry for the foreigners coming to Washington. In Europe they really roll out the red carpet. Last year, for example, we were guests for a performance of the Royal Danish Ballet in Copenhagen. In Washington, we'd go to a hotel, where they rather sling food at you.

"I'm really proud we could show some culture this time," said Mrs. Daane. "The whole conference seems to have been better. Someone has put some extra effort into it."

That extra effort for monetary leaders last night also meant that the "No Parking" spaces in front of the Center were filled with limousines, Rolls-Royces and Mercedes-Benzes, with nary an orange traffic ticket.

MASS FOR LIFE THROUGH HEALTH

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of childhood lead poisoning has stirred the hearts of thousands of people—not only people who have personally confronted this devastating illness, but others, as well, who have been moved by the needless ravages it produces.

In the city of Rochester, N.Y., there have been some very active and dedicated individuals and groups who have been combatting what is, in fact, a preventable disease. One of the most moving expressions of individual and group concern about eradicating this sickness which I have come in contact with is the "Mass for Life Through Health," a worship service jointly sponsored by the parishioners of Rochester's Immaculate Conception Church and the faculty, staff, and students of the University of Rochester's Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health.

I am including at this point a brief description of the "Mass for Life Through Health," published in the University of Rochester's Summer, 1971 "Rochester Review." I would offer one question for contemplation by my colleagues and others who might read this—why, when so many people are seeking to fight a dread disease which is clearly preventable, is the Federal Government—the executive, and the Congress—so reluctant to help by providing adequate funds?

The article from the Rochester Review, entitled "Mass for Life Through Health," follows:

MASS FOR LIFE THROUGH HEALTH

Each year some 400,000 of the nation's children are affected by a preventable ailment: poisoning by lead-based paint. Today's paints no longer are leaded, but the peeling chips in old ghetto dwellings remain a hazard for inner city youngsters. Not all "lead chip" victims die; not all suffer permanent injury to body or brain. But a sizeable number experience some lingering disability from eating paint from the flaking walls and window sills of ghetto buildings.

To parishioners of Immaculate Conception Church in Rochester's Third Ward and to faculty, students, and staff members of UR's Department of Preventive Medicine and Community Health, lead poisoning poses a constant threat to area children. From this mutual concern came the idea for a jointly sponsored worship service related to health and, specifically, to lead poisoning. The result—a unique Mass of Life Through Health—drew more than 1,100 participants to two services on a chilly Sunday morning late this spring; among the visitors, children from suburban Temple B'rith Kodesh and ex-prisoners from the county penitentiary who are engaged in a neighborhood health program with Medical School personnel.

For two weeks prior to the Mass, the eight grades in the Immaculate Conception School discussed lead problems in classes conducted by the UR team, and many youngsters entered their drawings, paintings, posters, and skits in a school art contest on the subject. Meanwhile, UR medical students and neighborhood volunteers blanketed the area with pamphlets on lead poisoning and offered to test paint from residents' homes.

Appropriately, the unusual Mass blended the traditional and the topical. There was gospel music and soul music . . . a sermon by Assistant Professor Naomi Chamberlain of the Medical School . . . the world premiere of "Paint Chips," a song written as a meditation hymn by Charles Blackwell, production manager for the Broadway musical "Promises, Promises." There were new words for much of the liturgy:

For those who own the houses with leaded paint—that is in a condition to maim and kill children—Open their minds and hearts today. Oh Lord let us pray

And new lyrics for the familiar "Jesus Loves Me":

In our homes and in our beds
Keep us safe from poisoned lead
To Jesus each of us belong
So help Him keep us well and strong

During the service, envelopes were passed out so that parishioners could send paint chips to the Medical School, which has developed a simple test for lead content. In the offertory procession, children carried some of the art contest entries to the altar; after the first service the prize-winning works were displayed at a coffee hour on lead poisoning.

Although the project has won widespread attention (the Mass was broadcast over the CBS "World of Religion" program and is being featured in leading religious and lay publications), its more significant outcome, for organizers and participants alike, is a very personal one; a greater awareness of a shared problem and a sense of community in trying to solve it, as, in the closing words of the service, "we are sent out now to find more life through health, for ourselves, our brothers, our children."

From the sermon delivered by Naomi Chamberlain, UR assistant professor of preventive medicine and community health, at the Mass for Life Through Health:

The practice of painting the inside of dwellings with such (lead) paint almost belongs to the past. The problem and tragedy of 400,000 children, little children between the ages of one and six, becoming poisoned from leaded paint eaten or chewed . . . is a problem and tragedy of the present.

