

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. MEEDS, Mrs. MINK, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. BELL, Mr. PEYSER, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. FORSYTHE):

H.J. Res. 923. Joint resolution to assure that every needy schoolchild will receive a free or reduced price lunch as required by section 9 of the National School Lunch Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HUNGATE, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLIARD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PODELL, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, and Mr. REES):

H.J. Res. 924. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the

United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. WRIGHT):

H.J. Res. 925. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 926. Joint resolution asking the President of the United States to declare the fourth Saturday of each September "National Hunting and Fishing Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H. Con. Res. 421. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies

concerning the rights of Soviet Jewry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 422. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. BURTON, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GRASSO, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. METCALFE, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H. Con. Res. 423. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that any individual whose earnings are substandard or who is amongst the working poor or near poor should be exempt from any wage freeze under the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, as amended, and amendments thereto and regulations issued thereunder pursuant to Executive Order 11615; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PORTLAND PATROLMAN NAMED POLICEMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I think we have come to recognize that our Nation's law enforcement officers are just as crucial as lawmakers in our efforts to maintain a sane and just democratic society. As never before, our men in blue stand as the focal point in the problems which arise among our citizens. While we strive for a system of laws and a responsive government, America's law enforcement officers are the men in the front lines, protecting our society day in and day out, and particularly during the nights, with their very lives.

In our efforts to keep tensions among our citizens to a minimum, we are asking our law enforcement officers to stand not only as symbols and enforcers of the law, but also as men of understanding and compassion, able to deal with their fellow Americans on human terms. It is fitting, therefore, that the International Association of Chiefs of Police in cooperation with Parade magazine has selected as recipient of the sixth annual Police Service Award a man who epitomizes this cooperation between our citizens and our law enforcement agencies.

I am very, very proud that the final choice as recipient of this award is Officer Wesley W. Ridlon of the Portland, Maine, Police Department. This selection is an honor not only for Officer Ridlon and his fine family, but also for the entire Portland Police Department, headed by Chief Douglas W. Steele. It is an honor well earned. We are indebted to Officer Ridlon and to the many, many men like him who stand in service to our Nation.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues not only the article which appeared in Parade on September 26, 1971, but also editorials which ap-

peared in the Portland Press Herald and the Portland Evening Express of September 28 and 30, respectively. These editorials express our pride as Maine citizens in our police officers and the heartfelt congratulations and thanks which we extend to Officer Ridlon.

[From Parade magazine, Sept. 26, 1971]

WESLEY RIDLON: POLICEMAN OF THE YEAR—HE BUILDS A BRIDGE BETWEEN KIDS AND COPS
(By John G. Rogers)

PORTLAND, MAINE.—When Officer Wesley W. Ridlon of the Portland Police Department recently came to the end of a rap session on drug abuse at a school for delinquent boys, one of the wayward teenagers approached him and mumbled, "If I'd had a chance to meet you a year ago, I don't think they'd had to send me to this place."

Wes Ridlon was touched because nearly all his work as a law enforcement officer is trying to build a bridge between kids and cops, trying to convince skeptical schoolchildren that the police are "human guys" vitally necessary to the orderly conduct of society.

NEW TREND IN POLICE WORK

More and more police departments all over the country are assigning full-time officers to this same assignment. And because it's thus acknowledged by lawmen to be important duty and because Wes Ridlon has been a model performer, he has been selected as the 1971 recipient of the symbolic Police Service Award conferred by Parade and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

This sixth annual award is made in appreciation of good work done by peace officers everywhere. It also is made in an effort to dramatize the great variety of police work which is not all chasing "bad guys." In Ridlon's case it's dedication to making friends.

"Kids are surely the most important resource we have," says Ridlon, himself the father of three. "Personally I shudder at the thought of alienating them and I can't see any reason why police work should be performed in a way that turns them off. We have got to show them that we're important to each other."

This week, in Anaheim, Calif., at the annual convention of the police chiefs' association, Ridlon will be awarded a plaque, and honorable mention plaques will go to ten other officers as symbolic awards recognizing the many ways in which police make themselves useful.

Ridlon's usefulness to the school kids of Portland, and by extension to the entire community, can be seen in many ways. He recalls that when he first began going to schools, he would hear mutters: "There's a cop. Wonder who he's chasing." But now they run up to him with a "Hi, Mr. Ridlon. Are you gonna give us a talk today?" And everywhere he goes about the city, he is greeted by his young friends. He visits them at schools and playgrounds for all sorts of group activity—lectures, film and slide demonstrations, bicycle rodeos and just plain rapping. And they come to him, more and more of them, as individuals with problems.

Says Assistant School Superintendent Clyde Bartlett: "As good a way as any to measure the success of Wes Ridlon's work is in the numbers of youngsters who seek him out after school hours and ask his advice. They'll often go to him rather than their guidance counselors. That's pretty fine praise for a police officer."

Ridlon recounts: "I never cease to be amazed at the variety of problems bothering kids today: How far can the police go in searching a car for beer cans? If a young fellow drinks moderately at a school dance, can he still get in trouble? If you're at a party and drugs are being used, but you don't know it, why is it the police can still arrest you? Frankly, I can't answer all their questions to their satisfaction. And if I can't, I level with them. You have to do that. A kid can spot evasion immediately."

Parade watched Ridlon in action before a group of disadvantaged young women and saw an example of his honest approach. One of them said, "You people make a big thing against narcotics but still you'll use alcohol. Aren't you a hypocrite?"

"All right, you've put me on the spot," Ridlon conceded. "I'd have to admit that if it's true the heroin user starts on marijuana, then you can say the alcoholic starts on beer. I won't defend the use of alcohol but I will say that on the average it doesn't have the savage destruction of narcotics or the need to turn to crime to get it."

SCHOOLTEACHER, TOO

Ridlon, 39 years old, a member of the Presidential Honor Guard during his U.S. Army days, probably works harder than a conventional policeman in his devotion to Portland's 17,500 schoolchildren. Last year he gave nearly 600 talks. His rap sessions in the high schools—called Problems of Democracy—have proved so popular that the young-

sters have asked that they be converted into a formal course with academic credit. As a result, Ridlon is now a "schoolteacher" as well as policeman, teaching a Community Awareness Program. The kids insisted that they wanted to put questions to "the people who run the community" so Ridlon is bringing in the city manager, finance director, public health officer, city councilmen and others who can answer the students' searching questions.

He constantly tries to give the youngsters a piece of the action: "At a parochial high school I asked them to tell me how the police department could be administered better. One of the things they came up with—they actually figured out that we could save several thousand dollars a year by buying smaller but more deluxe patrol cars because we'd get more money when we turned them in."

NEW CLIMATE

Says Portland Police Chief Douglas W. Steele: "Wes Ridlon's enthusiasm in working with school youngsters is creating a new climate among them as far as police work is concerned. Obviously we can give the community better service if we have the cooperation of our young people. Wes Ridlon may create a whole generation of law abiding citizens."

Ridlon doesn't pretend to aim that high. The other day at the delinquent boys' school, he encountered some of his former "customers" from Portland High School. They're now inmates.

But other cases give great satisfaction. Recently he "took charge" of a 16-year-old girl whose family had left her at loose ends. Shy and nervous, she'd taken to marijuana and speed pills. After she took an overdose, Ridlon helped place her in a mental health clinic. When she emerged he had a supermarket job waiting for her. First she worked behind the scenes, then was moved out to face the public as a cashier to overcome her shyness.

"I think she's made it," says Ridlon.

AMUSING INCIDENT

Recently he experienced an incident that amused him. Two boys were riding patrol with him while making a "documentary" on police work with camera and tape recorder. A pair of young toughs came along and began to yell provocative taunts at Ridlon. The documentary makers had become so identified with Ridlon, the policeman, that they urged angrily, "Let's arrest those guys."

Perhaps the most poignant moment in his career with kids came after he'd noticed that one long-haired, sloppily-dressed boy always seemed to sneak furtively into Ridlon's Problems of Democracy class. This went on for weeks. Finally a teacher at the school happened to see the boy. The teacher came straight to Ridlon and told him the boy had been expelled from school a month ago. But he was still coming back to rap with a cop. That indicates the caliber of performance that has made Officer Wes Ridlon the Policeman of the Year.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, Sept. 30, 1971]
BLUE IS BEAUTIFUL

As a general rule, kids and cops do not make an easy blend.

Portland can take special pride, therefore, in the selection of Wesley W. Ridlon as Policeman of the Year. The national honor was conferred on him this week by Parade Magazine and the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Patrolman Ridlon's specialty is getting through to the young people of the community. He is the Portland Police Department's school liaison officer, and his performance in that role has won the unbridled

admiration both of his colleagues and the kids he works with.

That he is a hit with the youngsters is undeniable, according to school officials who say that many students seek him out after school hours to ask his advice on a variety of matters.

His rap sessions have become so popular that on one occasion a hippie-type boy who had been expelled from a Portland school continued to sneak back into class whenever Ridlon made an appearance at the school.

Patrolman Ridlon's effectiveness is no small achievement, particularly in an era of social upheaval when many young people view the average cop as little more than a bully with a badge.

It is also a reminder that community relations—something relatively new in the lexicon of the nation's local police—should not be regarded as the sole responsibility of a single officer, but rather of all the men in the department.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Sept. 28, 1971]

TOP COP

Awards and titles are a dime a dozen these days but here in Portland we're extremely proud of the selection of Patrolman Wesley W. Ridlon as Policeman of the Year.

There is much more to it than just having the "top cop" in the country. There would be pride, of course, anytime a local officer was chosen for that award by the International Association of Chiefs of Police together with Parade Magazine. But the very special and distinctive sense of satisfaction derives from the service Officer Ridlon performed and the manner in which he did his job.

Officer Ridlon's very special assignment in Portland is school liaison officer. This is a highly delicate area of community relations. Building a relationship of mutual respect and understanding between police and young people today is no small challenge. All too often, there is likely to be ill disguised hostility between these elements. The young feel they're pushed around, the police resent the "pig" kind of thinking by what they may regard as a whole irresponsible segment of society.

It takes a special kind of policeman to overcome the prejudice and suspicion of young people and win their confidence. It may take special persuasion to convince a municipality that the attempt is worth the cost. Officer Ridlon is proof that such programs are vital. But they work only when they are conducted by men such as Officer Ridlon.

In this policeman, we believe, Portland young people have found someone who levels with them. They reciprocate. The benefits to the community may be even more apparent over a period of years.

We congratulate Officer Ridlon and thank him not just for the prestige he has brought to the city, but for what he is doing for Portland and its people.

THE SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIAL AND OTHER HARDWARE

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the number of deaths and crimes involving pistols or revolvers is increasing at an alarming rate throughout the Nation. A thriving underground

network of interstate traffic in guns exists, and it enables persons in States with restrictions on the purchase and possession of handguns to obtain them from other States where they are easily accessible. One result is that the number of handguns in the possession of private individuals is estimated, by "experts," to be between 30 and 60 million. Numerous gun control bills are pending before this Congress. We must move now to enact legislation providing for strict gun controls.

The severity of the problem of gun control and some of the possible legislative solutions is discussed in an article by Robert Sherrill in the October 10 edition of the New York Times magazine. I recommend this article, entitled "The Saturday Night Special and Other Hardware," and I insert it in the RECORD:

THE SATURDAY NIGHT SPECIAL AND OTHER HARDWARE

(By Robert Sherrill)

WASHINGTON.—Gun buffs who favor unfettered ownership of firearms consider Mayor Lindsay to be something of a crank because he accuses the Federal Government of "total permissiveness regarding gun traffic nationally." He's just sore, they say, because this year he has had to attend the funerals of eight New York policemen who were killed with handguns, most of them bought outside the city. But after all, that's only eight out of 31,500 men on the force.

The gun buffs also believe that Mayor Roman Gribbs of Detroit, where pistols and revolvers account for two-thirds of the murders, is the victim of an irrational emotionalism. Simply because his city's murder count for 1971 passed 500 on Sept. 11 (once again assuring Detroit the title of murder capital of America), they ask, was that any reason for Gribbs to declare, "We can stand no more!" and demand a statewide ban on all privately owned pistols and revolvers? Indeed, subsequent events have proved the gun buffs right and Mayor Gribbs wrong: Detroit has already stood a dozen more murders, and the sky hasn't fallen.

Still, even gun lovers should be able to understand why some public officials are upset. The traffic in pocket and belt armaments in this country does seem to be a bit out of control. Nobody knows how many handguns are loose in the land. The "experts"—of whom there are really none—put the number anywhere from 30 million to 60 million. If New York has its share, and who can doubt it, that means there are more than a million pistols and revolvers in the city, virtually all of them held illegally. For New York policemen, it's a losing proposition. While they hope to seize 10,000 handguns in 1971, the year is also expected to see an estimated 80,000 arriving in town.

A thriving underground interstate traffic exists. Eight out of ten handguns in places like Boston and New York come from other areas. Just to show how easily it can be done, two New York detectives flew recently to Kentucky, which offers gunmen all the conveniences, including no waiting period for purchases. They struck up a friendship with an ex-convict (they needed someone with local identification) who happily accompanied them to two gun shops and a pawn shop in Newport and Covington to buy some beautiful hardware: a .38 Smith & Wesson with a 2-inch barrel, a .38 Smith & Wesson Special with a 4-inch barrel and a .32 Brazilian Rossi with a 2-inch barrel. The detectives were back in New York the same day. Though it's a violation of Federal law for an ex-convict to buy a handgun, the detectives' Kentucky contact went even fur-

ther than that; he promised that when they came back he would help them get forged identifications of their own so they wouldn't have to depend on his.

But even with Kentucky I.D.'s, that's doing it the hard way. There are plenty of people around New York who will be happy to go shopping out of state for you. Albert A. Seedman, the city's Chief of Detectives, says one of his men bought a 9-mm. Luger and ammunition from a candy-store proprietor in the Bronx the other day. The candy dealer said that if the detective wanted any other firearms—including a machine gun for \$350—he should place his order quickly; the candy man was leaving for a shopping spree in South Carolina a few days later.

A significant number of the guns in underworld commerce are stolen—by the crate from piers and warehouses or singly in burglaries. In some New York neighborhoods, one can place his gun order at the pool hall. Half of all the nation's gun transactions are believed to be carried out on the street, and New York is said to follow that pattern. In some neighborhoods the market is glutted, or at least the police assume it to be glutted because, says Seedman, "We just assume that certain people all have guns. Like members of the mob who hang out in areas such as Bath Beach. Or if you go to Bedford-Stuyvesant or Harlem, it's assumed that certain people all carry guns." He backs his assumptions with statistics: Five years ago most New York murders were committed with knives; today most are with handguns.

The police in every major city report that at the bottom of the underworld heap, among the pettiest of the petty thugs, a communal system exists: Several disadvantaged criminals living in the same neighborhood share a gun. Chicago has a unique type of helping hand for the needy crook—a "rent-a-gun" arrangement by which, one police official explained, "a convict gets out of prison and can't buy a gun, so he rents one until he can make his first heist and then he buys the gun outright."

The Federal Government has traditionally shown a strange tolerance, even indifference, toward what goes on in handgun traffic. No Federal agency keeps accurate track of how many guns are manufactured or who buys them; no agency attempts to keep a record of the movement of guns from owner to owner. Agents of the Treasury Department's Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms Division are supposed to have some idea of what goes on in the firearms industry, but they keep records like Keystone cops, and they haven't the foggiest idea where all the guns have gone and are going. The U.S. Department of Commerce, which pretends to oversee manufacturing, has no figures for gun production later than 1967.

The record-keeping of most major police departments is just about as sloppy. But the best guessers seem to agree that the ownership of guns used for crime is increasing twice as fast as the ownership of sporting guns; and gun crimes seem to be increasing twice as fast as other crimes. Each year pistols and revolvers are used to carry out more than 100,000 robberies (some "experts" say more than 200,000) and more than 8,000 murders.

Prosecutors and judges are apparently as indifferent as Treasury agents to what's going on. Two times out of three, a person caught packing a rod in the nation's capital will not spend a day in jail. The police guess there are between 500,000 and a million handguns around Detroit, most of them unregistered, but only 1,200 persons were prosecuted for illegal possession in that city last year, and most of them got light punishment.

New York is supposed to be a tough place to be caught carrying an unregistered gun,

but Police Commissioner Patrick Murphy contends that, "because the American people have listened too long to the gun nuts, the judges don't deal with gun cases as a terribly serious problem, and the prosecution of the Sullivan Law has been said." That's one explanation. Another comes from Edmund G. Brown, the former Governor of California and chairman of the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. Asked about judicial tolerance of gun-law violations, Brown replied: "Well, there are some judges that are superannuated and senile and mentally ill and alcoholics, and they started on that."

This kind of a gloomy survey of uncontrolled gun-running, gun-happy criminals and gun-dumb officials occurs rather regularly in Washington. It happened again recently, bringing most of the above-named characters to town, and some of them will be back before the year is out to complete the annual tragicomedy of writing gun legislation. This year it is all the more entertaining because there is a plot within a plot, a political plot within the gun plot.

Senator Birch Bayh is chairman of the Senate juvenile delinquency subcommittee, which for the last dozen years has been handling most of the gun bills. Because of the several political assassinations and because of normal opposition from the National Rifle Association—whose million members constitute the most powerful grassroots lobby in America—the issue of gun controls is highly emotional, and any politician who gets deeply involved in it is guaranteed plenty of headlines. Bayh, who would like to become the Democratic Presidential nominee next year but usually scores no more than 1 per cent on any Democratic public preferential poll, needs plenty of headlines if he is to stay in the running. So on Sept. 13 he opened hearings on his bill to prohibit the manufacture and sale of the "Saturday Night Special" handgun.

Now, if you will bear in mind that at the time Bayh opened his hearings—in fact, until the second day of the hearings—he had not even introduced his bill, you will see the political plot begin to thicken. For it happens that Senator Edward Kennedy, a member of Bayh's subcommittee and also a contender for the Democratic Presidential nomination, had as long ago as Feb. 17, introduced his own bill, a bill that would do everything Bayh's would do and more (it would also require the registering and licensing of all guns and owners). Why wasn't Kennedy's bill being considered at the hearings, since he had beaten Bayh to the punch by seven months? That's the question Kennedy was reportedly asking privately, and he was pretty angry about it.

But just when Bayh thought he had out-finessed all rivals for publicity, he ran up against Mayor Lindsay. Naturally, no gun-control hearing would be complete without some message from the New York cops, so Bayh asked Commissioner Murphy to testify. Murphy at first said he was occupied with other things. Then he called back and said he might be willing to come down, but only if Mayor Lindsay were permitted to be the chief spokesman. By this time Bayh was in Europe, and when his staff got him on the telephone with the Murphy ultimatum, his response is said to have melted the trans-Atlantic wires. Lindsay, who recently switched to the Democratic party, is assumed to be a dark dark-horse candidate for something, and Bayh's crowd figured he wanted to come in and steal the spotlight.

Which is exactly what Lindsay did by staging a table-thumping confrontation with Senator Roman Hruska of Nebraska, the subcommittee's resident gun man, and by belittling Bayh's legislation as inadequate and even dangerous.

"Recently," said Lindsay (with all the TV cameras on him and none on Bayh), "a good deal of attention has focused on possible controls on the so-called 'Saturday Night Special'—cheap guns costing as little as \$1 to manufacture and usually selling for \$5 to \$15. Saturday Night Specials constitute the most outrageous element of the handgun trade, and Federal legislation against Saturday Night Specials alone would certainly be an improvement. But Saturday Night Specials are only the tip of the iceberg—the most visible part of the illegal handgun trade, but actually a small part of the problem. In New York City, 75 per cent of the illegal firearms seized by our police were not Saturday Night Specials."

"Outlawing cheap guns may give the public a sense that meaningful action on handguns had been taken. But that clearly is a dangerous deception. To ignore the literally millions of better handguns now available would be to ignore the essence of the problem itself . . . nothing less than national action against all handguns will suffice."

Commissioner Murphy chimed in, saying that the Specials are "by no means the most significant part of the gun problem." He added: "I strongly urge against limiting the focus of new Federal legislation only to Saturday Night Specials. Most of the guns we seized are quality weapons manufactured by reputable foreign and domestic companies."

Much the same thing had been said—with little publicity—by Lloyd Cutler, former executive director of the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. He called Bayh's bill "a step worth taking, but a very small step," deficient in that "it would only prohibit such sales by federally licensed dealers. It would do nothing to stop private resales and transfers of similar handguns already at large or to force their redemption and surrender to the Government. It would do nothing to control the production, sale and possession of the millions of other handguns which are more expensive and more lethal than the Saturday Night Special, but are equally lacking in redeeming social value."

These might seem strangely ungrateful responses to legislation that would at least banish from gun stores the weapon whose price makes it the most accessible. If it is ingratitude, it is compounded by being directed not only at Bayh but at some of the most faithful gun-control advocates in Congress, men like Kennedy and Representative John M. Murphy of New York City, both of whom have been riding the Saturday Night Special issue for months.

But in fact Lindsay, Murphy and Cutler have good instincts. There is something queer going on behind the Saturday Night Special legislation, and its advocates may be walking into a trap. The best evidence of that comes from the fact that some of the most vicious opponents of gun-control laws are actually encouraging this legislation.

Is it a change of heart? Is it true benevolence? On that question we raise the curtain on the gun plot. Enter, from the right, the weapon itself.

The genre has been around since before Frankie shot Johnny. Its predecessors were the little nickle-plated whistles that ladies of the evening carried in their handbags to ward off nonpaying drunks and the single-shot derringers riverboat gamblers carried up their sleeves. Over the years it has picked up a multitude of nicknames—"Murder Special," "Suicide Special," "7-to-11." The present nickname, though it sounds antique, has been around only since the early nineteen-sixties, and its place of birth was—fittingly—Detroit.

Mischievous Detroiters who could not buy guns near home would simply tool down to Toledo, less than an hour away, where guns were sold out of candy stores, flower shops, filling stations—anywhere. Since a great

many of these purchases were made to satisfy the passions of Saturday night, Detroit lawmen began to refer to the weapons as Saturday Night Specials. Thus was the language enriched.

But like many folk terms, "Saturday Night Special" does not have a fixed meaning. It can be just about any handgun that is cheap, easy to get and preferably—but not necessarily—easy to conceal. Originally a gun didn't have to be poorly made to qualify as a Saturday Night Special. Originally, it could be, say, a Spanish surplus military .38 that reached these shores 20 years ago and passed through 20 pawnshops and 20 poolhalls before being sold on a street corner by a Harlem junkie who needed \$5 for a fix. Before the passage of the 1968 Gun Control Act, many thousands of military-surplus weapons were imported each year. Some critics dismissed them as "junk guns," but in fact many were well made and highly serviceable. Many models were inexpensive and compact, and they rated as Saturday Night Specials. But the 1968 act cut off that supply by specifically outlawing military-surplus guns. It also cut off the brand-new but rickety, foreign-made \$3.50-and-up handguns (most of them small enough to hide in your hand). It did so by requiring that imported guns must be of certain dimensions—that pistols, for instance, must be at least 6 inches long and 4 inches high—must have certain safety features and in other respects pass as "sporting weapons."

But there was a gaping loophole in the law. It did not embargo the importation of foreign gun parts other than frames, so several American companies have started importing enough parts to assemble more than a million cheesy pistols this year. Another group of gun industrialists started producing cheapies from American parts. And still another group started importing guns that legitimately qualify as "sporting models" under the 1968 act; once they get the pistols past customs, they saw off the barrels and market them as "belly guns"—that's where you carry them and that's where you shoot the other fellow, by standing up against him.

Together, these entrepreneurs are expected—according to the Treasury Department, which can be trusted only somewhat here—to put more than two million handguns on the market this year, selling for \$10 to \$25 and offering no safety features, no engineering quality, almost no accuracy. Most are .22 and .25 caliber, though a few are .32's. The police say that these weapons and their predecessors will be responsible for a significant percentage of the nation's murders, assaults and holdups. It is this type of gun that has taken over the title Saturday Night Special, and it is this gun that Congress is going after.

To hear the manufacturers of these little items talk about their market, one might conclude that the Special is no more deadly than a scarecrow. Harry Friedman is the president of Arms Corporation of America in Nashville, Tenn., which turns out about 35,000 Mark-059 pistols each year, many of which he gets rid of through his own retail store. He says: "I find that most people buy guns for their wives, for the table beside their beds. Not to shoot, just to make their wives feel good, to feel like they've got protection. I had a gentleman call me yesterday who said, 'I want one of those inexpensive guns to give to my wife to make some noise, to make her feel like she's got protection.' She doesn't know how to shoot it. She takes it out once and shoots it to see if she can do it, and that's the last time the gun is fired."

"The American people are entitled to this market. If you are a \$1.60-an-hour working man and your wife is scared and you can't afford a \$95 colt, you may want ours for \$16.95. Your wife will never use it. How many women get raped, percentage-wise? How many houses get broken into?"

Anybody who wanted to take up crime seriously would be stupid to buy a Saturday Night Special, says Friedman. "These guns are not accurate. A holdup man would have to be right next to a man to hit him. We'd be better off if every holdup man in America owned one of these guns instead of a good .38. If you want an accurate gun, don't buy this one. If you want a gun to give to your wife to make noise or a gun to stick in your tackle box for killing snakes on fishing trips, O.K., this one is O.K."

The Saturday Night Special is not quite so innocuous as Friedman makes it sound. Indeed, it can be a wicked little job, as one of the \$3.50 versions demonstrated the other day when it was used to kill a Detroit cop. Lieut. Paul E. Murphy of the New York Police Department, a lifelong gun lover whose marksmanship was sufficiently developed to win him the department's second-highest medal, the Combat Award, says: "The .25 and the .22 are very underestimated weapons. It's a small bullet, but it has a tremendous velocity. If you shot one of those weapons at 125th Street, you could kill somebody in Jersey. Most people say, 'What can happen with a .22?' We had a policeman killed with one. The bullet went in his eye and around his skull three times—just cored his brain like you core an apple."

Any bullet that travels faster than 300 feet a second is capable of penetrating flesh and bone. Under ideal conditions, .22 bullets travel at 900 to 1,400 feet a second. Even though the Saturday Night Specials are so poorly constructed that a bullet fired from one lacks something in velocity, there is still sufficient energy left in the bullet to kill. Moreover, the .22 bullet has a special deadliness. Lieut. Charles V. Rorke, who runs the ballistics office at the New York Police Academy, explains: "When the larger-caliber bullet hits the body, it tends to go right through. If a person is shot in the shoulder with a .38 bullet, that ordinarily wouldn't be a lethal wound. It might tear half his shoulder off, but the wound would probably be restricted to the shoulder. The .22 caliber, because it is small but travels at great velocity, is easily deflected. You have a big bullet's velocity with a pellet that is very unstable. So the .22 might hit the shoulder and then rip off in another direction, maybe dropping into the chest area and doing some fatal damage there."

William L. Cahalan, the Prosecuting Attorney in Wayne County, which includes Detroit, says there is still another danger in the Saturday Night Special. "They are more deadly than the well-manufactured gun because they do not expel the bullet through the barrel in a true line," he says. "Rather, after four or five shots, the rifling is worn out, and this causes the bullet to come tumbling out of the barrel. It creates what doctors call a 'keyhole' wound—several perforations, and much more difficult to treat."

And there is always the possibility that the Saturday Night Special will be as dangerous to the shooter as to the target. Sometimes the bullets in the cylinder are so close together that two will fire at once. Sometimes a stuck bullet will cause the pistol to explode. More common than two bullets firing is no bullet firing: the hammer and firing pin are often so far out of alignment that they don't discharge the bullet—which makes it sometimes the safest gun on the market.

In the production of a high-class handgun—a Smith & Wesson, for instance—the finest ordnance steel is used; all parts are heat-treated to give them great strength; there are more than 1,000 inspection operations on each gun, and every one is test fired. For a Saturday Night Special, the opposite is true. Hold one over a bunsen burner and it will start melting in 10 seconds; it's pot metal. The guns are reported to be thrown together with virtually no assembly-line inspection, and rarely are they test fired.

It is, in short, quite easy to make an elaborate case against the Special, proving that it is very often both a menace and a gyp. But neither characteristic explains why the National Rifle Association, which never in the past favored outlawing any gun, favors outlawing the Saturday Night Special. Neither characteristic explains why Senator Hruska, as devoted a champion of laissez-faire gun ownership as there is in Congress, also wants to banish it. Equally mysterious is the seeming about-face of the Nixon Administration. It has been steadfastly against an extension of gun controls, yet it is for suppressing the Special.

Cynics, who are numerous in this debate, believe that the supposed change of heart is only a subterfuge for protecting one favored element of the gun industry from competition by the Special while increasing the supply of good foreign guns, which have been denied to the shooting fraternity since the adoption of the Gun Control Act of 1968. The diverse gun world—arms and ammunition manufacturers, gunsmiths, hunters, collectors, shooting clubs, criminals—has many interests, not all of them overlapping. But the cynics contend that the scheme now being proposed is a step toward satisfying some of the more selfish interests. It is constructed very cleverly, they say, around two arguments: the need for fair play in international trade and the need for consumer protection.

The background for the consumer argument is plain enough. The trade argument goes like this: Under the General Agreement for Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the United States is forbidden to discriminate against foreign products. If the manufacture of certain guns is allowed in this country, the importation of similar guns is supposed to be allowed. But the Gun Control Act of 1968 prohibits the importation of any gun that fails to meet the "sporting test," while American-made guns that would fail this test are flooding the domestic market.

Treasury officials say these violations of GATT are damaging U.S. trade relations. "Why, the embargo on Italian guns has turned some areas of that country into a poverty-stricken Appalachia," one official told me. "Communities that depended on gun exports to the U.S. have become ghost towns. Be sure to mention that in your story. You might even want to make it your lead. And of course, Italian officials are very unhappy. They put an embargo on Florida oranges, and when we complain they say, 'Well, if you won't let us send Italian guns you can't ship us Florida oranges.' And the same economic devastation is seen in Spain and Germany and elsewhere because of the discriminatory features of the gun-control act."

Testifying before the Bayh subcommittee, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Eugene Rossides said the U.S. had received formal protests from seven foreign countries because of the gun embargo's violation of GATT.

Italy dumped \$2.4-million worth of handguns into this country in 1968, and these exports slumped to \$200,000 by 1970. For Spain, the decline was from \$1.6-million to \$200,000; for West Germany it was from \$6.6-million to \$3.3-million; for Brazil, from \$2.3-million to \$600,000; for Belgium, from \$3.5-million to \$1.4-million.

But the "poverty" resulting from this decline apparently is no more than a Treasury Department hallucination. Martha Carbone, the State Department officer concerned with special trade agreements, says: "The embassies would be the only ones with data on that. They've never given it to us. The embassies of Italy and Spain have been the ones that have mentioned it." Did they just mention it, or did they scream about it? "Well, we've been talking about it, shall we say?"

Asked about the Treasury's description of the economic chaos in Italy, an official of the

Italian Embassy said: "It is true that Italy was damaged a little by the gun embargo, but it is not true that Brescia and its province—the center of our gun manufacturing—is 'ghostlike.' There are too many really important things in GATT to worry about guns right now."

"Where did you hear that we had ghost towns?"

The Treasury Department.

"Oh. Well, then, you should be a gentleman and write it that way."

Officials at the Brazilian Embassy were equally ignorant of any economic slump caused by the gun embargo, and at the German Embassy an official said: "I have no knowledge of unemployment caused by the gun-control act. We have very vehemently opposed the law, of course, but we have no unemployment. We have so little unemployment in Germany that we even employ quite a lot of foreign labor."

Actually, according to John Sipes, director of the State Department's Office of Munitions Control, the great majority of the guns imported before the 1968 embargo were military-surplus weapons, so the foreign industry could hardly be affected much. "We weren't importing many new guns," he says. "The foreign manufacturers may have lost a few mail-order sales to gun nuts in this country, but as far as volume sales, it did not come from new manufacture. I'd say at least 75 per cent was military surplus."

Nevertheless, Treasury officials proceeded with their little farce. They would rescue U.S. trade from the shoals of gun discrimination; they would create an atmosphere of international fair play by establishing standards that would apply to domestic manufacture as well as to foreign imports. And as a filip to their heroism, they set forth to do all this in such a way as to protect the U.S. consumer from defective merchandise—which, in a consumer-oriented era, they recognized as being a much more sensitive point than the question of whether it was intelligent to manufacture the product at all.

So with \$135,000 in tax money, the Treasury hired the H. P. White Laboratory of Bel Air, Md., to test 150 guns representing 58 different models from seven foreign countries and the United States to determine if objective tests for safety and reliability could be set up.

Significantly, although the press and the general public were refused information about what was going on at White Labs, the N.R.A., the gun lobby, was kept abreast of it all, and when the tests were about half finished—they ended in August—N.R.A. officials were permitted to take pictures and look over the records of the experiment. One official at White Labs explained that "in order not to offend the shooting community too badly, they [Treasury officials] sort of solicited the N.R.A.'s participation in this, so they went overboard to divulge information to them."

To nobody's surprise, D. R. Dunn, manager of White Labs, concluded that an adequate test for reliability and safety had been put together. The most important part of the test was 5,000 rounds of test firing for each pistol.

That is one hell of a lot of testing, so it was also to nobody's surprise that Dunn reported only 6 of the 58 models passed. To expect a Saturday Night Special to survive a test like that would be to expect a trade miracle. None occurred. Of the nearly two dozen .22-caliber pistols tested, only one survived, and it was not one of those costing less than \$20. It cost \$71.58. None of the .25-caliber models came through the test.

That, at least, was the official report paid for by the Treasury. But, interestingly, there had been unofficial reports seeping out of the laboratories that much cheaper guns were doing quite well. When the tests were 85 per cent completed, an official of White Labs told

me that although the N.R.A.'s magazine, *American Rifleman*, had carried an article implying that "a small, imported, low-grade handgun is either unsafe or unreliable, I can cite within our test data here a small imported low-grade handgun that whistled through everything we could throw at it. This weapon cost \$40. And I can cite a very expensive U.S. prestige weapon that failed after 15 or 16 rounds. You can make a gun out of papier-maché, and if it passes this test, then in our opinion it is a very safe weapon. It makes no difference whether it costs 25 cents or \$2,500, whether it has a very respected seal on the side of it or whether it was made up in somebody's backyard. The testing would seem to say to us that the failure cannot be related to cost, origin, type or whatever. But within that trend, there are some shadings."

The N.R.A., the Administration and Hruska and his gaggle of gun lovers are all pushing the White Labs test as the heart of whatever legislation is written to outlaw the Saturday Night Special. With luck, they can persuade Bayh and others to accept the test as an amendment. Bayh has said he is open to such a suggestion. Representative Murphy has already written the test into his legislation. If Congress agrees on this reform, then the Special, that absurd little piece of deadly gadgetry, will indeed be standardized off the market.

And at that point the trap will be sprung. Respectability will have been stamped upon the handgun traffic in America, for after that all guns sold on the open market will be federally certified as "safe" and "reliable."

If that happens, any further significant extension of the Gun Control Act of 1968 will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish. Even under the best of conditions, Congress hesitates to oppose the gun lobby, and any reform movement within Congress would be at a tremendous psychological disadvantage if the lobby could argue that only "safe" and "reliable" guns were being sold.

If the performance standards are applied to imports without discrimination, it will also mean—if GATT is to be satisfied—that the floodgates will again be lifted on the foreign military-surplus weapons (both handguns and rifles) specifically prohibited by the 1968 act. If U.S. military models are available commercially, their foreign counterparts should be, too. At least that is the opinion of Senator Hruska, who hopes devoutly that this will be the case. The N.R.A.'s position on military-surplus imports is not yet clear, but Jack Basil, its legislative director, speaks kindly of them: "We would be in favor of getting rid of unsafe guns. We're for it, the gun manufacturers are for it, everybody's for it. People play on emotions too much when dealing with gun safety. At the time of President Kennedy's assassination, they were yelling about the Italian rifle Oswald used. They were being melodramatic about guns, rather than judging them from technical standpoints. Same thing is true about the way they judged foreign military-surplus guns. Before the 1968 law, a lot of people were saying the U.S. was the dumping ground of cast-off guns. They were using emotional phrases like that. Actually, some of the foreign military-surplus stuff is excellent quality." A resumption of military-surplus imports also seems to be favored by some members of the Administration, including Associate Deputy Attorney General Donald Santarelli, who in 1969 told the Senate that he believed it was "unfair to exclude the good with the bad." He also said he thought some foreign surplus military weapons were very good.

Indeed they are. Good and sometimes inexpensive. Often as inexpensive as Saturday Night Specials. Many of the more than one million of these goodies that were imported in the last year before the embargo are still on the market, and their bargains shine from

the advertisements in any gun magazine: A British Enfield Mark 1, a .38 that, the ad says, was "designed for rapid, close-quarter defense work," only \$19.95; a .450 Webley & Scott by the famous British maker with a 2½-inch barrel that fits in the pocket nicely, only \$30; the same kind of Luger used by the Luftwaffe during World War II, \$36; the P-38, sidearm for the German Army in World War II, only \$19; a French M-35-S, built much like a Browning automatic, \$23.

Many of these guns will probably pass the performance test, which means that, so long as the supply of military-surplus imports holds out, the aspiring hoodlum can go into business with a lifetime gun for well under \$40, perhaps half that amount. Of course, he will have to pay more for the heavier caliber ammunition, but offsetting that extra expense will be the comfort of knowing that he will no longer be faced with the embarrassing misfirings that so often marred the performance of the Saturday Night Specials.

Even if the adoption of the performance test cuts the importation and domestic production of handguns in half, though, Kennedy and Bayh may sigh almost nostalgically for the return of the Saturday Night Special, for, say what you will about it, it does have one virtue: it falls apart fast. Fire a hundred rounds from some of the species and there's a good chance it won't be good for anything but a paperweight thereafter. Not so, the finely crafted \$100 rod. There are Colts and Smith & Westons that have fired many thousands of rounds over many years, and though they are outwardly battered, they are just as deadily efficient as ever.

The same is true of many of the foreign military-surplus handguns imported before the 1968 act. As Sipes, the State Department munitions expert, observed: "This surplus military stuff never dies, you know. Nobody ever buries these damn things. They keep moving around, passed along from owner to owner, for years and years."

Most of the 30 million handguns in this country are the quality jobs, and they will still be around and will still be just as dangerous 50 years from now unless they are bought up (or confiscated) and melted.

You don't hear many Federal politicians pushing that kind of remedy. They fear the National Rifle Association. The late Senator Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, who carried on the gun-control fight for a decade, lost in his first bid for re-election after passage of the 1968 act. Another leader in the control crusade, Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland, was also defeated in 1970. Leonard S. Bloude, a former Maryland legislator who pushed gun-control legislation and who is vice president of the National Council for a Responsible Firearms Policy, is under indictment on two counts of bribery, one of conspiracy and two of malfeasance in office. His friends feel he was framed by the gun lobby—and the lobby, eager to be considered omnipotent in matters of vengeance, encourages the idea, just as it encourages the idea that it knocked off Dodd and Tydings, which is a considerable exaggeration; both men had plenty of other troubles.

The toughest gun-control advocate in Congress is Representative Abner Mikva of Chicago, who stops short of advocating confiscation but does have legislation that would prohibit the manufacture, transportation, sale or transfer of handguns for any purpose but police or military work or competitive target shooting, with the proviso in the last case that the guns be kept locked at the target range. His bill also allows the Federal Government to buy, at a fair market price, any handgun a citizen turns in.

Representative Emanuel Celler of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, must think well of Mikva's bill, in principle, since he incorporated some of its provisions into his own bill. But there are more than 160 other gun bills stacked up in

Celler's committee awaiting action—some for expanding gun controls, most of them for repealing the 1968 act—and Celler doesn't seem eager to open that can of worms. He has yet to set a hearing on any of the bills.

"The real problem in getting attention here," says Mikva, "is that Celler and others sympathetic to tightening gun controls think any effort will be futile. I think I could talk from now to doomsday that Tydings wasn't knocked off by the lobby, but a lot of Congressmen would continue to think he was. My colleagues say they can't afford to sponsor my bill. I guess I've talked to 50 or 60 who say they would like to see stronger controls, but they say they can't get involved. I have no—I repeat, no—rural sponsors, though I can tell you that at least two dozen rural legislators say they would like stronger laws.

"I ran into the same thing in the Illinois Legislature. I started out in 1965 with 110 co-sponsors of a bill to register handguns, and by the time the Illinois Rifle Association got through, all but 38 had withdrawn their names. The lobby even came in advocating that we repeal the 'Capone Law'—our anti-machine-gun law. They were putting out brochures saying, 'The Russians know how to use machine guns, but American citizens don't. Americans are helpless.'