Today is not to be used to accuse or attack that which has happened in the past, for we are "forgetting those things which are behind and reaching forth into those things which are before." Isaiah 43:18–19, this morning's word, is "Behold I will do a new thing; now it shall spring forth; shall ye not know it?" . . .

Some good things have been done in relation to the problem and tragedy of lead poisoning of children, little children. Today we recognize the good that has been done and we offer an act of appreciation for those things, but today we must leave them and "do a new thing" . . .

We can, each in our own way, move from the past into a present and future where active concern becomes concerned action.

EGAN WRITES NIXON—SCORES STATE DEPARTMENT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on September 15, 1971, I introduced into the House of Representatives a comprehensive legislative package aimed at revitalizing the American fishing industry. At that time, I also introduced several bills designed to protect American fishing grounds and marine resources from foreign fishing activities.

One bill which I introduced would authorize the use of the "straight baseline" method for determining the inner boundary of the territorial sea. This method allows the inclusion of bays and other indentations in the coastline to be included within the territorial sea. This can add as much as 30 percent to the area subject to control and protection by United States and Alaska authorities.

In a recent letter to the President which was also published in one of Alaska's most distinguished newspapers, the Petersburg Press, Gov. William Egan expressed his strong support for the straight baseline concept. At this time, I would like to bring his letter to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

EGAN WRITES NIXON—SCORES STATE DEPARTMENT

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

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of State recently completed what we consider to be a carelessly executed project which threatens serious harm to the national interest and to the people of Alaska. We feel that corrective action must be taken promptly in order to prevent the Department's labor from resulting in a major international incident.

In concert with the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Environmental Science Services Administration of the Department of Commerce, the State Department has undertaken the publication of documents or charts purporting to delimit provisionally the territorial sea, contiguous zone and internal waters on the maritime boundaries of the United States. These charts have now been published. Though fortunately not yet widely dispersed, they are available for purchase by the public and by representatives of foreign governments.

These charts do not use the straight baseline concept in measuring the Alaska coastline, a method which is increasingly the standard method used in international law. I have little doubt that such a technique would be peacefully accepted by our neighbors. It is the normal method used by countries endowed with a highly irregular coastline for determining that part of their boundary. The nations employing the straight base-line concept are: Norway, Sweden, Poland, Finland, Spain, West Germany, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Ecuador, Yugoslavia, Iran, Iceland, Cuba, Venezuela, Indonesia, Ireland, People's Republic of China, Korea, Albania, Bulgaria, Denmark, Italy, Romania, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and Great Britain.

As a result of the failure to use this standard, a generous slice of the American continental boundary, encompassing thousands of square miles of precious sovereignty has been all but surrendered by the stroke of a draftsman's pen. I urge you to take a hard look at the use of the straight base-line concept in determining the boundaries of the United States.

Incidentally, but critically, the use of the straight baseline method would enormously simplify, to the advantage of all, certain technical, contentious and litigious issues in determining the historic waters of the United States in Alaska and Maine. Earlier consideration of this method would have prevented the grave error which has caused me to write to you directly out of concern for a situation which could get out of hand.

Without consulting the historic record, including the judgment of the Alaska Boundary Tribunal of 1910–11, without examining a continuous pattern of assertion of

sovereignty by public authorities going back to the Treaty of Acquisition, and without consulting the State of Alaska, the cartographers have allowed the high seas, including the contiguous zone, to invade every historic bay and channel of the Alexander Archipelago (the Alaska Panhandle) more than six miles wide, as well as the Bristol Bay fisheries and other waters on the periphery of the Alaskan land mass and related islands.

Mr. President, if this is allowed to stand, it will effectively destroy the fisheries regulation program conducted by the State of Alaska. It will encourage the intrusion of foreign fishermen into the internal waters of the United States, and open the door to penetration by foreign warships.

I cannot stand by and let this happen. A few years ago, protecting the sovereign jurisdiction of the State and the United States, the Alaska State Department of Fish and Game was forced to seize a Japanese vessel in Shelikof Strait. This action was taken only after I pleaded with the State Department to take appropriate action. Federal authorities ignored my plea that they urge the Japanese ambassador in Washington, D.C., to take steps interceding with Japanese fishing companies who had announced in Tokyo that a Japanese fishing fleet was preparing to go to Alaska's Shelikof Strait on a herring fishing expedition designed to establish, in their words, "historic fishing rights." Because of failure on the part of the U.S. Department of State to recognize the seriousness of the situation at that time, I was left with no other choice than to order the apprehension of the Japanese when they came in and persisted in violating the fishing laws and regulations of the State of Alaska. As well as protecting the sovereignty of State of Alaska waters, my action headed off potential violence. The Federal Administration was embarrassed by the national press coverage surrounding the incident, and now we are faced with a larger problem.

This situation is potentially more serious than the Shelikof Strait situation and threatens our good relations with our Canadian neighbors. If Canadian halibut boats attempt to fish Chatham Strait or any other waters which are internal to the State of Alaska, the State has no alternative but to act.

This is not a theoretical issue; we understand that already a Canadian vessel has experimented in testing these maps by fishing in the Strait and the U.S. Coast Guard forbore from action after consulting these maps.

We cannot so forbear. Not only do I feel it is my constitutional obligation to act, but in addition, if firm governmental action is not forthcoming, I would be fearful of violence as traditional fishing grounds of the United States and Alaska are invaded.

I would hope, Mr. President, that you could investigate the situation immediately. I am fearful that subordinates in the government, without your knowledge, have taken steps which could gravely injure the national interest.

Pending completion of your investigation the maps should immediately be withdrawn from sale and the Coast Guard and other agencies should be instructed to disregard them and not use them to change any established policy or practice.

One last feature of this arbitrary action by the government I would call to your attention. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, all agencies of the Federal Government are required to include in every recommendation on proposals for major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment a detailed statement on the impact of the proposed action on the human environment.

There is no doubt in my mind that the manufacture and distribution of these maps is such a major federal action significantly affecting the human environment. Yet arbitrarily and capriciously and without the public hearing which would have been an invaluable aid to the State Department, the two agencies have proceeded without the slightest regard for the National Environmental Policy Act to take action which could do irreparable harm to the national resources of Alaska. This alone is sufficient reason to rescind the action, at least until adequate public hearings are held and the Act complied with.

I urge you to act promptly to correct this deplorable and dangerous situation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

PENTAGON MANIPULATES HISTORY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that in its memorial to the late President Eisenhower, the Defense Department has misrepresented his farewell address to the Nation of January 17, 1961. In the Eisenhower Corridor of the Pentagon, certain portions of the late President's final address are quoted in an edited form which I believe distorts the essential thrust of the speech.

President Eisenhower was deeply concerned that advances in technology combined with the growing needs of the country had created an opportunity for the Military Establishment and the armaments industry to exert undue and improper influence in the formation of national policy. As a former general in the U.S. Army, no one knew the potential uses and abuses of military power better than he.

President Eisenhower balanced his belief in a strong defense with a firm dedication to the principle of civilian control of the military. He recognized the crucial distinctions between a strong military and strong military-industrial complex, and those between the necessity for security and the unnecessary luxury of expanding needless weapons systems.

National security, said Eisenhower, depended on "security with solvency . . . not in overindulging sentimental attachments to outmoded military machines and concepts, or in heeding noisy trumpeting about dazzling military schemes or untrustworthy programs."

President Eisenhower was deeply committed to the goal of disarmament. "The quest for peace," he said, "is the statesman's most exacting duty."

In his farewell address to the Nation, which he spent many hours personally drafting and revising, Ike said:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will exist.

History has made a prophet of the late President. But the Pentagon would manipulate history by the stroke of the censor's pen. They would ignore the general's ominous warning, and tailor his statements to the specifications of the Pentagon brass. The Pentagon's memorial to General Eisenhower, with its substantial editing of Ike's remarks, is more of an exercise in self-justification than an honest testimonial to the late President.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD the entire, uncensored Eisenhower speech for comparison with the abbreviated edition which appears in the Eisenhower Corridor just down the hall from Secretary Laird's office at the Pentagon:

[Delivered from the President's Office at 8:30 p.m.]

FAREWELL RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, JANUARY 17, 1961

My fellow Americans: Three days from now, after half a century in the service of our country, I shall lay down the responsibilities of office as, in traditional and solemn ceremony, the authority of the Presidency is vested in my successor.

This evening I come to you with a message of leave-taking and farewell, and to share a few final thoughts with you, my countrymen.

Like every other citizen, I wish the new President, and all who will labor with him, Godspeed. I pray that the coming years will be blessed with peace and prosperity for all.

Our people expect their President and the Congress to find essential agreement on issues of great moment, the wise resolution of which will better shape the future of the Nation.