"There's nobody even second to the N.R.A. as a lobby. They are working down there at the precinct level. You can't beat something with nothing—and those of us who want tough controls have virtually nothing. There's no organization on our side. You can't take on the gun lobby with good will. That's where the next set of tragedies will work."

The Nixon Administration will not support more gun controls. Attorney General John Mitchell has said so. Richard W. Velde, associate administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, says that those who want more controls must have forgotten that, after all, "the use of firearms is but a small segment of the over-all crime problem."

But the most serious handicap faced by anyone who tries to legislate total handgun control is not the irrational passion of the gun nuts and it is not the waffling of Federal politicians and bureaucrats. The most serious handicaps, oddly enough, are thrown up by the police and the "nice" people of America.

Carl Perian, who was Dodd's chief of staff before going with Congressman Murphy, may have a point. "After 17 years with the juvenile delinquency subcommittee," he says, "I have concluded that a great number of police officers enjoy the Wild West aspect of being a cop. We went to the Watts riots, right in the middle of it. The cops had bushel baskets full of guns they had taken off rioters and looters. But the precinct captain was very upset because we were investigating the gun traffic. He said that just because the rioters had hundreds of guns was no reason to prevent people from owning guns."

Police Chief Jerry Wilson of Washington recently told newsmen that he didn't think that Iowans should be strapped with a tight Federal gun law just because the District of Columbia's underworld is heavy with armament. Milwaukee's police chief came out in opposition to gun registration and licensing. The Minneapolis Deputy Police chief, Gordon Johnson, is against gun controls and says his feeling is shared by a majority of policemen in his area. Commissioner John Nichols of Detroit, though confronted with the most anarchistic gun situation in the nation, says he supports the outlawing of private handguns in theory but considers such a plan no more practical than the 18th Amendment's prohibition of liquor. Virtually all small-city police chiefs refused to support Mikva's or Murphy's bills.

Top police officials in Chicago, Cleveland, Oakland and New York proclaim a passionate desire to see handguns restricted to police use. But more often than not, the

tough talk ends in compromise. Nobody has seemed more earnest in advocating total control than New York's Commissioner Murphy, but he says he would be willing to see guns left in the hands of "some businessmen and merchants." His chief of detectives, Seedman, says: "If I were the owner of a jewelry store, I'd like to have a handgun on the premises." And the New York police ballistics expert, Rorke, says it would be "unreasonable" to ask sportsmen to leave their guns locked up at the firing range.

Those who take Rorke's position argue that people who buy guns for lawful reasons, sportsmen and the like, hardly ever go astray. "Of the 20,000 registered guns in this city," says Rorke, "no more than five or six have ever been used in a crime." This is the most dangerous argument, that firearms can safely be allowed in the hands of sporting fellows and decent citizens. You hear it stated, or see it implied, everywhere.

When former Governor Brown spoke on behalf of all laws that would take handguns out of circulation, he pointed out that "most murder in real life comes from a compound of anger, passion, intoxication and accident—mixed in varying portions." The prototype who emerges from that is the low-class, squabbling drunk. It's not hard to get agreement that guns should be kept from such people. But until the happy day of gun confiscation arrives, "nice" people should be allowed to maintain a gentlemanly arsenal. Right? Brown must think so, too, because he keeps a handgun in his home.

Congressman Murphy, in pushing his Saturday Night Special bill, said: "These gun nuts think their weapons are extensions of their penises." That colorful remark conjures up the kind of psychotic that most people would agree should be kept away from guns. But of course no one would think it applied even remotely to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Warren Burger, who answered his doorbell the other night to confront two reporters with a loaded six-shooter.

If "nice" people were easy to spot, it might work out. But the police blotters have proved many thousands of times that so long as there is this notion that "nice" people should have guns and "bad" people shouldn't, the "bad" people will wind up with more than their share anyway.

And Bayh and Kennedy and Murphy and their allies are likely to learn that attempts to pacify the nation by discriminating against bad guns will work no better. It is easy to work up almost total agreement on outlawing the shabby Saturday Night Special. But it wasn't a shabby little Special that Sirhan Sirhan used to blow the back of Bobby Kennedy's head off. It was a well-constructed Iver Johnson .22—a product, like the Kennedys, of Massachusetts.

THE LEGAL MISHMASH

Laws relating to the buying and keeping of handguns are a mishmash, and except in a dozen states (notably the Northeastern bloc—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania) where the standards are high, they are mostly mish.

In those areas of the country where handguns equate with *machismo*—places like Louisiana, Arizona, Nevada, Texas, Mississippi—control laws are nonexistent or scarce or largely ignored. In Texas, for instance, there is no required waiting period before purchasing a gun, no required permit or registration of guns, no license needed for carrying weapons either openly or concealed, no license needed for carrying a gun in a vehicle.

In New York, handguns are controlled by all those restrictions, but the law's enforcement is undermined by the "easy-buy" states. Merchandise sold out there has a way of getting to the big city via what Mayor Lindsay calls the "wide-open national handgun commerce."—R.S.

ALASKA RAID

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of Sunday, October 3, 1971, carried a news item under the heading "Conservationists See Alaska 'Raid'" which reported on the request of 12 conservation organizations to President Nixon to block those interests which desire to raid the public domain in the State of Alaska.

So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to be aware of this article, I include its text at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CONSERVATIONISTS SEE ALASKA "RAID"

(By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, October 12.—Spokesmen for 12 conservation organizations called on President Nixon today to prevent "a raid upon the public domain" in Alaska by speculators and exploiters in timber, mining, oil and other developments.

The raid would come about, they told Mr. Nixon in a letter, through bills reported by the House and Senate Interior Committees to settle the century-old claims of Alaska's natives—Indians, Eskimos and Aleuts.

The conservationists wrote:

"In recent months speculators and exploiters, never identified to the public but everywhere in evidence plying the halls of Congress, have been championing the cause of Alaskan native claims. Their theme has been: Enormous grants of public land and some money for the natives, but no restraints upon the commercial exploitation of the public lands in Alaska."

Nowhere in the bills, they said, was "the public interest accommodated—the interest of the 200 million Americans who own most of Alaska."

FORTY MILLION ACRES

The House committee's version would grant Alaska's 55,000 natives 40 million acres of land and \$925-million in settlement of their claims. The Senate panel voted 40 million acres and \$500-million in case and \$500-million in mineral royalties and other grants.

The conservation organizations wrote that by transferring 40 million acres from public to native ownership "it would set up a sequence of land selection and disposition that would relegate the national interest to the lowest priority." State, native and private interests would receive preference over "the public's interest in areas of the highest esthetic, cultural, scientific, wildlife and wilderness values."

The proposed legislation, they said, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to classify public lands not now reserved for public purposes for "mineral leasing and outright disposal to private parties in accordance with existing inadequate public land laws."

The letter continued in part:

"The House committee's version fails to require the Secretary to identify and propose for Congressional consideration areas suitable for inclusion in National Park and Recreation Areas, National Wildlife Refuges and National Wild and Scenic Rivers. The Senate committee's version, while directing the Secretary to advise Congress, fails to provide adequate safeguards during this critical review period."

IMPACT ON WILDLIFE

The House panel's bill would also eliminate "thousands of acres" from the National Wildlife Refuge System in Alaska, including

"some of this nation's most critical areas of wildlife habitat," they said. The Senate committee's version "suggests the impact on the refugees could be even worse," the letter said.

The conservation groups have been unsuccessful in their efforts to get a review of public lands in the state designed to exempt from native grants and state selection of public lands areas of "national value." Representative John A. Saylor of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican on the House Committee, has been defeated in his attempts to get a review before the state and natives are permitted to go ahead with land selections.

The conservation groups told Mr. Nixon that "we did not have the need nor the foresight to reserve adequate lands when many states were admitted to the union" and now, because of the pressure for more park and recreation land, the Federal Government had to buy back what were once public lands.

HEIGHT OF IRRESPONSIBILITY

"We believe it would be the height of irresponsibility for the United States to repeat that kind of mistake in Alaska," they told Mr. Nixon.

The organizations joining in the plea to Mr. Nixon were the Alaska Action Committee, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, Defenders of Wildlife, Environmental Action, Friends of the Earth, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, Trout Unlimited, the Wilderness Society, Wildlife Management Institute, Zero Population Growth, Inc. and the National Rifle Association.

TO THE RESCUE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the Economic Opportunity Amendments a week ago, I offered an amendment to exempt the 4-percent appropriation reservation for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the event that any State's program would need to be reduced because of such a reservation.

My own amendment was substituted quite handily by the amendment offered by the distinguished Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, JORGE L. CORDOVA.

It is encouraging to note that the Resident Commissioner's strong and successful battle for his constituents has not gone unnoticed in Puerto Rico. As part of my remarks I am including the lead editorial in the San Juan Star, on Friday, October 1. It is entitled "To the Rescue."

I might add that as a most capable representative to this body, my erstwhile opponent, Mr. CORDOVA, is fully worthy of the praise he is receiving in Puerto Rico.

The editorial follows:

[From the San Juan Star, Friday, Oct. 1, 1971]

TO THE RESCUE

Resident Commissioner Jorge Luis Córdova Díaz, with key help and support from other Congressmen, Thursday registered a major victory for Puerto Rico in the House by nailing down there equal treatment with the states for the island in the distribution of federal antipoverty funds.

Working closely with Rep. Herman Badillo, D-NY, and with floor support from Rep. Lloyd Meeds, D-Wash. and that grand lady of the House, Edith Green, D-RI, Córdova fought off opposition from the Office of Economic Opportunity that would have placed a ceiling on the amount of funds the island could receive.

Córdova, who showed his political versatility by uniting with three Democrats in this venture, chalked up another notable achievement to be added to his growing list.

Puerto Rico could immediately gain as much as \$30 million a year through those efforts, depending on what a house-senate conference committee works out. The Senate version raises Puerto Rico to equal treatment after two years.

BOSTON CITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the Boston City Council last week adopted a resolution urging the Massachusetts delegation in the House to support the Mansfield amendment. This action, taken by a governmental body whose responsibility it is to cope with our worsening urban crisis, is further evidence of the widespread recognition across the country that we must end our involvement in Southeast Asia.

I commend the Boston City Council for speaking on this issue, and for making clear that they will never be able to solve the problems they face in Boston until we stop diverting the resources they need to a cruel and senseless war.

At this point, I insert the resolution into the RECORD for my colleagues.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the military budget is now \$80 billion a year, or about \$400 per U.S. citizen; and

Whereas, more than \$100 billion has already been spent on the Vietnam War alone at a time when Boston and other large cities desperately need federal money for urban renewal, rapid transit, public housing, quality education, pollution control, and many other pressing needs; and

Whereas, many young men of Boston are being drafted against their will to fight and die in a war they neither support nor understand; and

Whereas, the U.S. Senate, by a vote of 57 to 38, approved the Mansfield Amendment to end all U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia within 6 months, assuming satisfactory arrangements have been made for the mutual release of prisoners of war; now, therefore,

Be it resolved: That the Boston City Council records itself as being in favor of the Mansfield Amendment to end the war in Southeast Asia and calls upon the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives to support this action by the U.S. Senate;

Be it further resolved: That copies of this resolution be sent to both U.S. Senators and all Congressmen from Massachusetts and to the Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and the President of the United States of America.

WHAT FUTURE FOR CORPORATIONS?

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, Henry C. Wallich has made extensive contributions to the economic thought of the Nation. He has served as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, as a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and as chief of the Foreign Research Department of the Federal Reserve Board of New York. Presently, he is senior consultant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

In the most recent issue of the Citicorp Magazine, which is published by the First National City Corp., Dr. Wallich discusses the future for corporations. I found his comments on a Federal Chartering Commission and the social objectives of business particularly thought-provoking. I believe his views will be of interest to the Members of the House, and I insert Dr. Wallich's article at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT FUTURE FOR CORPORATIONS?

(By Henry C. Wallich)

Potent, implacable, imperishable: Today's distorted image of the corporation stands at the center of much social criticism. The corporation shapes our lives, it twists our values, it resists reform. Robotlike, an "artificial person" in the words of the law, it amasses material wealth and enslaves humanity. That has been the message.

Every dramatization of history, on or off stage, needs a villain. In economic history, the robber barons, Wall Street, Madison Avenue have all been cast in that role. Much of the criticism was justified, some of it was helpful. Today the corporation is held accountable for a wider range of evils than were its predecessor villains. The proposed remedies are correspondingly drastic.

Even if we discount the exuberance of college students who want to destroy the whole system before they go on to law school, we must face up to more mature and subtle proposals for transforming the system from within. One such proposal, which seems to offer many keys though it may open few doors, takes the form of federal chartering of corporations. Uncle Sam and not the states would say what a corporation can do.

The idea is not new. In 1938, Senator O'Mahoney sponsored an unsuccessful bill to provide "a licensing system for corporations." Today compulsory federal chartering of corporations is being discussed as a means to control wage and price setting, hiring and firing practices, and standards of pollution, safety and product quality. Simply make the federal charter revocable, and let its continuance depend on how well the corporation meets federal requirements. The corporation could then be directed toward solving our pressing social problems. Why not?

There are many reasons. The hostile attitude toward the corporation which forms the philosophical basis of this idea reflects the same superficial analysis that has brought Europeans to blame irritating changes in their traditional ways of life on "Americanization." (The real source of European problems is not the American example, but the attainment of high per capita income. America just happened to be the first country to get there.) In the same way, it is not the corporation that is responsible for the computerized facelessness and ensuing alienation in modern large institutions. The economic su-

perior of large-scale organization is the true root.

The young man who refuses to work for a large organization is quite right, of course, in not wanting to be bent, spindled or mutilated. But his notions of the relaxed, humane form of life that the corporation supposedly has destroyed are unrealistic. The craftsman creating things with his hands, the small farmer drawing life from the soil, the small shopkeeper knowing all his customers are highly idealized and partial representations of the past. The reality of primitive countries, where life was "nasty, brutish, and short," differed sadly from the romantic idyll. Laborers working 12 hours a day six days a week, farmers and their wives aged at 40 by dawn-to-dusk physical chores, children at work instead of at school—that was the dominant color of precorporate reality.

Output per capita and per worker in the American economy have grown fairly steadily, allowing for cyclical fluctuations, for as long as we have data, across the precorporate age, the period of entrepreneurial capitalism, managerial capitalism, the advent of the corporate income tax, and the rise of the labor union. Today's corporation is the outward form of our economy. Its true moving forces lie much deeper.

What about the much-cited vast power of corporations? General Motors has about 700,000 employees whom it can fire, give a raise to or force to go on strike. It can determine the size, power and safety of cars, the locations of industry, and can make investors rich or poor. It cannot, however, do these things in a vacuum. Its hand is guided—though not altogether forced—by the need to stay in business. If GM fires good people, pays unreasonable wages, builds cars nobody wants or builds plants in uneconomic locations, it will go the way of other firms that ignored the compulsions of the market place. Corporate power exists—but is constrained severely by the market, the unions, the customer and economics.

The proposal for federal chartering of corporations is an example of misconceptions about the corporation. The issue is not a question of dealing with an evil force in society. It is not even a question of curbing unrestrained power. It is not an adversary proceeding at all. It is simply a question of achieving certain objectives that society has in mind. Corporations perform much of society's work. They can be enlisted on behalf of new causes. The question is whether federal chartering is an efficient way of going about the job.

THE ROLE OF A FEDERAL CHARTER

We have learned something from piecemeal regulation of business. The Federal Trade Commission supposedly regulates competition, advertising and related practices. The Securities and Exchange Commission deals with corporate disclosure, and the issuance of and trading in corporate securities. Both these agencies exemplify regulation of a corporate function. The Interstate Commerce Commission regulates railroads, the Federal Communications Commission regulates telephone, telegraph and TV, and so on. This is regulation according to industry.

Regulation via a federal charter presumably would cut across these distinctions. Perhaps we would have an agency called the Federal Chartering Commission, with departments relating to the social objectives sought. Some might be functional—such as to control pollution, or to organize on-the-job training of the unskilled. Some might be according to industry—to enforce safety standards for automobiles, or adequate teaching standards in universities. It would be a large, diversified and potentially very powerful agency.

The Federal Chartering Commission, presumably would work within a set of laws laid down by Congress. The writing of the de-

tailed regulations, their application to particular cases, the quasi-judicial process ultimately leading to the impositions of sanctions would presumably be under the control of the commission. From time to time Congress might raise old or impose new requirements and would hand their implementation to the commission, for the agency would be a flexible instrument capable of implementing the evolving social, economic and environmental goals of the nation.

All these provisions could be embodied in the charters issued to corporations, to be amended as appropriate from time to time. Or the charters granted by the commission might be of a more general sort, simply establishing compliance with present and future orders of the commission.

Obviously this federal chartering would go far beyond the chartering now done by the states. Obtaining a state charter is a routine operation that any attorney can perform with minimal cost and trouble. The relative attractions of particular states—greater or lesser flexibility in the management of corporate finances and in corporate procedures—are rarely decisive for the real operation of the business. Skillful lawyers and accountants, in any event, usually can find ways to help a corporation live even with inconvenient state charters.

Federal charters exist now for a few institutions—principally national banks and federal savings and loan associations. Mutual savings banks are seeking the right to a federal charter. For all these institutions, the federal charter is an alternative to a state charter, at the option of the regulated. Hence the federal charter does not mean an unavoidably tougher discipline.

A federal charter for corporations would not compete in this sense with a state charter. Presumably the latter would continue and might even remain controlling within its narrow domain. The federal charter might compete with or supersede what government agencies and particularly the existing regulatory commissions are now doing. This suggests a closer look at their work and achievements.

THE PRESENT REGULATORY EXPERIENCE

The federal regulatory commissions and agencies have the unenviable distinction of being among the most loudly criticized parts of the government. This may reflect the way they are organized or the way they are run. In either event, whatever is wrong is compounded by the difficulty of the job.

Not all the criticism is consistent, but neither is the performance of the regulators. A frequent complaint is lack of effectiveness. The Federal Trade Commission, as everybody knows, has not successfully curbed misleading advertising or anticompetitive practices. The Federal Communications Commission has not been notably successful in improving the quality of TV programs. Failure of this sort is not always the fault of the agency. Congress, for reasons of its own, may have intervened. Through legislation, or through the power of appropriations, Congress has more than once frustrated its own supposed intent.

Another form of regulatory failure occurs when the regulated industry comes to dominate the regulator. Of the process of regulating competition it has been said that it starts by protecting competition and ends with protecting the competitors. Intimacy of the regulators and the regulated is hard to avoid because, after all, they have to deal with each other. The public, which supposedly benefits, is hardly ever in sight. Moreover, to be influential with Congress or with the administration, an agency needs a constituency. The public will not provide it, but the regulated industry will be glad to, if there is reciprocity.

The worst results, perhaps, are achieved when over-regulation threatens to suffocate an industry. For example, the Interstate Com-

merce Commission decides thousands of railroad and trucking rates each year. The contested ones cause infuriating delays and absorb much of the energy both of the ICC and of the industry. (Total costs to all industries just of communicating with regulatory agencies, incidentally, have been estimated as high as \$1 billion.) As a result of this battle over detail, no one has had time to look at the broad picture and try to add up piecemeal regulation to a national transportation policy.

Recently a private group headed by Roy Ash, president of Litton Industries, was requested to advise President Nixon on how to reorganize the regulatory commissions. Certainly not the first and probably not the last of its kind, the Ash group proposes drastic changes, such as replacing the present court-type commissions by single executives, and ending the quasi-independence they enjoy now in favor of subordination to the President.

The reason why the Ash group disliked the existing setup is clearly the exasperating proneness to inaction that befalls a commission whose members must agree. The remedies are also understandable. The report proposes the kind of organization characteristic of business, with a clear chain of command and geared for action. But this would be accomplished at the cost of greater politicization and risk of arbitrary decisions. Critics of the Ash Report would prefer us to hold the line we have rather than fly to others that we know not of.

The overregulation which has hurt the railroads manifests itself differently among financial institutions. A bank that wants to be a national bank is now subject to regulation by the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Reserve and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Most other banks have two regulators.

While this situation is alleviated by the ability to choose regulators by switching charters, it is aggravated by an array of rules—legislative and regulatory, and differing from state to state—which determines where banks may operate, what they may do, what interest they may pay and in some cases may charge, and so on. All this, initially undertaken to protect the public, now thoroughly gets mixed up with protection of the banks and, one must fear, of the regulators.

The result has been, to some extent, unwholesome immunization of the banking industry against change and evolution. Many new financial techniques have evolved in recent years; there is danger in being left behind. Without great efforts on the part of the banks, this kind of overregulation could send them the way of the railroads.

Experience with existing regulation thus suggests some of the problems that might beset an attempt to implement social control of business through a federal charter. Probably the least of the risks is domination by industry. An agency that regulates all business would have very diversified contacts. No disproportionate intimacy with any one of them need develop. Different interests would provide checks and balances.

Multiplying overregulation would be harder to avoid. Most industries would have to do with more than one department of the commission—those dealing with environment, labor relations, product quality, for instance. Competing objectives would have to be reconciled, a large number of officials consulted. In this commission the motto would have to be "clear it with everybody."

Excessive concentration of power would present a problem in a Supercommission that we have not encountered in existing agencies. Regulating both by industry and function, a really effective federal commission would hold much greater power than any of the present bodies. Concentrating this power in Washington does not make the prospect more attractive.

The kind and amount of power wielded

would depend on Congress. The enabling legislation might leave the agency much or little discretion. The mandates might be changed only at rare intervals, and within well defined areas, or they might be open-ended, with frequent revisions and additions. In any event the power potential would always be present.

Concern over excessive power would be superfluous if the outcome of the whole exercise should turn out to be zero effectiveness. There are enough precedents to make this possible, both in existing federal regulation and in the chartering procedures by which the various states now breathe life into the corporate form. Precisely because of the vastness of the federal chartering enterprise, because of the need to limit the power of such an agency, and because of its lack of focus and clear priorities, ineffectiveness is not altogether unlikely. Regulation might become a formality, capable perhaps of tying things up with red tape, but producing no movement in any particular direction.

THE WRONG APPROACH

The difficulty of making a reasoned assessment of the probable impact of a federal charter derives not only from the mixed experience with existing methods of regulating business. It has a deeper reason. Existing methods have the virtue, at least of properly matching subject and object, the regulator and the regulated, the scope of the legislation and its purpose. Railroads are regulated because they are railroads, not because they are corporations. Securities issues are regulated because the legislature was concerned with securities, and not with everything else that corporations sell, buy or produce.

To regulate corporations, and to use this as a handle for regulating assorted corporate activities is a purpose lacking in adequate definition. The corporation is the wrong unit to regulate. The uncertainty about how such regulation should be accomplished, and what results, if any, it would have, derives from this basic incongruity. The attempt to proceed along this line would probably go off the rails in one direction or another.

Whatever improvements are needed in present social controls of business, they have at least proceeded in the proper dimensions. Industry or function provides a clear objective, to be dealt with by limited means tailored to the purpose. This is a regulatory principle that legislation seeking to achieve new social objectives would be wise to perpetuate.

Future legislation there will be. National priorities have been shifting toward the protection of the environment and of the consumer, with legislation and administrative processes to apply it. Much of this may have been merely the first shoe that was dropped.

The prospective need for future legislation altering and perhaps enlarging the social control of business, however, by no means implies a need for federal chartering power. There is nothing in a federal chartering procedure that Congress cannot do directly. The commerce clause of the Constitution is the source of this power. The concept of "interstate commerce" has been broadened so far that most corporate activities worth regulating fall under it. Federal incorporation would add nothing. In fact, if some requirement were imposed, as a condition to obtain or retain a federal charter, that could not be imposed by legislation under the commerce clause or some other clause, its constitutionality would probably be challenged.

Much can be said in favor of legislating separately for particular purposes. As contrasted with generalized legislation conferring broad powers upon a regulatory commission, the specific legislative route permits more thorough examination of proposed controls, in public hearings. It allows more give and take in the legislative process. Implementation can be more expeditious,

should the alternate route of broad authority by one agency lead to frequent litigation.

DO-IT-YOURSELF SOCIAL PRIORITIES

An issue more basic is how much government action is needed to implement our nascent priorities. How much, in the way of social responsibilities, can business be expected to take on without government compulsion?

The traditional position of classical economics has been that business serves society best if it allocates resources where they are most productive. Another way of saying exactly the same thing, generally, is that business should seek to maximize stockholders' profits, since that is accomplished by optimal allocation of resources. Many businessmen who originally took this position have shifted away from it. They are prepared to accept social responsibilities on behalf of their companies even if it costs the stockholders money.

For the executive this is attractive. From "hired hand" of the stockholders he is promoted to "arbiter among competing claims" and "trustee" of the claimants. At least, it will be attractive until he finds accountability following on the heels of authority: The "unreviewable discretion" with which lawyers like to endow trustees does not often go unchallenged in social matters.

To the economist, a business philosophy that does not maximize profits is uncomfortable. The profit guideline makes all business decisions predictable, in theory at least. When it is abandoned, business action and with it the behavior of prices, output, incomes and all the rest become indeterminate. Economics then has little to say about the behavior of a firm.

Actually, the businessman may be closer to the classical position than the economist who thinks in terms of the stockholders of a single firm. Today most stockholders are diversified—through their own portfolios, through mutual funds, or through pension funds and insurance. This makes their true interests much broader than those of any single company. Numerous social expenditures a firm can make, that may not pay off for that particular firm, do pay off for business as a whole. Suppose firm A invests in job training that pays off only if the trainee remains indefinitely. In fact, he quits after a time and takes a job with firm B. Firm A has lost, but B has gained a trained man without the training cost. If the stockholder owns stock in both A and B, he benefits by the training investment if B's gain exceeds A's loss.

Technically, the improvement in the labor force financed by A, and any similar service, is known as an externality, i.e., a benefit produced that A cannot capture. For business as a whole, it is not an externality. Somewhere in the economy the benefits will be captured. For the diversified stockholder, it is not an externality either.

This being so, the case for socially oriented expenditures by business gains strength. Individual firms will still be acting in the broader interest of their stockholders, even though a particular outlay does not pay off directly. They will be creating externalities the stockholder can recapture.

One of the most valuable externalities a firm can create and, when created by others, take advantage of is freedom from burdensome government regulation. By taking on some of the social responsibilities that might otherwise be imposed, an individual firm can contribute to this freedom.

Much of today's new regulation has resulted from popular concerns. The federal incorporation idea belongs in that category. To the extent that business can take care of such concerns voluntarily, pressure and the ensuing legislation will be muted. The action may not pay off directly. But it may pay off well for business as a whole, and for its diversified stockholders.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM O. COWGER

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, with considerable sorrow and a sense of personal regret, I call the attention of the House to the demise of the Honorable William O. Cowger, former Representative of the Kentucky Third District.

During his service in this Chamber, I had occasion to make the acquaintance of, and to work with this remarkable man, and in a short time had come to regard him as one of my closest friends. A strong believer in the best of American tradition, he was a true Republican, in the Lincolnian meaning of the word; conservative in the matter of conserving our national strength and our national purposes, yet progressive—once again in the manner of Abraham Lincoln—in demanding true equality for all.

A businessman, he knew well the importance of commerce in maintaining the national livelihood. A former athlete, he knew well the advantage of a vigorous policy in behalf of what is needed. A quiet philosopher, he recognized the requirement of justice under law, for every man alive, if we would hope to still the noisome cries of discord throughout the world.

Bill Cowger served in Congress for two terms, during which he was an active member of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Government Operations Committee. In both capacities he established himself as a man of high ability, with a rare talent for cooperation on the one hand, and tenacity of purpose on the other.

A native of Nebraska and a graduate of Texas A. & M., Bill Cowger saw naval service both in the Atlantic and Pacific during World War II, and upon his return to the States settled in Louisville, where he entered into business with considerable success. He was at different times president of the Louisville Junior Chamber of Commerce and president of the Louisville Mortgage Bankers' Association, and on different occasions was named Louisville Realtor of the Year, Kentucky Realtor of the Year, and one of Kentucky's three outstanding young men of the year.

In 1961, he successfully challenged a tradition of 30 years standing, winning election as mayor of Louisville, running as a Republican. Under his regime, public accommodations in the city were opened to black citizens for the first time.

In 1966, Bill Cowger was nominated for Congress and elected with the backing of a liberal coalition. In Congress, he compiled a voting record consistently in favor of bills supporting housing, education, and aid to the cities. He also served as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Urban Affairs, calling on the local Republican leadership in the District of Columbia to develop a positive program for solving District problems.

October 13, 1971

Initially a "Hawk," in support of the American involvement in the war in Indochina, Bill Cowger changed position on the war far in advance of many others, coming out for disengagement in the fall of 1968. In so doing, he may have lost some support and in his final campaign for office last year he failed of reelection by 211 votes out of nearly 100,000 cast. Yet even in defeat he was impressive, for he had held to his principle, and that was the only way he knew how to act.

His views on the war in Indochina stemmed in a large part from two personal visits to that area. I had the pleasure of accompanying him on both of those trips, along with the other members of the Volunteers for Vietnam. Bill deserves great deal of the credit for the success of the visits by our team. His contributions were substantial, including our final report to President Nixon.

The Commonwealth of Kentucky has lost a great man in the early, tragic death of William O. Cowger, and I and many others have lost a true friend.

TIME TO REDISCOVER AMERICA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in 479 years, we are commemorating as a nation, Columbus' voyage of discovery. I believe we should use the occasion to launch a rediscovery of America.

When Columbus came to America, he found a land of vast beauty, rich in natural resources and full of the promise of greatness. The New World offered an open frontier, attracting persons from around the globe who came here seeking refuge from persecution, a new life and an opportunity to shape their own destiny with a freedom never before known.

In the centuries that followed, the "America" which was to emerge would represent an ideal to all repressed peoples, a land of opportunity—equal opportunity—a Nation working for the common good, a land of freedom.

Now in 1971, it is time for us to rediscover America.

We have shamefully abused the once beautiful land which Columbus discovered. Through apathy and neglect we have lost sight of some of our great goals. We have allowed our knowledge and technology to tower over us, draining every available source of power out of the earth, poisoning the air we breathe, permitting the rivers and lakes that feed our land to deteriorate from our wastes.

We have, at times, abused the ideals of our Founding Fathers and denied liberty and justice for all. We are not living up to the faith and hope which built this Nation.

Lest I sound altogether negative, permit me to paraphrase Winston Churchill: This is the least perfect nation on earth, with the single exception of all the others.

But that does not free us from an obligation to do better. That is why, Mr. Speaker, on this day, I suggest that we Americans reflect and reevaluate ourselves as a nation.

BUSING—THE BIG UGLY SLEEPER

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much said and written about the compulsory cross-busing policy that there is a scarcity of that which is not repetitious. An exception to this seems to be found in a Newsweek article written by the distinguished writer, Stewart Alsop.

These comments by Mr. Alsop are objective and revealing. The expressions are timely, and should be read by all Americans:

THE BIG, UGLY SLEEPER

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—What the politicians call a "sleeper"—an emerging issue that could have a decisive political impact—is just becoming visible as the Presidential election year approaches. This big, ugly sleeper was created when the Supreme Court handed down its recent decision requiring school busing for purposes of racial balance.

The decision was written (very fuzzily) by President Nixon's own appointee, Chief Justice Warren Burger. But that shrewd fellow, Mr. Nixon, quickly recognized the impact of the sleeper, and publicly ordered his subordinates to "hold busing to the minimum required by law."

The President's natural enemies, the liberal Democrats, are beginning, uncomfortably, to recognize the impact of the sleeper, too. But they cannot overtly oppose the Court decision and remain liberal Democrats in good standing. As a result, their statements on the issue (of which this reporter has made a choice collection) might be published for the benefit of ambitious fledgling politicians, under the title, "How to Straddle an Issue."

The Court decision was, of course, motivated by the very best of intentions. But good intentions are what the road to hell is paved with, and some rather hellish consequences, especially for the liberal Democrats, are already visible. The decision principally affects those people who have traditionally constituted the basic liberal Democratic constituency—the "little guys," the proles, the unaffluent urban whites. It does not at all affect ruling-class liberals—a category to which all the Democratic Presidential candidates belong, as well as all the liberal commentators who have attacked the President for his "hypocritical" failure to support the Court decision.

PRIVATE SCHOOL

To prove that this is so, it is only necessary to ask where the leading Democratic Presidential hopefuls send their own children to school. Just one of them—Sen. Henry Jackson, reviled by many liberals as a cold-war reactionary—sends a child to a District of Columbia public school. Jackson's daughter goes to a D.C. public school which is about a third Negro.

The other liberal Democrats have displayed no unconquerable urge to send their children to a central-city school to promote racial balance. Sen. Edward Kennedy and Sen. Birch Bayh have children at St. Alban's, Washington's closest approximation to St. Grottlesex. Sen. William Proxmire's child

goes to Landon, another private school and so did Sen. Hubert Humphrey's most recent school-age child.

Sen. Edmund Muskie's school-age children go to private Catholic schools. Sen. George McGovern's five children have gone to the suburban Bethesda-Chevy Chase school, currently with about 3 per cent Negro enrollment. As for New York's entry, Mayor John Lindsay, some years ago Mrs. Lindsay remarked flatly that her children had always gone to private school and always would.

RACIAL JUSTICE

It is a good guess—and indeed, no guess at all—that those liberal commentators who have been most critical of the President's anti-busing stand have displayed a similar disinclination to sacrifice their children on the altar of racial justice. (Just for the record, all this more-or-less liberal commentator's six children have gone or are going to private schools.) Nor is this disinclination particularly shameful—for surely it is understandable that every parent wants for his children the best education he can afford.

That kind of education is rarely if ever available in schools which are given an artificial racial balance by busing or other means. A two-month survey by The New York Times in 1970 reached the amply documented conclusion that "in virtually every part of the country where schools have substantial Negro enrollments" the result has been "racial polarization, disruptions, and growing racial tensions that sometimes explode into violence."

That is not the sort of school to which even the most dedicated liberal would voluntarily send his child. For example, Sen. Walter Mondale, one of the ablest and most genuinely idealistic of the liberal Democrats, sent all his three children to D.C. public schools—two are still there. But when he discovered that his son, in a Negro-majority school, was receiving virtually no education, and was getting "rolled" almost daily, he understandably withdrew the boy.

Whose children, then, do get bused across town to provide racial balance in central-city schools? The answer is quite obvious—the lower stratum of urban whites, the people with several children and \$8,000 or so a year, who are already up to their eyeballs in debt, and who can't afford to escape to the white suburbs, much less to send their children to private schools. These people are the traditional basic constituency of the liberal Democrats—and the notion that their children are being used to save the consciences of ruling class liberals is not likely to please them one bit.

There is no doubt at all that the consciences of the white majority in this country could do with a bit of salving. It was morally monstrous that until 1954, many Negro children could not go to the nearest tax-supported public schools because of the color of their skins. The Supreme Court's 1954 decision sending little Linda Brown to the nearest white public school in Topeka was surely morally correct.

It is still morally monstrous that per-pupil expenditure in poor school districts should be a third or less of that in prosperous suburban districts, like this area's Bethesda-Chevy Chase. Thus the recent California decision calling for equalized expenditures was surely morally correct too. Surely it is also morally correct that the power of the Federal government be used to open up middle-class jobs and the middle-class suburbs to Negroes. All the evidence indicates that integration really succeeds only when the middle class is integrated with the middle class.

DEMOCRATIC EROSION

But is it really morally correct that a little Linda White, say, should be bused across town to experience "racial polarization, disruptions, and . . . violence" for one reason only, that her parents cannot afford to ex-

tricate her? Is it not at least morally dubious that America's ruling-class liberals should support class legislation in the form of a court edict, which forces the unaffluent whites to send their children to schools where affluent whites will not send their own children? Surely this kind of Marie Antoinette liberalism plays directly into the hands of the likes of George Wallace, and erodes the support of the basic constituency of the liberal Democrats.

**GOV. JOHN J. GILLIGAN SPEAKS
ON ECONOMY**

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Governor of Ohio, John J. Gilligan, appeared before the House Banking and Currency Committee to describe the harsh economic conditions which now exist in Ohio, and to give his ideas for remedial action. At that time he endorsed a concept in which I strongly believe: that in our effort to control inflation we should not short-change the many worthwhile and productive governmental programs we have established in recent years. As Governor Gilligan said:

To cut back spending in the public sector is a double disservice: it has a direct and deleterious effect upon the quality of life in all our communities, and its disemployment, or denies employment opportunity, to millions of Americans who are eager to work, and to put their skills and efforts at the service of their fellow citizens.

I would now like to commend to the attention of my colleagues the text of the Governor's statement:

GOV. JOHN J. GILLIGAN'S TESTIMONY BEFORE
THE HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COM-
MITTEE

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I am profoundly honored to be asked to appear before this distinguished Committee to offer some comments on the President's new economic game plan from my vantage point as Governor of the State of Ohio, a state of 11 million people that has historically played an important role in the industrial foundation of the American economy, and has been traditionally responsible for about 5% of our gross national product.

Let me say at the very outset that much of what I will offer for the consideration of the members of this committee is based upon speculation and surmise, since no one really knows what the President may be planning to announce for Phase II, or Phase III, of his new program of economic controls.

An Administration spokesman was recently quoted in a national news magazine as saying, "Of course we are jittery. It's like blasting off in a two-stage rocket while the mechanics are still working on the second stage. The fact is that we don't have all the answers and we are committed to a course. This would make anyone nervous."

If that Administration spokesman is nervous in his position as a member of the launching crew, it is fair to say that those of us who must, willy-nilly, ride aboard the economic spacecraft designed by the President and his advisors are deeply apprehensive. Since we are uncertain as to where we are going, or how the flight director proposes

to get us there, it might be useful to consider first where we are in the present state of the American economy.

At the recent National Governors' Conference in Puerto Rico, a substantial majority of the Governors present subscribed without equivocation to a statement outlining the dimensions of the economic crisis which presently grips America. They pointed out, among other things, that "Our country now has the highest unemployment level in a decade, coupled with the highest rate of inflation in 20 years, the lowest business profits since 1938, the first negative balance of trade in this century, a disastrous cost-price ratio in agriculture, and the largest deficit in the Federal budget since World War II. One-fourth of existing factory capacity is idle. In short, it has finally been admitted that we are faced with the worst economic crisis in a generation."

While economists have estimated that 28% of America's plant capacity now stands idle Vice President Agnew, in an address to the Governors in San Juan, declared that it was the Administration's view that it is unrealistic to believe that any substantial share of that idle industrial capacity could be put to use unless America became involved in a major war. Without any further comment, I will simply ask the members of this committee to meditate upon the long and short range implications of that astounding statement.

Permit me to attempt to translate the statistics of idle plant capacity into more human terms as they apply in my own state.

Ohio is a major industrial state with a widely diversified base of primary industries: coal and steel production, fabrication, assembly and distribution of manufactured products of all sorts.

Two years ago this month the number of Ohioans claiming unemployment benefits under Ohio law was 23,582. Last year that figure had come to 63,562. Last week it was 99,872—and there are, moreover, 40,000 Ohioans who have exhausted their unemployment benefits, and are now no longer even a statistic in the unemployment compensation reports.

That means that in two years almost 100,000 Ohioans have lost their jobs, and their families today are facing privation (despair), and despair.

Startling as these figures may appear, they only trace the outlines of the problem. They do not take into account thousands of unemployed Ohio workers, who were laid off from their jobs not covered by the provisions of unemployment compensation programs. They do not deal with the problem of tens of thousands of young Ohioans coming into the job market in the last two years who have yet to find their first job, and who face a future that is bleak indeed.

I am not talking only about the high school and college graduates who are walking the streets searching for employment; I am talking as well about the men returning from service in Viet Nam.

Ohio was the first state to launch a program in which we sought to identify, and locate, every single returning Viet Nam veteran, to find out where he lived, what his phone number was, whether he was employed or in school, what his job skills might be, so that we could help him to reestablish himself in what the troops call "the real world."

We found that there were no less than 32,000 Ohio boys who had served their country in Vietnam yet could not find a job, although some of them had been searching for as long as 18 months. Many of them had families to support; many were reduced to asking for welfare; and it is not easy for me to convey to the members of this Committee the kind of resentment and bitterness which we found among these men who feel that this Nation has used them in an ugly and use-

less war, and as a reward for their sacrifices, has now consigned them to a sort of human scrap heap.