My own relations with the Congress, which began on a remote and tenuous basis when, long ago, a member of the Senate appointed me to West Point, have since ranged to the intimate during the war and immediate postwar period, and, finally, to the mutually interdependent during these past eight years.

In this final relationship, the Congress and the Administration have, on most vital issues, cooperated well, to serve the national good rather than mere partisanship, and so have assured that the business of the Nation should go forward. So, my official relationship with the Congress ends in a feeling, on my part, of gratitude that we have been able to do so much together.

II.

We now stand ten years past the midpoint of a century that has witnessed four major wars among great nations. Three of these involved our own country. Despite these holocausts America is today the strongest, the most influential and most productive nation in the world. Understandably proud of this pre-eminence, we yet realize that America's leadership and prestige depend, not merely upon our unmatched material progress, riches and military strength, but on how we use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.

III.

Throughout America's adventure in free government, our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement, and to enhance liberty, dignity and integrity among people and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people. Any failure traceable to arrogance, or our lack of comprehension or readiness to sacrifice would inflict upon us grievous hurt both at home and abroad.

Progress toward these noble goals is persistently threatened by the conflict now engulfing the world. It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sac-

rifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle—with liberty the stake. Only thus shall we remain, despite every provocation, on our charted course toward permanent peace and human betterment.

Crises there will continue to be. In meeting them, whether foreign or domestic, great or small, there is a recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties. A huge increase in newer elements of our defense; development of unrealistic programs to cure every ill in agriculture; a dramatic expansion in basic and applied research—these and many other possibilities, each possibly promising in itself, may be suggested as the only way to the road we wish to travel.

But each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs—balance between the private and the public economy, balance between cost and hoped for advantage—balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable; balance between our essential requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation upon the individual; balance between actions of the moment and the national welfare of the future. Good judgment seeks balance and progress; lack of it eventually finds imbalance and frustration.

The record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their government have, in the main, understood these truths and have responded to them well, in the face of stress and threat. But threats, new in kind or degree, constantly arise. I mention two only.

IV.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

Our military organization today bears little relation to that known by any of my predecessors in peacetime, or indeed by the fighting men of World War II or Korea.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security more than the net income of all United States corporations.

This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every State house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.

Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

In this revolution, research has become central; it also becomes more formulated, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government.

Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society.

V.

Another factor in maintaining balance involves the element of time. As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

VI.

Down the long lane of the history yet to be written America knows that this world of ours, every growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect.

Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic, and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences, not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war—as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years—I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

Happily, I can say that war has been avoided. Steady progress toward our ultimate goal has been made. But, so much remains to be done. As a private citizen, I shall never cease to do what little I can to help the world advance along that road.

VII.

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—my fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied; that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full; that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spirital blessings; that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities; that all those who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity; that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

[Abbreviated version]

FAREWELL ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

So—in this my last good night to you as your President—I thank you for the many opportunities you have given me for public service in war and peace. I trust that in that service you find some things worthy; as for the rest of it, I know you will find ways to improve performance in the future.

You and I—by fellow citizens—need to be strong in our faith that all nations, under God, will reach the goal of peace with justice. May we be ever unswerving in devotion to principle, confident but humble with power, diligent in pursuit of the Nation's great goals.

To all the peoples of the world, I once more give expression to America's prayerful and continuing aspiration:

We pray that peoples of all faiths, all races, all nations, may have their great human needs satisfied;

that those now denied opportunity shall come to enjoy it to the full;

that all who yearn for freedom may experience its spiritual blessings;

that those who have freedom will understand, also, its heavy responsibilities;

That all who are insensitive to the needs of others will learn charity;

that the scourges of poverty, disease and ignorance will be made to disappear from the earth, and

that, in the goodness of time, all peoples will come to live together in a peace guaranteed by the binding force of mutual respect and love.

CLIFTON C. CARTER—GREAT AMERICAN

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Samuel Johnson once said:

We cannot tell the precise moment when friendship is formed.

These words are so true, because friendship is a positive and unalterable choice of a person whom we have singled out for qualities that we most admire. Clifton C. Carter was just such a man to me. Although he never held a public office per se, he was a public servant; a devoted husband and father; a true American and a Christian gentleman. His untimely death is a great loss to the coun-

try which he dearly loved and fought for. I share the grief of his family and so that some small part of the contributions which he has made to his country and to mankind will be a part of the recorded annals of the Congress, I would like to insert at this time the articles which appeared in both the Washington Star and the Washington Post following his death:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 23, 1971]

CLIFTON C. CARTER DIES AT 53; ADVISER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

(By Michael Hodge)

Clifton C. Carter, former President Lyndon B. Johnson's "political troubleshooter" and former executive director of the Democratic National Committee, died Tuesday at Arlington Hospital. He lived at 3811 N. Nelson St., Arlington.