Again the statistics I have cited reveal nothing about tens of thousands of Ohioans who are still employed, but who are working shorter hours with less overtime, and who are bringing home reduced pay checks that are totally inadequate to meet the higher prices for every commodity and service their families require.

Last year, for the first time in 20 years, the real income of fully employed Ohio workers turned downwards! And I can only say again that the bare statistics are incapable of conveying the kind of economic distress and wide-spread suffering which press upon thousands and thousands of Ohio families.

As part of the answer to this problem the Administration has recommended an investment tax credit for industry, designed to encourage investment in new machinery and equipment, in the apparent hope that such investment will produce new jobs. That device should certainly be more effective than the earlier proposal of accelerated depreciation schedules for equipment and machinery already on the line; but no one should be deluded into believing that his constitutes any really effective response to the kind of problem that I have just outlined.

Some employment may result, but we all recognize that while new machinery and equipment often increase production, there is frequently a concomitant sharp reduction in the use of human labor in the productive process. And the experience over the last 20 years in our basic industry in Ohio is that production levels may well climb while employment levels in those same industries sag.

It would, in my judgment, be very dangerous for the Congress to assume that the tax credit approach will provide an automatic or effective means of cutting substantially into the unemployment problem. It has been estimated, for instance, that we will need 4 million new jobs in America next year, to bring unemployment levels below 5%! I am not a trained economist, but I would most respectfully suggest to this committee and to the Congress, that America must face the fact that these new jobs simply will not be developed in the private industrial production field, but must be developed in the fields of services and most especially in government services.

That brings me to the consideration of the very great problem in the field of public employment, and of the impact upon public employees of the measures already invoked by the President, including the wage-price freeze as well as the measures designed to stimulate additional employment in the field of private production.

Much has been said of the basic inequity of an across the board wage freeze, but let me attempt to relate that criticism to some of the fundamental facts of life in Ohio.

The State of Ohio today employs approximately 55,000 people, almost 3,000 less than during the month of August, because we were forced to dismiss hundreds of employees due to insufficient state tax revenues. Local government employs over 65,000 people in Ohio, and in some of our major cities hundreds of these employees have been laid off because of reduced municipal budgets.

There are 100,000 teachers in Ohio schools, and again hundreds of them have been dismissed because of inadequate resources available to the school boards.

It has been estimated that state and local governments throughout the Nation in the past year lost 3.5 billion dollars because of the impact of the current recession on anticipated tax yields.

Clearly, therefore, unemployment in the public sector is directly attributable to the

economic policies of the national administration.

I would emphasize that almost all of these public employees are completely without the protection of unemployment compensation, and when dismissed they are immediately confronted with economic disaster. Hundreds of them are quickly reduced to absolute destitution. While welfare rolls continue to swell, there are those who would demand that welfare recipients simply go out and find a job. Where?

In March of this year I presented to our General Assembly the results of a study of income levels of state employees in Ohio compared to people doing similar work in the Federal Government, and other states, and in the private sector. We discovered that while the average weekly wage paid in Ohio industry was \$151.45, the average wage in state government was \$130.71. We discovered further that while in the spring of 1970 the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics declared that a minimum budget for a family of four was \$6960 a year, and that anyone living below that level could be considered to be living in poverty, fully 60% of our full time state employees were earning less than that.

Incredible as it may sound, our study revealed that under the terms of the 1970 Disaster Relief Act, due to go into effect in December, nearly 2,000 full time employees of the State of Ohio will qualify for the Federal Food Stamp Program. The study also disclosed that several hundred employees actually qualified for welfare assistance under the very low income standards established by our State.

I therefore recommended to the General Assembly an across-the-board wage increase of 16%, and about 2500 separate adjustments for specific job classifications within the wage structure. This proposal was designed to bring state employees up to a level with other states and with private industry. Although we are 2½ months into the new fiscal year, our General Assembly has not yet approved a biennial budget, and has not yet acted upon the pay package for state employees. Now it is apparently the intention of the Administration, by executive edict, to freeze the income levels these thousands of Ohio public employees at their present inadequate and unfair levels. Such a proposal clearly seems to me to represent a body blow to the effort to reestablish some basic equities, and to revitalize our nation's economy.

Moreover, the President has announced his intention to reduce the Federal Government's payrolls by 5%, and if we in Ohio are to take our proportionate share of such cutbacks, the result will be an additional 5 to 6 thousand unemployed.

I don't believe that I can overstate the case: millions of American men and women are engaged in public service employment today, doing work of every conceivable description, work that is vitally important to the standard of living which all of us enjoy. Millions more can, and should, be employed in the public sector, making their own contribution to the fields of education, public health, air and water pollution control, crime control and public safety, and all the other activities which are so capable of enriching the life of our society. To cut back spending in the public sector is a double disservice; it has a direct and deleterious effect upon quality of life in all our communities, and it disempowers, or denies employment opportunity, to millions of Americans who are eager to work, and to put their skills and efforts at the service of their fellow citizens. The proposed tax credits won't touch this problem. Wage freezes, laid on across-the-board, will exacerbate the present inequities. Reductions in public spending for domestic purposes will render the problem finally insoluble.

I know that the members of this Committee will understand that the task before all of us is to put Americans back to work, in useful employment—whether in the public or

private sectors—at income levels which permit people to live in decency and dignity, and to raise their families in security.

Again, I want to thank the Chairman, and the members of this committee for permitting me to express my views on this critical problem.

DAMAGE EFFECTIVENESS—II

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last week—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 7—I point out that Senator BUCKLEY's amendments to the military procurement authorization of 1972 to equip our land and sea based strategic missile force with a hard target damage limiting capability would not have given the United States a first strike capability over the Soviet Union, as some seemed to assume. A first strike capability requires an overwhelming preponderance of force. Increasing the accuracy of our Minuteman-Poseidon force would not produce the necessary preponderance. This type of upgrading would not provide us with assured destruction of the Soviet ICBM force necessary for a calculation of successful first strike and does not interfere in any way with the deterrent effect of the other two portions of the Soviet triad, their strategic bombers and submarine launched ballistic missiles. Either one of these two systems provides the Soviets with an excellent deterrent against the United States, and will into the foreseeable future. Combined they provide the Soviets with more than enough guaranteed retaliatory power to forestall any U.S. attack even if we had the desire. The fact is we do not.

What Senator BUCKLEY's amendments would have done if they had passed is help eliminate several Soviet attack options which are developing as a direct result of our failure to make our missile force accurate enough to render the Soviet hardened missile force something less than invulnerable. I made specific reference to only one increasingly feasible method of attack, that being a combined SS-9 and SLBM attack which could critically degrade our land based Minuteman force and our land based strategic bomber force. As was pointed out in a study recently released by the Operations Research Society of America investigating the 1969 congressional debate on Safeguard:

E. The Problem of Coordinating Strikes on Both Missiles and Bombers.

Opponents of Safeguard frequently raised the objection that even if Minuteman and bombers were separately vulnerable, it would be impossible to design an attack that did not give one or the other component enough warning to launch before being attacked. For instance, Wiesner states that an SLBM attack on the bomber bases "would occur before attacking ICBMs launched at the same time would reach their targets and that this could provide the basis for firing the U.S. missile force" (p. 75 of the Chayes-Wiesner book), and Panofsky states in testimony on April 22 (p. 1128, part 2, Stennis Committee):

"If we did imagine a coordinated attack both on our missile sites in the north by

multimegaton missile warheads, and at the same time arrival of an attack from the sea on our bomber bases, then the amount of warning available to us from detecting the launch of a massive ICBM attack against our missiles would be ample to get the SAC bombers into the air. On the other hand, if the bomber bases were attacked first, although part of the bomber force might not escape destruction, our missiles would be intact and the Soviet planners would know that they would be exposed to an overwhelming retaliatory strike from our Minuteman force. . . . Therefore the combined strategic bomber and land-based missile force assure survival of one or the other from attack.

These statements ignore the possibilities of SLBM attacks on the Minuteman force during the time interval before ICBMs impact on the Minuteman sites spaced to make it unwise to launch Minuteman. With the numbers of submarines cited by Foster for this time period, and with reasonable SLBM reliabilities, this type of joint bomber and missile pindown attack may well be feasible. Those who wish to challenge the possibility of a pin-down attack by the Soviets must treat all reasonable tactics that might lead to pin-down, and demonstrate that none of them will succeed. This was not accomplished during this debate.

This point was discussed further in the 1970 debates. Foster stated in this connection (Stennis 1970, pp. 2332-2333), "We believe that a first strike against both the Minuteman force and the strategic bomber force, although difficult, is technically feasible. The most suitable Soviet tactic would be to launch from its submarine fleet simultaneously an attack on our bomber bases and an attack to prevent our launching Minuteman. The timing of such an attack, although critical, is by no means infeasible."

Panofsky's reply was, "we are faced again with a claim that a coordinated attack which would disable both Minuteman and the Strategic Air Command is technically feasible in a 'first strike scenario.' Because of the timing problems I have referred to in previous testimony such an attack would indeed require 'an attack to prevent our launching Minuteman' from sea-launched missiles. This would require an enormous increase in numbers of Soviet missiles, their accuracy, and in the confidence the Soviets would have to have in their system. Moreover, the SAC fleet would have to remain on the ground as 'sitting ducks' even in times of stress, that is, they would have to be not on airborne alert; moreover the SAC airfields would have to be within reach of the Soviet's SLBMs a fact we are presently changing."

"The final remark given in this DOD comment is covered by the statement in my testimony. 'We are giving the Soviets credit for a degree of performance and reliability of the military systems, which we could not dream of achieving ourselves.'"

"The type of reasoning presented in this DOD comment represents the kind of contrived threat which totally ignores the kind of realities the Soviet planner would have to face."

The Committee does not feel that discussion by Panofsky on the infeasibility of coordinated strikes against U.S. bombers and missiles satisfactorily refutes Foster's claims.

Another Soviet attack option which we are opening up by failing to make relatively inexpensive modifications that would improve the accuracy of our missiles is the city evacuation attack. Calculations of a successful first strike rest upon being able to lower the enemy's retaliatory capability, through the use of counterforce weaponry and ballistic missile defense, to a point where the damage to oneself is not expected to be unacceptable. Civil defense in this case

is nothing less than a form of passive ballistic missile defense, complementing anti-ballistic-missile systems.

If the nation upon which the attack is being contemplated has its entire retaliatory strategy based on nothing more than inflicting civilian casualties then it is apparent that the importance of civil defense in achieving a first strike capability increases tremendously. In the abstract, perfect civil defense coupled with a minimal level of nuclear forces able to penetrate and destroy enemy cities could give one a first strike capability.

Unfortunately Soviet civil defense measures are far from being abstract. The Soviet Union is today spending up to three times as much on civil defense measures in 1 year as the United States has spent in the last 6 to 8 years combined. Noting that the Soviet Union has a GNP only one-half of ours helps to illustrate the degree of seriousness with which they take civil defense. The article by Miss Joanne Gailar of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which will be inserted following my remarks, goes into some detail on the magnitude of the Soviet civil defense program.

The effects of the Soviet program in terms of our strategic force posture aimed at nothing other than decimating Soviet noncombatants, has been drawn out for us by one of America's greatest living physicists, Dr. Eugene P. Wigner. Professor Wigner was instrumental in designing and testing the world's first atomic pile and has received numerous awards for the genius he has exhibited in his field. These include the Enrico Fermi Award, the Atoms for Peace Award, the Nobel Prize for Physics, and the National Science Medal. He is a man fully qualified to speak on the subject of the effects of nuclear weapons and their relation to civil defense.

Dr. Wigner has made some calculations based on the current Soviet civil defense program which should be of great interest to everyone. First he assumes that the United States will target only enemy civilians and industrial concentrations rather than hardened Soviet missile sites. This is the key to successful city evacuation attack, the condition which Senator BUCKLEY amendments were designed to eliminate. Our force posture known as "mutual assured destruction," also known as "assured destruction" and "realistic deterrence" hereinafter abbreviated as "MAD," has resulted in having missiles which are not capable of the accuracy necessary to target anything other than "soft" urban-industrial centers.

Starting from our "MAD" targeting doctrine Dr. Wigner bases his calculations on the Soviets successfully carrying out their current city evacuation plans and gives the United States the best possible chance of inflicting maximum casualties. He assumes that: First, the Soviet first strike against our missile forces is without effect; second, the Soviet ABM system is completely inoperative; and third, the United States aims only at the evacuated civilians. The first assumption is probably close to what would happen in reality since we would

probably have peaked our forces during the time it took the Soviets to evacuate their cities. The second and third assumptions simply give us a best shot possibility and serve to emphasize the magnitude of Soviet civil defense procedures.

Dr. Wigner calculates that we would inflict just about 10.5 million casualties on the Soviet Union. While this is an enormous number of casualties it is well to recall that deterrence under the "MAD" concept, as it was spelled out by the previous administration, is based on being able to destroy 20 to 30 percent of the population of the U.S.S.R., 48 million to 72 million people, and between 50 to 70 percent of its industry. Dr. Wigner goes on to point out that the loss of some of our missiles and the targeting of others toward industrial centers or soft military targets, would reduce the number of Soviet casualties by perhaps one-half. He concludes:

While 5½ million lives lost is a terrible retribution, is it assured a destruction? Is it sure to deter a nation that lost twice that many in World War II? Can a President of the United States bargain with this deterrent against the threat of a first strike which can kill many millions of Americans?

When attempting to assess the magnitude of fatalities that will serve to deter the Soviet Politburo we must take into account their attitude toward the loss of human life. Robert Conquest's study prepared for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, "The Human Cost of Soviet Communism," gives us a good indication of the value placed on human life during the time which the current Politburo leaders were making their way up the ladder to their present positions. Mr. Conquest's findings, simply as regards deaths in Soviet prison camps, is staggering. He concludes his study with the finding that—

Thus we get a figure of 20 million dead (over the period 1936-1950 in the prison camps), which is almost certainly too low and might require an increase of 50% or so, as the debit balance of the Stalin regime for 23 years.

This would suggest to me the possibility of a relatively high criteria for unacceptable damage measured in human lives.

By failing to give our missile forces a hard target damage limiting capability we are working ourselves into an untenable position. If the Soviet Union begins to evacuate its cities we do not have the means necessary to render their strategic offensive missile forces ineffective. The only alternative facing the President is to launch on evacuation before our target disappears into the tundra or simply to wait and hope that they are not going to strike while our deterrent capability, that is their reason for not striking, is vanishing.

The administration's decision not to upgrade our land and sea based missile forces to the point where they have a hard target capability is thus presenting the Soviets with another possible successful attack option. Prof. Morton Kaplan of the University of Chicago has put our acquiescence into the development of possible successful Soviet attack options in the proper perspective. Professor Kaplan stated:

People treat the arms race as if the proper analogy would be poker. They assume that finite deterrents will work under all circumstances, that no objective is likely to justify the Soviet's use of first strike and that the world will develop in benign directions. Therefore they wish to place their bets on the probably winning hand. Yet the more appropriate analogy would be that of Russian roulette. It could be pointed out in defense of Russian roulette that there is only one chance in six that the chamber will have a bullet in it and the person be killed. Yet any sensible person would refuse to play the game in the first place. The truth is that we live in a world with one history, that we are seldom able to correct past mistakes, and that a catastrophe will be irrevocable. In this kind of world, a relatively small payment to insure that the game is not one of Russian roulette would be quite worthwhile, even if we could be assured that there are forty chambers to the gun and that only one chamber will have a bullet in it.

As any intelligent and honest social scientist will admit, we are unable to predict the future and many surprises will occur. In a regime or bloc crisis, a first strike against the United States might prove tempting to the Soviet Union, provided that some reasonable calculations could be provided by the Soviet high command."

To allow the Soviets to develop the means whereby they calculate that they can successfully dispatch the United States through nuclear war is highly provocative. To reject the upgrading of our forces necessary to deny the Soviets successful attack options on the basis of nothing more than the shop worn theory of Soviet paranoia—that is, our war fighting capability may frighten them into committing suicide by attempting an attack which they can be reasonably sure will fail—we are acting in a manner unbecoming to reasonable men. Offsetting postulated Soviet fears to the point of allowing them to achieve a central war winning capability is truly playing Russian roulette with the lives of the American people.

The fact that the administration wishes to maintain our land- and sea-based missile force with the degree of inaccuracy necessary to insure that we cannot limit damage to ourselves should the need arise means that the initiative in this instance will have to come from the Congress, as was the case with Senator BUCKLEY's amendments.

It is certainly ironic that an administration which makes such a point of stressing a force posture based on Soviet capabilities rather than Soviet intentions should use the SALT talks as one of the reasons against equipping our forces with a hard target capability. Talks represent nothing more than possible intention. Negotiations are one thing, forces in being and under construction quite another.

So that my colleagues will be able to critically evaluate the matters which have been discussed here I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the article by Dr. Wigner in which he details his calculations and the article by Miss Joanne Levey Gailar, a staff member of the civil defense research project at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, on the magnitude of the Soviet civil defense program. For those of my colleagues who are interested in reading about the Soviet

civil defense program right from the horses mouth, the Oak Ridge Laboratory has recently completed the translation of the current Soviet civil defense manual and it is available from the National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce. Both Dr. Wigners and Miss Gailar's articles originally appeared in *Survive* magazine.

The articles follow:

THE MYTH OF "ASSURED DESTRUCTION"

(By Eugene P. Wigner)

(Facts of modern Soviet defense reveal a drastically different picture than that of an obliterating second strike by the United States in the event of Soviet nuclear attack. Here Princeton University's Dr. Eugene P. Wigner, renowned physicist and civil defense authority, examines these facts and arrives at the conclusion that the Soviet Union would not be crushed by our counterattack. It would, thanks to effective survival plans, lose fewer people than it lost in World War II—probably less than half as many.)

A large part of our public and much of our military consider civil defense preparations unnecessary because they believe we can rely on the "assured destruction" doctrine. This doctrine tells us that, even after being subjected to a first strike, our forces can inflict such damage on the assailant that his destruction as a nation is assured. Hence, no nation will ever attack us or ever threaten us with an attack. The purpose of this article is to expose this doctrine of "assured destruction" as a myth. It became a myth principally as a result of the elaborate preparations which were undertaken by the USSR to evacuate its cities. If such an evacuation were carried out before a confrontation is precipitated, our deterrent based on the threat to the Soviet urban population would have evaporated.

Underestimating the effectiveness of defense—in the present case the civil defense and city evacuation plans of the USSR—is almost as common a mistake as preparing defenses against the enemy tactics of the preceding war. Thus, before the First World War, it was taken as axiomatic that the outcome would be determined one way or the other within three weeks because the offensive power of at least one of the parties would overwhelm the defense of the other. Yet the trenches protected the troops of both sides and stalled the progress of the attacker for four years. As to the Second World War, psychologist Janis observes, "prior to World War II, government circles in Britain believed that, if their cities were subjected to heavy air raids, a high percentage of the bombed civilian population would break down mentally and become chronically neurotic. This belief, based on predictions made by various specialists, proved to be a myth." Indeed, the stories of horror, the subject of a variety of books before the Second World War, depicting the utter hopelessness of people roaming the streets, their disorientation and helplessness, must have deeply affected every reader. Yet, when the attacks came, the air raid shelters proved to be very effective—effective not only emotionally by preventing the breakdown of morale anticipated by Janis' "specialists," but also physically by providing a remarkable degree of protection.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DEFENSE: U.S. DOUBTS VS. SOVIET CONFIDENCE

The situation now is somewhat similar to that before World War II. Both our military and our public give credence to statements by those who grossly exaggerate the power of offense over defense. They tell us that we can do little or nothing to protect the civilian

population against the effects of nuclear weapons. In the USSR, on the other hand, civil defense has the wholehearted endorsement of the military, and belief in its effectiveness with which the Soviet government has developed protection for its people.²

The publications in the USSR do not conceal the terrible nature of nuclear weapons. Thus, the article of General Chuykov,³ which forms one of the bases of this article, gives a fair and, in fact, unusually clear picture of the effects of these weapons. One can only wish that all our people were familiar with this article. However, it then goes on to say that "there is no poison for which there cannot be an antidote, nor can there be a weapon against which there is no defense. Although the weapons we have examined are mass weapons . . . they will not affect masses but only those who neglect the study, mastery, and use of defense measures."

SOVIET SURVIVAL MEASURES

Indeed, as readers of *Survive* well know, the Soviet Union is well ahead of us in shelter construction. According to Podchufarov,⁴ the length of their subway tunnels is by now 130 miles. Even though they surely exaggerate when claiming that all the subways in the USSR are "safe" in the case of nuclear attack, it is true that they have hardened subways and these provide not only fallout but also very good blast protection—much better than any of the public shelters in our country.

The public shelters in the cities of the USSR are, nevertheless, designed to protect only a small part of the total population—those whose services would remain indispensable even during a conflict. What then renders our theory of assured destruction truly a myth? The USSR's extensive plans for evacuation of cities. These are barely more than two years old, yet they extend to all details—often, it seems, to a ridiculous extent. However, their principal lines are simply and clearly formulated. The decision to evacuate "will be announced by radio, television, published in the press (note this), or brought to you at your place of work or residence." People are expected to take along only what is most necessary, not more than 110 lbs. per person.

The evacuation plans, communicated to all city residents, specify the collection point where transportation will be provided for them. At the destination, food, lodging, shelter, work, medical services, will be available. Mail will be automatically redirected to reach people at the evacuation point rather than at their city residences. Plans are also formulated for the evacuation of sick and infirm persons—even for women who have just given birth to a child. Some of the plans appear to be too detailed.

EFFECTIVENESS OF EVACUATION

How effectively would the evacuation, if carried out completely, reduce the casualties and thus negate our "assured destruction"? It is difficult to give an exact figure for this because the total number of casualties depends on several factors. Chief among these are (a) the extent of the success of the USSR first strike in reducing our retaliatory capability, i.e., in destroying some of our missile sites.⁵ (b) the effectiveness of the USSR ballistic missile defense in destroying the missiles which we can launch after absorbing a first strike. (c) our own targeting doctrine, whether, under the conditions outlined, we would aim at the remaining missile sites in the USSR, at their evacuated cities to cause industrial damage, or at the evacuated population.⁶

Clearly, the maximum number of casualties would be caused under the least likely assumption: that (a) the USSR first strike against our missile bases is without any effect, (b) that the ABM of the USSR is entirely inoperative and (c) that we aim only at the evacuated people, disregarding

the cities and industries, the people sheltered there, as well as the remaining missile sites in the USSR. This last assumption is, of course, least credible.

Under the assumptions just made, the USSR hostage level is easily estimated. The evacuated people are immune to two of the most important effects of nuclear weapons: fire damage and fallout. The shelters protect them from the fallout radiation and no large fires can spread in the countryside. They are subject to the blast. Anyway, if fallout is to be caused, the area subject to a certain blast damage is reduced to about one-half. The total area which we can cover with a blast wave of 15 psi overpressure is 19,000 square miles.⁷ This overpressure, 15 psi, is far from the "mean lethal overpressure"⁸ of about 50 psi, as established by extensive studies.⁹ Hence, one might claim that the number of fatalities which the USSR leaders have to fear is considerably less than the number which we shall obtain, using the adverse assumptions (a), (b) and (c). To some extent this may be true. However, if one considers additional effects, such as initial radiation, flying objects, as well as damage to the ear-drums which (though by no means lethal) occurs at much lower overpressures, the 15 psi may be a good estimate for a "practical mean lethal overpressure."

If evacuation has taken place, how many people will there be within the area of 19,000 square miles in which we may be able to create the "practical mean lethal overpressure"? This depends on the area into which the people of the cities will be dispersed. Chuykov's aforementioned article³ gives an indication for this. He mentions a "city A," which we can assume to be Moscow, with a population density of 7000 per square kilometer (18,000 per square mile). After evacuation, the density would drop to one tenth of these figures. Since the population of Moscow is about 7.5 million, one obtains an evacuation area of 3900 square miles or a maximum evacuation distance of about 35 miles.¹⁰ This area then can be destroyed by less than one half of our missiles even though the "area coverage" needed for this is, since circles do not cover an area without overlap, about 4700 square miles.

How to use the remaining missiles, with an area coverage of 19,000—4,700—14,300 square miles? The next largest city in the USSR is Leningrad and, since it lies on the sea, its population cannot be dispersed as well as that of Moscow. The dispersal area for its 4 million people is closer to 2000 square miles (again using the maximum dispersal radius of 35 miles), requiring an area coverage of about 2400 square miles, leaving an area coverage of 11,900 square miles for the other large cities. These—Kiev, Baku, Karkov, Gorky and Tashkent—have populations of about 1.4 million each. The dispersal of these people into areas similar to that given by Chuykov for "city A," would give an average density of 1.4 million/3900 square miles, that is 360 per square mile. There would be no point in covering any of these dispersal areas with an overlapping pattern so that the remaining 11,900 square miles would place an additional 4.3 million people at risk. Together with the populations of Moscow and Leningrad, this gives $7.5 + 4 + 4.3 = 15.8$ million people at risk. If we accept the official estimate that about two-thirds of our missiles function as expected, the total number of hostages we may have in the USSR becomes just about 10.5 million people.

This estimate is obtained under the unrealistic assumptions (a), (b), and (c), as explained above. Actually, the loss of some of our missiles to a first strike, the destruction of others by the missile defense of the USSR, and the fact that at least some of our own missiles would be aimed at industrial and military installations, would reduce the number of "hostages"—would reduce it to perhaps one-half of the 10.5 million figure.¹¹

Footnotes at end of article.

The total number of casualties suffered by the people of the USSR in World War II was about 11 million.

EVACUATION—A PRELUDE TO CONFRONTATION?

There is a question that must have arisen in the reader's mind concerning the real effectiveness of evacuation in negating our "assured destruction" capability. It concerns the time needed for evacuation as contrasted with the warning time of a missile attack. The flying time of the land-based missiles is about 20 minutes, that of submarine-based missiles may be shorter. Evacuation of cities takes at least a day—according to General Chuykov, the press is one of the means of communicating the order to evacuate. Hence, evacuation is not a valid defense measure¹² against a first strike, certainly not against an unanticipated first strike. Does this circumstance revalidate the doctrine of assured destruction, and is it reassuring in this sense?

The answer is, in this writer's opinion, rather the opposite. City evacuation may not be a valid defense measure but, should a first strike or a confrontation be planned, evacuation would give the initiator a tremendous advantage. While 5½ million lives lost is a terrible retribution, it is "assured destruction"? Is it sure to deter a nation that lost twice that many in World War II? Can a President of the United States bargain with this deterrent against the threat of a first strike which can kill many millions of Americans?

We are spending less than 35 cents per person per year for civil defense. We have hardly any blast shelters, no plans for evacuation, and most of our fallout shelters are located in cities, exposed to destruction by blast. We have 5½ million Russian hostages; the USSR can threaten the destruction of more than 80 million American lives. In a confrontation, our President would be in a very, very inferior position.

Assured destruction has become a myth.

FOOTNOTES

¹ I. Janis, Bull. At. Scientists. VI. 256 (1950).

² See various articles in *Survive* by J. Levey, later J. Gallar.

³ Marshall V. I. Chuykov. *Nauka i Zhizn* (Science and Life) No. 1, p. 43 (1969). Marshall Chuykov may be known to the American public as a representative of the USSR at President Eisenhower's funeral.

⁴ I. Podchufarov, *Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil* (Communist of the Armed Forces) No. 8 (April, 1968), p. 52.

⁵ See "Last To Be Eaten," by Edward Teller, page 8, this issue of *Survive*.

⁶ See "They Bet Your Life," by Arthur A. Broyles, page 6, this issue of *Survive*.

⁷ See, for instance, this writer's article in *Survive*, Vol. 2, No. 4, p. 16.

⁸ The "mean lethal overpressure" is the pressure of the blast wave which causes fatal injuries in 50 per cent of those exposed to it.

⁹ See various publications of the Lovelace Foundation, in particular Report LP-1242-1 by Clayton S. White. See also DASA report 2113 by I. G. Bowen, E. R. Fletcher and D. R. Richmond of the same Foundation.

¹⁰ This writer's estimate for the evacuation area, before the article of reference 3 became available, was 50 miles. The resulting estimate of the maximum casualty figure was then 7.5 million, instead of the 10.5 million to be arrived at here. Actually, the book of reference 11 supports the original, higher estimate of dispersal area (p. 63).

¹¹ The estimate given in the USSR textbook on Civil Defense (edited by N. I. Akimov) is about four times lower if I understand this passage correctly.

¹² According to the opinion of the authors of the Little Harbor Study, it is not a valid defense measure to be initiated by the U.S. See "The Threat" chapter of *Civil Defense*,

Little Harbor Report, TID-24690, published by the Division of Technical Information, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, 1969.

IS THE SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM REALLY BETTER THAN OURS?

(By Joanne Levey Gallar)

SOVIET PROGRAM GROWING; AMERICAN PROGRAM SHRINKING

When I speak to various groups on Soviet civil defense, a question that repeatedly comes up is this one: If someone so desired, could he not make just as good a case for the extensiveness of the U.S. civil defense effort as you have made for the Soviet one? This question is asked invariably by reflective, intelligent members of the audience, those who want to be sure that I have not been oversold on the earnestness of the Soviet civil defense effort by the Soviet material I have read.

I freely acknowledge that in the event of nuclear war, no one can give an ironclad guarantee that the Soviet program to protect their essential industrial workers in urban blast shelters and to evacuate everybody else to the surrounding countryside and provide fallout protection for them will work.¹⁻⁵ I can attest, however, both to the earnestness and the intensity of the Soviet effort to instruct their entire population in the means and methods of defense against nuclear weapons, compared with a very low-key American program. The Soviet program appears to be growing in strength and effectiveness, while the American program is shrinking.

INSTRUCTION OF SOVIET POPULATION—NATION-WIDE, COMPULSORY, DIRECTED

Numerous articles,⁶⁻¹¹ for example, on the civil defense instruction of school children in grades five, six, seven and nine leave no doubt that the Soviet school children in all fifteen republics of the Soviet Union are being taught to protect themselves. Details about the 1968-1969 curriculum which include important changes in method and content of courses taught in the previous year, letters of suggestion and criticism from parents and teachers, and descriptions of equipment (gas masks, first-aid kits) and teaching materials (manuals, handbooks, posters, film strips) supplied to the schools, all point to the fact that Russian school children indeed receive a thorough training in civil defense.¹²

Nor is it school children alone who are instructed in civil defense. Marshal V. I. Chuykov, U.S.S.R. Chief of Civil Defense, when outlining the 1969 civil defense program in an interview, stated, "It is pertinent that this year the task of training the population in the 21-hour program is to be completed."¹³ And as Joseph Romm, the then Director of Civil Defense, testified at a recent hearing, "They (the Soviets) have a tremendous civil defense training program. Their society is different. They can direct people to be trained. There is no question that over 100 million people have taken their intensive civil defense training course. They are now, I think in their sixth mandatory training cycle."¹⁴

INSTRUCTION OF U.S. SCHOOL CHILDREN—SPOTTY, VOLUNTARY, UNDIRECTED

On the other hand, I know of no similar nationwide program in the U.S. for instructing our own population. While the national Office of Civil Defense has provided training for instructors of adult education courses and has developed with the Public Health Services a medical self-help training course, these courses have been adopted in what Mr. Romm describes as "spotty fashion" at the junior high school and high school levels. Under a training program like ours, which in Mr. Romm's words is "voluntary . . . not directed,"¹⁵ only a very small fraction of our populace, either in school or out of school, is learning about civil defense. In fact, few

of us know of any children who have received any civil defense training.

DIRECTION OF SOVIET PUBLIC ATTENTION TOWARD CIVIL DEFENSE

Similarly, the attention of the Soviet public is continuously directed toward civil defense through all the press media—newspapers, magazines, movies, radio and television, while the attention of the U.S. citizens is rarely called to civil defense matters through any press medium whatsoever. A Soviet article informs us, for example, "It is very pleasant to note that in recent times materials on this subject (civil defense) have been published in all the central newspapers, and also in the magazines 'Kommunist,' 'Soviet deputatov trudnyashchikh,' 'Sovetskoye profsoyuz,' 'Ogonek,' 'Nauka i Zhizn,' and others."¹⁶ Another Soviet source indicates that "more than a thousand persons have participated in (providing) television broadcasts in all studios."¹⁷

But skeptics need not take the word of the Russian sources. U.S. resident reporters in Moscow from two of our most distinguished newspapers verify the outflow of articles on civil defense in the Russian press. Bernard Gwertzman of the New York Times reports: "The article (on large-scale civil defense preparations in the Soviet republic of Kazakhstan) in *Pravda*, the Communist party newspaper, was the latest of a series in recent years stressing the importance of civil defense."¹⁸ And Charlotte Salkowski of the *Christian Science Monitor* attests, "A drive to bolster public awareness of civil defense is under way here. The Soviet press recently has carried a number of articles about air-raid drills in factories, training exercises on farms, and other measures designed to prepare Russians in the event of nuclear war. . . . Movie houses show special films and veterans of World War II give lectures on the subject (of civil defense)." According to Miss Salkowski, "Justification for this heightened attention to civil defense is the allegedly growing threat of the 'forces of imperialism' and attempts of the West to undermine the Communist camp."¹⁹

ATTENTION OF U.S. POPULACE DIRECTED AWAY FROM CIVIL DEFENSE

On the other hand, when Dr. Eugene Wigner, U.S. Nobel laureate, submitted an article on civil defense to the New York Times, it was politely received but never printed. A similar effort to interest the *Reader's Digest* in reprinting an article on Soviet civil defense was turned down with comments implying that the subject of civil defense was of little interest. That these are not isolated cases is substantiated by a review of the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature* for the past three years. *Readers' Guide* of March 1966 to February 1967 contained seven articles on "Civil Defense"; *Readers' Guide*, March 1967 to February 1968, but two articles, one of which was on Russian civil defense; and *Readers' Guide*, March 1968 to February 1969, not a single article on civil defense, U.S. or otherwise. Thus, in the same years that Soviet periodicals and newspapers stepped up the number of articles on civil defense, American articles in periodicals and newspapers have decreased to zero. I recently questioned ten people at random; like me, none had seen a program or even a spot announcement having to do with American civil defense on television for several years.

PARTY AND GOVERNMENT MANDATE STRENGTHENS SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE; EVACUATION PLANS CONSOLIDATED

The increase in articles on civil defense in the Soviet Union can be viewed legitimately as a reflection of government and party concern. Soviet civil defense was given a major boost in 1966 at the Twenty-third Party Congress when the Central Committee of the Communist Party called for strengthening civil defense.²⁰⁻²² The Soviet government

gave legislative teeth to this mandate with the Law on Universal Military Obligation, article seventeen of which calls for compulsory civil defense training in the grade schools, high schools, and technical schools throughout the Soviet Union.²⁴⁻²⁵

Another result of the party and government mandate was to substantially consolidate and strengthen existing plans for pre-attack evacuation and dispersal of large segments of the civilian population during periods of crisis escalation. V. I. Chuykov, Soviet Chief of Civil Defense; O. V. Tolstikov, former Soviet Chief of Civil Defense; and Lt. Gen. D. Shuvyrin, First Deputy Chief of Soviet Civil Defense, have all recently emphasized that urban pre-attack evacuation is an extremely effective measure in saving lives. Shuvyrin, in describing evacuation as "the most radical means of defense," indicates that through evacuation, "it is possible to achieve a reduction in the population density by scores of times in the large cities." In addition, he points out that the feasibility of evacuation is enhanced in the Soviet Union (1) by the socialist system and the planned economy, which enables the S.U. to organize and carry out evacuation on a nationwide scale; (2) by the vast expanse of the motherland, the great capacity of the suburban area, which permits the settling of an enormous quantity of individuals in rural localities, and (3) by a well-controlled transport, which can move people out of cities in a short period of time.²⁷ Marshal Chuykov, in an article appearing in *Science and Life*, a widely distributed and highly regarded Soviet magazine, makes the same claims for the feasibility of evacuation²⁸ as Shuvyrin, stressing that in the light of its effectiveness, supplying people with food and water—not defending from nuclear weapons—is the really knotty problem.²⁹

That the Soviets take evacuation seriously is also evident in the comprehensiveness and detail of their program. Every town, for example, has an evacuation transport commission, which is headed by the deputy chairman of the local Council of Workers' Deputies, whose responsibility is to coordinate the evacuation of the population by rail, motor and water.³⁰

Elaborate evacuation plans including the designation of collecting points at which the evacuees would assemble; evacuation passes for every man, woman and child,³¹ the presence of a doctor or nurse with every evacuation train or convoy or trucks; explicit instructions on what every family should take³² (depending on climate and season) and the maximum weight of luggage and contents.³³ There are also plans for receiving the evacuees in the country³⁴—providing them with food, water, and jobs, and even for having their mail delivered to them at their new addresses.³⁵ Thus, the seriousness with which the Soviets take evacuation is evident in (1) the declarations of their military strategists of its effectiveness, (2) the existence of civil defense evacuation commissions in every town and village, and (3) the comprehensive and detailed plans for carrying it out.

DECREASING BUDGET ALLOCATIONS WEAKEN U.S. CIVIL DEFENSE

I have suggested that the increase in articles on civil defense in the Soviet press is a reflection of government and party concern. By the same token, it is likely that press apathy toward civil defense in the U.S. is a reflection of government apathy, which is evident in decreasing budget outlays for civil defense. While the U.S. government authorized \$238.9 million for civil defense in 1962, only \$105.1 million,³⁶ less than half the 1962 allocation, was authorized for 1966, the year that the Communist Party in the Soviet Union issued its mandate to strengthen civil

defense. And the allocation for civil defense for 1969 was \$68.1 million,³⁷ the lowest (Decreases in civil defense allocations admittedly reflect budgetary cuts to offset expenditures incurred by the Vietnam War. However, even when allowing for the higher priority of military requirements in Southeast Asia, the wisdom of so severely curtailing our civil defense program seems questionable. Joseph Romm has testified before the House of Representatives as follows:

"Last year I emphasized that the FY 1969 budget estimate of \$77.3 million was the minimum sustaining level for the national civil defense effort. The FY 1969 appropriation was \$61 million, or 21% less than the sustaining budget and 29% less than the FY 1968 appropriation. As a result, essential parts of the FY 1969 program have had to be severely curtailed and some elements deferred."³⁸ (Author's italics.) authorized Federal expenditures for civil defense in the past eight years.³⁹

Present policy of attempting to provide fallout protection for people near their homes and places of work has prevailed since 1958 when the Federal Civil Defense Administration (FCDA) declared that national civil defense policy "which now includes planning for the movement of people from target areas if time permits, will now also include the use of shelter to provide protection from radio-active fallout."⁴⁰ In the same release the FCDA cast serious doubt on the effectiveness of blast shelters when they stated, "There is no assurance that even the deepest shelter would give protection to a sufficient number of people to justify the cost."⁴¹ While the wording of the 1958 FCDA release seems to give equal billing to evacuation and fallout protection, in practice national policy since that time has placed almost exclusive emphasis on fallout protection with virtually no consideration of evacuation. Nor has any effort been made to provide blast protection for the population.

In citing the absence of a workable evacuation plan in the U.S., I am not suggesting that we should inaugurate such a plan ourselves. On the contrary, a federal order to evacuate our population during a period of crisis could very well serve to escalate the crisis rather than diminish it. Also, as the Soviets themselves recognize, an evacuation policy has a greater chance of success in the U.S.S.R. where there is a well established tradition of public obedience to the directives of a strong central government and a distinct separation of cities (in contrast to the megalopolises of the U.S.). And, finally, as the Soviets again correctly surmise, they could evacuate their population with reasonable confidence that we would not attack them unless we were ourselves attacked. Thus, I am not criticizing the U.S. for de-emphasizing evacuation as a civil defense policy. I simply want to point out that successful evacuation of Soviet cities during a period of escalating international crisis could give the U.S.S.R. a decided strategic advantage over us. It would degrade our deterrence capability, take the teeth out of McNamara's policy of assured destruction, and offset the strategic balance by substantially reducing the number of Soviet urban casualties in a countervalue attack. However, the only answer today to a successful Soviet evacuation might be a return to our pre-1958 evacuation policy, even with all the inefficiency and confusion an actual evacuation would entail.