Mr. Carter was born in Smithville, Tex., 53 years ago, and had been a key assistant to Lyndon Johnson since he volunteered to help out in Mr. Johnson's first congressional campaign in 1937.

He initially enrolled in Schreiner Institute, at Kerrville, Tex., but transferred to the University of Texas.

His education was interrupted by World War II when he was called to active duty with the 36th Texas National Guard Division, in which he rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel.

During the war he earned the Legion of Merit, Bronze Star and Croix de Guerre.

In 1948, he headed up Mr. Johnson's race for the Senate. In 1949 he was appointed U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Texas and served there until 1954.

In 1957 he joined Mr. Johnson's staff to direct his home office in Texas. Four years later, he came to Washington to assist the then Vice President.

In 1963, Mr. Carter moved back to Texas to return to private business but stayed there only a few months before he returned to Washington and became Mr. Johnson's chief liaison with the Democratic National Committee.

A year later, he became executive director of the Committee. He left the Committee in 1966 to head his own public relations firm here.

He returned to politics briefly in 1968 to help Mr. Johnson with his decision to run for another term.

Mr. Carter is survived by his wife, the former Mary Jane Garrett of the home; three daughters, Mrs. Michael Livingston of Austin, Tex., Mrs. Daniel B. Shuffle of Annandale and Laurie of the home; two sons, Bill, a student at the University of Cincinnati and Lyndon, a student at the University of Texas; two sisters, Mrs. Gordon Hughes of Smithville and Mrs. Joe Marshall of Lake Jackson Tex., and a brother John P. Carter of McLean, Va.

[From the Washington Star, Sept. 22, 1971]

CLIFTON C. CARTER DIES; FORMER JOHNSON AIDE

Clifton C. Carter, 53, a former executive director of the Democratic National Committee and a political lieutenant in most of Lyndon B. Johnson's election campaigns, died yesterday in Arlington Hospital after a brief illness. He lived at 3811 N. Nelson St., Arlington.

Mr. Carter began working for Johnson elections as a volunteer during the former President's first campaign for the House in Texas in 1937.

Since resigning as national committee executive director in 1966, Mr. Carter had been in the investment business here, both as a counselor for several firms and for individuals.

Mr. Carter was born in Smithville, Tex., a railroad town near Austin. He attended Schreiner Institute in Kerrville, Tex., and was president of the student body and captain of the football team before transferring to the University of Texas. There he played tackle on teams coached by Francis X. Bible.

During World War II, Mr. Carter became a lieutenant colonel in the Army. He served overseas 30 months with the Texas National Guard's 36th Infantry Division. His decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star and the French Croix de Guerre.

After the war, he operated a soft-drink bottling business in Bryan, Tex., where he became president of the Lions Club, Jaycees and Chamber of Commerce. He also once was president of the Texas Bottlers Association. Mr. Carter served on the Bryan city commission and by 1947, he was named an outstanding young man in Texas.

He was campaign manager in 1946 for Rep. Olin E. Teague, D-Tex., in the special election in which Teague was elected to his first House term. That victory was regarded by Texas politicians as proof of Mr. Carter's ability to reconcile the irreconcilable in a five-man race. Teague finished second, barely forcing a runoff, but by midnight of election day, Mr. Carter had lined up the three eliminated candidates to support Teague. Two days later the frontrunner withdrew.

Mr. Carter handled the Teague (6th) district for Johnson when he ran for the Senate in 1948. In 1949 he was appointed U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Texas.

After Johnson was reelected in 1954, Mr. Carter became chairman of Johnson's statewide political oragnization.

In the 1960 presidential election Mr. Carter played a major role in carrying Texas for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket.

Mr. Carter joined then-Vice President Johnson's staff here in 1961. A month after President Kennedy's assassination, he was designated as the White House liaison man with the Democratic National Committee.

In 1963 Mr. Carter moved with his family back to Texas to work in private business, but at Johnson's request he returned here several months later.

He became executive director of the national committee in 1965. In early 1966 the White House took a firmer grip on party finances by seeing that Mr. Carter became committee treasurer. He had been acting treasurer since the resignation of Richard Maguire.

Mr. Carter, as executive director, ran the national committee while National Chairman John M. Bailey, installed during the Kennedy regime, was largely a figurehead chairman.