ROUGH ESTIMATES OF CERTAIN, SPECIFIC SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE COSTS

While figures on the cost of the Soviet civil defense program are not available, it is possible to make some very rough estimates of annual expenditures for certain specific civil defense activities, which we know exist, and to extrapolate the cost from that of the same civil defense activity were we to inaugurate it in the U.S. Let us take, for example, the cost of civil defense instruction of

the population. As we have already noted from Mr. Romm's testimony, over 100 million Russians have received intensive civil defense training. We also know that the present civil defense training course for adults in the Soviet Union is twenty-one hours, while school children receive eighty hours of civil defense instruction by the time they complete the ninth grade. Keeping these figures in mind, let us consider the cost of training 85 million Americans—the equivalent of 100 million Russians—in civil defense. If we allow \$1 per hour per person (The amount paid to U.S. industrial workers (in the Soviet Union workers receive civil defense training during work hours)⁴² would doubtless be considerably more than \$1 per hour. However, since we must include students and the unemployed, an average cost of \$1 an hour seems fair.) for a 21-hour program of instruction, the cost to our national economy would be about \$1.7 billion (to the Soviet economy, over \$2 billion), a figure which is more than our total national allocations for civil defense for the past eight years. (The reader should be aware that even were we to inaugurate a civil defense instruction program similar to the Soviets' the actual costs would not be reflected in the federal defense allocations. Nevertheless, the cost of such a program would represent a real allocation of national resources "costing" approximately the amount we suggest. The Soviets, of course, may also keep their books in a similar way.) And this does not include the cost of training the instructors, who, in the Soviet Union receive 35 hours of special instruction for civil defense teachers.⁴³ Nor does it include teaching materials, such as slides, posters, and textbooks; nor equipment, such as gas masks and first-aid kits. Also, we must keep in mind that instructing the population is but one aspect of civil defense.

Again we know from Mr. Romm's testimony that the Soviet Union has a "heavy military organization from top right down to the bottom"⁴⁴ specifically to assist the civilian civil defense organization. The civil defense military organization is headed by V. I. Chuykov, a full fledged Marshal, and senior colonels are located in small political jurisdictions (equivalent to our cities and states), where they head up units of civil defense which consist principally of military people. The Soviet Union has several schools to train these people. One is the two-year Moscow military civil defense academy established in March 1967 to train junior officers in civil defense.⁴⁵⁻⁴⁶ The costs for operating this academy and maintaining the civil defense military units are difficult to determine, but undoubtedly are considerable.

We have yet to mention the costs for urban blast shelters, which the Soviets have provided, at least in some degree, for essential workers in vital industries. And, of course, there are expenses connected with the elaborate plans that the Soviets have for evacuating the bulk of population, all people who are non-essential to vital industries,⁴⁸ to the countryside.

A COMPARISON OF CERTAIN SOVIET AND U.S. CIVIL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

We have estimated the cost of instructing 100 million Soviet citizens in civil defense to be about \$2 billion. It is difficult to determine the time period over which this instruction has taken place, as we know that the thrust to provide every one with a minimum of 21 hours of training was a fairly recent one.⁵⁰ However, even if we should say that this training took place over the past six years, the total federal allocation in the U.S. to all civil defense activities during this same period—\$573.7 million—would represent 28.7% of the amount spent by the Soviets on one single aspect of their program; educating the public.

We have yet to mention the cost of the U.S. instruction program. Of the total federal allocation for civil defense over the past

Footnotes at end of article.

six years, \$573.7 million, the amount spent on education and training activities was \$63.7 million.²¹ Thus, the budgetary allocation for all education and training activities over the past six years in the U.S. has averaged \$10.6 million a year, or 11.1% a year of the total authorized outlay for civil defense over this period.²² If we were to use this percentage to extrapolate the total cost of the Soviet program over the past six years, we would arrive at the staggering figure of \$18 billion, or \$3 billion a year. Even if we were to raise the percentage of the Soviet civil defense outlay for education to 33 1/3%, we would still arrive at a figure of \$6 billion, or approximately \$1 billion a year. Thus, we can say with some degree of certainty that the annual Soviet budget for civil defense lies somewhere between \$1 and \$3 billion. Or, put another way, the Soviets spend one to three times more on civil defense in one year than the total amount allocated by the U.S. federal government for civil defense in eight years. For a country only 15% larger than ours to spend over ten times more than ours on civil defense points to a seriousness of interest an order of magnitude greater than ours.

SOVIETS RECOGNIZE NEED FOR BLAST PROTECTION

Thus, the Soviet Union, unlike the U.S., provides compulsory and nationwide civil defense instruction for its population. But the differences between the two programs do not end here: there is also an essential difference in philosophy over the importance of blast protection. The Soviets recognize the need for affording protection from the blast effects of nuclear weapons to people in cities and have provided such protection in all cities with subways. The Moscow subway system, for example, extends for over seventy-five miles and has more than eighty stations. U.S. visitors to the Soviet Union have attested to the depth of this subway and to the presence of both heavy blast doors in the stations and high-speed escalators, which convey passengers down into them. Nor is Moscow the only city with subways equipped with blast doors. Again U.S. visitors have observed similar protective facilities in both Leningrad and Kiev. Baki and Tbilisi also have subways, and new ones are being established in Tashkent and Kharkov. That all seven systems are designed for blast protection is substantiated by a recent Russian television scenario on "Reliable Means of Protection." This scenario, which includes shots from a film of a subway, has the accompanying script: "These structures can protect a person from blast waves, light radiation and radioactive contamination. Here you see the subway. In cities which have one the residents will always find protection in it."²³

PROTECTION IN UNITED STATES LIMITED TO FALLOUT

Meanwhile, since 1958, the policy of the U.S. has been to focus exclusively on fallout protection. Thus, there has been no emphasis even on using preferentially those fallout shelters that afford some measure of blast protection. This policy has led, for example, to the identification of 10 million fallout shelter spaces in Manhattan (much more than the peak population of the island) with no preferential selection of those shelters for public use which might offer protection from blast as well as fallout.

SOVIETS STRESS FALLOUT PROTECTION IN RURAL AREAS

While the Soviets recognize the need for blast protection in cities, they emphasize protection against fallout in the country. Thus, there are explicit manuals with detailed instructions both on erecting hasty shelters out of materials at hand on or converting vegetable bins, cellars and basements and silage pits to fallout shelters.²⁴ Village dwellers are given blueprints and allotted bricks for strengthening these facilities.²⁵ Since the centerpiece of the Soviet

civil defense program is to evacuate all non-essential urban dwellers to rural areas, it is hardly surprising that they stress increasing the fallout facilities in the country.^{27, 28}

UNITED STATES DISCONTINUES RURAL SHELTER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Meanwhile, the U.S. Office of Civil Defense, which appropriated funds to four agricultural engineers for the past year and a half for a minimal "Rural Shelter Development Program," brought this program to a close on December 31, 1969.

SUMMARY: YES, THE SOVIET CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM IS INDEED MUCH BETTER THAN OURS

Coming back to our original question—Is the Soviet civil defense really better than ours?—we have no choice but to answer in the affirmative. That the Soviets take civil defense more seriously than we do and are instituting it much more effectively than we are is evident in these facts which we have considered:

(1) Instruction of Soviet school children is nationwide, compulsory and directed; instruction of U.S. school children is spotty, voluntary, undirected.

(2) Direction of public attention toward civil defense in the Soviet Union is apparent in the increased use of all press media for civil defense purposes over the past three years; direction of public attention away from civil defense in the U.S. is apparent in the virtual disappearance of any mention of civil defense from all news media during the same period.

(3) Party and government have issued mandates for strengthening civil defense in the past three years and have funded a greatly extended program, of which one aspect alone, public instruction, has cost about \$2 billion; U.S. government has decreased total appropriations for civil defense from \$105.1 million to \$68.1 million over the same period of time, its eight-year total for civil defense allocations coming to less than the Soviet expenditure for instructing their population.

(4) Soviet policy is to recognize the need for blast protection and to provide it, for example, in seven urban subway systems; U.S. policy is to focus exclusively on fallout protection with no provision for preferential use of shelters which offer some degree of blast protection.

(5) Soviets stress fallout protection in rural areas and provide free blueprints and materials to farmers and villagers; the U.S. brought its extremely small Rural Shelter Development Program to a close at the end of 1969.

FOOTNOTES

¹ V. I. Chuykov, "Civil Defense Stressed as Common Concern," *Nauka i Zhizn' (Science and Life)*, January 1969.

² A. Bardin, "Role of Students in Civil Defense," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)* (Moscow, 1967).

³ I. Apjostolov, "Methods of Protection: Evacuation and Dispersal," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, April 1967).

⁴ S. Nurmagambetov, "Civilian Defense in Kazakhstan Discussed" (originally entitled "Civil Defense—A Public Affair") *Kazakhstanskaya Pravda* (January 10, 1969).

⁵ D. Shuyryin, "Development of Civil Defense System Traced," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 10 (Moscow, 1968).

⁶ "Secondary School Civil Defense Curriculum" (originally entitled "Civil Defense Training Program for Students in the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Grades of the Eight-Year and Secondary General Education Schools"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 9 (Moscow, 1968).

⁷ A. A. Sychev, "Civil Defense Training in Secondary Schools" (originally entitled "Study and Expand Experience"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 9 (Moscow, 1968).

⁸ "Civil Defense Training in Cherkasskaya Oblast," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 7 (Moscow, 1968).

⁹ "Civil Defense Training in the Schools" (originally entitled "A New and Very Important Subject"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

¹⁰ A. Tsikhun, "Civil Defense Training in Belorussia Discussed" (originally entitled "A Sacred Obligation"), *Sovetskaya Belorussiya* (10 April 1969).

¹¹ Ernits, "Estonian Teachers Instructed in Civil Defense," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 8 (Moscow, 1968).

¹² For a more detailed account of what Soviet pupils learn, see: Joanne Gailar, "Soviet Civil Defense Instruction in Grades Five, Six and Seven," *Survive*, Vol. 2, No. 5, September-October 1969, pp. 2-5.

¹³ V. L. Chuykov (as interviewed), "Civil Defense Chief Outlines 1969 Program Tasks" (originally entitled "In the Jubilee Year"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 1 (Moscow, January 1969).

¹⁴ "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970." Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Ninety-First Congress, First Session, Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development, Part I, p. 796.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 789.

¹⁶ V. Sergeyev, "Current Civil Defense Propaganda Means Discussed" (originally entitled "Universal Attention to Informational Propaganda"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, July 1969).

¹⁷ K. Kotlukov, "Technique of Civil Training by Television Discussed" (originally entitled "If You Go on the Air"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, March 1969).

¹⁸ Bernard Gwetzman, "East Soviet Adds to Civil Defense," *New York Times*, August 15, 1969, p. 1.

¹⁹ Charlotte Saikowski, "Forces of Imperialism Cited: Kremlin Alerts Citizens on Civil Defense Preparedness," *The Christian Science Monitor*, February 26, 1969, p. 14.

²⁰ O. V. Tolstikov, *CPSU on Imperative Upgrading of Civil Defense*, Atomizdat Publishing House (Moscow, no date).

²¹ Extension of Pupil Civil Defense Instruction" (originally entitled "What is New in Student Training?"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 10 (Moscow, October 1967).

²² "Spreading Civil Defense Information" (originally entitled "Only Specifically!"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1968).

²³ L. I. Brezhnev in report to Twenty-Third Congress, as quoted in "Everyone Should Know This," *Kommunist Tadzhikistan*, March 29, 1968.

²⁴ Extension of Pupil Civil Defense Instruction," p. 15.

²⁵ A. Getman, "The Role of DOSAAF in training Youth" (originally entitled "Teach the Youth Military Affairs"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1968).

²⁶ V. I. Chuykov, *Civil Defense in Nuclear Missile War*, Atomic Publishing House (Moscow, 1968).

²⁷ Shuyryin, p. 4.

²⁸ Chuykov, "Civil Defense Stressed As Common Concern," p. 43.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 44.

³⁰ Tolstikov, p. 8.

³¹ Ye. Pipus, "Evacuation, Dispersal Discussed by Civil Defense Official" (originally entitled "Everyone Ought to Know This"), *Bakinskiy Rabochiy* (Baku, September 5, 1969).

³² Apjostolov, p. 9.

³³ V. Vinogradov, "What Alarm Signals Mean" (originally entitled "On Signals"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

²⁴ Morozov, pp. 1-3.

²⁵ G. Malinin, "Lessons Learned from a Factory Civil Defense Exercise," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 2 (Moscow, February 1967).

²⁶ "The Fiscal Year 1969-70 Defense Program and the 1969 Defense Budget," Statement by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the Senate Arms Services Committee—Prepared January 22, 1968, p. 215.

²⁷ "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970," pp. 806-807.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 788.

²⁹ "The Fiscal Year 1969-70 Defense Program and the 1969 Defense Budget," plotted from Table 2, p. 215.

³⁰ Federal Civil Defense Administration Release, SR 571, May 7, 1958, p. 1.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

³² Tolstikov, p. 13.

³³ "On-Job Training in Civil Defense Makes Progress," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 8 (Moscow, 1968).

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 1.

³⁵ Sychev, p. 16.

³⁶ "Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriations for 1970," p. 795.

³⁷ Ya Bryanskiy, "New Civil Defense School in Moscow," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, 1968).

³⁸ F. Popenko, "Moscow Civil Defense School Reports Activities," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, (Moscow, February 1969).

³⁹ Chuykov, "Civil Defense in Nuclear Missile War," p. 34.

⁴⁰ Tolstikov, p. 13.

⁴¹ As given by Miss Bette E. Funn, Administrative Assistant in the Training and Education Division of the National Office of Civil Defense.

⁴² Plotted from information given by Miss Funn. (See reference 51.)

⁴³ Kotlukov, p. 47.

⁴⁴ L. Gorshdov, "Vegetable Storage Bins as Shelters," *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 4 (Moscow, April 1967).

⁴⁵ V. Morozov, "Civil Defense in Rural Areas" (originally entitled "A Primary Concern"), *Voyennyye Znaniya (Military Knowledge)*, No. 3 (Moscow, 1968).

⁴⁶ A. D. Gorchakov, Yu. A. Zhukov, L. I. Koshel'ev, N. A. Rossal and A. A. Khomko, *Simple Shelters for Protection Against Weapons of Mass Destruction*, State Publishing House on Literature on Construction and Architecture (Moscow, 1964).

⁴⁷ B. Morkovkin, *Civil Defense in the Countryside* (Moscow, 1964).

⁴⁸ A. P. Durikov and V. I. Chumakov, *Protecting the Rural Population Against Radioactive Contamination*, Publishing House for Agricultural Literature (Moscow, 1963).

JUDGE SHERMAN G. FINESILVER TAKES OATH OF OFFICE

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, this coming Friday an important event will take place in the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado. The oath of office as U.S. district court judge will be administered to Judge Sherman G. Finesilver, whose nomination to the Federal bench was recently confirmed by the Senate.

Judge Finesilver is a truly distinguished jurist. He received his degree in law from the University of Denver in

1952 and was admitted to the Colorado Bar shortly thereafter.

Judge Finesilver first served as an assistant city attorney for the city and county of Denver and was appointed to the Denver County bench in 1955 and for four successive terms.

He was elected to the Denver district court in 1962 and reelected in 1966.

Judge Finesilver's career has been an outstanding one. During his tenure on the bench, the court received no less than five American Bar Association awards for being one of the most outstanding courts in the United States. Judge Finesilver also earned recognition for his human approach to the law. Among his many awards is an honorary doctorate of laws degree from Gallaudet College for his work in the field of legal rights for the deaf. His work in the field of highway safety brought him national recognition and appointment in 1969 to a National Task Force on Highway Safety.

Judge Finesilver made his mark long ago as a community leader in Denver and a prominent judge. So it came as no surprise when President Nixon nominated him to the U.S. district court.

All of us who know Judge Finesilver send him our best wishes for a distinguished career as a Federal judge.

LEAA COMMAND TRAINING PROGRAM

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, social responsiveness and non-violent restraints constitute two of the newly recognized essential attributes of effective police enforcement in group confrontation crises, which have become more recurrent in recent days, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration deserves much credit for its highly respected command training program, which emphasizes these qualities, among others, in the mediation of social conflicts.

The New England Institute of Law Enforcement Management, which is headquartered in the Woodland Hills section of Babson College, in Wellesley, which is located within my 10th Congressional District, in Massachusetts, has awarded certificates of achievement to the first group of police officers and personnel to conclude a 3-week course in the institute's new facility.

It can well be a source of great encouragement to all concerned Americans to note the increased emphasis and recognition accorded in-depth training for police personnel, and study of new approaches to effective crime deterrence, high among the priorities of this institute, from which more than 1,500 police personnel have now received certificates.

The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, and the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, are highly to be commended for their initiatives in the success of this timely and most worthwhile institute.

RHODESIAN CHROME EMBARGO

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle of September 17 contained a fine editorial calling for the elimination of the ban on importation of chrome ore, a strategic material, from Rhodesia.

The Senate included in the recently passed military procurement bill a provision—section 503—which would have the effect of eliminating the Rhodesian chrome embargo. Efforts to eliminate or weaken this provision were defeated.

The editorial by the Dothan Eagle is one of many which appeared in support of ending the embargo and thereby eliminating the dependence of the United States upon the Soviet Union for most of its chrome ore.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "It's Also Idiomatic," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Dothan (Ala.) Eagle, Sept. 27, 1971]

IT'S ALSO IDIOMATIC

The United States has no domestic production of metallurgical chrome, a vital war material, and as a consequence must buy this commodity overseas. For many years, the U.S. got its chrome at a reasonable price from Rhodesia, a friendly nation and ally, but in 1966 President Johnson ordered an embargo on trade between this country and Rhodesia—as desired by the United Nations Security Council and Great Britain.

The United States had to find another source of chrome and the major supplier turned out to be Soviet Russia, a Communist country, ally of our enemies in Asia. So, we started buying from Russia. Not only did we trade with a friend of the enemy to spite an ally but we paid a larger price because the Soviets boosted it from \$25 to \$72 a ton. Worse than that, perhaps, we became dependent upon the Soviet for a strategic material.

Senator Harry F. Byrd (D-Va.) along with some sensible colleagues, introduced legislation to remedy this ridiculous and dangerous situation. It would amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide that the President could not prohibit imports of a strategic material from a free world country as long as the importation of the same material is permitted from a Communist-dominated country.

Now, Senator Byrd told the Senate the other day, he has "learned by the grapevine" that the State Department may seek to eliminate section 503 of the proposed law which says that the President could not apply a ban on chrome from Rhodesia. Thus an issue is made clear cut and simple, as Senator Byrd put it:

"Is the United States going to continue to be dependent on Communist Russia for a material vital to the defense of our country?"

Section 503, the Senator from Virginia went on, "would not require that the United States abandon all sanctions against Rhodesia, much as I wish this could be done . . . the only commodity affected . . . would be chrome ore. The reason for singling out this commodity is clear and simple: It is the one item which could be imported from Rhodesia that is vital to the national security of our nation."

It is not only "illogical and dangerous" for the United States to be dependent upon Communist Russia for a strategic war material, as Senator Byrd pointed out, it is idiotic. The idiocy is further compounded when it slaps a friendly nation such as Rhodesia in the face.

THE EXCELLENCE OF WESTBROOK COLLEGE

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, I was highly gratified to note in the New York Times of last Sunday, October 10, 1971, an article by M. S. Handler outlining the success and excellence of Westbrook College, a junior college for women located in my district.

This fine institution, founded in 1831 and now under the guidance of a new president, has managed in this difficult economic time to increase its freshman enrollment by 15 percent this year. But more importantly, and to its immense credit, Westbrook College has meaningfully reformed its courses of study, while at the same time remaining respectful of its past and traditions in the standards of conduct its expects from its students.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call the following article to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

MAINE COLLEGE REVISES STUDIES BUT STILL KEEPS ITS TRADITIONS
(By M. S. Handler)

Successfully resisting the economic tide that has forced some colleges to close and many others to curtail their activities, Westbrook College, a women's junior college in Portland, Me., has increased its freshman class 15 per cent this fall by reforming its study programs while preserving its traditions of student conduct.

Westbrook College, which was founded in 1831 as the Westbrook Seminary and Female Collegiate Institute, enrolled 494 students this fall, according to its new president, Dr. James F. Dickenson.

Under Dr. Dickenson's guidance, the college has introduced an "open-ended baccalaureate degree" that a graduate of the two-year course may earn at her own pace over a period of years. The student may take courses in other accredited institutions, and, having fulfilled the necessary requirements, return to Westbrook to receive a bachelor of arts degree.

TWENTY-FIVE ENROLLED

Dr. Dickenson said that 25 former graduates signed up for the new program this fall and the college has received more than 100 inquiries from other graduates.

Dr. Dickenson said that the open-ended baccalaureate program was designed on the basis of the life styles of many Westbrook graduates. At some time or another, many graduates of Westbrook's two-year program had enrolled in other institutions for further study. It was concluded at Westbrook that the bachelor of arts degree should be open to these women, provided they accumulated sufficient credits in their various studies.

Within the framework of its liberal arts program, Westbrook continues to offer courses in dental hygiene, nursing, medical technology, library technology, medical secre-

tarial work, retailing and training as executive assistants for students preparing for working careers.

WORK EXPERIENCE

Another facet of the occupational training programs is one that gives a student up to nine hours of credit for work experience outside the college in the belief, as Dr. Dickenson put it, that more may be learned at work than in the classroom.

Dr. Dickenson, who came to Westbrook last year from Colgate University, where he served as vice president for development, alumni affairs and public relations, said that Westbrook still stressed traditional codes of student conduct.

There is a midnight curfew during weekdays and a 2 A.M. curfew for weekends. "Open" dormitories are not in style.

Cafeteria service also is out of style at Westbrook; the women sit down for dinner, and the food is served to them.

TRADITIONAL CLOTHING

Traditional fashions in clothing are favored, too. Westbrook students are required to wear dresses and pants suits; the college frowns upon the casual fashions and "be-draggled" look so often seen on other campuses.

Although the dormitories are not locked at night and the campus has only two watchmen, there is no drug or crime problem at Westbrook, according to Dr. Dickenson. Thefts and vandalism are all but unheard of, he added.

PULASKI DAY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, October 11, was officially proclaimed by the President as Pulaski Day.

The name of Count Casimir Pulaski is well known to school children as one of the Nation's Revolutionary War generals. After fleeing from his homeland of Poland and following short stays in Turkey and France, Count Pulaski came to Washington in 1777 to join in the cause of the Americans against the British.

After consultation with Gen. George Washington and John Hancock, Pulaski was given charge of the newly created cavalry division. In his first fight as an American partisan, the Battle of Brandywine, he served with distinction.

His career as an American revolutionary lasted only another 2 years. It was marked by many defeats and disappointments. In October 1779, Pulaski led a charge against the British during the siege of Savannah. He fought bravely and gallantly until he was felled by an enemy bullet. He died of his wounds 2 days later.

Although his military campaigns were not filled with victories, his spirit and dedication merit great respect from a grateful nation. In his defeats he always sought strength to renew the fight against the enemy. He never lost sight of the fact that constant dedication to a just cause is in itself a reward. In his final battle he was spurred on by the never ceasing courage he displayed throughout his life.

Mr. Speaker, we all could heed well an example from the life of Count Pulaski. The way to success may not always be marked by a series of reassuring victories. For many, victory and reward will only come after many defeats.

As a nation we can be justifiably proud of the courage and dedication to the American cause displayed by Count Casimir Pulaski. He was an honor both to his native country and to his newly adopted Nation.

SECRETARY ROGERS SPEAKS AT DEDICATION OF THE PALISADES SHORE NATIONAL RECREATIONAL TRAIL

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on September 28 the Honorable Rogers C. B. Morton, Secretary of the Interior, dedicated the Palisades Shore National Recreational Trail at Palisades Interstate Park, N.J., which is in my congressional district. At this time I would like to place in the RECORD the text of his address:

REMARKS BY ROGERS C. B. MORTON

I look forward to being part of a dedication ceremony as it is my pleasure to participate in today.

America's earliest history is etched in the trails and footpaths that took our founding ancestors from frontier to frontier. Trails run deep in America's historical conscience.

Being here gives me a first-hand opportunity to view accomplishments of citizens who are close to the problem of providing needed outdoor recreation opportunities in and near our cities.

In designating 27 new National Recreation Trails last June, I remarked that I wanted to see some of those trails and meet with the people who had the foresight to make dreams realities. I wish people in other metropolitan areas could benefit from your innovative efforts. To carve a trail such as the Palisades Shore Trail—where millions of people live—is a remarkable accomplishment.

We are also dedicating symbolically today as National Recreation Trails the Palisades Long Path and the Harriman Long Path, which are also administered by the Palisades Interstate Park Commission.

All three of these trails represent aspects of American life that often are taken for granted or overlooked. The Palisades originally were saved from destruction by concerned citizens who fought for them around the turn of the century.

Your predecessors long ago set their priorities for preservation of these trails and similar lands for the enjoyment of today's generations.

Now, we are attempting to do the same things by following one of President Nixon's great goals, that of creating a "Legacy of Parks." One part of the "Legacy" is providing additional recreation opportunities closer to where people live, which involves the broader goals of the Palisades effort, the States of New York and New Jersey and the Department of the Interior.

We are partners in progress. Our success will be measured in future years as more and more people move into already-crowded urban centers. If they arrive and find con-

crete canyons of high-rise structures and little park or open space, we will have failed. If, on the other hand, the new arrivals to our cities find ample places to hike, swim, play or commune with nature, we will have succeeded in setting aside sufficient outdoor recreation places and in preserving the natural environment.

There is a pressing need for continuing initiative on the part of all of us to build the "Legacy." Without this initiative we would not have the Palisades Long Path National Recreation Trail nor the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, both acquired in large part by countless volunteers who had the courage to carry through their plans and programs.

The farsightedness of leaders of our times has provided a head start in conservation of places for trails and other recreation opportunities without which we would be unable to join in this ceremony today.

The day has past that exploitation of all kinds will be permitted. We must wisely use not only our natural, but our human resources lest we start the destruction of our heritage of freedom, initiative and lose forever the right of stewardship we now enjoy.

This thought is carried to all of our actions, not only the preservation of thousands of acres of wilderness in the west, but as we select and nurture those small spaces closer to the homes and to the feet of millions of Americans who seem to be forever bound by buildings and highways and who never really enjoy their piece of the heritage, or the peace this heritage offers to all.

Our Department has had a rewarding experience the past two summers in working on the Recreation Support Program for inner-city children. We have had our share of problems in some of these cities, to be sure, but we have also had some heart-warming successes. Children of all races and faiths have benefited from a fun-filled summer where before their horizons were filled with the bleak streets and corners.

During our program we have taken children to summer camps, walked them along trails, had cookouts, attended baseball and football games; we helped organize athletic programs that involved literally thousands of disadvantaged children. We made a contribution to preservation of human resources by opening new doors and letting the young people into the outdoors. Their reaction was tremendous! We had children who, after overcoming an initial fright, learned to love a campground far removed from the sounds and smells of the city. In one case, we heard of a child who so loved his camping experience that he hitchhiked back to the camp and tried to work to earn his stay for as many more days as he could remain.

Government cannot do it all, however. There is a need for more effort on the part of all, be they private industry, individuals or whomever, to help in the wise use of our resources. You have here, within the Palisades Interstate Park Commission's facilities, ideal places where children and their parents can get to know each other and nature. These trails represent the end products of forces which have taken strong measure of the needs of people and have acted accordingly.

It is now my pleasure to officially dedicate the Palisades Shore Trail, the Palisades Long Path, and the Harriman Long Path as National Recreation Trails. I have formal letters and certificates on these trails which makes official their designation. (Presentation to Mr. Rockefeller.) One small shore now is to switch a sign so that all who use this path will know that it ranks high in stature as part of the national system.

CONTINUATION OF GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Robbins (North Carolina) Record of September 16 contains an interesting editorial on the theme of the message in Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg Address which calls for a continuation of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

The editorial makes the point that in some recent decisions, the Federal courts seem to be ignoring the intent of the U.S. Constitution and thereby moving away from the kind of government which President Lincoln wanted to see preserved in this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, "Government of the People, By the People, For the People", be included in the Extension of Remarks.

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

[From the Robbins (N.C.) Record, Sept. 16, 1971]

"GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, FOR THE PEOPLE"

Abraham Lincoln closed his most memorial speech—his Gettysburg Address, by calling for a continuation of "government of the people, by the people, for the people."

When we consider the busing of school children to achieve a certain ratio of integration, it looks as if we are getting pretty far from Lincoln's Gettysburg call.

The Gallup Poll reports that in response to a recent survey this question was asked: "In general, do you favor or oppose the busing of Negro and white school children from one school district to another?"

Nationwide the vote was 18 percent in favor, 15 percent of the whites in favor and 45 percent of the blacks.

With the courts giving new meaning to the constitution and with only 18 percent of the people favoring busing to achieve integration it seems that Lincoln's call for "government of the people, by the people, for the people" is getting away from us.

Also, when a Federal court bans the playing of "Dixie" at local school functions, we concur in the statement of Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Independent, of Virginia when last week he said in the U.S. Senate: "Mr. President, it was with disbelief that I read recently that a federal court in Alabama had banned the playing or singing of 'Dixie' at local school functions. . . ."

It should be remembered that at the close of the Civil War that President Lincoln called upon the military band to play "Dixie", saying that in conquering the South they had also won the South's song.

The Federal courts are not measuring up to the original interpretation of the U.S. Constitution.

The Federal judges—most of them are named for life—a carryover of the olden days when kings ruled for life.

This is bad and a system which should be changed.

If Federal judges were elected on a district basis, and the Supreme Court justices named for a stated time, subject to reappointment and reconfirmation our thinking is that we would not be subject to all the turmoil and

lawlessness through which this generation has been undergoing.

In last week's Public Opinion Poll conducted by the W. H. Long firm in Greensboro, one question was: "Who or what do you blame most for the present disorderly conditions in American Society?"

Twelve choices were given, and the number one reason given was "Courts and Judges" followed by parents and politicians.

Yes, our Federal government seems to be getting away from a "government of the people, by the people, for the people".

But one thing we can be thankful for: There is a way to change it and bring it back to the people, and that is the ballot box.

THE MOST WONDERFUL FREEDOM OF ALL: TO HELP YOUR FELLOW MAN

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, with the implementation of a number of inflationary restraints being imposed on the economy and, in turn, on each and every one of us, it may seem inappropriate to speak about charity. I feel differently, however, and perhaps charity under the circumstances will be ever so much more important than were we to continue the business-as-usual attitude. I mean this in the very real sense that as an inflationary psychology has been nurtured over the years, whereby it is believed that prices only go up, there has been the development of a complementary psychology which has instilled the belief that no matter what the problem, the Federal Government is the only place to look to solve it. In fact, the more rampant the inflation, the more demands there have been from every sector of our society for more help to bail out the hole-ridden boat simply to keep it afloat.

Of course, this cycle had to be stopped sooner or later, and the time is now upon us. The time is also here for the 1971 United Fund campaign. It is time to realize that it is not the primary responsibility of the Federal Government to keep bailing us out for we can do a lot to help ourselves and our fellow man by diverting our own individual resources, at our discretion, directly to the problem areas and the organizations designed to deal with them. I want especially to commend Mr. Andrew Gendron, the 1971 general campaign chairman for the United Fund of Gloucester County, N.J., for his perceptiveness in highlighting this opportunity for all of us when he says that the freedom to help our fellow man is "the most wonderful freedom of all." He goes on to make the poignant comments, perhaps more apt today because of our economic plight, that "if you don't do it—it won't get done."

In Mr. Gendron's editorial, "The Most Wonderful Freedom of All," the concept of freedom which he envisions is worthy of special note:

So often we think of Freedom and "Rights" in a personal, somewhat self-serving manner. We tend to evaluate Freedom in terms of per-

sonal benefit, and less often by the magnitude of responsibility they engender for each of us to preserve the rights and human dignity of our fellowman.

When we are willing to recognize and accept this basic concept of Freedom, it logically follows that "The Most Wonderful Freedom of All" is: "Freedom to Help Your Fellowman." I believe this could well be "Freedom's Golden Rule" . . . a Freedom far more important than any of the others that have received so much more attention in the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad for this unique opportunity to share the complete text of Mr. Gendron's message:

THE MOST WONDERFUL FREEDOM OF ALL

Freedom: What a wonderful, promising word. But so much more important . . . what a truly wonderful, meaningful, heritage to be blessed with . . . and to be able to give to our children and our children's children.

Freedom is the force that gives true meaning to the "Rights" we cherish . . . and, in return, our "Rights" are the privileges that, when properly used, serve to protect the dignity and freedom of the individual.

So often we think of Freedom and "Rights" in a personal, somewhat self-serving manner. We tend to evaluate Freedom in terms of personal benefit, and less often by the magnitude of responsibility they engender for each of us to preserve the rights and human dignity of our fellowman.

When we are willing to recognize and accept this basic concept of Freedom, it logically follows that "The Most Wonderful Freedom of All" is: "The Freedom to Help Your Fellowman." I believe this could well be "Freedom's Golden Rule" . . . a Freedom far more important than any of the others that have received so much more attention in the past few years.

The time to really start exercising this kind of Freedom is now . . . today. Each and everyone of us has the Freedom and opportunity to help so many of our friends and neighbors in need, and in so many ways . . . through the United Fund of Gloucester County.

Your one contribution will aid the Abilities Center help mentally and physically handicapped persons in the County become self-sufficient, employable citizens. It will help retarded children overcome, or adjust to, their difficulties and become better equipped to face the future with a new and promising lease on life. Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts will also be benefited by your one gift . . . pre-school children and their families too, will be aided in many constructive ways through the Child Development Centers. Those in need of mental health assistance will receive the full spectrum of care and men in the Armed Forces will receive kindness, friendly assistance, and emergency aid from the Salvation Army, the USO, and the American Red Cross who also conduct other programs of safety instruction as well as provide invaluable service to those in need in disaster areas.

Your one gift to the United Fund of Gloucester County will also help pay for the speech therapy and diagnostic service provided by the United Cerebral Palsy.

Last year, Traveler's Aid, another United Fund Agency, came to the assistance of 215 Gloucester County residents . . . and, Visiting Homemakers spent well over 37,000 hours helping the disabled, the aged, the chronically ill, and families with children in emergency situations.

The YMCA and the CYO provided healthful activity for over 13,000 Gloucester County boys, girls, and adults in 1970 and the Visiting Nurse's Association rendered their valuable service through 105 clinics and almost 14,000 home calls in 1970 alone. All of these United Fund agencies and more, will be

continuing to provide their services of aid to those in need throughout Gloucester County because so many care enough to give enough to the United Fund each year.

With all the good, all the excellent work that was accomplished, and all the happiness and security that was brought about for so many people, it is reprehensible that we are still faced with the tragic fact that the 20 United Fund Agencies were unable to take care of all those who came to them for help in 1970. *The need in Gloucester County was far greater than the gifts to the United Fund were able to support.*

And, this year, the need is even greater.

To just maintain the services at the level of last year, the United Fund goal would be \$350,000 . . . a 15% increase over last year. For the agencies to improve their services, and assist the greater number of people seeking help, would require almost \$500,000. This is our "Goal of Need" . . . the Goal we look to you, and our other friends and neighbors in Gloucester County, to help us meet.

If you don't do it . . . it won't get done! And if the job doesn't get done, a great many people will not have exercised "The Most Wonderful Freedom of All" . . . *The Freedom to help your fellowman.*

All of us pitching in and doing the job right . . . *giving our Fair Share* (the equivalent of one hour's pay per month) to help our friends and neighbors in need, *is truly the American Way.* And we in Gloucester County can take pride in taking care of our own. How about it?

Won't you please increase your gift to the United Fund this year so that others may gain their freedom from the tyranny of deafness, retardation, speech defects, and the many other physical and mental handicaps that prevent them from enjoying all the benefits of freedom we are blessed with, and take for granted as an accepted way of life. We ask so little . . . to do so much.

If you give at work—please give your "Fair Share" . . . and if you don't give at work, please send your "Fair Share" directly to the United Fund headquarters at 71 Cooper Street, Woodbury, New Jersey, 08096, or telephone 845-4303 and ask them to have a volunteer pick up your Fair Share Gift.

When there is Freedom . . . *giving comes from the heart* and your receipt is the *satisfaction* you get in knowing you did your Fair Share, or more, to help your fellowman in need when he so desperately seeks a helping hand.

INDEPENDENT BANKERS OF MINNESOTA

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, the Independent Bankers of Minnesota recently held their 10th Annual Convention, and I have just received copies of the resolutions that were adopted.

I want to commend the membership for their interest in issues directly and indirectly related to banking and I would like to call two of their resolutions to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION No. 2—A BOOST FOR THE FARMER

Whereas the cost-price squeeze in agriculture continues to plague our farmers and the inability of the federal government to solve the inequities in farm income impels us to look for a new way to attack the problem, and

Whereas many farmers are reaching the point where they can no longer substitute credit for profits, and

Whereas the American farmer's remarkable efficiency has resulted in low prices in the market place, and he is no longer able to compete with organized industry and organized labor, and

Whereas the majority of our independent banks in Minnesota depend upon the strength of agriculture and the prospering of the people we serve, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Independent Bankers of Minnesota urge legislative and other government action to improve the bargaining power of the farmer as a way to solve the economic problems that afflict rural America today.

RESOLUTION No. 3—SECONDARY MARKET FOR STUDENT LOANS

Whereas the communities that our banks serve will rely heavily in future years upon adult leaders who are educated to the fullest extent of their abilities and special talents, and

Whereas present economic conditions make it imperative that financial aid to worthy college students be continued, and

Whereas the student loan program will inevitably be curtailed unless a secondary market is provided, now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we express to Congress our firm conviction that a workable secondary market for student loans is absolutely necessary for the continuation of the insured student loan program.

EMINENT CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYERS OPPOSE PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is vitally important that the Members of the House thoroughly familiarize themselves with the arguments set forth by three eminent constitutional lawyers; namely, Paul A. Freund, Harvard Law School; William Van Alstyne, Duke University; and Leo Pfeffer, of New York; in opposition to the proposed prayer amendment. Since we are embarking for the first time in our history in breaching the Bill of Rights, it is incumbent upon each Member to study and evaluate all comments addressed to this subject.

The comments follow:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY, Cambridge, Mass., September 27, 1971.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am glad to reply to your letter of September 24 inviting my comments on H.J. Res. 191, to amend the Constitution with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings.

As applied to the public schools, this proposal runs counter to our basic constitutional tradition. The vitality of religion, our Constitution affirms, depends on its voluntary practice and belief. The reciting of a prayer in unison in a classroom would, in contrast, be a psychologically coercive exercise. Our religious traditions of prayer have been built up over the centuries with distinctive and cherished features. Children finding the school prayer unfamiliar and not

in keeping with their own traditions would be put in the dilemma of yielding to the dominant mode or creating a painful division within the class along religious lines. Surely the strength of religion does not depend upon, and will not be enhanced by, this kind of domination or public division over a brief ritual.

To require that the prayer be "nondenominational" does not offer a meaningful escape. The mode of prayer is identified with particular religious traditions. In the school-prayer case from Pennsylvania which reached the Supreme Court, a theologian testifying for the state characterized a certain prayer as nondenominational, but was obliged to admit that he meant this only within the context of the Protestant Sects.

The secular value of school prayers—to instill feelings of humility, reverence for the unknown, and awe in the face of the unknowable—will be achieved more meaningfully and without violence to our tradition of religious pluralism by the general atmosphere of the schoolroom and the spirit of the teacher in the learning process. If anything more is wanted, it might be sought through a few moments of silent meditation, which would respect the voluntarism and pluralism of our tradition and which remains open, as I understand the decisions of the Supreme Court, under the Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL A. FREUND.

DUKE UNIVERSITY,
Durham, N.C., October 4, 1971

The Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I appreciate your recent inquiry regarding a proposed amendment to the Constitution, and I have prepared the following brief reply for the consideration of your Committee. The proposed amendment to which my comments are directed provides that:

Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.

There are three general objections I would associate with the proposed amendment in respectfully urging its rejection: (1) difficulties of interpretation as to its scope and meaning; (2) a possible and peculiar inconsistency with the settled interpretation of the wholly unaffected by the proposed amendment; (3) a potentially embarrassing trivializing of the amendment process itself.