Mr. Carter's 1966 resignation came as the Democrats were gearing for the fall elections. A surprise to most committee personnel and to Capitol Hill party strategists, the move was regarded by some Democrats as a matter of Mr. Carter's frustration at some of the tasks he had been assigned. He had to see that the heavy Democratic majority was maintained in Congress, and to cut committee expenses and staff, and to endure criticism on an "ad book" the committee published to pay off the heavy 1964 campaign debt. Democratic sources said that Mr. Carter had done yeoman work under financial and other handicaps.

He leaves his wife, the former Mary Jane Garrett; three daughters, Mrs. Michael J. Livingston of Austin, a bridesmaid in the wedding of Luci Johnson Nugent, Mrs. Daniel B. Shuffle of Annandale, and Laurie; two sons, William G., at the University of Cincinnati, and Lyndon, at the University of Texas, and three grandchildren.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 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?

NATHANIANA AT "DRIVE TIME"

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, every weekday afternoon from 2 to 6 p.m., one of my constituents carries on with droll conversation, plays records and generally makes life easier for the thousands of motorists parked bumper-to-bumper on the Southeast Expressway. Between those hours, Norm Nathan broadcasts from his "plush but not overly ostentatious studio above scenic Morrissey Boulevard."

Norm does not work alone. His assistant on WHDH, Marilyn Garelnik, helps him conduct the Teen Canteen and gets some of the shyer participants over the rough spots. She is particularly considerate with Frieda because none of the boys will dance with her.

But no tribute to Norm would be complete without mentioning his wife Norma, a State House reporter for the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune. Together, they form a team composed of alliteration, warmth, and great good humor.

Norm is an acknowledged expert on jazz and when he was hosting "Sounds in the Night," it was a pleasure to have insomnia. But in Boston, the greater common good was served by shifting Norm to a daytime hour. The Boston Globe had a feature on Norm this week. To acquaint my colleagues with this Boston institution, I am placing the article by Bruce McCabe in the RECORD:

NATHANIANA AT "DRIVE TIME"

(By Bruce McCabe)

At about 2:05 p.m. yesterday on WHDH, the last lingering echoes of Barbra Streisand's lush, rather heavily orchestrated version of "Beautiful" were fading when a voice, slightly nasal and slightly irreverent, said:

"That takes care of the overture."

The voice belongs to Norm Nathan, an owlish, subtly iconoclastic 45-year-old disc jockey who, perhaps as much as anyone in Boston broadcasting, is responsible for whatever knowledge Bostonians have about some of the better things in popular music. To many homeward-bound commuters, it is a voice as familiar as the sound of an engine idling.

Sometimes it seems as if Norm Nathan has been doing his show forever, from some studio secreted away on one of the most cosmic middle-of-the-road music stations in the universe. But this is not true. He has been on afternoons, during what he refers to as "drive time," only for the past three years.

Authentic experts on Nathaniana stress that it was during a 12-year stretch, from October 1956 to June 1968, on "Sounds in the Night," which was aired nightly between the approximate hours of 11:30 p.m. and 5:30 a.m., than Nathan emerged as somewhat of an institution on Boston radio.

"That was my first decent job," he says. "I started out playing half an hour of Mantovani and half an hour of Andrei Kostalanetz, but then I started slipping in a little Duke Ellington and Charlie Barnett and pretty soon I dropped the other stuff."

His aversion to lush, overripe instrumentation a la Mantovani is something that persists to this day. He responds to the selection of one of these records by his music department by playing it as background music to graphic narrations extolling the "beautiful Georgetown, Mass., gravel pits" or the "charming sanitary landfill operation at the Peabody dump."

(One of the less happy aspects of Nathan's switch to days is the section of his material by someone other than himself, someone with taste more commercial(ized). When he was doing "Sounds in the Night," he scheduled his own music and "it was like being in business for yourself," he says.

Nathan may have done more than anyone to promote jazz in Boston over a sustained period of time. Besides scheduling it for his show, he talked intelligently about it with guests who dropped by the studio when they were in town, Louis Armstrong, Errol Garner, Buddy Rich, Sarah Vaughn and Stan Kenton among them.

Nathan came to WHDH after winning a couple of summer replacement auditions. He got the "Sounds in the Night" assignment after the Andrea Doria sank and the station decided that it wanted an on-the-air announcer in case of similar disasters. Nathan replaced a device that played recorded music on the program and he considers it one of his triumphs that "I am one of the few humans to replace automation."