The principal difficulty of the proposed amendment, however, is the sheer improbability that its adoption would have any significant effect at all corresponding to the presumed desires of its sponsors. Specifically, I assume that the amendment has been proposed principally for the purpose of permitting the kinds of religious observances which the Supreme Court found to be forbidden by the Establishment Clause in *Engel v. Vitale*, *School District v. Schempp*, and *Murray v. Curlett*: the intergration of religious observances in public school programs, including classroom prayers and devotional uses of bible reading. In all frankness, however, I cannot see that adoption of the amendment would necessarily affect those decisions at all. My reasons for concluding that the amendment would be virtually without any practical effect whatever are these:

(1) The amendment is limited solely to the permissibility of "prayer," and thus does not affect the prohibition of the Establishment Clause of any other kind of governmentally-supported religious exercise. Necessarily, therefore, Supreme Court decisions forbidding governmental support of non-academic

uses of religious scripture (e.g., bible reading as dealt with in *Schempp* and *Murray*) are unaffected, as, of course, are decisions regarding on-school released time programs of religious instruction (dealt with in *McCollum*) and all other aspects of subsidized religious activity.

(2) The amendment on its fact contemplates the permissibility of participating in prayer in public buildings only if such prayer is strictly "nondenominational," a limitation which if honestly followed, is incapable of fulfilling an individual's personal religious needs. As a strict legal and practical consideration, the concept of the truly nondenominational prayer is a chimera, an illusion or fabrication of the mind or fancy. In *Torcaso v. Watkins*, the Supreme Court acknowledged that there are at least eighty different religious sects each with more than 50,000 adherents in the United States, each qualifying as a "religion" within the proper construction of the First Amendment. Among these are expressly included polytheistic groups such as Hinduism, a faith acknowledged as a recognized religion in this country as early as Madison's writings on religious toleration. Expressly included as well are nontheistic faiths such as Ethical Culture, Secular Humanism, and certain levels of Buddhism. In view of the Court's additionally generous interpretation of "religion" in the draft cases (e.g., *Seeger* and *Welsh*, and see especially Mr. Justice Harlan's concurring Opinion in *Welsh*), it is simply not possible to propose a prayer which is honestly "nondenominational" in the plain sense of being equally acceptable within the basic tenets of all recognized religious groups. For instance, the mere advertence to a "God" (as in the state-composed prayer invalidated in *Engel v. Vitale*) is disrespectful and incompatible with nontheistic denominations as well as with polytheistic denominations of religious faith. Similarly, any prayer acknowledging the immanence of a living God, or one responsive to prayer itself, is disrespectful of tenets of Deism, a specific religion still in currency and, in fact, adhered to by some of the very founding fathers who helped to draft and to adopt the First Amendment.

But even supposing that I am incorrect in this, and that a prayer could conceivably be composed sufficiently "nondenominational" so to become acceptable under the proposed amendment, still it must be clear that any such prayer must necessarily be so flat, dry, stale and unprofitable as scarcely to fulfill the authentic religious needs of anyone inclined to participate in it. I mean by this no disrespect to the religious sensibilities of those who may favor this amendment, but only to suggest that they may be mistaken in their premise as to what is "nondenominational" and possibly in error in supposing that precepts of Christianity describe the outer boundary of religion in the United States. It is surely not so, as those who drafted the First Amendment had the wisdom to discern.

(3) Apart from these difficulties, there are others still. The activity manifestly protected by the proposed amendment is solely that of "participation" alone. The amendment establishes solely that the physical availability of space within publicly-supported buildings shall not be deemed inconsistent with the Establishment Clause insofar as persons otherwise lawfully present in such a place may wish to "participate" in prayer. Clearly, therefore, the amendment contemplates no addition, the use of governmental power to simple provision of available space itself. Thus, the proposed amendment plainly does not permit a school board to author a prayer, to endorse the saying of prayers, to commend their use, or otherwise to exercise authority in the encouragement of participation. It is only participation by individuals in public buildings which is permitted, and not, in addition, the use of governmental power to encourage such participation. Clearly, as a

consequence, no teacher could use his salaried and official position to lend encouragement, contrary to what is otherwise forbidden by the Establishment Clause and not authorized by this amendment, whether by offering to lead in prayer, suggesting its content, or even by setting apart a moment from each class hour so to encourage it when he would not have made an equal accommodation each day for any other activity anyone might have cared to consider. Similarly, I do not see how, under the amendment as framed, the school board itself could do anything so to encourage prayers, as by specifically directing teachers to set time apart for prayers they otherwise cannot sponsor or subsidize in the use of their authority. Such forms of ulterior influence, as we know, are otherwise forbidden under Supreme Court interpretations of the Establishment Clause. As this amendment does not itself deal with that larger subject, such use of state power distinctly in aid of specific religious activity would presumably remain forbidden.

The consequence is, by a process of strict but fair construction, that the amendment is exceedingly trivial from any reasonable point of view. Indeed, it is not even necessary for the accomplishment of the only thing it clearly authorizes. Although there is no Supreme Court case exactly on point, without this amendment it is already entirely likely that persons who may feel moved to pray within a public building may surely engage in that prayer at least where they do so in a manner, at a time, and in a place not disruptive of the immediate interests of others. This much, almost certainly, is assured by the free exercise clause.

While the proposed amendment is in fact trivial in my view, I nonetheless agree with you that its adoption would not necessarily itself be a trivial matter. Proposal of the amendment doubtless generates expectations in the public that are unwarranted by the measure, but which surely ought not to be so disingenuously encouraged. So to cultivate these expectations against a reasonable certainty that the Supreme Court must, by fair construction, then hold them for naught is unkindly to use the Court as a whipping stool in our public life. Additionally, to propose an amendment which would have to be promiscuously interpreted to be given any large significance sets at large an exception to the First Amendment which would then become of such uncertain scope that none could tell whether he truly desires it as a part of our fundamental law.

For these and other reasons, I consider the proposed amendment truly ill-advised and earnestly hope that it will be abandoned.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM VAN ALSTYNE.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
September 30, 1971.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CELLER: I am responding to your request for my comments and observations on H.J. Res. 191, to amend the Constitution of the United States in respect to prayer in public buildings. Although the proposal seems innocuous on its face, as evidenced by the fact that 218 Members of the House signed a discharge petition to bring it to the floor for a vote. I believe its adoption would be gravely unfortunate.

The proposal reflects dissatisfaction with and an effort to nullify the decisions of the Supreme Court holding that the First Amendment does not permit state-sponsored prayer in public schools. These decisions, *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962) and *Abington School District v. Schempp*, 374 U.S. 203 (1963), each decided with but one Justice dissenting, are not the first to encounter disagreement and efforts at a re-

versal through constitutional amendment. Occasionally, as in the cases of the Dred Scott and of the Income Tax decisions, the effort succeeds and an amendment is adopted. But never in the history of the United States have the people approved an amendment which would cut down the Bill of Rights. On the contrary, every relevant amendment to the Constitution—the 13th, 14th, 15th, 17th, 19th, 23rd, 24th and 26th—has been in the direction towards expanding rather than restricting the Bill of Rights.

This history is of great significance, for over the long run it has been the guaranties of the Bill of Rights which have evoked the most controversial Supreme Court decisions. We are all familiar with decisions which many have considered to be too solicitous of the rights of religious heretics, suspected subversives, pornography purveyors, and assorted criminals. Yet, the good sense of the people has dictated that the Bill of Rights not be tampered with. Should H. J. Res. 191 be adopted, it would be the first time in the one hundred and eighty years during which the Bill of Rights has protected the rights of all Americans, that its guaranties will have been watered down by constitutional amendment. This would set a precedent which may have grave and regrettable consequences. It would encourage amending the Constitution to overrule every Supreme Court decision that does not meet with universal favor. It would reduce the Constitution to the level of a statute which is easily repealed or amended, a consequence which Chief Justice John Marshall warned against in more than one of his great decisions.

I have suggested that the particular amendment proposed by H.J. Res. 191 appears innocuous on its face. It purports to permit only "nondenominational prayer." But the sponsors of the proposal are apparently unfamiliar with the sad history of "nondenominational prayer" in the public schools of the United States. Many state constitutions have provisions forbidding "denominational" or "sectarian" teachings or practices in the public schools. Like H.J. Res. 191, none of these provisions attempted to define what is "denominational" or "sectarian." The result was untold suffering experienced by Catholic children by reason of judicial and administrative decisions that the King James Version of the Bible, though forbidden to Catholics by the Canon Law, is nevertheless "nondenominational" or "nonsectarian," and by Jewish children because of decisions that the New Testament and the Lord's Prayer are similarly "nondenominational" or "nonsectarian."

By no means untypical were the experiences of Father John Bapst who was tarred and feathered because he urged Catholic children not to participate in Bible reading in the public schools of Ellsworth, Maine; or of 11-year-old Tom Wall in Boston who was beaten with a rod by his teacher for a half-hour until he finally yielded and participated in Bible reading; or of the hundred or more Catholic children who were expelled from the public schools in Boston for the same reason; or of the Indiana Catholic girl who was kept in school after dismissal day after day as punishment for refusal to participate in "nondenominational" reading from the King James Bible; or of the many thousands of Jewish children all over the United States who sat silently but with great mental anguish while the teacher read from the New Testament the account of the crucifixion of Jesus by the Jews.

The experiences of Catholic and Jewish children, as well as of children of other minority faiths and of no faith, show too how unrealistic is the claim that participation is or can be entirely voluntary. Few children of elementary school age have the courage or foolhardiness to isolate themselves and face the disapproval of their teachers and classmates by not participating in a prayer serv-

ice which has the sanction of school authorities. (I do not mean to suggest that I would favor H.J. Res. 191 if it were amended to insert the words "over the age of 14" on line 10 so that it would read "abridge the right of persons over the age of 14 lawfully assembled . . .", but I do think that such an amendment is the minimum required to protect the welfare of children.)

Some state courts recognized reality and held that there is not and cannot be "nondenominational" or "nonsectarian" Bible reading or prayer, and that truly voluntary participation is similarly impossible. Unfortunately, these were a minority, and it was the Supreme Court's decisions in *Engel* and *Schempp* that brought an end to this sad chapter in American history. It would be unfortunate if it were reopened by adoption of H.J. Res. 191.

The proposal presents a grave threat not only to the welfare of children but no less to the integrity of religion and the independence of churches. It imposes on governmental officials the responsibility of examining and determining which prayers are denominational and which are not, and censoring out the former. Moreover, they must do this without any prescribed standards—necessarily so, because it is impossible to prescribe such standards. (Perhaps the best way of disposing of H.J. Res. 191 would be to require every member of Congress who votes for it to simultaneously submit a definition of "nondenominationality.") In many decisions, the Supreme Court has pointed out that one of the purposes of the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment was to protect the independence, freedom and integrity of churches by keeping the government out of church affairs and particularly by forbidding it to pass judgment on religious beliefs or doctrines. H.J. Res. 191 would propel the government into the business of censoring prayers; that alone should be cause for its rejection.

I could greatly expand the length of this letter by adding many other grounds for rejection or discussing in more detail those I have set forth herein. Because of the urgency of the situation, however, I have limited the letter to what I consider the three major objections to H.J. Res. 191.

Sincerely,

LEO PFEFFER.

PERIODIC RECONFIRMATION OF FEDERAL JUDGES

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger of September 11 contains an excellent editorial concerning the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would provide for the periodic reconfirmation of Federal judges by the Senate.

Reviewing recent trends in the courts, the editorial comes to the conclusion that "Federal judges have increasingly become more than judges." I strongly agree.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "A Judge for Life," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger, Sept. 11, 1971]

A JUDGE FOR LIFE

Sen. Harry Byrd of Virginia has a good idea.

He has proposed a Senate review every eight years on the qualifications of Federal court judges.

Right now, Federal court judges are appointed for life.

Some, maybe even most, are excellent.

But some are not.

Listen to Sen. Byrd:

"It is time that we made federal judges more responsible to the people. Too many have assumed more and more power—and have run rampant in asserting authority over the daily lives of all Americans . . . In recent years, the federal courts have acted under the premise that the Constitution is whatever the judges say it is . . .

"Prayer has been swept from our schools; the historic right of a legislature to redistrict itself has been abolished; sociological treatises have replaced the common law; traditional equity powers have been enlarged to allow rule by judicial fiat," Byrd says.

"Mr. Justice Cardozo once noted that if judges are permitted to substitute their personal sense of justice for rules of law, the reign of law will end and the rule of benevolent despots will begin.

"Is not that about where we find ourselves today?

" . . . The revolution which began in the Supreme Court has permeated the lower federal courts. Judges of these courts have, in many cases, arrogantly assumed unto themselves the prerogatives of lords of the Middle Ages. Nothing in our system at present exists to control these judges. They have lifetime appointments. Their passions of the moment are unrestrained. . . .

"One Federal judge has stated that he is contemplating the consolidation of the school system of two counties and one city. If this can be done, what is to prevent the judicial enforcement of total mergers of cities and counties?

"I fully support the concept of an independent judiciary," Byrd says. "The legislation I introduced simply provides a method by which the courts might be made more accountable to the people."

We agree with Senator Byrd.

Federal judges have increasingly become more than judges.

THE NEED FOR AN UPDATED WEAPONS SYSTEM

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration is nearing completion of withdrawal from our Southeast Asia military involvement. It has proved an unpopular war, and only the perspective of history will fully evaluate our participation.

But as in the historic afterflow of our country's other foreign wars, we find many in our country who blindly thrash out at our Military Establishment, careless or indifferent to the needs of our Nation's military defense posture in an unpredictable world of amoral and unreliable nations which in their "have not" national social psychology pose a continuing threat to the United States.

As strong as our hunger is for inter-

national peace and as strong as our desire is to move forward to the demanding and necessary goals of domestic priorities, so we must be strong in our military deterrent so long as international banditry and irresponsibility continues.

It is important that all America know that the threat spectrum posed to our naval forces, and to our country, requires an aircraft/weapon system capable of meeting and defeating the existing sophisticated, missile-equipped Soviet fighter aircraft under electronic command and control, their subsurface and surface-launched antiship missiles, mobile SAM—surface-to-air missile—batteries, and their heavily defended bomber aircraft equipped with long-range air-to-surface missiles. This defined threat dictates the choice of the aircraft system. All analyses to date conclusively show the F-14A is superior to the known and projected Soviet threat in the 1970-80 time frame.

The threat is already in being and serious now, and is becoming more severe because Soviet investment in military technology has reached the payoff stage.

To ignore or doubt the severity of threat predictions and not adequately prepare to counter them is strategically unsound. Inherent delays in the development required to achieve an operational capability with a new fighter design are not acceptable to national security. If we do not face the facts realistically and introduce the advanced superiority possessed by the F-14 against the entire threat spectrum, the long-term costs will be immeasurable.

The F-14A is a balanced weapon system utilizing the AWG-9 radar in conjunction with the long-range Phoenix missile—AIM-54—the medium-range Sparrow missile—AIM-7—and the short-range Sidewinder missile—AIM-9—and M-61 20-millimeter gun.

The F-14 has been designed, first and foremost, as an air superiority fighter. Its ability to perform the fleet air defense mission in no way derogates dogfight performance. The air-to-ground capability was not a dictating design requirement; such a capability exists, to a limited degree, as a "fall-out" from other governing design features. The fact that Tomcat can carry air-to-ground ordnance does not compromise its air superiority airframe/system design.

The Tomcat is a weapon system that can destroy long-range multiraid aircraft and missiles as well as enemy fighters in close-in combat. Weight reducing microminiaturization of avionics, balanced with airframe and engine design, has eliminated performance penalties formerly associated with multimission fighters. In the F-14 1 percent of the aircraft weight makes it possible to use Phoenix, Sparrow, Sidewinder, Agile—dogfight missile under development—a gun and air-to-surface weapons. A large part of that weight is in removable pallets not used in the dogfight configuration.

Navy performance estimates of the F-14A and F-14B have been substantiated by an independent National Aeronautics and Space Agency assessment

made at the request of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering. It was further concluded the multimission performance estimates were attainable without degrading the pure fighter capability.

The long range Phoenix missile, carried on the F-14 has a real and required air intercept capability. An integral part of the F-14/AWG-9 weapon system, Phoenix has been designed to cope with the entire air threat spectrum of the 1970-1980 time frame, ranging from low altitude—subsonic and supersonic—to high altitude mach 3—three times the speed of sound—weapons. These threat weapons include high performance fighter aircraft—Foxbat, Flag-on, Fitter—carrying medium and long-range air-to-air missiles; surface launched cruise missiles—Styx and Shaddock—and supersonic bombers carrying long-range air-to-surface missiles—Kangaroo and Kitchen.

The Phoenix missile system capability versus the cruise missile threat has been examined and tested in a realistic operational environment. In engagements versus this small, fast, low altitude threat, important parameters are radar look down capability, system detection and tracking ranges, radar scan window, system response time and number of missiles simultaneously in flight. Maximum required missile maneuver capability is not determined by the cruise missile threat, but is based on engagements versus highly maneuverable enemy fighters utilizing acceleration forces of up to eight times the pull of gravity.

The Phoenix system, with its: first, multishot capability; second, large transmitter power; third, flexible selection of radar scan windows; fourth, quick-firing AWG-9 digital computer solution; and fifth, rapid missile response to correct errors in launch position and target heading changes; provides the fleet with a weapon system that will be able to counter the expected cruise missile threat whether it is launched from bombers, surface vessels or submerged submarines.

Verification of actual missile performance was attained in several successful firings conducted against drones which are smaller—both in cross-section and physical dimensions—than the expected cruise missile threat.

The AWG-9 fire control system and the Phoenix missile have enjoyed one of the most successful test programs in the history of weapons development. The design and test phases have been closely monitored and participated in by operational people who will eventually use this system. Although not yet employed operationally, Phoenix tests to date demonstrate that all design performance requirements are being satisfied. Thus far, 42 missiles have been fired with unprecedented success against realistic threat target simulations. Many of these launchings were impossible to accomplish with any other known missile.

The weapons control system must be matched on an aircraft design of comparable aerodynamic performance to fully exploit the full capability of that system. The Tomcat is that aircraft. It is equally capable in air intercept, com-

bat air patrol, escort, or in a dogfight. This versatility is only possible because of recent innovations, including the fan engine, swing wing, maneuvering slats/flaps, and light alloys. The aircraft design has been evolving since 1959 and has benefited from the technological progress made since. F-14 aircraft are now flying successfully and rapidly verifying the entire predicted aerodynamic envelope. In areas of acceleration, combat ceiling, and combat air patrol loiter time, Tomcat is meeting or exceeding both specification guarantees and Navy forecasts; more impressively, escort radius—on internal fuel only—will be almost 20 percent better than specified.

In recent months, some critics of the F-14 have stated that simply adding maneuvering slats to the F-4 Phantom, long the mainstay of the U.S. fighter arm, would equal or exceed Tomcat performance.

The story of the slatted F-4 is an interesting one. To produce a technically feasible slat installation for the U.S. Air Force and German F-4's a two position slat—either in or out—is being developed. This two-position slat installation will not permit safe carrier landings for the Navy F-4J where landing speeds are critical.

A three-position slat is required for the Navy F-4J. That minimum installation is not the simple addition of a slat. It is essentially a new wing. The installation cost of a slatted wing for the carrier F-4J is far from minimal and adds slightly more than 1,000 pounds, half a ton, to the overall nonpayload weight of the airplane.

The only performance area where the slatted F-4J is better than the present F-4J is in a slow-speed, turning fight. In all other mission areas it is degrading to performance, a thousand pounds degrading.

The F-14A has significantly better dogfight performance than any F-4 versions, existing or proposed, even in the slow-speed, turning arena:

F-14A is 40 percent better in turn radius, 27 percent better in maneuvering climb, 21 percent better in sustained "G", 21 percent better in acceleration, 20 percent better in rate of climb, and 21 percent better in roll performance than F-4.

Additionally, in terms of combat radius of action for escorting today's A-6 and A-7 attack aircraft; loiter time on station in protecting the fleet from incoming fighter, bomber, or missile threats; and radar and missile range, the Tomcat possesses the following advantages over the F-4J:

Eighty percent more combat radius on internal fuel, 50 percent more loiter time with (a) Phoenix missiles—compared with Sparrow-equipped F-4J—100 percent more loiter time with (b) Sparrow missiles, more than twice the radar range, and more than 2½ times the missile range.

The F-14A possesses significant capability over the F-4J in interdiction or attack roles. These capabilities, although strictly fallout, amount to an 80-percent increase in radius with an equal number of 500-pound bombs.

In actual flight test comparisons with the F-4 to date, the Tomcat needs only one-half the takeoff distance, has 30 percent lower fuel flow at cruise speeds, is more stable with SAS—stability augmentation system—off than the F-4 with SAS on, is almost 100 knots faster and 2 miles ahead after side-by-side acceleration from 8/10 the speed of sound to 1.2 times the speed of sound, has approach speeds 25-30 knots lower, and requires only one-half the landing rollout distance.

The large increases in mission performance as evidenced above combined with the required maintenance man-hours per flight hour—only 50 percent of the F-4J—offer significant savings to the fleet in terms of more efficient operation and reduced maintenance personnel for a given mission.

It should be emphasized that the Tomcat's capabilities discussed up to this point are confined to F-14A performance. The F-14B, with identical weapons system abilities, has essentially the same performance margin over the F-14A that the F-14A has over the F-4. This performance increase is primarily in sustained turning ability, acceleration, and excess energy—rate of climb—which is needed to counter expected Soviet developments in the 1975 time period. Future improvements in F-14A performance is limited by lack of further growth potential in the TF30-P-412 engine, as this engine has already been refined over 10 years for maximum thrust and specific fuel consumption—SFC. On the other hand the F-14B performance can be expected to increase as the F401-P-400 engine reaches maturity with better thrust and SFC. The F-14B is required to meet the threat of the future. With the Foxbat currently in operation the increased threat could well be faced in the near term.

F-14B VERSUS F-14A

Combat radius same as F-14A, 40 percent more rate-of-climb at M equals 1.0, 10,000 feet, 75 percent rate-of-climb while maneuvering at 5 g. at M equals 0.9, 10,000 feet, and 35 percent better acceleration.

The most expensive weapons system in the world is an inferior one. Tomcat, the product of our country's outstanding engineering and manufacturing teams, possesses all the necessary ingredients for air superiority; agility, energy/endurance, cockpit visibility, detection capability, weapons combinations, and carrier suitability; optionally blended to insure success in any arena.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 479th anniversary of the discovery of America. On this day, historians tell us, Christopher Columbus, defying the

advice of scholars, geographers, and merchants, found the New World.

In recent years, there has been a great deal of discussion about who really discovered America. Was it Leif Erickson sailing with his Viking troops? Was it a group of sailors or merchants from some ancient civilization in a crude vessel made of papyrus?

Speculation of this nature is really unimportant. The significance of Columbus Day is that it recognizes the journeys of Christopher Columbus as the beginning of a new era in Western civilization.

There may have been others who traveled to the "New World," but the real discovery of its magnificent potential belongs to one man and that is Christopher Columbus.

On this 479th anniversary it is fitting to consider the importance of that discovery, when Columbus first set foot on the soil of the New World, there were no highly sensitized cameras recording the historic event. Unlike Neil Armstrong, Columbus did not have an audience numbering in the hundreds of millions. But, the electrifying impact of Columbus' "giant step for mankind" was no less important.

Columbus' voyage opened up the New World for exploration and eventually colonization. From his early journey, the Americas were founded.

Today, with the numerous pressures on our country, we perhaps have lost our sense of discovery that is embodied in the commemoration of Columbus.

On Sunday, October 10, in the city of Auburn in Cayuga County, Astronaut Karol Bobko will join the residents of that area in commemorating Columbus Day. It is fitting that a member of the astronaut team join the hundreds of residents of Auburn in paying tribute to the man who can rightly be called the first American explorer.

The spirit of Columbus is alive in this country, but a bit diminished by our own domestic concerns. Nonetheless, we need to rekindle the zeal for exploration. It need not always be another planet. The same spirit should move us to finding solutions to poverty, pollution, crime, and the other ills which sometimes seem on the verge of overwhelming us.

The greatest tribute to Columbus would be to recapture the spirit which in the face of great odds permitted him to discover the New World. With that spirit, new worlds of accomplishment would be ours.

TREASURY VERSUS COPPER FIRMS

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has agreed to rule on a request by three American copper companies on special tax considerations in view of the high-handed seizure of American copper interests in Chile.

We are all appalled by the brazen at-

titude of the Chilean Government in confiscating by edict—they call it "nationalization"—of copper mining operations of Kennecott Copper Co., the Anaconda Co., and the Cerro Corp. I understand the Chilean Government has decided not to reimburse the American firms for losses sustained in the nationalization.

But the whole story is not known. And the Treasury Department has decided to rule on the matter of how the domestic companies can handle their losses through tax writeoffs on the basis of closed-door hearings. Apparently, the company officials, a few State Department and Commerce Department copper specialists, and the IRS will be the only ones involved. The public, which stands to lose as much as \$175 million, according to an estimate by Senator PROXMIER of Wisconsin, will not be permitted to know what basis formed the ruling by IRS. We are all going to be locked out.

I am concerned over reports from industry sources who tell me that even though the Chilean Government will take over 100-percent ownership of the operations, the American companies will still have a large say-so in the management and perhaps the marketing. This may only be an unfounded rumor, but if this is so, then it is imperative that the public know. For it could easily appear to some people that the Chilean Government is not paying the American firms any compensation because they have been assured the companies will be allowed to write off their losses at the expense of the American taxpayer through special tax privileges.

The whole question of IRS rulings which cost the taxpayers millions of dollars without their prior knowledge of what went into the decisionmaking process by which these rulings were arrived at needs airing. I agree with Senator PROXMIER that we need public hearings in IRS rulings.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I wish to point out that Kennecott and Anaconda are two of four domestic producers which control and virtually monopolize the copper market in this country, and, to some extent, the free world.

I have been studying these producers and their pricing practices for several years, and have been alarmed at the amount of secrecy involved with Federal Government agencies when it comes to any question relating to copper. Apparently the IRS and the Treasury are no different than the Justice Department and the Commerce Department, which have been shielding the copper cartel for years.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert in the RECORD an article appearing on page 14 of the Christian Science Monitor, April 15, 1970. This article explains the already highly favorable tax loopholes the copper companies get at the expense of the taxpayers, and I have checked its accuracy, and believe it to be a fair presentation:

TREASURY VERSUS COPPER FIRMS: TAX LOOPHOLE STILL OPEN AFTER 31 YEARS' EFFORT

(By David R. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—This is a story of taxes and political pressure.

It tells of how one industry, the copper industry, has kept wide open a tax loophole that the Treasury began trying to narrow in 1939. It involves congressmen from the copper-producing states. It promises again to become a hot issue.

In 1932, Congress extended the percentage depletion allowance to metal mines. The rate for copper was 15 percent.

This meant copper producers each year could deduct 15 percent of their gross revenues from their taxable income. As with oil, the deduction can be made every year for the life of the mine. Unlike ordinary depreciation on machines and buildings in other industries, the depletion allowance does not run out when it exceeds capital costs.

CUTOFF POINT NOT SPECIFIED

One problem was that Congress did not specify a cutoff point for the depletion allowance.

By Treasury practice, this point was set after the concentration process. In the copper industry, ore is taken from the ground containing only a small percentage of copper. This is then concentrated to remove some of the rock.

Later stages, classified as manufacturing, include smelting and refining.

But by the 1930's, the copper industry already was combined into a relatively few integrated firms. The Internal Revenue Service (IRS) found that only insignificant amounts of copper concentrate were being sold. Thus there was no easy method for calculating the revenues eligible for the depletion allowance.

The IRS decided the copper companies could compute the revenues eligible for the depletion allowance by subtracting their manufacturing costs after the concentration stage from total revenues.

This decision, says former Treasury official Thomas F. Field, was the result of "bureaucratic ineptitude." It meant that all of the copper companies' profits became eligible for depletion allowance. It assumed no profit at all was made on smelting, refining, sales, or other postconcentration operations.

MISTAKE CAUGHT

Treasury officials caught up with this mistake in 1939. Then they revised the regulations.

If no market price for concentrates is available, the new regulations stated, the copper companies must allocate only a proportionate part of profits, based on costs, to mining and thus the depletion base. For example, if one-third of the costs of producing copper for a particular firm fell on the mining stage (up to concentration), then one-third of profits would be eligible for the depletion allowance.

The copper producers disregarded the 1939 regulation. Except for one or two tiny firms, they still are disregarding the regulation, even though it was reinforced in 1968 by updated regulations.

Today the tax savings for the copper companies run into tens of millions of dollars, according to Treasury estimates. The copper industry intends to fight to protect this tax privilege.

The IRS first picked up the failure of the copper companies to use the proportionate-profits method of computation when it audited the 1942 returns of the copper companies.

It was wartime, and the IRS was short of personnel. In any event, the government and the copper firms negotiated an ad hoc settlement of the tax bills, attributing portions of profits to the manufacturing end and allotting the remainder to mining.

In the early 1940's, the price of copper was controlled at \$240 a ton. Today it has risen to about \$1,200 a ton. However, the major copper companies have stuck to the patterns set by those wartime settlements.

In one wartime case, about \$2 a ton in profits was attributed to the manufacturing end—the rest to mining. Since metal mining, as in industry, makes somewhat better than an 11 percent after-tax profit on its sales, that indicates the copper firms make substantially more than \$100 of profit on a ton of copper. If only \$2 or so a ton is attributed to the complex smelting, refining, and sales end, the tax advantages of putting the rest of the profit on mining become enormous.

"It is a way of sharply increasing the depletion allowance," comments Mr. Field. He left the Treasury in January to form an organization entitled "Taxation With Representation."

One of his areas of expertise at the Treasury was taxation of the mineral industries. He was closely associated with an effort in recent years to force the copper producers to adopt the proportionate profits system.

OLD METHOD USED

With the present tax system, the copper producers pay roughly about as little in federal income taxes proportionate to their gross profits and revenues as do the oil companies. A billion-dollar copper firm might typically pay under \$10 million in federal income tax.

The copper companies' method of computation was never challenged again until 1965. Then Phelps Dodge Corporation got involved in a tax case involving exploration and development expenses.

The Internal Revenue Service, looking into the firm's tax records, discovered that Phelps Dodge was still using the old 1942 technique for computing depletion allowance. This was introduced into the case, and the firm made a settlement that cost it millions of dollars.

But the fat was in the fire. Research disclosed that no major firm was using the proper proportionate profits method. Indeed, at least one was using the pre-1939 technique of allocating all profits to mining.

Thus in 1966 the Treasury proposed depletion-allowance regulations again that stated where there was no "market or field price" at the cutoff point, the firm must use the proportionate-profits method of computation.

At this point, recalls Mr. Field, the industry began to bring "substantial pressure" on the Treasury to modify the regulations to benefit copper. The industry argued that because the "manufacturing" costs of copper are a relatively high proportion of total costs as compared with some other metals, the ruling was unfair. They contended, that the proportionate profits method does not take into account the value of the copper in the ground.

CONGRESSMEN OBJECT

Copper producers came to Washington in 1967 and 1968 to discuss the proposed regulations with Treasury officials. They represented the Anaconda Company, Phelps Dodge Corporation, Kennecott Copper Corporation, American Smelting & Refining Company, and Newmont Mining Corporation. These firms produce more than 90 percent of total domestic copper.

"Delay is a great thing as long as it works for you financially," says Mr. Field.

Finally, however, on July 26, 1968, the regulations went into force.

The copper industry turned to congressmen for help.

"We try to work as much as we can through the American Mining Congress," said W. E. Quigley, vice-chairman of the board of Anaconda, during a telephone interview. "But we find that the Treasury Department listens more to congressional or senatorial comments rather than the association. It is the best way to get some consideration from them."

Within a few weeks in October and November of 1968, the Treasury got letters objecting to the regulations from Sens. Mike Mansfield (R) of Montana, Wallace F. Bennett (R) of

Utah, and Paul J. Fannin (R) of Arizona, and Reps. Arnold Olsen (D) of Montana, John J. Rhodes (R) of Arizona, Sam Steiger (R) of Arizona, and James F. Battin (R) of Montana.

Stanley S. Surrey, then assistant secretary of the Treasury for tax policy, replied to the congressmen in January, 1969, that he could do nothing for the copper companies since they had not applied for permission to use some other method of computation.

ECONOMIC STUDY UNDER WAY

The copper companies say they would like to use a computation method known as "rate of return on investment." They want to use a 8.5 percent rate of return on their "manufacturing" investment. The Treasury considers this extraordinarily low.

The copper producers are preparing an economic study to try to persuade the new Republican team at the Treasury of the correctness of their position.

The IRS says it will insist that copper companies use the proportionate-profits method when no market or field price is available. But the corporate tax statements remain open to challenge for some years back. In the case of Anaconda, 1962 is the last year the tax books were closed finally. Thus the copper industry hopes to cut the ground out from under the IRS auditors by having the regulations changed before the tax books are closed.

Since the July, 1968, regulation is retroactive to 1954, the tax bill facing the copper industry is huge—perhaps \$50 million or so.

This lengthy tax story raises several points: It indicates the years it may take to settle a tax issue if a strong industry wants to buck Treasury regulations.

It illustrates how an industry can bring political pressures to bear in an attempt to alter its own tax rates.

Congressmen argue that they are only representing their constituents.

Treasury officials, however, deeply resent such interference in their executive tasks. One official maintains that if Congress wants to set the taxes for an industry, it should do so by changing the law—not using backdoor pressures to alter regulations.

Mr. Field believes all correspondence from Congressmen to the Treasury on tax affairs should be public. This would help maintain separation of the executive and legislative branches. It also would make congressmen less vulnerable to pressure from special interests.

Otherwise, the suspicion grows that congressmen making such tax pleas do so in order to obtain campaign contributions.

It shows the enormous complexity of tax law. Only a few experts know the details of some sections of the tax code, and most of those are employed by the firms concerned. The public has few experts, if any, to protect the tax base from industry nibbling.

To some extent, the Treasury can work for reform. But that depends on the individuals currently in top slots and the political pressures on them. Civil servants in the Treasury cannot make public stands against some tax loophole if this is contrary to the position of the administration.

SEATBELTS FOR SCHOOLBUSES

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, automotive seatbelts have become a way of life—or, more accurately, a way to stay alive—in the United States.

Seatbelts are required equipment in new automobiles and—within a year—they will be required on commercial buses. Thus, we can tell our children to "buckle up" and expect a nearly reflexive response—unless they are riding on a schoolbus. If they are, there probably would not be any seatbelts. Incredibly, even the latest Department of Transportation regulations specify that only the driver of a schoolbus need be provided with a seatbelt.

Last spring, Mr. Speaker, following an inquiry by a newspaper in my district, the Englewood Herald Sentinel, I began an investigation of schoolbus safety.

Data supplied by the National Safety Council and the Department of Transportation showed that, currently, we can expect upwards of 100 student deaths in schoolbus accidents annually in the United States, and some 4,000 student injuries.

Furthermore, it was asserted by various experts that many if not most of these casualties could be averted simply by extending Federal safety criteria developed for common carriers and passenger autos to schoolbuses.

It became apparent to me that most schoolbus bodies simply are not built as strongly as their counterparts. Perhaps the Department of Transportation should develop more stringent standards, for surely the structural integrity of the vehicles we build to carry schoolchildren is as important as that of vehicles we build to carry cross-country travelers.

However, of even more direct and pressing concern, it seems to me, are the matters of seatbelts and the passenger seats themselves.

National Transportation Safety Board studies several years ago indicated that many schoolbus casualties result from bodies flying about in a bus during an accident and coming into contact with hard or sharp objects.

Furthermore, the studies indicated that installation of seatbelts in existing schoolbus seats might well cause more casualties than they prevent—either from the whiplash effect or from the impact of heads and bodies on the tops of seats and the metal handholds which are common to many schoolbus seats.

The best answer, in the opinion of NTSB, appeared to be installation of seatbelts on properly padded seats with backrests at least 28 inches high.

Last August, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Legislative Counsel to prepare a bill which would remedy these serious shortcomings in our Nation's highway safety requirements.

In addition to the establishment of physical criteria, I asked the bill drafters to include in the proposed legislation an authorization of Federal funding to assist local schools in complying with Federal schoolbus seat and seatbelt laws. To retrofit a fleet of existing buses with this equipment will be expensive.

But, I can think of no better way to use our Federal resources. If we can cut the annual death and injury toll simply by facilitating the application of safety criteria already being utilized in passenger cars and commercial carriers,

then can we in all conscience hesitate? I doubt it.

Ironically, even as my legislation was reaching final draft form, one of the worst schoolbus accidents in recent U.S. history occurred. And it took place in Colorado.

On September 11 a Gunnison, Colo., high school bus carrying a junior varsity football team crashed on 11,312-foot Monarch Pass. Eight teenagers and a coach died. Twenty-nine others were injured. While the basic causes of the accident still are under study, one fact has subsequently been determined by Federal investigators:

Had the bus been equipped with seatbelts, the toll would have been much less.

On October 6, according to the Denver Post, the Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration released a preliminary report indicating that—

It is clear from the Federal studies that the passengers who stayed inside the bus were far better off.

Of the 48 occupants of the bus, the report indicated, 38 were thrown out as the bus flipped 2½ times. Of the 10 victims who remained inside the bus, nine suffered minor injuries and the 10th was hospitalized but not seriously injured. And, although the bus came to rest upside down, with its roof crushed down to seat level, those who stayed inside were protected the most.

The chief Federal investigator, Dr. Eugene Flamboe, is quoted as saying that his agency would strongly support seatbelt installation in schoolbuses, as well as better seat design.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would require that seatbelts be installed in all existing and future schoolbuses. It would also direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish adequate standards for safe seats. And, it would authorize Congress to appropriate funds necessary to assist local schools in financing the necessary changes to existing equipment.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Colorado's news media for some excellent research which has been most helpful to me in preparing this legislation. With the approval of this body, I insert the article from the Englewood Herald Sentinel which brought the problem to my attention, an article from the October 3 issue of the Denver Post which summarized the preliminary findings of inquiries into the Monarch Pass tragedy, and the October 6 Denver Post article which summarizes the report of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration:

[From the Englewood Herald Sentinel, Apr. 21, 1971]

IS SCHOOL BUS SEAT BELT A SAFETY KEY?
(By Douglas Bradley)

Could the heavy mortality rate on the highways be reduced if safety standards and the use of seat safety belts began in the school bus? Safety experts think so.

Apart from instilling in passengers the use of safety belts as an automatic reflex, the installation of the belts in school buses would tend to save student life and hold injuries down.

But a check by your Sentinel newspaper

showed that a seat belt on a school bus is a rare occurrence. Safety officials were perturbed about the long-time trend, but school authorities, in the main, were phlegmatic about the omission.

Consider these facts and statistics obtained from the Colorado Safety Association, a chapter of the National Safety Council:

Safety belts are now available to about four out of five of all passenger car occupants, and are installed in all new cars. Belts are being used only about 40 per cent of the time, according to the safety officials. (This estimate is considered too high by some police authorities who said 20 per cent is more realistic.)

If safety belts were used at all times, up to 10,000 lives would be saved annually, it is estimated. In the past year, between 2,700 and 3,300 lives were saved by seat belts, according to safety officials. Use of the belt is also ranked a decisive factor in lessening the extent of traffic crash injuries, of which there were 2 million disabling cases in the past fully recorded year (1969).

School bus accidents killed 140 persons in the same year in the United States, including 75 pupils, five bus drivers, and 60 other persons. There were 3,000 pupils injured.

In Colorado, school buses were involved in 126 accidents during the same year, in which 40 students were injured.

Why is the average school bus not equipped with seat belts?

Inquiry turned up these facts:

Bus manufacturers, unlike auto makers, are not subject to any federal regulation on the installation of the belts.

Safety belts are not installed unless specially ordered. The cost involved is the apparent deterrent to bus maker and school district, plus the existing configuration of school buses. With most buses now in use, only half-effective remedial measures could be carried out.

Some school officials in the Sentinel survey took the position that the combination of a good safety record and the infrequency of school bus crashes, was justification not to go to the expense of bus safety measures.

Nationally, school buses were involved in 39,000 accidents in 1968, the last year for which total data was amassed in the 1970 edition of Accident Facts, published by the National Safety Council.

The characteristics of school bus transportation show many variations between operational procedures. Drivers of many school buses have been recorded as being too young and inexperienced; and even worse, sometimes as experienced but with an undisclosed police record of traffic offenses.

In Colorado, there are more than 3,000 school buses which travel more than 27 million miles annually in transporting 151,000 pupils daily. A rule-of-thumb guide for the life of the average school bus is eight years or 80,000 miles. Some are used up to 15 years with a record of 250,000 miles.

In addition to school bus accidents involving other vehicles, the safety analyzers estimated other school bus accidents involved an estimated 700 pedestrian, 150 bicycle and 10 railroad accidents in the last statistical year; all of which accidents would hypothetically involve the bus drivers in applying brakes suddenly with consequent propulsion of the student passengers.

One school official (who was not typical) thought it would be more logical for educational authorities to press for the safest transportation and meet the additional cost "rather than put emphasis on providing the latest in swimming pools."

"It is ludicrous," he remarked, "for people to worry about Johnny putting on his seat belt in the family car when he doesn't have to do it in the school bus."

Richard K. Ayers, managing director of the Colorado Safety Association, noted that with the present type of school bus, potential

damage to students would be greater with a safety belt than without one.

"Collision tests at the University of California, with the use of mannequins, proved this," Ayers said.

"The configuration of the bus as presently constructed does not lend itself to restraints. The bus seat is fastened to the plating on the floor.

"The anchoring would be simple to correct but the way the seats are shaped with the metal piece across the back, a child would be thrown by the belt into the seat ahead in a crash.

"The damage to the head would be greater than if the child was loose and thrown."

Lack of organized pressure from the public has caused perpetuation of the ill-conceived school bus while automobile safety standards have been consistently improved.

Ayers said the challenge to the bus-making industry is in two directions:

"Better configuration of the bus itself must be established, and restraints developed that will protect the child," he said.

"Most safety authorities feel that by adding padding and anchoring the seats, it would be a great help toward safety of the passengers, but it would not be the total answer."

The Colorado and national groups have been advocating better school buses for years, and there is federal concern directed toward the subject.

The Department of Transportation is now grappling with a schedule of requirements on the design and manufacture of school buses.

Ayers thought that whatever reforms were initiated, it would be a long time before they could become effectual.

"There is the problem of equipment already owned and the increased cost of better buses," he said.

In the meantime, he suggested, efforts should be redoubled to ensure that bus drivers are properly trained, and pupils instructed in safety measures.

"Thus, we will hold the accident situations to a minimum until we can come up with better solutions," Ayers said.

A representative of a bus manufacturing firm protested that "the schools are getting what they want."

Asking not to be quoted ("they're my customers") he added:

"We make what people will buy. If innovations make the bus cost more, the schools would be the first to squawk."

Despite the ring of protections afforded a school bus—flashing lights, special signs, slow speeds, short distances etc.—the accident ratio continues.

"A school bus is not exposed to accidents as much as a normal passenger vehicle," Ayers said, "but any assumption it is the safest place in the world, would be wrong."

"We have a law that all new cars must have safety seat facilities installed. It would not be illogical to extend the same requirement for the benefit of children."

Most of the seriously injured in crashes, Ayers pointed out, are discovered without a safety belt, irrespective of whether it is available in the vehicle.

"If children have the habit of wearing a seat safety belt, and the habit springs from school bus and family car, it is likely the habit will stay with them through life," the safety official asserted.

[From the Denver Post, Oct. 6, 1971]
GUNNISON TRAGEDY ANALYZED: SCHOOL BUS DESIGN CHANGE PRESSED

(By Leonard Larsen)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Investigators probing the Gunnison, Colo., High School bus crash will recommend—at a minimum—changes in school bus seat design, installation of seat belts and stronger roofs, a federal spokesman said here Wednesday.

The preliminary findings in the probe of the Sept. 11 tragedy on Monarch Pass, Colo., which killed nine persons were released by Dr. Eugene Flamboe, chief of the accident investigation systems design panel of the Office of Accident Investigation and Data Analysis.

That office is a part of the Department of Transportation's National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

The recommendations released Wednesday reaffirmed reports and recommendations made after earlier school bus tragedies:

That many if not most school buses in use today are structurally weak; that seat belts should be installed and used, and that seat backs should be redesigned to eliminate the potential of serious injury from metal handbars across the backs of passenger seats.

Dr. Flamboe told the Denver Post Wednesday that an "interim report" on the Colorado accident, one which probes deeper into the Gunnison High School bus mishap, will probably be available sometime between Nov. 1 and Nov. 15.

As of Wednesday, said Dr. Flamboe, "It is clear from the federal studies that the passengers who stayed inside the bus were bar better off. Eight young football players and one coach suffered fatal injuries when the bus went out of control on Monarch Pass, turned over and crashed.

Of the 48 occupants of the bus, he said, 38 were thrown out as the bus flipped 2½ times in its fatal plunge.

Of the 10 victims who remained inside the bus, Dr. Flamboe said, nine suffered such minor injuries that medical records weren't immediately available on them, and the 10th apparently was hospitalized but not seriously hurt.

The preliminary report of the injuries suffered by those killed and those who survived, Dr. Flamboe said, show that "the more severe injuries" were suffered by the passengers on the left side of the bus nearest the windows, the side onto which the bus turned in the accident.

In the first flip of the vehicle, Dr. Flamboe said "it landed on the left side near the roof line and the whole window area on that side was wiped out."

He said probes found that only two passengers were thrown from the bus on that roll.

On the second roll—with the gaping hole now in the bus roof line—36 passengers were thrown out, he said.

"The important thing," Dr. Flamboe said, "is that even though the bus came to rest on its top, with the roof collapsed down to the seats, staying inside offered the most protection."

Dr. Flamboe said his agency would "strongly support" seat belt installation in school buses and would "undoubtedly" recommend better seat design to eliminate the handbar.

The bar, intended as a hand hold for youngsters entering and leaving a bus, is "very bad," Dr. Flamboe said.

The federal official said a detailed analysis of mechanical failures which contributed to the Gunnison tragedy would probably be made in the interim report due early in November.

[From the Sunday Denver Post, Oct. 3, 1971]
SCHOOL BUSES LITTLE MORE THAN WEATHER SHELTERS

(By Norman Udevitz)

It was a clear, bright Saturday morning as the familiar yellow bus nosed over the crest of 11,312-foot Monarch Pass in south central Colorado.

Inside the new but spartan-like vehicle, 44 Gunnison High School football players—the youngest 13, the oldest 17—their two young coaches and an aide, were concentrating on their games that afternoon in Salida, about 45 minutes away down the pass to the east.

Slowly the bus cleared the crest and began the sharp descent to Poncha Springs below. Quickly the heavily loaded bus gained momentum as the narrow ribbon of black asphalt dropped away before it.

At first it swayed gently around the graded curves. There was no alarm. Then, about two miles below the crest, the top-heavy vehicle's controlled glide turned into a headlong lurch.

ASPENS UNNOTICED

The red and gold of changing aspens on the steep surrounding mountains flashed by. But no one aboard noticed. Instead, they concentrated on the driver's efforts, and those of a coach, to shift gears and apply brakes.

The young riders crouched behind metal seats, their ears filled with the whining roar of the engine, the acrid smell of smoke in their nostrils.

Then, looming up before them, a glut of traffic filled both lanes of the precipitous road. There was a steep embankment to the left, a sheer 50-foot drop to the right—no way to get around.

As the bus hurtled toward that traffic, miraculously a service station parking apron came up on the right. It was a chance. The driver took it, swerving onto the apron, around a small car and a semi-truck—and almost made it back to the road.

BOULDER IN PATH

But not quite. Hitting a sign and a large boulder, the bus flipped in the air, rolled over twice and came to rest on its top in a 20-foot gully, its roof partially torn away, the remainder crushed to seat level.

Those few harrowing moments on a Colorado mountainside on the sunny autumn morning of Sept. 11 sealed the fate of nine young men, all killed by the crash.

All of the 39 other persons were injured, most seriously, many critically.

What caused it? Was it anyone's fault? Answers to these crucial questions are yet to be found. Dozens of investigators from federal, state, county and local agencies and bureaus continue to examine, probe and prod.

They will, of course, find answers. They will also file voluminous reports, making them available to Congress, legislatures, federal and state safety agencies, bus manufacturers, state and local school officials, school boards and the public.

Among their findings, if the findings in many other similar crashes are an indication, will be that most of the deaths and injuries, if not the crash itself, could have been avoided.

And, again based on previous findings, after an appropriate amount of time, the public—which must pay the bill for corrective equipment and programs—will forget, leaving its elected and appointed officials nothing else to do but declassify the tragedy to an "incident" and file the reports away for the benefit of investigators of future fatal crashes.

That such crashes, with their attendant deaths and injuries, will continue to occur with predictable regularity is almost certain.

That they have happened, almost identically, in the past is a fact.

That this bloody history has resulted in few changes in equipment and programs also is a fact.

For instance: Near Decatur, Ala., on April 23, 1968, a school bus lost its brakes near the top of a long hill. The driver couldn't control the bus. It ran off the right-hand shoulder of the road into a deeply eroded gully and overturned. Four children were killed and 34 persons were severely injured.

The same year, on Nov. 19, near Huntsville, Ala., a school bus lost its brakes descending a hill, ran off the right-hand side of the road, struck a tree and turned over.

One youth was killed, 29 others were seriously injured.

SIMPLY FELL APART

In both cases, the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) concluded, the deaths occurred because bus coach structural assembly was inadequate. The superstructure of both buses simply disintegrated on impact.

The injuries were a result of what authorities termed the "second accident"—when unrestrained passengers, their momentum unchecked, are thrown through the bus after impact, striking protruding objects such as coat hooks, racks, fire extinguishers, wall-hung first-aid kits, and, most importantly, the sharp, jagged edges of interior sheet metal torn loose by impact and structural disintegration.

"The predominant injury pattern," the bureau's report says, "was to face and scalp, with multiple lacerations, abrasions and contusions."

In the recent crash on Monarch Pass, medical authorities reported similar injuries, particularly noting that there were few lower-body injuries.

SCREWS WIDELY SPACED

The NTSB report on the two Alabama crashes concluded that the raising of sharp edges was made possible by the "very wide spacing" of screws used to fasten edges of sheet metal interior roof panels to each other and to roof bows.

Ironically, the bureau report says, the interior panels would have given "substantial strength" if they had been adequately fastened.

An inspection of the Gunnison High School bus by a Denver Post reporter five days after the crash showed that even though the superstructure was crushed to seat level, there were loose, dangling, jagged roof panels.

A later inspection of buses recently purchased by the Jefferson County School District showed panels screw-fastened to roof bows exactly in the same fashion as in the two Alabama buses.

In the Gunnison accident, a State Patrol officer said, most passengers were thrown out of the bus after the roof was partially torn off. And, federal investigators believe, some passengers were ejected through pop-out windows that gave way when the superstructure collapsed.

They also believe that two of those ejected were killed when the bus came to rest on top of them and that another four were crushed to death inside the bus.

Detailed reports of the two Alabama crashes strongly indicate that almost any school bus superstructure would collapse under similar stress.

This structural inadequacy is peculiar to school buses. Part of the problem, the NTSB says, can be credited to the integrity of "riveted structural joints."

Engineering standards (Mark's Standard Handbook for Engineers) call for rivets to be spaced at specific distances—about 2½ times the diameter of the rivet.

Rivets in the Alabama buses were spaced from 5 to 20 times farther apart.

A Denver Post inspection of the Gunnison bus, and of numerous other buses in other Colorado school districts, showed rivets to be spaced in identical fashion to the Alabama buses.

"This," the bureau says, "is sufficient to resist wind and weather, but . . . contributes little to structural strength."

BUREAU CRITICAL

The bureau, in fact, was generally critical of total school bus structure.

Its report said, in part, that school bus bodies are constructed primarily of steel joined by welding, riveting, bolting and, in some areas, sheet metal screws.

City and intercity buses (such as those used by Denver Metro Transit and Grey-

hound), however, are constructed of aluminum external sheets formed and riveted to underlying structural members of aluminum or steel.

"Substantially higher efficiency in riveted structural joints is achieved in this (the latter) design if they reported."

The bureau also reported that its investigations of several severe city and intercity bus accidents hadn't revealed any "disintegrative" damage and separation of interior panels.

The bureau concluded that city and intercity buses are built to resist impact damage while school bus structure does little more than keep out weather.

The bureau, observing that school buses are much lighter and typically carry more passengers in less space than city or intercity buses, said:

"It would appear that, if anything, lighter-weight school buses would require greater efforts to achieve efficient joints and thus employ all the material to resist structural disintegration."

Evidently few saw or paid heed to this document.

Gunnison school officials had never heard of it. Neither had Jefferson County school transportation authorities.

Colorado State Department of Education officials said they had heard of it, but acknowledged they haven't read it.

It couldn't be found in National Safety Council files, at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), or at National Education Association (NEA) offices in Denver.

And there wasn't any acknowledgement of it at the School Bus Manufacturers Institute in Washington, D.C.

Yet the report (NTSB-HSS-70-2) was adopted and released 14 months ago, and a copy was obtained by The Denver Post in 48 hours.

The bus involved in the Monarch Pass crash was delivered almost a year after release of the report, which detailed structural deficiencies, and three years after the first Alabama wreck.

In Alabama action was taken before the report was completed. That state's legislature passed its first school bus inspection legislation.

General Motors Corp., manufacturer of the bus involved in the Huntsville crash, also took action before the release of the report.

Under provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) caused GMC to recall 10,450 Chevrolet and GMC buses for possible brake malfunctions.

COLORADO REACTION

That action had some effect in Colorado. Cordell Smith, coordinator of the state highway safety department—created by the Highway Safety Act of 1966 and federally funded—sent an NHTSA-authored memo to all Colorado school district pupil transportation supervisors.

The memo, dated April 18, 1968, urged supervisors to make repairs if their fleet contained one of the recalled bus models.

It also drew attention to "what appears to be serious and general degradation of quality bus maintenance operations" and urged that corrective action be taken.

The memo recommended that every district employ qualified mechanics, conduct periodic inspections, develop maintenance check lists, require daily bus inspections by drivers, and set up machinery for periodic spot checks of maintenance programs.

DRIVER TRAINING URGED

A prime recommendation urged immediate development of driver training programs.

The memo concluded by urging that its recommendations be given highest priority, regardless of cost.

The memo and the subsequent NTSB re-

port weren't the first data available to state and local school officials—or bus manufacturers—about bus structure inadequacies.

In January 1967, the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering at UCLA released an exacting report on its series of comprehensive bus-collision experiments.

The report revealed that, on impact, unrestrained passengers—those without seat belts—became "flying missiles."

In the experiment, anthropometric dummies with imbedded electronic instrumentation were used to represent humans.

They rode out initial impact well until they hit a protruding object—such as a heater enclosure, a book rack, a coat hook, a fire extinguisher, for example. At that point "injury," or "death," occurred.

Installation of seat belts isn't a solution, the study showed, because when the body is restrained by a lap belt, the torso "jackknives" forward and the face or head hits the hard metal frame in back of the seat in front, causing even more severe injury.

Even if the seat back is padded, reducing injury potential, the torso snaps back anyway and the neck breaks. That happens because seat backs are too low and can't absorb the backward movement.

PADDING PROPOSED

The answer, the institute concluded, was a padded seat with a minimum 28-inch back. That would permit use of seat belts, minimize jackknife-related injuries, and avoid injury resulting from "flying" through the bus and striking protruding objects.

The study also recommended that drivers wear seat belts regardless of passenger seat configuration. In the event of minor impact, the study said, a seat belt would avoid loss of driver control and thus prevent a more serious accident.

Most of Colorado's 3,000 school buses are equipped with driver seat belts, but only a handful have shock-absorbent padding on seat backs. None has seats 28 inches high. And nearly all contain protruding racks, fire extinguishers, first-aid kits, coat hooks, heater enclosures, and similar items.

BRAKE FAILURE

There is, of course, the matter of school bus running assemblies, particularly brakes. More often than not, brake failure causes fatal accidents in the first place.

Numerous studies, some of them made before 1966, recommend that buses be equipped with a three-way system: normal hydraulic brakes, a redundant air system, and an emergency air lockup system that would engage automatically after other systems had failed.

A few buses are being delivered to some Colorado districts with such safeguards.

But, safety experts agree, some brake and transmission failures will occur anyway. That puts the burden on bus structure and safe interiors.

DRIVER COMPETENCE

Another factor is driver competence. But most experts have concluded that improving driver performance, whether in cars or buses, is unrealistic.

The safety establishment is focusing its attention on vehicle design. The move isn't intended to free drivers from blame, but is based upon the fact that changes in vehicle design can be brought about more speedily and effectively than changes in the driving habits of millions of American motorists.

TREND MISSES BUSES

The trend to safer vehicle design is becoming apparent in passenger cars, over-the-road trucks, transit and intercity buses.

But school buses remain substantially unchanged. And they aren't safe. In fact, in the view of one authority, Dr. Robert Van Schwartz, a Denver vehicle malfunction investigator, "the chances of escaping uninjured from a school bus accident are about the same as escaping unharmed from a game of tag on the freeway at rush hour."

OPPOSITION TO WYLIE AMENDMENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 191

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, in October of 1964, EMANUEL CELLER, the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, spoke to the eighth annual Baptist Conference on Religious Liberty regarding the widespread confusion and misunderstanding that existed not only over the Supreme Court's school prayer decisions, but also over the vital subject of religious liberty in our time.

As the debate once again intensifies in preparation for House action on the prayer amendment in early November, I find there is still widespread confusion and misunderstanding of the issue. In an effort to promote a greater public understanding of the issue and clarify any misconceptions that may exist, I call attention to Chairman CELLER's address before the Baptist Conference in 1964:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen. I want to share with you a letter I received during the course of the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary on prayers and Bible reading in the public schools. Here is the full text:

"DEAR MR. CELLER:

"I am opposed to the Becker Amendment to the Constitution. It may cause separation of Church and State."

These two short sentences suggest the widespread confusion and misunderstanding, not only over the Supreme Court's "school prayer" decisions, but also over the vital subject of religious liberty in our time.

As your able representative, Dr. Carlson, observed in his testimony before our Committee, "There is an all too human tendency to assume that freedom will keep in the archives. But we have discovered that it requires a vital experience, generation by generation * * *." I, too, believe that each generation, in the light of its own experience, must rediscover for itself the meaning of our historic guarantees of liberty embodied in the Constitution. Those guarantees would soon become a dead letter if each generation failed to apply them to its own changing institutions and practices. As Judge Learned Hand has reminded us:

"Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; * * *. While it lies there it needs no constitution, no law, no court to save it."

Specifically, with regard to the "school prayer" controversy, Mr. Justice Brennan observed in the *Schempp* case that "the structure of American education has greatly changed since the First Amendment was adopted," and "our religious composition makes us a vastly more diverse people than were our forefathers." (374 U.S. at pp. 238, 240).

Thus, the question today, as Justice Brennan put it, is whether religious exercises in public schools "threaten those consequences which the Framers deeply feared; whether, in short, they tend to promote that type of interdependence between religion and State which the First Amendment was designed to prevent." (374 U.S. at p. 238).

Dr. Carlson also truly observed before our Committee that the school prayer and Bible reading issue "touches only the fringe of the

much larger question of the scope of free exercise." You are to be congratulated, therefore, on holding this conference to consider the broader implications of the free exercise of religion in today's world. For I am persuaded that the emotions engendered by the "school prayer" controversy stemmed not only from misunderstanding of the Supreme Court decisions themselves, but also because national attention had not been focused for some time on the meaning of religious liberty in our swiftly changing society.

Now it is the essence of our democratic faith that out of the clamor of discordant voices—by "free trade in ideas"—a free society distills its own consensus. I believe the hearings of the Committee on the Judiciary served a useful function in providing a national forum in which all points of view could be heard on the "school prayer" controversy, and on the related questions, involving many facets of religious freedom, raised by the various resolutions before the Committee. From that discussion, I feel greater public understanding has developed and the issues have been considerably clarified.

My mail clearly showed this process at work. Before hearings were announced, the Committee, and I as its Chairman, were receiving a steady stream of mail from all over the country in support of the proposed amendments with only a trickle in opposition. Much of this mail was of the form letter and postcard variety, and many individual letters displayed misunderstanding both of the Supreme Court decisions and of the broader questions posed by the many resolutions proposing amendments to the Constitution.

During the hearings, which were ably reported and widely described by the press, there came a turn in the tide. The volume of mail in opposition to the proposed amendments steadily swelled. More important, however, letters on both sides generally began to reflect increasing awareness of the issues at stake. These letters often referred to discussions in churches and temples, and to reports and editorials in the press regarding the testimony at our hearings.

I think this experience plainly shows that Americans are highly responsive to an exchange of informed opinion on a subject which touches us all so closely. Beyond the immediate reaction, furthermore, there will surely come a second wave, so to speak, of criticism and comment in learned periodicals and in just such meetings and conferences among interested individuals as you are holding here today. From such mature deliberation, intelligent judgments can be reached regarding the true meaning and scope of religious liberty today.

At this point, I must pause to pay tribute to the many witnesses—religious leaders, constitutional lawyers, educators, and concerned citizens—who contributed to the public dialogue on this vital subject by giving our Committee and the American people the benefit of their scholarship, their experience, their thinking, and their convictions.

Perhaps I can contribute to your discussion most usefully by reviewing some of the testimony at our hearings regarding the impact of the free exercise clause on religious practices in the public schools.

At the outset, it is well to recall the words of Representative Daniel Carroll of Maryland during the debate on the Bill of Rights that "the rights of conscience are, in their nature, of peculiar delicacy, and will little bear the gentlest touch of governmental hand." In this spirit, the First Congress proposed the Bill of Rights which begins with the command that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is our task today to translate "the majestic generalities of the Bill of Rights, conceived as part of the pattern of liberal government in the eighteenth century, into concrete re-

straints on officials dealing with the problems of the twentieth century * * *." *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U.S. 624, 639).

Long ago, in the leading case of *Watson v. Jones*, 13 Wall. 679, the Supreme Court interpreted the First Amendment to mean that the State must be neutral in matters affecting religion, for "[t]he law knows no heresy, and is committed to the support of no dogma, the establishment of no sect." (13 Wall. at p. 728)

In the aftermath of the Civil War—the War for Union—we adopted the Fourteenth Amendment which makes applicable to the States the essential guarantees of liberty set forth in the Bill of Rights. And nearly a quarter of a century ago, in *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, the Supreme Court specifically held that the Fourteenth Amendment makes the freedom of religion clauses of the First Amendment binding on the States.

I believe thus far the Supreme Court's decisions under the First and Fourteenth Amendments command general assent today. Who among us would not object if one of the States should undertake to establish a church or to interfere with our right to worship when, where and as we please, subject only to the requirements of public order?

Viewed against the background of this general consensus, I believe the Supreme Court's "school prayer" decisions are not nearly so far-reaching as some of their critics suggest.

I should say at once that in the "school prayer" cases, the Supreme Court expressly reaffirmed its earlier holding that "we are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (*Zorach v. Clausen*, 343 U.S. at p. 313). The Court expressly endorsed objective teaching about religion and study of the Bible, recognizing that "The history of man is inseparable from the history of religion" (*Engle v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. at p. 434). And the Court went out of its way to intimate that its decisions in no way affect chaplains in our Armed Forces, legislatures and prisons, nor do they affect references to God in oaths of office and of witnesses, on our coins and public buildings, and in our national anthem and the Declaration of Independence.

Indeed, the concurring opinions of Justices Brennan, Goldberg and Harlan in the *Schempp* case pointed out that religious exercises in public schools present a unique problem involving, as they do, "young impressionable children whose school attendance is statutorily compelled" (Goldberg, J., 374 U.S. at p. 307). And Mr. Justice Brennan, stressing "the particular dangers to church and state which religious exercises in the public schools present", remarked that "the constitutional prohibitions encounter their severest test when they are sought to be applied in the school classroom." (374 U.S. at p. 230)

Hard questions inevitably arise when prayers and Bible reading are required in a public school classroom full of students of the same age, but of many different faiths—or even over a public address system to an entire student body, as in the *Schempp* case. The children are assembled by force of law in a school run by public authorities and supported by public funds. Under these circumstances, who is to decide what prayers are to be offered and which Bible is to be read?

Moreover, is it the business of the State to confront the nonconforming child with a Hobson's choice: either to confess disbelief in the faith of the majority in order to be excused or to suffer in silence while the majority practices its beliefs?

Again, do "nonsectarian" prayers, which are widely accepted by people of all faiths, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, pose a "special danger", as one distinguished authority has suggested, because "those who

cannot conscientiously participate"—scrupulous believers as well as non-believers—"may be regarded as less than 100 percent American?" (Prof. Wilber G. Katz, Hearings, p. 814)

Finally, do such brief opening devotions provide meaningful religious experience? A prominent Roman Catholic layman testified before our Committee that "many parents are evading their responsibility in the religious education of their children by depending upon meaningless exercises in the public schools. * * * It is a dangerous illusion for parents and children to think they are receiving a true religious experience through the public schools." (John Q. Adams, Hearings, p. 1122)

On the other hand, proponents of the proposed resolutions asked whether, under the free exercise clause, the public school authorities may restrain children from praying or reading the Bible, individually or together, if they wish to do so, so long as they do not thereby disrupt the orderly operation of the school?

Furthermore, what of Justice Stewart's suggestion, dissenting in the *Schempp* case, that "a compulsory state educational system so structures a child's life that if religious exercises are held to be an impermissible activity in schools, religion is placed at an artificial and state-created disadvantage"? (374 U.S. at p. 313)

Supporters of the "school prayer" amendments asked whether their children would be prevented from praying or reading the Bible in school, and they voiced concern over the exposure to religion of those children whose parents were either opposed or indifferent to religion.

With respect to children from anti-religious or irreligious homes, opponents of the "school prayer" amendments replied that this was a challenge to the churches and not to the tax-supported public schools. As to the right of public school children to pray or to read the Bible, there was, I believe, general agreement on two propositions: first, every child has the right to pray or read the Bible individually when school functions permit; secondly, no child has the right to disrupt school classes or functions by uttering prayers or reading the Bible aloud whenever the mood moves him. Mr. Justice Roberts put the matter well (*Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296, 303-4): "the [First] Amendment embraces two concepts—freedom to believe and freedom to act. The first is absolute but, in the nature of things, the second cannot be."

Proponents of the "school prayer" resolutions particularly asked whether the rights of a majority of the children to free exercise of their religion should be proscribed by demands of the nonconforming minority.

The answer of the opponents of the "school prayer" resolutions is epitomized by the testimony of two constitutional experts. Professor Chester James Antieau, Director of the Institute for Church-State Law at Georgetown University stated (Hearings, p. 2067-8):

"* * * once we adopted the Bill of Rights and the First Amendment, we committed ourselves to the path that the majority would not always have rights over minorities." Dean Willard Heckel of the Rutgers Law School similarly testified (Hearings, p. 1984):

"* * * the thrilling thing about the American Bill of Rights is that the majority have said in their Constitution, 'We prize so much the individual freedom of people that we, the majority, will not seek to impose our views at all costs upon the minority.'"

The classic statement of this point of view was by Mr. Justice Jackson in *West Virginia Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 638:

"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them

beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts. One's right to . . . freedom of worship . . . and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

In short, precisely because "the rights of conscience are, in their nature, of peculiar delicacy" (in the words of David Carroll) and one of the "choicest privileges of the people" (to quote James Madison), opponents of the "school prayer" resolutions maintained that the First Amendment forbids religious exercises in the public schools. Otherwise public officials—most likely the school board, the principal, or the classroom teachers whom Bishop J. Brooks Mosley described as "perfect symbols of authority"—would have to decide which prayers should be recited and which parts and versions of the Bible should be read. Thus these religious questions would be placed in the political arena and made subject to ultimate majority control at State, local or school board elections.

Because of issues like these, testimony at the hearings dwelt heavily on the free exercise clause, as well as the establishment clause of the First Amendment. Indeed, a number of experts in constitutional law testified that while the Supreme Court "school prayer" decisions are expressly based on the establishment clause, they cannot be understood without reference to the free exercise clause. Running through all of the opinions in both the *Engel* and the *Schempp* cases is a common thread of concern over the pressure inevitably exerted upon the nonconforming child by required prayers and Bible reading in the public schools.

However, the constitutional experts also noted another aspect of the free exercise clause. They pointed to the Supreme Court's decisions in *Fowler v. Rhodes Island*, 345 U.S. 67, and *Niemotko v. Maryland*, 340 U.S. 368, establishing the principle that religious groups have the right under the free exercise clause to meet in public parks without discrimination, subject to reasonable exercise of the State or municipal police power.

Applying this principle to public school buildings, a number of constitutional lawyers expressed the view that children of like faith and their parents could use public school facilities before and after the school day to meet for religious exercises and instruction, subject to other demands for the same facilities by the school administration and by other community groups, such as PTA's, and provided also that such meetings are not promoted or participated in by school authorities as part of the school program.

Some witnesses suggested this possible solution to the school prayer and Bible reading controversy: Prayers and Bible reading could be removed from the classroom during school hours where children of many faiths are assembled together only because they happen to be of the same age, under compulsory education laws. Instead, public school facilities could be made available, if needed, out of school hours to children of all ages drawn together of their own free will by a common faith, without any pressure by the public school authorities, and without compulsion of law. I believe it was the consensus of the constitutional experts who testified at our hearings that prayer, Bible reading and religious instruction under these circumstances would be constitutional.

The constitutional touchstone appears to be the avoidance of the slightest pressure by public school authorities on children who do not wish to participate—the avoidance, in short, of "the gentlest touch of governmental hand" upon a child's religious beliefs.

While there are no hard-and-fast rules, the factors relevant to constitutionality include the closeness of such meetings to school hours when attendance is compulsory, the participation or non-participation of teachers or other school officials, the partici-

pation or non-participation of the clergy, and above all, whether these meetings are kept separate and apart from the regular public school curriculum.

To illustrate the application of these variable factors, some legal experts believed that participation by the clergy would be constitutional at meetings held in the evenings, well removed from school hours.

Likewise, some experts felt that it would be a permissible accommodation to the desires of a given community for public school authorities to extend the lunch hour to permit children who choose to do so to meet with others of the same faith for religious exercises and instruction, provided that equally desirable alternatives are available to the children who do not want to participate, and provided further that such meetings are no part of the public school curriculum and no pressure to participate would be placed on the children.

However, *McCollum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203, led some constitutional experts to question participation by the clergy in a meeting on school premises during the school day, such as an extended lunch hour of the type I have just described.

A particularly delicate area involves the participation of teachers. Three primary considerations are relevant here: First, under the free exercise clause, a teacher may not be required to participate in or lead religious exercises if he or she does not choose to do so. Second, under the free exercise clause, should not the teacher be free to join in such exercises if he or she does choose to do so? Third, if the teacher participates in religious exercises during the school day, will not impressionable school children come to feel that such exercises are endorsed and supported by the public school in possible violation of both the establishment and the free exercises clauses?

I have said enough to suggest how delicate are the questions which confront you without providing many answers. In an area where there is a strong tendency to be dogmatic, the solutions are seldom as clear-cut or as tidy as one might wish. Such are the difficulties inherent in the continuous process of accommodation to changing times and customs which we must undergo if we are to preserve our historic religious liberties.

I believe if these difficult questions are approached with a sense of accommodation, goodwill and good humor, common sense solutions appropriate at once to our constitutional traditions, to our religious heritage and to our religiously pluralistic society can be reached. In such a spirit, your deliberations will surely contribute to that end.

THE PERILS OF "REORDER" PROPAGANDA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as the Soviet military buildup continues with increasing speed it would seem appropriate to enter into the Record at this point a short study first published in 1963 entitled "Resistance or Death?—The Perils of Surrender Propaganda."

The author of this article, Dr. Stefan T. Possony of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, analyzes some of the factors which should be taken into consideration for those who feel that a U.S. surrender to the Soviet Union is preferable to re-

sistance. Dr. Possony points out that even if it were technically possible for the United States to surrender we can expect over 40 million Americans to be liquidated by extrapolating from previous examples of Soviet consolidation of power.

He goes on to enumerate some of the difficulties involved in surrendering and concludes:

Hence, from whatever angle we are looking at our problem, so long as the communists have not abandoned their plans for world conquest, they will be compelled to attack the U.S. with nuclear weapons. Arguments and propaganda weakening U.S. preparedness will merely harden the Soviet resolve, and render a communist attack more likely, as well as more costly, to ourselves.

The difference between the propaganda campaign which was going on in 1963 and today's effort to pressure the United States into fatal force reductions does not detract from Dr. Possony's analysis of the situation we will face when the discrepancy between the relative United States-Soviet strategic force relationship reaches the point where the Soviets feel that they can bend us to their will using nuclear weapons as the major instrument of persuasion. However, the current turn taken by the Soviet psychological warfare campaign to create a predisposition on the part of the American people favoring disarmament is significant and should be mentioned.

The "better Red than dead" approach dealt with by Dr. Possony has been supplanted by the more sophisticated and effective theme which revolves around the slogan of "reordering priorities." Does this mean that everyone or even a substantial number of those calling for "reordering priorities" is a Soviet agent or consciously seeking to pave the way for a successful Soviet attack of the United States? No, it does not. If it were simply pro-Soviet elements or those desiring world war III espousing this line the cry would be weak indeed. Nevertheless, this slogan serves the same functional purpose as does that of "better Red than dead" and if carried through to the extent desired by its most extreme advocates will weaken the United States to the point where the Soviet Union attains a position of unquestionable and decisive strategic superiority.

The Soviet Union recognizes this fact. A major point in the action program adopted by 75 Communist parties at the Moscow conference in June 1969 calls for a stepped up attack on the "military-industrial complex" of the United States and a reallocation of our resources currently put toward defense. The pertinent extract from the action document follows:

The basic interests of the peoples demand the intensification of the struggle against militarism in all its forms, particularly against the military-industrial complex of the USA and other imperialist states. We call on all peace-loving forces to mount a struggle for a radical cutback in military budgets, for general and complete disarmament under effective international control so as to switch resources now absorbed by the arms race to improving the working people's life, promoting the health services and education and rendering assistance to the developing countries—

On the other hand, the Soviet Union will continue to arm to the teeth—

In the series "The Decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress in Life," the Military Publishing House has put out the book by Marshal of the Soviet Union A. A. Grechko, "On Guard for Peace and the Construction of Communism."

As is known, our party and its Central Committee, along with the other tasks of communist construction, constantly keep the questions of military development and the strengthening of the might and combat capability of the Soviet Armed Forces at the center of attention. "The greatest possible rise in the defense might of our motherland, and indoctrinating Soviet people in a spirit of high vigilance and a constant readiness to defend the great victories of socialism," states the resolution of the 24th CPSU Congress, "in the future should remain one of the most important tasks of the party and the people."

The effectiveness of the "reorder priorities" slogan over the "better Red than dead" pitch comes from the fact that it can elicit support from a far larger number of our citizens. Natural supporters of this theme include all those who are ignorant of the realities of defense and wish to receive some Federal funds or feel that there is some type of positive correlation between Federal nondefense spending and the general welfare. It is easier to gain mass support under the bright banner of bettering society than for the establishment of a Communist order in the United States. Many people with the best of intentions do not grasp the essential factor played by national defense in a free society nor understand what is necessary to maintain the necessary defense forces. In calling for the reordering of priorities away from that which is necessary to preserve our independence and liberty, these people work toward the same ends as those who a decade ago were enthralled with the "better Red than dead" idea.

As Jules Monerot once pointed out—

In the real world intentions do not watch like guardian angels over the actions they inspire.

Following Dr. Possony's study I would like to insert an article by William Beecher which appeared in the New York Times of October 11, 1971, containing some recent information on the Soviet strategic buildup. You will note that there is a discrepancy between the U.S. force levels postulated by Dr. Possony and our real force level as outlined by Mr. Beecher. Dr. Possony's estimates of the U.S. strategic forces are far too high. His estimate was made 8 years ago, before the McNamara theorists decided that peace can best be preserved by allowing the Soviet Union to reach a position of strategic parity with the United States, thus limiting our freedom of action and increasing theirs, and the current administration decided that peace can best be preserved by allowing the Soviets to achieve strategic superiority.

The articles by Dr. Possony and William Beecher follow:

RESISTANCE OR DEATH? THE PERILS OF
SURRENDER PROPAGANDA
(By Stefan T. Possony)

Stefan T. Possony is director of the international political studies program at the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace, Stanford, California, and an associate of the Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania.

Born in Vienna, Austria, in 1913, he earned his Ph.D. at the University of Vienna in 1935, and has studied in Italy, France, Germany, and the United States. He served as an advisor to the French Air Ministry, a psychological warfare officer for the French Foreign Office, and a Carnegie fellow at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, N.J. From 1943 to 1946 he was psychological warfare specialist in the Office of Naval Intelligence, U.S. Navy. From 1946 to 1961 he was special advisor to the U.S. Air Force and professor of international politics, Graduate School, Georgetown University.

Dr. Possony has written numerous articles for military and foreign affairs journals. He is the author of *Tomorrow's War* (1938), *Strategic Air Power* (1949), *A Century of Conflict* (1953), "Analysis of the Khrushchev speech of January 1961," *Committee on the Judiciary*, U.S. Senate, June 16, 1961; and *Lenin: the Compulsive Revolutionary* (scheduled for publication in 1964). He is co-author of *International Relations* (1950, 1954), *A Forward Strategy for America* (1961), *The Geography of Intellect* (1963), *The Communist Manifesto* (Regnery edition with preface by Dr. Possony), and *The Three Revolutions* (Regnery, 1959).

"Et propter vitam vivendi perdere causas . . ." Juvenal, *Satira*, VIII, 185.

("And for the cause of life to lose the reason of living.")

THE PROBLEM

During the past few years, the slogan "better red than dead" has made considerable headway in the United States, notably among college students and professors. This slogan originally started after World War II in Germany and suggested that it would be unwise to liberate East Germany and thereby risk World War III. Subsequently, the slogan spread to England—where Lord Bertrand Russell propagated it after he gave up preaching preventive war—and then to the United States.

The slogan now serves as shorthand justification for the advocacy of unilateral disarmament. Its message is that it would be inadvisable to fight a nuclear war to determine whether communism or the freedom systems should organize the world. Nuclear war, it is contended, would lead to the extermination of all belligerent nations and possibly of the entire human race. Differences between political systems are quite immaterial to dead people, we are told.

On the basis of this contention the free world is enjoined to lay down its arms and surrender to the Kremlin. Communism, it is conceded, will take over the globe, but the hope is held out that perhaps in 200 or 300 years, the communist system would decay. Ultimately, freedom might be reestablished.

The advocacy of the "better red than dead" course of action springs from three roots: first, basic pacifist convictions formed in a period when the stakes of conflict did not entail the defense of individual and national freedom in its most vital aspects; second, overly optimistic interpretations of communism and the evolution in the Soviet Union; and third, emotional reactions to the existence of nuclear weapons.

Since their aggression in Korea—in a typical demonstration of practical "dialectics"—the communists have been supporting so-called "peace campaigns", of which the "better red than dead" slogan forms an integral part. In fact, the class warfare theme has all but been replaced in most industrial countries by disarmament agitation. Since 1957, the world communist movement has been under specific instructions to work, with great urgency, for a nuclear test ban and for the cessation of nuclear production.

In partial modification of the doctrine previously announced by Stalin, Khrushchev and other leaders of world communism have insisted that war no longer is "fatalistically inevitable". Obligingly they have spelled out

the meaning of this cryptic verbiage: the communist parties jointly with so-called peace movements should bring about the surrender of free governments, notably the government of the United States. If surrender cannot be achieved, then full-fledged nuclear war for the "burial of capitalism" will have to be fought.

The Kremlin would be stupid if it did not prefer U.S. surrender to a bloody nuclear war. The communists continue to pursue the goal of world revolution relentlessly. They are realistic enough not to expect miracles. Hence they do not anticipate an American surrender except as a result of the Soviet Union acquiring overbearing military superiority or actually defeating the U.S. in battle. To facilitate their military tactics, the communists are using disarmament propaganda to weaken the United States. Thus, the "better red than dead" talk is not just an academic exercise in disputation; it has a specific function within the framework of Soviet strategy. This particular slogan constitutes one of the main thrusts of the propaganda campaign which the communists presently are waging against the United States.

It is entirely logical for convinced communists to call for the surrender of the "main bastions of capitalism". To further the communist objective, this propaganda is an appropriate effort. Consequently, to argue about this slogan with communists would be futile. Yet only few surrender advocates are conscious instruments of the Kremlin conflict managers. Most of them are unwitting victims who do not realize that they are targets of well-planned psychological warfare operations.

We want to address ourselves to those non-communists who, largely for humanitarian reasons, and also because they neglected to study communism and nuclear strategy seriously, have found the surrender theme to be persuasive. The question is whether surrender to the Soviet Union would make sense for persons and nations who do not believe in communism, but who are unable to see how the defense of freedom remains feasible in the nuclear age.

Should a non-communist, because he is concerned about the dangers of nuclear war, advocate surrender? This is a legitimate question which deserves a factual and logical answer.