Some of his purist listeners, accustomed to him as a voice in the night, were offended by his decision to take the day job. But Nathan has no regrets.

"Jazz was losing its popularity among college-age kids. They were switching to folk and rock. And when you start losing the kids, you lose a lot of your audience. It's the kid that stay up all night. Married people go to bed after the 11 o'clock news."

At its start, Nathan's afternoon show was more-or-less straitjacketed in the Wayne Newton-Robert Goulet-Al Martino-Jerry Vale syndrome, but, under the insistent prodding of music director Bob Clayton, it is becoming more adventurously middle-of-the-road. Led Zeppelin will probably not make it for a while, but Joan Baez and the Beatles have infiltrated successfully.

In a sense, popular music is moving in a rather circular direction today, making such distinctions as "middle-of-the-road" rather suspect.

"White singers from Minnesota and North Dakota are singing 'black' in imitation of English singers who imitate blacks. Everybody sounds like a Mississippi Delta black except the guy who comes from there. The blacks are teed off and I don't blame them. There is a young guy in town now, Bill Withers, who is billed as 'the black James Taylor.' And Taylor is a white guy who sings 'black.' Where does it end?"

Nathan has also developed a cast to assist him with his show, one member of which is a melodramatic sportscaster named Ron Lillis who sounds suspiciously like Don Gillis and whose expertise lies in the story that ends, ". . . and that man was . . ."

Another is the never-heard but "always lovely Marilyn Garelnik," whose tips about news from the world of entertainment (car-wash openings, rodeos on ice and nose-flute concerts) sound strangely like the items from the city's poorest-written nightclub column.

And finally there is "Your beloved story teller, Arnold," a rather mauldin moralizer who specializes in such tales as the criminal "fence" who distributed his ill-gotten watches and jewelry to neighborhood kids and their parents, thus proving the adage that "good fences make good neighbors."

Nathan reserves his most colorful descriptions for what he refers to as "WHDH Broadcast City," a sprawling complex that bears little relation to the station's Morrissey boulevard quarters but which contains a heated swimming pool, a short subjects theater, a sauna bath-health room and periodic fashion shows which feature the smiling and ever-popular "WHDH beauties." (Nathan broadcasts from "plush but not overly ostentatious studios.")

All of which is, as Nathan says, a long way for a boy born in Boston, raised in Everett and graduated from Chelsea High School.

In a busines known for its pressures and its flamboyance, Nathan remains solid and stable. His vivacious wife, Norma, is a staffer for the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune, and they have two daughters, Sonja, 12, and Sarah, 4. The family has lived in Middleton for years and has just moved into a Colonial on 28 acres of land where Nathan says he has high hopes of "growing things."

Unlike many radio personalities, he is not panting to do television, or even talk radio, which he describes as "like asking your milkman to make a speech on where he stands—who cares?"

Perhaps the only thing he feels really strongly about is the tendency of a younger generation to link him with the kind of music Lawrence Welk plays, as if age somehow automatically hardened one's musical arteries.

"I never did like Lawrence Welk and I doubt that I ever will."

Mr. Speaker, the Gloucester Times, a daily newspaper in my district, recently won second honorable mention in its division for the A. J. Liebling Memorial Awards. In citing the Times, the Newspaper Editorial Workshop Services noted that the Times has exceptional news, feature, and photography coverage. From firsthand knowledge of the paper, I have to agree. The reporters and editors take their jobs seriously and Charles Lowe, the paper's photographer, adds art to what otherwise would be a straight news photo. The Gloucester Times is an integral part of Gloucester, and the recent award is well deserved.

NIXON'S ECONOMIC PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent reversal of his past economic policies is in essence an acknowledgement of the failure of his administration to deal with the now all-too-familiar problems of inflation, unemployment, and balance-of-payments disequilibrium. During the past 2½ years of Nixon's presidency, unemployment has climbed from 3.3 to 6.1 percent, prices have risen at an annual rate of 8.4 percent, the GNP has fallen for the first time since 1958, and the United States suffered its first balance-of-trade deficit since 1893. Clearly, it was high time for the Nixon administration to give second thought to its optimistic claims about impending economic recovery and to yield to the long-standing recommendations of many economists and Congressmen.

Although I feel it is essential that the basic outlines of the President's new economic program be put into effect, I do have several serious reservations about particular aspects of this program. H.R. 10947 has dealt with some of these; in particular, I support those changes in Nixon's original program which would provide for additional tax relief for low-income individuals. I also support the bill's reduction of the accelerated depreciation allowances and of the investment tax credit from the proposed 10 percent to the present 7 percent. In Nixon's original program these alone would have cost the Government over $8 billion in loss of revenue.

I have joined other Democratic representatives in a statement proposing certain other modifications of the President's program which would benefit the consumer as much as the President's bill benefits business. To review these briefly, the statement recommends:

First, that the President use the authority he now has under the Credit Control Act of 1969 to limit increases in interest rates;

Second, that more funds should be used to expand emergency public service and public works job programs and for the enactment of welfare reform;

Third, that additional needed revenues be raised by closing the loopholes in the Federal tax system which benefit special interests;

Fourth, that the local property taxpayer be helped by maintaining Federal aids for State and local governments needed to head off further increases in the property tax; and

Fifth, that efforts be made to get labor and management agreement on effective wage-price controls which protect the interests of all parties, including the consumer.

In addition, I feel that two other aspects of the President's program need revision—the 10-percent import surcharge and the President's action in deferring Federal pay raises and reducing Federal employment by 5 percent.

The import surcharge, combined with the suspension of the dollar's convertibility into gold, has served its temporary usefulness in bringing about much-needed revaluations of Japanese and several European currencies and in stimulating reform of the international monetary system. The surcharge by itself, however, cannot be relied on to improve the U.S. balance of trade; in fact, unless its temporary nature is specified, it more probably may serve to trigger a retaliatory trade war.

Not only is the surcharge a departure from the rules of the general agreement on trade and tariffs and an irritant in our foreign relations, but it also sabo-

tages the interests of the American consumer and indeed Nixon's anti-inflationary objectives themselves, in the sense that it deprives Americans of lower priced products and thereby insulates the U.S. economy from world prices.

In another sense, too, it seems that the President's program has unequally distributed the burdens of national sacrifice. While I would agree that it is important for the Federal Government to set an example in austerity, I do feel that the President's directive in extending the freeze for Federal employees and in requiring a 5-percent cut in Federal employment is decidedly unfair and can only serve to damage the morale of Federal workers and the attractiveness of Federal service itself.

Government workers have lagged behind organized labor in cost-of-living wage increases, and now it seems they are being asked to endure special sacrifices in order to help compensate for the Government's revenue loss from the investment tax credit, the repeal of the automobile excise tax, and the accelerated depreciation allowances. The 6-percent Federal raises granted by Congress in January 1970 cannot by themselves be considered a causal factor of wage-push inflation, for they were in fact recommended by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in order to restore wage comparability to Federal workers at that time—in January 1970. To deprive Federal workers of these raises by extending the freeze for them would certainly be an injustice which they cannot be expected to tolerate.

Furthermore, I would also recommend that some real mechanism of enforcement be created which could insure that those whose salaries are less visible than Government workers' salaries share equally in the burdens of the wage-price freeze.

On the matter of the freeze on rents, let me say that I wholeheartedly support Congressman RYAN'S legislation to extend the rent freeze until April 30, 1972. The housing problem is one of the most serious this country has to face. If the rent freeze is not extended, tenants may well be presented with rent hikes so exorbitant as to make middle-income housing almost impossible to find.

SENATE—*Monday, October 4, 1971*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Vouchsafe Thy blessing, O Lord, upon the Senate and upon all work undertaken in Thy fear and for Thy glory; and grant that all who serve Thee here—Senators, officers, staff, and attendants—may keep the spirit of service ever before them, remembering Him who said, "Whoever would be greatest among you, let him be the servant of all."

Grant Thy higher wisdom to the President and all who are set in authority that justice and righteousness may prevail at home and peace may be achieved abroad among the nations.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 2613. An act to extend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, for 1 month; and

H.R. 10538. An act to extend the authority for insuring loans under the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 1, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE SENATE FLOOR FOR THE CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 368, Senate Resolution 171.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. Res. 171, relative to extending the privilege of the Senate floor to the Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 171

Resolved, That, rule XXXIII of the Senate be amended to insert a new line following "The Architect of the Capitol", as follows: "The Chaplain of the House of Representatives."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 364), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

Senate Resolution 171 would amend rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding the Chaplain of the House of Representatives to the list of persons who may be admitted to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session.

This action has been taken by the Committee on Rules and Administration as an expression of comity with the House of Representatives, which customarily has admitted the Chaplain of the Senate to the House floor while the House has been in session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination in the U.S. Coast Guard.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination in the U.S. Coast Guard on the executive calendar will be stated.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of William M. Benkert, to be a rear admiral.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.