THE NEW REALITY

We must rivet our attention on the basic fact that nuclear weapons exist. Nothing can be done to "uninvent" them or to go back to earlier technologies. The nuclear bomb holds no secrets but can be built, in one form or another, by any group of competent physicists with a reasonably advanced industry at their disposal. If all bombs and warheads were destroyed, any number of nations would be able to rebuild a nuclear arsenal.

Certainly, agreements outlawing nuclear weapons might be concluded. In practice, however, such agreements cannot be supervised and enforced. We do not have the space to discuss the many-sided disarmament problem. Suffice it to say that the feasibility of dependable inspection remains to be demonstrated and that no effective disarmament treaty cum adequate inspection seems likely for the duration of the present crisis. Even if concluded, such a treaty always could be cancelled at a moment's notice: The Soviet constitution (Article 48, paragraph 0) authorizes the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet to repudiate unilaterally any international treaty at any time.

No case has ever been made for the basic pro-disarmament argument: wars are fought by weapons; hence if weapons are abolished, war is deemed to be impossible. This logic is fallacious: all dogs are mammals, hence all mammals are dogs.

During this century, we have been con-

sidering many proposals on how to prevent war. Despite these celebrations the as yet unfinished 20th century has been the most bellicose in all known history. Perhaps the statesmen of our epoch are more wicked than those of earlier periods. Hitler and Stalin undoubtedly were the worst criminals of history. But individuals are not that important. Powerful war-producing social forces have been at work and continue to operate, some of them with increased virulence. We may hope that through better statesmanship future catastrophes can be avoided. But we cannot be sure. Presently, two great powers—the Soviet Union and China—are aiming at world conquest. War is too serious a problem to be approached by wishful thinking. Mankind must readjust its mode of living according to the exigencies of the new technology.

The argument that wars are caused by strife between nations, and that therefore the abolition of nation-states and the establishment of a world-state would eliminate the danger of war is faulty and obsolete. The Soviet Union is not a nation-state; and the Soviet "bloc" is an expanding empire. The present world crisis is not caused by nation-states quarrelling about real estate or markets, but results from a conflict between socio-political systems, and more particularly from the communists' intent to impose their dictatorship and to eliminate the right of national self-determination.

In any event, a world-state has not yet come into existence. On the contrary, the present trend is toward increasing the number of independent states. Suppose we agreed to work for the establishment of world government: a reform of such magnitude cannot possibly be carried out within a few short years. Can it be accomplished without the massive application of force and violence? We may discuss the shape of an ideal society but we should also recognize that Platonic ideas never are realized in the concrete world.

Our reality is characterized by five factors. First, we neither have disarmament nor world government. Second, the current world-embracing conflict, in one way or the other, may develop into full-fledged nuclear war, a contingency we must seek to avoid. Third, small wars and revolutions are occurring all the time and might degenerate into large conflicts. Fourth, there exists a new potent and rapidly "accelerating" technology, which includes a growing number of nuclear devices which will improve the energy household, ameliorate the raw materials supply, and lead to fundamentally new industrial processes. And, fifth, due to increasing population pressure and "rising expectations", nuclear technology, sooner or later, will become indispensable to the industrial economy of all advanced nations.

Consequently, the problem with which we must concern ourselves, irrespective of whether communism remains aggressive or not, is this: how can we arrange to "co-exist" with nuclear know-how and capabilities? Actually, this question must be put more sharply: what steps do we have to take to fight and win nuclear wars and survive them without excessive casualties?

This question does not imply that war would be desirable. On the contrary, we should make every effort to avoid full-fledged military conflict. But we must recognize the possibility that despite our best efforts, total war may occur and that the probability of a major war occurring is by no means negligible. As a matter of common sense routine, most of us insure ourselves against accidents, sickness and death. The same kind of prudence is necessary when we are dealing with the fate of nations.

WHAT IS SURRENDER?

Would surrender to communism save our lives? Would resistance to communist aggression kill us?

Let us assume the United States, on a critical day some time in the next decade, possesses 1,500 intercontinental missiles, 500-1,000 bomber aircraft, 100-odd Polaris submarines with 1,600 long range missiles, 20-odd divisions armed with tactical nuclear weapons, a large number of nuclear anti-air and anti-missile defenses, vast stores of fissile materials, and supplementary weapons of all descriptions. All in all, there would be about three million men under arms, both in the United States and in overseas bases, one million civilians attached to the military services, and several million reservists and national guardsmen. Let us assume further that there would be about 100,000 scientists in laboratories working on new weapons, including many which would be unknown to the opponent and some which, like biological munitions, would be small in size, easy to produce and easy to hide. In addition, there would be many millions of citizens armed with rifles, conventional explosives, and weapons of chance. Most of the soldiers and civilians would be opposed to surrender.

Suppose the Soviet Union sent us an ultimatum demanding our surrender and suppose we decided to surrender. What is surrender? It is, first, notification to the enemy of a political decision that the government-in-power does not intend to fight; and, second, a series of acts handing over physically all major weapons to the opponent or destroying them under his supervision. This act of physical surrender is designed to deprive the surrenderer of his capabilities to conduct military operations. Lest he wants to expose himself to sudden attack, the victor must insist on the physical seizure or destruction of the arms of the vanquished, i.e., he must seize or destroy the 1500 ICBM's, the 1000-odd bombers, the 100 subs, etc., which constitute our main strength; and he must take precautions against the utilization of the lesser arms.

In the past, surrender usually occurred after military defeat which incapacitated the surrendering party. In addition to the customary political act, the capitulation consisted in the transfer of substantial quantities of arms and equipment; often a sizeable percentage of the troops was sent into captivity. The case we are discussing is quite different. The United States would not have been defeated but would be surrendering its fully intact military capabilities. The troops and the nation at large, though demoralized politically, would not suffer from the type of irreversible demoralization which results from large casualties, air attacks, famine and epidemics. The nation's powers of moral recuperation would still be unimpaired.

Upon receipt of the American surrender, the Kremlin would be confronted by a very difficult technical problem: How can large quantities of American arms be transferred to the Soviet Union and how can the destruction of those arms, which cannot be transferred, be supervised in the United States? Submarines and bombers could be ordered to proceed to Russian ports and airfields, but missiles, air defenses, and many tactical weapons would have to be destroyed at their U.S. bases. Theoretically, the Soviets could fly troops to the U.S. and occupy our installations; for this purpose they could commandeer the American jet transport fleet. A little calculation shows, however, that to transfer an appreciable number of troops to the United States would take several months. The piecemeal deployment of Russian troops to America would put the initial echelons at considerable risk.

While this deployment is slowly taking place, the President might give secret orders to sabotage the surrender; the Joint Chiefs of Staff may take a hand in trying to save American arms; state governors might organize resistance; or individual base commanders and thousands of soldiers may decide that they would fight and die rather than

become prisoners and be sent to Siberia. There is a danger that transport aircraft carrying the Soviet troops may be sabotaged and that American bomber aircraft ordered to give themselves up may instead drop their nuclear bombs on Russian targets. The Polaris submarines may shoot off their missiles. There also is a danger that American weapons, notably nuclear explosives, will disappear somewhere within our three million square miles.

Numerous other complications could occur. For example, the President may resign, or be impeached or assassinated. His successor may decide to change policy or, if he were a communist—and thus assume power by unconstitutional means—he might not be obeyed. None of these particular events need happen, but it is a foregone conclusion that a nation like the United States does not suddenly lose its instincts of self-preservation and just walk into oblivion.

The Kremlin, in pondering its course of action, cannot possibly know how the American military establishment and nation will behave. It cannot take any chances with a surrender operation lasting many months. It cannot risk that a considerable portion of American weapons be absconded. It cannot chance a sudden reversal in American policies.

True enough, if the Russian inspectors are attacked in the United States—for example, when trying to take over an atomic storage site—a missile with a nuclear warhead can be dispatched from the Soviet Union and the resistance be crushed. But as soon as even a single missile is fired, the entire surrender operation may be jeopardized and America decide to resist after all. The odds that there will be no resistance whatsoever, and hence no shooting, are indeed small. They would be minimal if the terms of capitulation stipulate, as they well-nigh must, that a large percentage of the armed forces must be imprisoned and removed to the Soviet Union.

There is no hope, therefore, that an American surrender can be effected without the Soviet Union being compelled to repress rebellions and attempts at resistance. Even in the initial absence of such incidents, Americans cannot be effectively disarmed within a few short days. As the take-over proceeds and Americans begin to realize what is happening to them, large-scale resistance probably will spring up. Hence, it makes little sense for the Kremlin to anticipate a peaceful and gradual disarming of the United States.

The Kremlin will have to consider a number of additional problems. For example, the American surrender will be useful to them only if the government were taken over by American communists and the country as a whole be organized according to soviet wishes. It would be wise to establish government control by gradual steps, as it was done in Czechoslovakia, for example. But the enormous power of the United States renders such a course risky. Hence the soviets are likely to push authentic communists into power as quickly as possible. But given the peculiarities of the situation it is just as likely that only those communists who are ostensibly pursuing an "independent" or "American" course would exert a neutralizing impact on the nation. Such American communists may be Titos, Gomulka's or Mao Tse-tung's, yet in view of the geostrategic situation they could not help but attain an even greater measure of independence than these "predecessors." The potential dangers to Moscow from such a development would be very great, especially if the new communist regime manages to retain some forces-in-being—which Moscow may have to concede in order to placate their American "allies" and provide them with internal security.

Add to this the probability that while the United States is surrendering, almost all other nations will go through a similar

process of disarming and installing new political regimes. The Kremlin's resources for world-wide take-over and control would soon be over-extended. Suddenly many genuine and phony communist regimes may flip-flop because their political survival depends on their willingness not to take orders from Moscow.

DOES SURRENDER SAVE CASUALTIES?

Thus, peaceful surrender of the United States would place the Kremlin before an unmanageable situation. There is, however, a solution: to respond to the American surrender and to an initial dismantling of American defenses, including warning and command systems, with a full-fledged nuclear attack. Instead of slowly taking physical possession of U.S. arms, the purpose would be to destroy American military power rapidly. This "counterforce" attack may be accompanied by strikes to reduce the American population and stun the survivors, in order to facilitate the establishment of a Moscow-controlled communist regime. Simultaneously, nuclear attacks may be directed against other military forces within the heretofore free world and against those populations which seem likely to resist communism.

The disarming strike would create the situation the Kremlin needs in order to win and to avoid the complications arising from peaceful gradual surrender. At the same time, the fact that the U.S. has surrendered would preclude truly effective American retaliatory counter-attacks. This possibility of waging nuclear war unilaterally, as it were, denotes a hope of getting the highest results from nuclear weapons without major risks.

The assertion is not that an American surrender must be followed, with absolute necessity, by a Soviet nuclear attack. Nothing in these matters can be stated axiomatically. The assertion is merely that an American surrender would put the Kremlin leadership before an unmanageable situation in which recourse to a nuclear strike offers the perhaps only practical solution. It is also asserted that nothing in Soviet mentality and morality would induce them to reject this solution, especially since massive blood-letting may be the prerequisite of the establishment and maintenance of the communist dictatorship.

Nuclear attack undertaken after formal political surrender would achieve a maximum of surprise. Hence a post-surrender Soviet attack would result in American casualties far higher than could be expected from a nuclear duel occurring within the framework of regular war.

Those who advocate "rather red than dead" have never thought through the technical aspects of the policy they are advocating. They are unable to give any assurance that an American surrender would in fact rule out nuclear devastation.

There is one catch in a Soviet strategy aiming at U.S. surrender: before being presented with a Soviet ultimatum, the U.S. is hardly likely to capitulate (if there is any likelihood of surrender at any time). The formal summons to surrender may be answered by a sudden recuperation of American will culminating, in lieu of surrender, in a pre-emptive strike. This is precisely the type of contingency the Kremlin must avoid.

There are two solutions to this quandary. First, the Soviets would decide to use defeatist propaganda merely to weaken us in a general way, but otherwise would rely on surprise attack to knock us out; in this case they would not tip their hand with an ultimatum.

Second, the objective would be to cause the gradual unilateral disarmament of the United States. It is conceivable that the United States will dismantle its armaments step-by-step and fall behind in technological development. Unfortunately, this is not purely a matter of theory. For example, we have

allowed the soviets to gain on us in nuclear yields so that at the critical hour, the opponent may possess superior firepower. Despite our enormous military budget, we seem to permit the soviets to move ahead of us on strategic bombers, anti-missile defenses, military space capabilities, etc. If the soviets were to possess more missiles with greater yields than the U.S., as well as supersonic bombers, anti-missile defenses and space weapons, while we lacked equivalent systems, we would be disarmed, as surely as if we had destroyed our weapons. Against an America equipped with obsolete weapons, a soviet ultimatum to surrender would not entail serious risks of counterattack. In this case, American surrender need not be followed by a soviet disarming strike: the soviets would know that we did not have significant capabilities anyway.

In practice, however, the situation would be less cozy. The soviets might feel compelled to attack before the unilateral-technological disarmament process is completed in the United States, if only because they must fear a sudden reversal of this "strategy" after our next election. Furthermore, they could not assume that they are completely informed about all hidden U.S. military resources.

Hence, from whatever angle we are looking at our problem, so long as the communists have not abandoned their plans for world conquest, they will be compelled to attack the U.S. with nuclear weapons. Arguments and propaganda weakening U.S. preparedness will merely harden the soviet resolve, and render a communist attack more likely, as well as more costly, to ourselves.

THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM

Let us grant, for argument's sake, that in one way or the other, surrender may be accomplished peacefully. Would this save the lives of all of us?

1. The avowed soviet policy is to liquidate the former "oppressing class." Whatever the theoretical or sociological definition of this term, the soviet purpose would be to incapacitate all actual and potential oppositional groups and persons. They might select victims according to wealth, income group and profession, religious and political affiliation, positions in the government, universities and military services, or any combination of criteria they deem important. Some of the liquidations would be carried out immediately after the communist seizure of power, others at a later time. The details do not matter.

Countries like the United States, Canada, Western Europe, Australia and Japan and far less "assimilable" to communism than Russia, Eastern Europe and China. Americans who are highly outspoken and cherish non-conformism, self-reliance, free speech, and high living standards would soon be driven into rebellious acts.

In 1940, the soviets took over the three Baltic states which surrendered peacefully. As soon as the Red Army had taken possession of these little countries, which posed no conceivable threat, the leaders and military commanders—the very persons who had surrendered—were liquidated, and a large percentage of the "middle class" was shipped to Siberia. In due time, many of the natives, "proletarians" or not, were dispersed throughout the Soviet Union and Russians were "re-settled" into the conquered territories.

The Bolshevik revolution has exacted a blood and demographic toll of the peoples within the Soviet Union which ranges anywhere from 15 to 25 per cent, depending on the population base selected for comparison and depending on which particular wars are ascribed to the communist regime. The example of the Ukraine shows that enormous demographic loss, in the form of a decline of birth and reproduction rates, may occur under alien communist rule. Within less than 15 years East Germany lost over 15 per cent of its original population to emigration alone.

The human loss of Cuba, in a far shorter period and in terms of emigration only, also seems to be approaching 15 per cent.

If the United States would suffer like East Germany or Cuba, 27 million Americans would flee abroad—if there were some place to go. To the number of refugees must be added the numbers of those killed in violent conflict and through "purges" and terror; and of those imprisoned and dying in concentration and labor camps. If the U.S. were to suffer a fate similar to that of Russia, the human toll of our nation would reach about 45 million.

There is no particular point in spinning out these calculations: it is enough to realize that the toll, even in the case of initially peaceful surrender, would run into tens of millions in the U.S. alone. World-wide, with the old safety valve of emigration blocked, the blood toll would reach into the hundreds of millions.

2. It is an illusion to assume that the communist take-over would remain unaccompanied by resistance. Irrespective of what the American government does, and irrespective of whether all of our allies would capitulate, resistance movements would spring up. The techniques of subversion, guerrilla warfare and insurrection would be applied against the communists, possibly with nuclear and biological weapons. The communist take-over in Russia was followed by four years of civil war. China was conquered by protracted civil war, which cost the lives of untold millions of people. True, during the soviet conquest of Eastern Europe there was only a modicum of resistance, but conditions were special. Those countries were conquered by overwhelming communist military power and the local resistance movements initially considered the Soviets to be their allies. Unrest in Georgia and Kazakhstan, uprisings in Poland and East Germany, and a full-fledged revolution in Hungary prove that resistance to communism is feasible.

If, after an American surrender, the Soviets were to seize the Western hemisphere, Western Europe and all the rest of it, their military power would be dangerously overextended. Communist strength is squarely based on Russia but the Great Russians account only for approximately one-half of the peoples within the Soviet Union and for only one-third of the bloc (minus China and the Asiatic satellites). The Soviets hardly could use Czechs, Poles and East Germans to impose their law overseas, and it would be logistically quite impractical, throughout the foreseeable future, to move large numbers of Chinese. Since it takes more than 20 counter-guerrillas to suppress one guerrilla, the Soviets would be incapable of subduing resistance movements by conventional "counter-insurgency operations." To escape the traditional fate of the conqueror who has overreached himself, they would have to rely on nuclear weapons.

The communists know enough about conflict to anticipate that they might have to suppress resistance movements by nuclear means. Global "preventive" strikes against anti-communist local armies, capital cities and potential resistance areas might be the most practical way to preclude resistance and to cow populations into submission. The successful "construction" of socialism and communism almost presupposes a reduction of the world population. Through neutron bombs—which kill but do not destroy—"depopulation strategy" could be accomplished without smashing the industrial plant. Thus, per capital production for the survivors would be boosted dramatically. In the last analysis, a "population-balancing" strategy must be adopted if a minority group—and the communists are a minority—wants to conquer and reorganize the entire globe.

We do not know whether the Soviets actually will adopt such a strategy, or be forced into it by circumstances, or else

abandon the world revolution because they shy away from the monstrosity of the requirement. For our purposes it is enough to identify the danger.

3. The avowed communist goal is to establish a unitary world-wide dictatorship. The communists also adopted as their ultimate objective the merging of all peoples into one great world-nation speaking a single language. We need not take this goal too seriously, but the question of whether there is to be a single communist capital or a world-wide "polycentric" set-up is of great importance. Under Stalin, the system was overcentralized and did not work. Under Khrushchev, a certain degree of decentralization has occurred but decentralization is incompatible with centralized planning.

The overall objective is to organize the economic resources of the entire world according to a single plan. Yet, according to their own theory, the various nations and peoples are standing at different stages of their social and industrial development. Forced industrialization, which constitutes the main communist development technique, would be used to advance the backward nations. Yet, to insure dominance, the Russian communists must be expected to appropriate a disproportionately large share of the industrial output. They cannot afford, as Khrushchev once put it, to be "milked dry" by their underdeveloped clients. Investment programs will benefit Russia and reliably communist nations and discriminate against those not in Moscow's favor. Such a set of policies, especially if it were aggravated by capital shortages, does not make for peaceful relations.

The communists are known to engage easily in acrimonious disputes among themselves, a propensity of which Moscow's conflicts with Yugoslavia, Hungary and China give ample evidence. Circumstances will force upon local communist rulers divergent interpretations of the one and only ideology. Such ideological differences among communist states enjoying *de facto* sovereignty cannot but cause covert and overt "struggles."

The very intent of the communists to reconstruct all social systems will usher in an era of prolonged conflict, and this is precisely what the communists expect. Further, the performance of the communist system will prove disappointing. Hence nationalism will not abate, but will be greatly strengthened. There is no need to predict that (to use a Marxian term) the "contradictions" of world-communism or the antagonisms between communism and nationalism must develop into war. It suffices to understand that communist victory will not be followed by the millennium of eternal peace.

One special case deserves mention. Just as the cleavage between Russia and China may lead to war ultimately, even while both countries live under communist rule, so the installation of communism in the United States may eventuate in rivalry between North America and the Soviet Union, or between North America and China. If the communization of the United States occurred without impairment of its vital forces, in all likelihood an aggressive communist leadership would come to the fore in Washington. These leaders might reach out to place world communism under an American aegis. This is one of the main reasons why the Russian communists will be disinclined to allow the United States to escape unscathed from the surrender. If surrender were bloodless, the conflict would be merely postponed and the two "super-powers" would still be called upon to settle their respective claims for world leadership.

A strategy of surrender, therefore, offers no guarantees that nuclear holocausts can be avoided. On the contrary, the chances are that the American surrender would initiate a period of endless violence. It is one thing to advocate surrender on an established cer-

tainly that it would save untold lives. It is an entirely different matter to advocate such a step without admitting the vast uncertainties of its cost, and without acknowledging the possibility, if not probability, that surrender may demand more human sacrifice than an effective strategy aiming at the prevention of catastrophe.

MUST EVERYBODY DIE?

About 80 years ago, amateur strategists were infatuated with the idea that the machine gun had rendered war infeasible: the new weapon could fire enough bullets to kill every soldier and civilian on earth.

This was by no means the first nor the last time that this fallacious argument was proclaimed with great fanfare. The future impossibility of military conflicts was "proved" with respect to black powder, poison gas, air bombardment, naval blockade and biological warfare. Presently, it is alleged that the utilization of space will secure eternal peace. But the most popular contention is that nuclear weapons have rendered war "unthinkable."

It could be hoped that an argument which has been disproved so often, ultimately would be discarded. Unfortunately, this particular incantation satisfies an emotional desire. Hence it will recur whenever we move from one technological weapon cycle to the next.¹

The proponents of the alleged technological infeasibility of future war usually overlook some pertinent factors:

1. Every military staff, by necessity, must structure its labors around the task of utilizing new technologies and finding defenses against new weapons. Sometimes a new weapon may be overpowering, but counter-weapons have always been invented. Strategy, tactics, logistics, production, protection, etc., gradually master the seemingly "insuperable weapon." Belief in "absolute weapons" is typical of amateurs.

2. The human and material costs of war fluctuate greatly: those wars where a particular weapon was in strong ascendancy are not necessarily the most costly. On the contrary, history shows that those wars are the most devastating in which the opponents are evenly matched in technological effectiveness.

It is argued, however, that nuclear weapons are completely different and possess destructive power so far superior to all previous arms that the historical continuity has been broken; hence the experiences of earlier wars no longer are valid.

A typical heavy World War II bomb contained one ton of TNT, whereas a modern H-bomb may have a yield of 100 megatons,² the equivalent of 100 million tons of TNT. The two bombs differ by eight orders of magnitude. If we compare on an aircraft-by-aircraft basis, we find that a heavy World War II bomber could carry about eight tons against a present possible payload of 100 MT. This increase is by more than seven orders of magnitude. The payload difference between a World War II bomber and a modern ICBM is between five and six orders of magnitude.

¹ Resistance against technological change is frequent even in the civilian economy. It suffices to consult the history of European railroads. "Featherbedding" to avoid abolition of jobs rendered supernumerary because of technical change is psychologically similar to the test-ban agitation. Although resistance to modernization, which is due to a cultural-psychological "time-lag," has been gradually weakening in the gadget-conscious U.S., it persists with respect to the industrial utilization of atomic energy.

² This is presently the maximum yield of soviet weapons. More typical "strategic" yields range between 500KT and 20MT. "Tactical" yields start at .1KT or less and go up to about 20KT.

In the war against Germany and Japan, the Royal Air Force and the U.S. Air Force were running more than one million bomber sorties (though not all of them with a very heavy bomb load). About 3.5 million tons were dropped on Germany and Japan, which was inadequate for victory-through-airpower alone. If the war had continued for another year, a total of ten million tons would have been dropped and might have resulted in an exclusively airpower victory.

A modern air force is quite incapable of attaining large numbers of sorties. It may have a capability of 1000 effective sorties.³ If, which is an unlikely case, one 100-megaton weapon were delivered on target per effective sortie, 100,000 MT would be dropped, as against a total of 10 MT which might have been dropped during World War II. This increase in the intensity of war would be by four orders of magnitude. The addition of missiles would not change this comparison materially.

In actuality, existing force levels and weapons yields indicate that in the present era nuclear war hardly would exceed an expenditure of 50,000 MT from both sides. Thus, the firepower increase would be by a factor of 5000. Since effectiveness does not increase proportionately but according to the cube root, actual military "worth"—or destructiveness—would grow by a factor of 17,⁴ i.e. by a little more than one order of magnitude. By considering only one instead of two sides, the increase would be less.

Although this sounds far more prosaic than figures of near-infinity, this is a considerable increase and it could spell the near extinction of individual nations. However, German and Japanese target areas were less than 400,000 square miles, while a future world war would be fought over a territory at least 20 times larger and involve considerably more, larger and "harder" targets. Germany and Japan, moreover, are far more densely populated than the present protagonists. Finally, the population of the world has been growing very rapidly. Although war fought between rising populations may cause higher casualties than a conflict between smaller populations, casualty rates may actually go down.

Thus, most key factors—weapons effectiveness, expanse of war-affected territory, number and hardness of targets, belligerent populations—have grown, more or less, in the same proportion. Just as it should have been expected: the historic continuity has not been broken by any means. True the dynamic process has not yet come to a standstill. Numbers and yields of weapons still may increase dramatically; on the other hand, a partial switch to neutron weapons would decrease yields substantially. We can rest assured that there won't be any major discontinuity.

It is easy to calculate that given delivery-on-target of a certain number of bombs with a certain yield and a fall-out pattern, and given lack of warning as well as military and civilian defenses, a certain number of casualties must result, almost by mathematical necessity. On such simplified assumptions, the amount of megatons and the distribution patterns of the explosions needed to kill mankind as a whole can be calculated. Some people counting numbers of cities and generalizing from the Hiroshima attack, when 20 Kilotons killed 100,000 people, assert that we now possess tremendous "overkill" capabilities, and could easily destroy

every town with more than 100,000 inhabitants on the entire globe.

The trouble with such calculations is that they have no realistic validity but simply reflect *a priori* assumptions unconnected with strategy, war plans, performance characteristics, counter-actions, etc. The number of explosions needed to bring about "global death" exceeds delivery capabilities and even stockpiles by far. When nations go to war, they will not fight to cause their own extinction. To obliterate mankind, this goal would have to be planned and the implementation of this plan must include the suicide of the executioners and the killing of their families. But is there not a genuine danger of mutual annihilation by accident? If so, the would-be aggressor would not take to arms. On the contrary, aggression will be launched only if and when the aggressor is convinced, not only that he is able to prevent his own destruction, but also that he will avoid excessive casualties.

The casualty rate of previous wars was largely dependent upon the duration of the conflict, military and civilian morale, disease, medical effectiveness and food. The performance characteristics of weapons have affected casualty rates only to a minor degree. On the assumption that weapons characteristics will be decisive in the future, the number of casualties and the destructiveness of nuclear war still would depend on at least 20 major variables:

1. Number and types of aggressor's delivery vehicles.
2. Reliability of these weapons and capability to fire according to a tight time schedule.
3. Quantitative ratios between attack and defense weapons and number of targets.
4. Number of weapons hitting and actually destroying assigned targets.
5. Yields of weapons exploded.
6. Heights at which the attacker's nuclear weapons are exploded.
7. Manner by which aborted and intercepted weapons are destroyed and the place of such destruction.
8. Places where the "misses" are detonated.
9. Types of the aggressor's nuclear weapons, including their "cleanliness."
10. Dependability and timeliness of defender's warning system.
11. Defender's capability to act upon warning.
12. Effectiveness of active defenses.
13. Target system selected by aggressor and the tactical timing of the attack.
14. Degree of hardness and/or mobility of defender's military installations.
15. Protection of the defender's industry and population, including numbers and types of shelters.
16. Capability of the medical service, panic control, effectiveness of evacuation, food reserves, etc.
17. The attacker's compulsion to launch his entire force on the first strike or his capability to hold back for follow-up attacks.
18. Target systems for the follow-up attacks.
19. Nature, capabilities and vulnerabilities of defender's command, control and communications systems.
20. The strategic purposes of the nuclear strikes.

The casualties inflicted through the defender's retaliatory strikes would in turn be a function of equivalent 20 variables.

Simple mathematics shows that at any moment, and for each side, there are $20 \times 20 = 400$ interactions. If each of these variables could assume ten different values, this figure would rise to 40,000. Yet even this large figure does not define the upper limit of the possible combinations. incessant technological change must be expected to modify every single value at frequent intervals; and key factors such as morale are not even carried in the above list. While each set of numbers would be

characterized by a specific casualty figure, we must not forget that such calculations involve many unknowns and that many values resulting from interactions are unpredictable. It is therefore quite impossible to produce firm estimates on the human cost of nuclear war.

The implication is not that because we cannot really undertake to calculate or "war game" so many different and dynamic situations, casualties would be small. The implication is that, if we were able to perform the required calculations, we would come up with a broad range of casualties, some very high, some quite low. Furthermore, each nation has many options through which it can act upon these variables to reduce casualties.

One significant difference between a modern nuclear war and a World War II-style strategic air war is often overlooked. The doctrine of strategic bombing called for attacks on the enemy's industries and transport systems. The expectation was that as the output of weapons was curtailed by bombing of key industries, e.g. oil refining, electric power, railroads, etc., the battlefield forces could be defeated by forces whose supplies were kept flowing; or strategic bombing would deprive the population of its supplies and thus force surrender.

Since industrial targets usually are located in or close to cities, civilian "spillover" casualties could not be avoided and sometimes were intended in order to reduce the labor force and demoralize the civilian population.

The crucial phase of nuclear conflict would be short and be fought with forces-in-being exclusively. The effects of attacks on industrial installations are felt only after a time-lag of 9 to 12 months. Hence, in nuclear war, industrial bombing does not make sense.

The highest priority objective of a nuclear aggressor must be to disarm the opponent immediately. Consequently, such military targets as radars, command and communications systems, missile sites, air bases and submarines must be attacked by necessity, without wasting any efforts against industry. Yet military targets usually are not located in cities. Air bases often are near small cities but rarely close to metropolitan areas. Hence the nuclear attack would be preponderantly directed against targets which are at a relatively safe distance from urban concentrations. Population therefore would escape the blast and heat effects of direct nuclear hits. Capital cities may or may not be included among first priority targets, but city "busting" could be resorted to only after the defender's military power has been eliminated; and there must be strength left for this undertaking. Assuming the aggressor is capable of launching follow-up attacks on urban areas, it makes a great deal of difference whether cities are hit within the first few minutes of the war or at some later time.

A simultaneous attack on the defender's military force and his population requires vast quantitative superiority, and therefore presupposes previous unilateral partial disarmament by the defender.

After the attacker launched most of his missiles and aircraft, the retaliator could strike the aggressor's residual strength and his air and missile defenses. But, paradoxically, he may find that the enemy's cities may be his only "useful" targets. Yet, it is to be expected that the aggressor, before shooting, will have evacuated most of his cities. Therefore industrial installations would be destroyed but, by and large, the population would be affected by fall-out only; in all likelihood shelters would have been prepared for this contingency.

Thus, the defender would lose his military force, and the attacker his industry and his force (which he expended in the aggression). But the population of neither would be put at risk directly. It follows that in nuclear

³ This would be the capability of an air force with 2000 operational planes if one-third of its planes in each attack were to reach their targets.

⁴ Or by about 25 if we base the calculation on the tonnage actually dropped from the air during World War II. These tonnages, however, do not include fire power expended by ground forces.

warfare, the defense may possess considerable strategic strength despite its tactical handicaps. This point illustrates the wisdom of a strategy of resistance as against surrender.

SOME TECHNOLOGICAL TRENDS

At the present moment, the danger of nuclear "holocaust" probably is greater than it will be in the future. Not that the effectiveness of nuclear weapons has reached its maximum. Yield increases are inevitable in response to hardening, just as further hardening will lead to bigger yields. The reason is rather that while offensive weapon systems, during the last 20 years or so, enjoyed massive advantages over the defensive, present trends will gradually reestablish a better balance between the offense and defense. About five years ago, American missile sites were "soft" and air bases highly vulnerable. Since then, effective measures have been taken to render our aircraft and missiles less vulnerable to surprise attack. Great progress has been made in early warning capabilities and in the defense against subsonic and supersonic aircraft. Sooner or later, reasonably effective anti-missile systems will be in operation.

The protection of population is still at a minimum, but at least a few first steps have been taken. Calculations demonstrate that through combining active defenses with shelters, casualties could be reduced very substantially. In particular, active defenses forcing the attacker to explode his warheads above 50 or 60,000 feet would greatly reduce fallout and enhance the effectiveness of shelters. I will forego quoting figures, because all seemingly exact quantitative data are misleading. However, realistic computations have shown that through proper combinations of active and passive defenses, casualty rates may be held down to those of World War II.

Better dispersal of our weapons would provide additional help. Space surveillance systems would impair the attacker's ability to strike with full tactical surprise. In the more distant future, space defense systems might increase missile interception rates. The gradual development of space as a military environment may draw much firepower away from the inhabited regions of the earth, just as the submarine has been drawing firepower away from the land to the sea.

This is not to say that during the next weapons cycle, the defense will become stronger than the offense. As defensive weapons improve, new offensive weapons will be constructed. This see-saw race will continue as long as technology continues to evolve. The challenge is to ensure that the would-be aggressor does not attain a posture allowing him to attack without excessive risk. If the U.S. and NATO maintain technological and quantitative superiority such that effective surprise attack will remain infeasible, war probably will be avoided—and the communist conquest of the world will not take place.

UNCONTROLLED FALL-OUT

Blast and heat are the primary effects of fission bombs (A-weapons); radioactivity accounts for little. Fission-fusion bombs (H-weapons) have the same effects but produce larger amounts of radioactivity, part of it as uncontrolled fall-out which spreads over large areas. The magnitude of fall-out was unexpected but soon was considered to be a military "bonus."

It is indeed true that the danger of uncontrolled fall-out inhibits the aggressor. He may be able to protect his population during the shooting phase of conflict, but large amounts of radioactivity which linger for years, may inhibit him from reaping some of the fruits of victory. Fall-out weapons are "useful" for genocidal strategies but the unpredictability of air movements renders these weapons less "attractive" than may appear at first glance even for this most extreme

strategy. The "backfire" hazards grow with the amount of megatons exploded.

Actually, the fall-out danger is to some extent transitory because protection, though expensive, is feasible. As soon as one side possesses shelters, radio logical counter-measures, evacuation plans and defensive weapons, the balance of terror—which is derived, above all, from the fall-out threat—would be broken.

As to the indirect effect of fall-out (e.g. stontium-90 getting into milk, and genetic consequences), better understanding of the mechanisms involved would be of help. Improved biological and medical knowledge gradually will become a factor of alleviation. Panaceas probably will not be found but problems of this sort are essentially manageable by public health programs. Clearly, food reserves would be of great importance in a fall-out war. This is a factor which favors the United States.

Fortunately, the trend toward all-fusion weapons will reduce or even eliminate uncontrolled fall-out. All-fusion weapons ultimately will replace present fission-fusion models, not just because they are cheaper and more efficient, but precisely because they do not produce uncontrolled fall-out. In due time, fall-out no longer will have military utility but will be considered to interfere with the rational conduct of war.

This does not mean that radiation—as distinguished from fall-out weapons will disappear from the arsenal. Quite to the contrary. In the first place, there is always the danger that logic will not prevail and that desperation may induce mad strategies. Moreover, many parts of the world will not be sheltered for quite some time. Consequently, one must be prepared to cope with the fall-out danger by maintaining a reprisal capability.

Secondly, soon-to-be-perfected neutron bombs are radiation weapons. However, neutron radiation would be restricted to a fraction of a second and to clearly delineated small target areas: neutron weapons would not set off fall-out except in negligible quantities. In space, neutrons, and possibly X-rays, are probably the only types of "fire-power" which can be used.

Third, it is conceivable that, at some time in future, radioactive substances will be used to block ground access and to prevent utilization by the invader of industrial installations. Non-lethal and non-destructive blocking would seem to be preferable to destroying installations physically, especially if such destruction were to be carried out by casualty-producing inaccurate shots over long ranges.

Radioactivity and fall-out are nebulous and mysterious subjects to most people. Radioactivity is a new force with which we must learn to cope. It poses enormous but by no means insoluble problems. There is no reason to approach these tasks in a defeatist spirit and to assume, as many do, that this challenge is beyond human capacity.

VALUES

We now have a factual background which should allow us to evaluate the "better red than dead" slogan. The ultimate decision, of course, is one of moral choice and value preference. Is it more moral to surrender or to oppose communism? Some non-communist pacifists like to answer: "It would be more moral to oppose communism but such opposition would cost enormous human casualties. Non-opposition would save untold lives and therefore is the more moral option."

This answer is based on the disregard of the human cost of surrender, of communist seizures of power, and of communist dictatorship. Furthermore, the hypothesis that resistance to communism will kill more people than surrender stipulates implicitly that resistance necessarily entails fighting a nu-

clear war. Yet the free world, with its vastly superior resources, is able to deter major communist aggression indefinitely. If successful, a strategy aiming at the deterrence of major war would cost far less human lives than surrender. Deterrence in permanence might convince the Kremlin that pursuance of the world revolution has become impractical. Such a conviction would open the road toward a beneficial evolution of the Soviet system.

Therefore, even if we buy the debatable notion that the cost of human lives should be the only criterion ruling the choice of strategy, no convincing case can be made for a strategy of surrender. A policy of firm resistance probably would be the cheapest course of action we can choose.

For the most part, the advocates of surrender are neither communists nor even fellow-travellers. However, many surrender advocates are interpreting communism in an unduly optimistic light. Surrender appears "attractive" on the assumptions that the communists henceforth will respect Christian-humanistic traditions, that the system will work efficiently and produce a dramatic and rapid improvement of living standards, that the dictatorship will "wither away" soon, and that the establishment of a communist world-state will automatically terminate the international power struggle. The average proponent of "better red than dead" harbors strange illusions on the "red" alternative.

Psychologically, people are disinclined to fight against something they do not consider evil. Those who do not want to fight because they consider peace to be the highest if not the only value, easily persuade themselves that the evil, which is to be resisted, really is no evil at all. This attitude leads many to minimize or even ignore such historical communist policies as artificially created famines, slave labor camps, purges, and mass murder. By contrast, those who argue that it is worthwhile to oppose communism, if necessary by war, have a largely pessimistic image of how the communist system actually works. They anticipate that communism never will function effectively and never cease to be oppressive, nor ever forego the frequent and cruel use of terror, force and violence.

Economic management is not the main difference between communism and freedom. The "difference" is between tyranny and liberty. These terms are not just clichés, or words of interest merely to constitutional lawyers, but each term denotes a specific reality. Tyranny and freedom bear directly on all phases of human life and affect every individual and his happiness.

Most Americans experienced little trouble grasping the difference between nazism and "constitutional government." In the end, the emaciated bodies in the extermination camps gave mute testimony confirming the validity of American "theories." Yet today, many Americans find it difficult to comprehend the meaning of communism. The communist ideology often is mistaken as a sort of contemporary radical Christianity. The crucial distinction between the ideals and realities of communism is being obfuscated.

In a dictatorship practising centralized economic "planning," the individual may not be allowed to choose his profession, his place of residence, and his mate; he may be forbidden to leave his job or to bring up his own children. He cannot enjoy the fruits of his own labor because "private property" is not allowed. As long as the subject of the communist state remains seemingly "free," i.e. not under arrest, he may be considered a serf. As soon as he is punished for alleged crimes, he works as a slave with a short life expectancy.

In a dictatorial regime, the individual is told that he owes his highest allegiance to the state, that the interests of the "state"

supersede any allegiance he may feel toward his family, relatives and friends, or even toward his own self-interest, and that he is subject to the orders and whims of petty bureaucrats. There is no Bill of Rights, and no guarantee that constitutional and legal provisions protecting the individual will be observed. He cannot expect justice or due process of law, and his rights may be violated any time a policeman decides to do so. There is no end to the accusations that may be leveled against him. Once accused in spite of being innocent, the defendant must prove his innocence—if he is allowed to defend himself at all. If found guilty, the penalties meted out are excessive.

As though all this were not enough, the communist state resorts to such techniques as "indoctrination," "conditioning" and "brainwashing." The individual's own mind and thinking are suppressed and to the extent that the regime is capable of performing this task, replaced by government-sponsored thoughts. According to the 1961 program of the communist party of the Soviet Union individuals are to be "moulded."

"Moulding" aims at the depersonalization of the individual and is diametrically opposed to the concept of freedom. A free government should be shaped to allow the greatest scope for self-expression, "to each individual as he is and wants to be." But communist dictatorships would not survive unless individuals were formed according to the image of the bureaucrats. The dictatorship needs obedient robots instead of courageous, self-reliant, self-sacrificing, thinking, outspoken, well informed, and moral citizens.

The meaning of tyranny or dictatorship no longer is clearly comprehended, *provided* the regime poses as one of the "left." Actually, all dictatorships are by nature "reactionary" and exploit the individual for the state, more accurately for the tyrant and his "ruling class." Tyrannical government always is destructive of the higher human values and happiness. When it is ideologically motivated, it also is most destructive of human lives.

Moreover, experience has shown that the communist dictatorship may fall into the hands of a mentally sick person: Josef Stalin ran the communist dictatorship as a government-by-assassination-of-communists. Since his death in 1953, the communist party has not instituted reforms which would prevent the repetition of the Stalin experience.

Among those who survive the surrender, some will tend to accommodate themselves to communism. Others will try to collaborate with the communists. But the success of these maneuvers is unpredictable. Those who succeed initially cannot be sure that their luck will last. The communists like to liquidate, at an early time, the "stirrup-holders" who helped them to seize power. They exploit but do not cherish "fellow travellers." Similarly, they use pacifists, but once in power they do not want them around. The "better red than dead" types have a poor chance of surviving, should any government be crazy enough to adopt the policy they are preaching so vociferously.

Perhaps the advocates of surrender are motivated by pre-existing attitudes which induce them to revolt against danger, duty, firmness and self-sacrifice; perhaps they despair of the magnitude of the problem; perhaps they have no faith that mankind. Whatever the causes and purposes of the proposed "escape from freedom" may be, they do have responsibilities toward their own country. Few will harbor the illusion that they will talk the United States into surrender. In all likelihood, the surrender advocates will always remain a small sect. If so, what does their propaganda accomplish? It creates a great deal of confusion, contributes to demoralization, delays the building of shelters, slows down technological progress, and hampers the government in its efforts to devise a sensible strategy. The surrenderer

wants to save lives. But to the extent that he paralyzes preparedness, his propaganda actually will cause the death of many Americans who could have been saved.

CONCLUSION

There is no way of turning back the wheels of history. The challenges of the nuclear age are no greater than those of earlier eras. It is unworthy of man to shrink from the duty which history has thrust upon him. The American tradition always has been to solve problems but not to fight them. The positive approach has been the secret of the American success story. We must reach out for the most valuable resource yet invented, and harness nuclear energy for progress and peace. The defense of freedom is hazardous, but no moral and material risk is greater than the surrender of liberty to tyranny. The Swiss philosopher Jean Lavater wisely remarked: "Strange that cowards cannot see that their greatest safety lies in dauntless courage."

SATELLITES SPOT A SOVIET BUILDUP FOR ATOMIC ARMS—MANY SILOS REPORTED AS WELL AS INCREASED FACILITIES TO BUILD MISSILE VESSELS

(By William Beecher)

WASHINGTON, October 10.—Satellite photos of the Soviet Union have uncovered evidence of a substantial build-up of more and better strategic nuclear weapons.

The new information shows that the Russians are continuing to build two new classes of silos, or emplacements, for large missiles, are constructing yet a third type of new silo, and are doubling the production facilities for Soviet missile submarines.

Some officials in the State and Defense Departments and the White House say this build-up increases the need to secure at least a first-step arms control agreement as soon as possible.

Others throughout the Government privately stress that unless this build-up is stopped soon, the United States may feel impelled to expand its own nuclear arsenal to maintain a balance of strategic power.

RELUCTANCE ON DETAILS

A senior Pentagon official, pressed for details on the extent and character of the Soviet nuclear program, insisted that the arms-control talks were at such a delicate stage that the Defense Department did not intend to provide details of the build-up until its next annual report to Congress in February.

Other officials in various Government departments were sufficiently concerned, however, to sketch out some details of the Soviet build-up.

The reconnaissance satellites have found that the number of silos of two different sizes generally believed designed for improved or entirely new long-range missiles now exceeds 90—up from the 10 noted early this year and 60 seen in midsummer. The smaller of these silos is significantly larger than the 10-foot diameter of the Russian's largest operational missile the SS-9.

A third type of silo, larger than the others, has been sighted, with one each at several missile complexes. Analysts believe the new holes are destined either for a special-purpose new missile or a new type of command and control facility.

The Russians now have about 41 Y-class missile submarines ready or under construction, thus drawing abreast of the American Polaris submarine force. The new intelligence findings indicate a doubling in size of the principal Soviet nuclear submarine construction yard at Severodvinsk, on the White Sea.

1,600 REPORTED COMPLETED

The total number of Russian Intercontinental ballistic missiles, completed or under construction, is said to exceed 1,600, compared with 1,054 for the United States. In addition nearly 100 Soviet ICBM silos at test

and training centers would be expected to be put to use in a crisis; the United States has only a handful of such test silos.

The intelligence reports indicate that the Russians are working at what one senior official calls an "incredibly intense" pace in completing a ring of antiballistic missile sites around Moscow.

Publicly, the Administration, through the President, has emphasized the hope for early success in the talks to limit strategic arms, which have been on for two years.

On Sept. 25, President Nixon called the prospects good. Whether the two countries can achieve an initial agreement by year end, "no one can say at this point," he declared. "We have made progress. I believe the goal will be achieved."

NO CHARGE OF BLACKMAIL

He concluded: "Neither power at this time could, if it wanted to, gain that superiority which would enable it to, frankly, blackmail the other one."

But privately, some senior officials are less optimistic. One official said:

"We have consistently underestimated the numerical goals of the Soviet missile programs for 10 years. We have also consistently assumed, incorrectly I'm afraid, that they bought our strategic concept of deterrence."

"They obviously don't want a nuclear war any more than we. But they're building a sufficient edge in nuclear strength, and in conventional forces as well, so they may have reason to expect us to back down in future confrontations, as we made them do in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962."

AIM IS DETERRENCE

The American strategy is based on having a nuclear force that can ride out a surprise attack and retaliate against the attacker's cities rather than against his remaining nuclear weapons. By maintaining such an "assured destruction" capability, the strategy seeks to deter nuclear war.

The arms-limitation talks are aimed at curbing the number of offensive and defensive nuclear weapons to the point where neither side would feel confident that it could destroy the retaliatory capability of the other in a surprise attack.

Administration officials differ on the kind of missiles that are to be deployed in the more than 90 new missile silos being built at locations east and west of the Ural Mountains.

The majority of analysts believe the Soviet Union would not build the huge silos unless it intended to install much improved versions of the SS-9 and SS-11 ICBM's or even new generations of missiles with improved accuracy, reliability and warheads.

SECURITY A POSSIBLE PURPOSE

A minority view holds that the new silos are designed to provide greater security against attack.

Silos of both types have been constructed at the Tyuratam missile test center and test firings are expected soon. Data from such tests should dispel much of the mystery surrounding the new silos, analysts believe.

The third type of new silo, about four feet wider than the largest ever seen, has now been spotted, with one each at several complexes.

Analysts are mystified about the purpose of these silos. Some speculate that they could house well protected command and control centers from which Russian missile officers could command nearby ICBM's in a war. Others believe the holes are designed for a special purpose missile that is being dispersed to achieve greater protection against concentrated attack.

Among the possibilities cited are the following: missiles designed to carry special communications satellites to communicate with Russian missile submarines just before or during a nuclear war; big rockets

set off very large explosions over the United States in an attempt to black out its radar and communications temporarily or make it difficult to fire ICBM's through large radio-action cloud, and large missiles to carry orbiting bombs in a crisis to persuade the United States to back down, much as the forward flights of American B-52 bombers during the Cuban missile confrontation were designed to force the Russians to remove their missiles from Cuba.

THIEU'S VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an interesting item I read in the Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of October 5. I think readers will find it very perceptive:

THIEU'S VOTE OF CONFIDENCE

Although the question of validity will continue to plague Sunday's South Vietnamese presidential election the results carry some interesting implications.

Incumbent President Nguyen Van Thieu, the lone candidate, had pledged to resign if he failed to obtain endorsement by at least half of the country's registered voters. He won more than 94 per cent of the ballots cast, and a record 87.7 per cent of the country's seven million registered voters went to the polls.

Bolstering the validity of the results were the returns from particular areas. In Thieu's home province of Ninh Thuan the unopposed contender received 98.6 per cent of the vote. In Hue, where sentiment runs fierce against the Saigon regime, Thieu was given only 64.3 per cent.

On the surface it appears that President Thieu enjoys a level of support known only by a few national leaders throughout all history. Assuming the validity of the results, it suggests that Thieu probably could have won reelection even over his strongest possible opponent, Vice President Ky.

(There's no great mystery in this since Thieu has politicked diligently to corral the support of the army and other major political forces in South Vietnam. Public opinion polls taken by American newsmen months ago reflected a high level of support for Thieu in rural areas, mainly because Thieu's was the only name recognized in regions where illiteracy runs high.)

It was speculated that realization of Thieu's vote-getting potential was a prime factor behind the withdrawal from the race by Gen. Duong Van Minh, and possibly even Ky himself, whom Thieu had maneuvered into eligibility after Minh's withdrawal.

Regardless, the one-man presidential election falls far short of the Western concept of democratic process in which existence of a valid choice is a key element. It could be inferred that the South Vietnamese had only a choice between Thieu and the potential chaos that could have erupted had the country been left without a recognized chief of state.

The most remarkable aspect of the election, however, is the record voter turnout. The 87.7 per cent showing runs far ahead of the results in even American presidential elections, in which turnouts usually total little more than 60 per cent of those registered to vote. And the South Vietnamese election was conducted in the midst of a terrorist campaign by the Communists aimed at keeping people from the polls.

Therein lies the real victory in Sunday's

voting. The South Vietnamese people apparently have gained such confidence in the central government's ability to protect them that they were willing to brave the threat of Communist bombings to vote even in an uncontested election.

This, in itself, ought to count for something.

THE NINTH DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY—SEVENTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, each year I have sent a questionnaire to the residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, the district which I have the privilege and honor to represent, soliciting their views and opinions on various issues confronting our Nation.

This year, I sent my seventh annual questionnaire to the 160,000 households in the Ninth Congressional District. The volume of response to the 1971 questionnaire with 26,572 replies has been most gratifying. This, I feel, indicates the widespread interest the residents of the Ninth District have in the problem facing us today.

The annual questionnaire method of sampling my constituents' opinions continues to be an effective means for district residents to convey their views on major issues. I employ this method, because I want my constituents' reflections about matters that come before us as Members of Congress.

Through extensive sampling, I was able to obtain a good index of prevailing opinion in my district. This knowledge is an invaluable aid in helping me formulate my judgments in the legislative considerations of Congress.

The enthusiastic response demonstrates that my constituents are concerned about their Government. In submitting answers to my questionnaire, many constituents attached detailed letters to explain the positions they took on issues and problems. Others placed concise and cogent remarks on their questionnaires. During our August recess, I had the opportunity to read each questionnaire sent to me with additional responses. I found an acute awareness of the work that must be done not only at the Federal level, but at all levels of government to get our Nation moving.

All of the responses have now been tabulated. I shall send a copy of the results to every household in the Ninth District so that my constituents may compare their individual views with the consensus of opinion of district residents.

Tabulating the questionnaires required a tremendous amount of effort. I wish to extend my thanks publicly for the wonderful cooperation of the many volunteers and members of my staff who spent countless hours completing his tabulation.

At the conclusion of these remarks, I will insert in the RECORD a numerical summary of the responses to the 21 questions I posed, but at this point I wish to

call your attention to some of the significant reactions to several important issues:

Over the years from 1966, it has become increasingly apparent that our involvement in the war in Southeast Asia was losing the support of the American public. A majority of my constituents have consistently expressed support for a greater emphasis on peace initiatives and for the inclusion of the National Liberation Front in arriving at a settlement of the conflict. By 1969, over three-quarters of those responding favored our withdrawal from Vietnam or a mutual cease-fire agreement. Last year, the questionnaire was sent shortly after the Cambodian invasion commenced, and considerable dissatisfaction with the administration's handling of the war was evidenced as 62.5 percent of my constituents responding supported the Cooper-Church amendment, and 53 percent favored complete withdrawal of our military forces. These feelings culminate now in the view held by 51.7 percent of the people in the Ninth Congressional District that the administration should set a firm deadline of December 31, 1971, for complete withdrawal of American troops. I might point out that at the time the questionnaire was mailed, the one-candidate election in South Vietnam on October 3 had not been held.

The fourth question was included to gauge district opinion on the issue of continuing or abolishing the Selective Service System. The results showed that the majority—52.1 percent—was of the opinion that the draft should be replaced by an all-volunteer military force, a view I supported in Congress. It is interesting to recall that a 1-year extension of the draft lost by only two votes in the House of Representatives this past spring.

Another subject receiving great attention in the press and in Congress is health care, as we find our Nation, compared to the world, ranked approximately 18th in the quality of health-care services. About 55 percent of the responses favored the establishment of a national health care insurance plan which would include dental coverage.

Reaction to the President's revenue-sharing proposal was quite mixed, with 39.9 percent in favor, 44.2 percent opposed, and 15.8 percent undecided. As an alternative, it was asked whether my constituents would prefer the Federal Government to take over the operation and funding of the 50 States' present welfare programs. The latter proposal received wider approval, with 55.2 percent in favor, 33 percent opposed, and 11.7 percent undecided.

The President's plan to provide a federally guaranteed income for every family, with some State financial participation, was favored by 39.1 percent, opposed by 44.7 percent, and 16.2 percent were undecided.

I asked if my constituents would favor or oppose the setting of wage, price, and interest controls. Two-thirds responded in the affirmative; however, it is extremely important to note that interest controls were incorporated in the question. Obviously, the public was aware of the need for such controls as early as

May and June; yet, it appears that District residents had an equitable structure of controls in mind. From the volume of mail I have received, I feel that the current situation, with various wage and salary contracts being negated by the Presidential directives, would not have garnered such support.

Concern for our environment was strongly demonstrated in the responses. The vast majority—84.6 percent—believed that an organization with the structure and form of the Delaware River Port Authority or the Port of New York Authority should be created to restore and maintain the Passaic River Basin. To use the Passaic River as a model river was an administration consideration, but unfortunately was subsequently rejected.

This interest in the environment was also shown in the last section of the questionnaire, which presented five major problems—inflation, unemployment, crime, pollution, and the Vietnam war—and requested the respondent to number these in order of importance. Pollution was given top priority by my district, as 23 percent of the respondents registered that view. Unemployment—22.75 percent—and the Vietnam war—20 percent followed. Crime was rated first by 18 percent. Inflation was considered the most pressing problem by 15 percent.

Under the priorities section, a number of unsolicited additional comments were made. Below, in order of frequency, are listed the added priorities mentioned by at least 5 percent of those responding:

LIST OF PRIORITIES

1. Drug abuse and rehabilitation problems
2. The need for welfare reform
3. Questionable credibility of the Administration.
4. Insufficient mass transit
5. Corruption in Government
6. Supreme Court decisions too lenient
7. Lack of housing and oppressive rent increases
8. Rising tax (including property) burden
9. Care for the elderly
10. Infringement of civil liberties
11. Inadequate anti-trust law enforcement
12. Union abuses
13. Excessive military expenditures
14. Doctor shortage
15. Population explosion.

The completed questionnaire tabulation appeared in the *Record* on October 6, 1971.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, this year, for the first time in our Nation's history, Columbus Day was celebrated as a national holiday.

It was on October 12, 1492, that Columbus landed on San Salvador Island. This voyage, which cost the modern-day equivalent of \$52,000, was a spectacular example of courage, faith, and determination. It is especially fitting that the anniversary of this discovery be celebrated by all Americans, for when Columbus set foot in the New World he opened the floodgate of exploration which

led to the eventual establishment of our Nation.

Columbus' remarkable accomplishment was only the first of many achievements which have been made over the years by those of Italian ancestry. Italian-Americans have made significant contributions to our country's arts and sciences, music, literature, sports, and countless other fields which have added to the greatness of our Nation.

On this day we should all pause and pay homage—not only to Columbus the man—but to Columbus as a symbol of man's conquest of the unknown. At this time, it is also appropriate that we should remember that America is a nation of immigrants. Columbus Day should be an annual reminder of the numerous contributions which have been made to our American way of life by the many ethnic and nationality groups which make up our Nation's heritage.

ECONOMIC STABILITY FOR MINORITIES

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, founder and chairman of Board Opportunities Industrialization Centers, spoke at 62d annual NAACP convention, July 6, 1971, in Minneapolis, Minn. This year's recipient of the NAACP's Spingarn Award, Reverend Sullivan emphasized the need for proper training among minority groups as the beginning of economic stability for minorities. I highly recommend Reverend Sullivan's speech, "Steps We Must Take," for reading among my worthy colleagues:

STEPS WE MUST TAKE

First, let me thank you for this Award. I am aware this is among the highest honors a Black man can receive. I want to thank you for considering me and for this presentation.

One hundred years ago the Black man began the journey towards full emancipation in America. The journey has been long and hard. A full century has gone by, and three generations have passed off the scene since the journey began, but we still have not reached our goal. The attainment of full emancipation, equal opportunity and first class citizenship is still a distance away.

To be sure, giant strides have been made. Never in the history of the world have a people, starting with so little, gone so far. The road has been rocky and rigorous. As James Weldon Johnson put it in that stirring anthem: Lift Every Voice and Sing.

"We have come over a way that with tears has been watered,
We have come treading our path thro' the blood of the slaughtered."

Somehow, though, in spite of it all, with God's help, we have survived. We have endured. We have come this far.

Now, the question is: Where do we go from here? What steps must we take now, at this time, in this journey that continues on? What steps taken now, today, can more appropriately, wisely, and solidly help us on our way?

This evening, on this high occasion for me, I should like to discuss some "Steps We Must

Take" that I believe will get us closer to our goal. These may not be giant steps, but I think they are steps headed in the right direction.

First, the Black man must take a step in the direction of training and skill preparation. Even to this day, no less than 90% of the work being performed by the African American is in the non-skilled scope of employment. This would not have been so disturbing to me 30 years ago, when the majority of the work being done in America fell in non-skilled classifications. But it is disturbing to me, now, because I know that by the year 2000, just 29 years hence, one-half of all the non-skilled jobs being performed today, will not even exist. New jobs, requiring some minimal technical ability and skill, will have taken their places. This means if the Black man does not, on a massive scale, begin to develop skills that will qualify him for the new kind of jobs that are sure to come along in the years that lie ahead, that more and more of our families will have to depend upon doles and relief for our survival.

I am not against assistance to a family that needs the help. In fact, I support the efforts of welfare organizations that are striving to secure sufficient income for families that are struggling to survive. So many of our families fall in that number. But I know, too, that the Black man must never permit himself to get into the position of having to depend upon the government or anyone else to sustain and support him all his years. (applause) As long as the government supports a man, the government will be able to control a man, and even destroy a man. (applause) The ultimate freedom of the Black man in America depends upon his ability to develop self-dignity, self-pride and self-dependency. As long as our people have to crawl and beg for a few crumbs from the table, so long will our people be pushed around, and kicked around, and treated like second-class citizens. (applause) I don't want to see this happen to a Black man; I don't want to see this happen to a Chicano; I don't want to see this happen to a Puerto Rican. I want to see Black men and women stand proud, self-sufficient and free. (applause) I want to see a Black man be able to make his own way and stand on his own feet. (applause)

It was for this reason that 7 years ago, the first OIC, Opportunities Industrialization Center, was begun. We wanted to reach our Brothers and Sisters and help them in programs of training and preparation, that they might be motivated to self-improvement. Our slogan became: "We Help Ourselves."

The OIC recruited, and took in men and women from every stratum of life. The average age of an OIC trainee was 27, and the average grade attainment was the 10th grade. One-third of those who came to us were on relief, and 80% of those who came had incomes beneath the poverty line. Most of the men were hostile towards society and most all of the men and women who came were hopeless. OIC began to turn that hopelessness into Hope. OIC began to teach that genius was color blind; and OIC began to teach that it was not important where a man came from, but where he was going that counted; (applause) OIC taught that a man is like a balloon, it is not his color that makes him rise, but what he has inside of him. (applause)

Beginning thus, in an old abandoned jail house, OIC began to train by the hundreds, and then by the thousands, men and women into useful skills, making salaries that most never dreamed of making in their lives. In Philadelphia, OIC trained 10,000 men and women into useful skills for jobs and added more than \$100 million dollars to the economy of the City of Philadelphia. (Applause.)

From Philadelphia, OIC spread to 10 cities, and then to 20 cities and now OICs are established in 100 cities across America, including Minneapolis and St. Paul. And now, also, OICs are in Nigeria and Ghana, and

developing in Kenya, (applause) Ethiopia and the Dominican Republic and British Honduras. Indeed, there are inquiries for the establishment of OICs throughout the Black world, as well as throughout South America and Asia.

All together, OICs have trained and placed in jobs these past few years, around America, 75,000 men and women, now earning \$400 million dollars a year. It is the goal of OIC in the decade of the Seventies, to train and place in jobs, one million men and women out of the concentrated communities of America, and out of the rural south. If we reach our goal, OIC will add 20 billion dollars in wages to the economy of the country, and considering the economic multiplier of money generated as the result of dollars earned, the sum total of money that will be added to the gross national product of the country, will exceed \$100 billion. (Applause.) And most important of all, this money will be turned over and over again where it is needed most; among Black and Brown and Red men, and Orientals in the concentrated communities of America and in the rural Southland. This kind of money could begin to help stand our communities on their feet.

Significantly, too, OICs are administered, supervised and led for the most part by Blacks at every level of the organization. Perhaps, more Black men and women are serving as administrators and executives and supervisors of large scale manpower programs, than ever before in the history of the world. (Applause.) Too, in many respects, OIC is an on-job training program for Black management and executive workers. Already, many are finding new employment opportunities in government, private enterprise, and other areas of professional employment.

I do not look upon OIC as any cure-all, but I do see it as a "step" in the direction I think the race has to go. We must continue to fight for integration, as I have fought for integration. It was I who created and initiated and led great boycotts in the early sixties, that opened jobs to Blacks in Philadelphia and other parts of America. I shall continue to fight for integration in employment opportunities as long as I live, (applause) because I know as long as the White man can keep us back in job opportunities, that the Black man will always be kept down. (Applause.) But I know too that, "Integration without preparation is frustration;" (applause) and that to the same extent that I must fight for job opportunities for my people, I must also work to train my people to go through those doors when they are opened. "We've gotten the man on the bus. Now we want to be sure he can do something when he gets off." (Applause.)

Some may say: "Leave it to the Government." Well . . . the Government is not going to take the initiative to train Black men to do the kinds of jobs I am talking about. The government will do no more than it has to do in this matter. They seem to have some idea in Washington that training for Black men and women means training for "stop-gap", "dead-end", "going no place in a hurry" jobs; or emergency jobs of some kind that will keep the summer cool. (Applause.) Therefore, much that will have to be done in the field of training and re-training, for the kinds of jobs we "want" and "need", must be done out of our own efforts and persuasions. Either we will do it ourselves, with the cooperation of private industry, and persuade the government to provide maximum resources to help us help ourselves, or our people will not get the help that they need in job training opportunities.

We have in the past, and we shall continue to appeal to the Congress of the United States, and to the President of the United States, for more funds to support the OIC work. All OIC programs are ini-

tiated out of the pockets and the efforts of Black and Brown men and women, or other minority citizens, who believe in the philosophy of OIC, and in what we are trying to do. We also secure significant support and help from the industrial community of the nation. And although the government helps us some, OIC receives only a pittance compared with the large sums of money spent on Manpower programs in the nation, most of which have fallen on their faces. (Applause.) We contend that OIC should get a "fair share" of all Manpower dollars being spent in the nation, particularly since so much of it is supposed to be going to help the Brothers. (Applause.) If the government can pour billions into Manpower programs that don't work, we say it is time now for the government to put some of this money into something like OIC that does work. (Applause.) Therefore, the OICs of America are appealing to the President and to the Congress to help OIC. We have 25 million dollars to work with now and we thank the Department of Labor for that kind of help, because at least it is something, but we need at least 100 million dollars a year to begin to do the job that we can do to help our people. This will help OIC to train and place 100 thousand men and women a year, in jobs and therefore reach our goal of one million men and women trained and re-trained into useful, good paying jobs in the decade of the Seventies and we believe OIC can get \$100 million. (Applause.)

But, we are not concerned just with OIC, we are disturbed generally about the inaction of the government relative to the needs of the nation's poor. There are 30 million poor: Black, Brown, Red and White in this country, but the Federal Government, meaning the President and the Congress, have been playing political "tiddly-winks" with the needs of the poverty stricken. The policy of both the President and the Congress seems to be: Like "tiddly-winks." Don't disturb them, "Take a few off the top, but don't upset those on the bottom." (Applause.) The only thing that has come out of this government these last 3 years on measures affecting the poor has been "Hot Air" and "Veto's!" (Applause.) Speeches in Washington get longer and longer; and the poor get poorer and poorer. (Applause.) It is time now for the President and the Congress to stop playing petty politics with the poor. And I am talking about Republicans and Democrats both, because neither are doing much for Black people, (applause) or we would not be in the mess we are in all over the country today. (Applause.) They are playing games with us in the national government and in the cities and it's time to end this game playing. (Applause.)

It is time that America should take the billions of dollars being spent meaninglessly in Vietnam, (applause) and some of the billions of dollars being spent in space, (applause) and put that money to work eliminating poverty from among the poor people of this nation. If America really wants to do something about poverty, it can. We can do what we want to do! All we need to do is do it!

"If America can put a man on the moon in outer space, then America can help put a man on his feet in Mississippi." (Applause—standing ovation.)

So, we want some meaningful legislation out of Washington to help people with jobs, and training, and hope. And we can't wait for 1972 for something to happen. We might all be wiped out by 1972. (Applause.) We need the President and the Congress to get together to provide some meaningful help now, in 1971. We want funds to help us develop OICs in 100 cities, and in the Rural South and on Reservations. We want to help Blacks and Chicanos and Puerto Ricans and Appalachian Whites and Red Men who want a decent job. It is time a program to help the

poor; founded, developed and run by Black people got a part of the action. (Applause.)

The second step (applause—laughter) the Black man must take, is in economic development. Now I do not mean Black Capitalism. I do not know why, when or where that term was ever started, or by whom. Because there is no such thing as Black Capitalism. Capital is not Black—it is green. (Applause—laughter.) What Black people want is: some green money, in order that we might be able to buy what we want to buy, live where we want to live, and do what we want to do. It is not Black Capitalism the Black man wants, but some Green Capitalism. "We just want some money!" Don't we? (Applause.)

In this respect, there is a need, therefore, for Black men to develop enterprises so that we might become producers, rather than just consumers. We have a long way to go in this respect. We have so little. If we were to take all the businesses owned by all the Black people in America, and put them together, the sum total would not be worth the value of one building on Fifth Avenue: The Empire State Building.

We must, therefore, take a step in the direction of economic development so that we might become economically emancipated in the market places of the nation and the world.

Now . . . the world of economics is a hard world. It is a cold world. It is a concise world. It deals with balance sheets, profit and loss statements, and hard management practices. The three main factors in this kind of world are: Cost, Quality and Time. We cannot deal in this kind of world as we have dealt with other matters. In this world of economics, either "you make it" or "you lose it." (Laughter.) In the next 30 years it will be necessary for us to develop at least 50,000 new businesses, operated by Blacks, but selling to everybody, in order for us to just get a foot in the door.

Several weeks ago, I looked at the listing of Fortune's top 1000 Industrial Enterprises in America, and in going through all 1,000 there was not a single Black-owned enterprise on the list, not even 999th. Something can, and must be done about it. (Applause.)

To move in this direction, new methods will have to be devised for capitalization and management training; including cooperative savings, and investment groups, and self-help community and entrepreneurial training centers. We must collectively utilize our resources that we might be able to compete with individual wealth. That is to say, that we must cooperativize to industrialize. (Applause.) Our economic future must be built on the collective unity and the collective savings and investments of our people. We may not have a Rockefeller in the Race, but 5,000 of us together can make one; (applause) and 100,000 of us can make a Ford Foundation. (Applause.) In many ways I am a Black American Patriot. I believe in America. For those who say "If you don't like America why don't you leave," I say "When the last Indian leaves, I will be right behind him." I just want to see America and Free Enterprise work for Black people like it works for White people. (Applause.) If America is to be America, then let it be America for everyone. (Applause.) The 10-36 plan is one example of the kind of thing that can be done.

The 10-36 Plan in Philadelphia was initiated by 200 members of my church a few years ago, and has since grown to 6,000 investors who invest \$10 a month for 36 months, demonstrating what can be done when people collectively share and invest their resources for mutual goals. This 10-36 group has built housing developments, constructed a shopping center, initiated factories developed an inner city food store chain, secured office buildings, started entrepreneurial training center programs, and created a lending enterprise for aspiring Black busi-

nessmen. I long to see this kind of example duplicated in other communities wherever our people live. It works; and it can be done anywhere.

A Black couple went to rent an apartment and were told they couldn't live there because of their color. They came to us and we went back and bought the apartment building. (Applause.)

And every industry and every company of the first 1,000 in America should assist in the development of Black owned businesses, as cooperating companies; much as the General Electric Company provided technical resources, subcontracts and support to a totally minority owned and managed, successful multi-million dollar enterprise in Philadelphia, called Progress Aerospace Enterprises. Similarly, every large industry and company in the nation could provide that same technical resource, sub-contracts and management support to developing Black owned enterprises. And the larger the company the more it should do.

Economic emancipation is the top priority of the race; in job preparation and in the creation of productive enterprises. Not until the race begins to produce will the world stop seeing us as beggars.

The third step we must take is in the area of group respect and togetherness: (applause) It is imperative that we establish a new standard of humanity, brotherhood, group respect and togetherness among our own people. (Applause.)

Today, more and more, we are turned against ourselves. Black men are turned against Black men. We fight each other. We curse each other. We kill each other. This condition is seen throughout the Black community. During the same time span of the present war, Black men have killed more Black men in arguments with each other, *here in America*, than all the Black men that have been killed by the Viet Cong during the entire Vietnam War. (applause) We have let our conditions make us turn against ourselves. Somehow, this must be stopped, or our divisions and self-conflict will halt our progress.

There is nothing the enemy of Black progress wants more than to see us divided and fighting among ourselves. (applause) We need a national crusade for group respect and togetherness in the race. This kind of group respect and togetherness is needed among individuals, and our organizations as well. We spend so much time in our organizations, vying with each other, that we don't have time left to fight the enemy. (applause) We are all in the struggle together. We rise together, or we fall together.

Make no mistake about it; we need each other, and we had better start working together, as individuals, and as organizations, or our cause will be lost.

Rivers flow from many sources to arrive at the same goal. So with the race. Some of us are conservative, some of us are militant, some of us are quiet, some of us are loud, some of us wear dashikis, and some of us wear sport jackets, but we must let the world know that whatever we wear or however we look we all intend to arrive at the same goal; and that goal is freedom for our people! (applause) We must not let the White man divide us any longer; (applause) and we must not divide ourselves. The emphasis of the future must be: Together! Together! Together! (Applause.)

Like Fingers on a Hand: Strike a man with fingers divided and you hurt the Hand—Strike a man with fingers united and you hurt the Man. (Applause.)

So . . . strike discrimination with the race divided and no good will be done—but strike discrimination with the race united and Victories will be won.

Whether we be Conservative, Moderate or Militant: Whether we be NAACP, Urban League, Southern Christian Leadership Con-

ference, the Muslims, the Panthers, or OIC, or whatever we may be, we must let the Nation know that we are in this struggle Together . . . Together . . . Together!

If anyone wants to know who the leader in America is in Civil Rights—"The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People" is the leader. (Applause—standing ovation.) If anyone wants to know who is the main speaker for Black people, tell them to call Roy Wilkins. (Applause.) And the NAACP will stay the leader until Freedom comes!

We must all help to make the NAACP strength of the NAACP in America is the strength of the Black man in America.

The OIC Board has passed a resolution to buy a life membership in the NAACP. And another resolution was passed calling upon every OIC in the country to support the NAACP. That's really going to be something when OIC and the NAACP start rolling together! (Applause.)

Then there is the fourth step that we must take; of Black International awareness. For whenever Black men are in the world, our fates are tied together. *Black men will not be free anywhere until Black men are free everywhere!* Therefore, we must be concerned with the suffering of our Brothers and our Sisters wherever they may be: in Angola and in Rhodesia and in the Union of South Africa, where the most ruthless system of discrimination practices in the world today are perpetrated against the Black man. My friends, *Apartheid must come to an end!* (Applause.) There are those who say to me, "Be silent on this matter," but that has been the trouble already. We have been silent too long. I shall not be silent. (Applause.) I shall not be silent until Apartheid comes to an end in the Union of South Africa. (Applause.) And we must do whatever is necessary to see that it comes to an end. If it means a United States economic embargo against the Union of South Africa, then we must fight for that; if it means the removal of American based plants and industry out of the Union of South Africa, then we must fight for that. Whatever is necessary to be done to help our Black brothers in the Union of South Africa and to rid the world of Apartheid must be done. For I repeat, *Black men will not be free anywhere until they are free everywhere.* (Applause.) And it is not necessary for the plants to be moved if some fundamental things are done.

To resolve the situation in the Union of South Africa, let the Black man be recognized as a full human being and not a subspecies to the White man, with full citizenship rights in his own country and with the right to vote, and the freedom to go and live where he pleases without discrimination. And let the Black man have the right to equal wages for the same job done as received by the White man. Though I be a voice in the wilderness, I shall not be silent until progress is made in this direction. (Applause.) We must be . . . Together . . . Together . . . Together! (Applause.)

I know there are other steps that must be taken that you, the NAACP, do better than anyone else I know; Political Education, Integrated housing, Improvement of Public Education, and more. I would not presume but so much . . . I have given you these steps. Training, Economic Development, Togetherness, and a concern for our Brothers across the seas. They may not be giant steps, but they are steps in the right direction. And, I believe, if we take these steps, the day will come when we shall, with the help of God, reach our goal of full emancipation and equal opportunity, and freedom for the Black man in America, an daround the world.

Let us move on Together . . . Together . . . Together!

Thank you for this great honor. I hope in the years ahead it can be proved that I merited it.

Incidentally, domestically, General Motors is doing a little better these days. Right on! (Applause—standing ovation.)

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following:

Each year about 8 million children go off to camp. These campers are mainly schoolchildren, and the vast majority attend camps during the summer vacation months. But while a parent finds little difficulty in ascertaining the relative safety of a child at school, millions of parents are forced to send their offspring to camps with little or no knowledge of whether the place meets basic minimum safety standards. And too often they do not.

In many cases camps virtually take the place of parents for several weeks in the year. Yet in 19 States there are no regulations governing camping at all, and in many of the remaining States only isolated aspects of camping are covered by law or regulation.

For instance, 40 States have no training requirements for counselors who supervise waterfront activities. Forty-six States have no regulations regarding the condition of vehicles used for transportation or the qualifications of drivers. The same number of States have no regulations restricting the age of counselors. Twenty-nine States fail to require annual camp inspections.

In the absence of State regulations there are a number of excellent camping organizations which have established standards for camping. The American Camping Association, with 3,400 member camps, the scouting organizations, the Association of Private Camps, and church-oriented groups have all made a substantial contribution to better camping. But a great many camps in America do not belong to these organizations, and it is well understood that the standards set by private organizations lack any real enforcement provisions. One out of every eight camps visited by representatives of the American Camping Association in 1967 failed to meet ACA standards. And it is generally recognized that these are some of the best camps in the Nation.

The failure to establish adequate standards for many of our camps has had tragic consequences. In my own review of the situation, I have heard enough verifiable horror stories to persuade me to seek better protection for our youngsters.

To alleviate this unfortunate situation, Congressman DOMINICK DANIELS of New Jersey and I have proposed a Youth Camp Safety Act as title IXX of the Higher Education Act, H.R. 7248. This bill will set basic minimum national safety standards and encourage the States to pass their own more stringent

standards. The act, if passed, will make Federal money available on a matching basis to pay for inspections conducted by the States to insure that the State and Federal standards are complied with. It is my sincere hope that when this bill comes before the House we can, by passage of this measure extend the same protection to our children at camps as we give them at home.

POW EVEN FOR ANOTHER DAY

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 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.

Following is the language of House Resolution 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

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

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date and will end on the same date.

"A cease-fire will be observed between the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces and the Armed Forces of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, as soon as the parties reach agreement on the withdrawal from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp."

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

ADDRESS BY ADM. JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR.

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it will be of great interest to my colleagues I insert an address by Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., USN, commander in chief, Pacific, to the United Press International Managing Editors Convention in Honolulu, October 5, 1971. The address follows:

AN ADDRESS BY ADM. JOHN S. MCCAIN, JR., USN, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, PACIFIC, TO THE UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL MANAGING EDITORS CONVENTION, HONOLULU, OCTOBER 5, 1971

It is a personal pleasure, privilege, and honor to speak to the ladies and gentlemen of the United Press International Managing Editors' Convention. UPI is one of the world's great news services, and I am very aware of the vital role your outstanding organization has in keeping our nation and people fully informed about the personalities, events, and issues of the day.

Like you, I believe in freedom of the press and the public right to information. Not quite a year ago I reported to the convention delegates of that other great American news service in Honolulu that I was "delighted to see more objective reporting on the war coming from our nation's news media."

I can say to you today that my impression has been reinforced in the interval. Not that everything the press has to say about the battle in Vietnam is absolutely correct from my point of view. But I can say—and this is the real strength of our democracy—the American people, in the long run, cannot be intimidated or misled regarding our nation's policies, actions, and vital interests in Southeast Asia.

I have stressed adequate military defenses in my "collective security" speeches over a hundred times before domestic and allied audiences during my three years as CINCPAC. Lately, however, I have found another task: helping to inform our countrymen that the finest weapons system won't mean a thing if we don't support the men who defend our people and soil.

My other major tasks, of course, are the battle in Indochina; the drug problem, which is a national failing; the prisoners of war; and military assistance, really cheap insurance to keep our friends going and to give them the means to fight aggressive communism. I might add these are equally important tasks.

I intend to initially discuss with you the worldwide expansion of communism in general terms, followed by a brief appraisal of this expansion as it affects the Southeast Asian area. Lastly, I will review the current situation in Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

The threat of aggressive communism in Asia continues to affect the peace of the area and the problem of collective security throughout this vast area. A major problem in mutual security is the continuing growth of worldwide Soviet expansion. In recent years the Soviets have been actively pursuing a strategy aimed at extending USSR influence on a global basis.

This strategy, which I call the "Strategic Island Concept," is designed to spread USSR influence throughout the world. In this concept, strategic "islands" are not necessarily islands surrounded by water. In a broader sense, they are entities, or centers, either on

land or at sea, from which the USSR can and does project power. This power may be political, economic, military, or psychological.

This "Strategic Island Concept" is an insidious policy. It has achieved for the Soviets the global power status they have long sought, and in pursuing this policy the Soviets are leapfrogging throughout the world.

This Soviet strategy in action takes many different forms. It may be the actual or implied use of a military force, the rendering of economic or military aid, the extension of commercial aid service, or the wide-ranging deployments of the merchant and fishing fleets. It might also take the form of humanitarian aid, diplomatic and trade activities, or scientific and space efforts. Any or all of these measures may be applied as the situation requires.

Backed by impressive economic and manpower resources, Soviet Far Eastern military strength remains a major threat. In the Far East, the Soviets have an army of a quarter of a million troops; an air force comprised of over a thousand jet aircraft and a rocket force of hundreds of nuclear-tipped missiles. The threat posed by their modernized Pacific Fleet is increasing steadily. Presently, in the Pacific, they have over 50 major combatants and more than 100 submarines, many of them missile-equipped. Their navy also has hundreds of other craft involved in many types of missions.

Russia, endeavoring since the days of the Czar, to protect and bolster her Southern Flank, has emerged as a naval power. She has finally succeeded in operating fleets in the great oceans of the world. Soviet naval and air maneuvers have been seen in the Norwegian Sea, the North Atlantic, in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, the Sea of Japan, and the Philippine Sea. Clearly, the Soviets do not use their navy in a parochial sense. They have grasped the significance of seapower and its importance to trade, fisheries and oceanographic research.

A specific example of Kremlin interest in the Indian Ocean area includes the almost continuous use of the anchorage off Socotra by the Soviet Indian Ocean force and the presence of Soviet advisors during the South Yemeni renovation of the Ras Kharma Air-strip on the island.

The use of military and economic aid is another means by which the Soviets have expanded their influence. When the Soviets first began their aid program to the Free World in 1955, it was largely limited to communist nations; however, in recent years military assistance has also been provided to 38 Third World nations. Soviet military assistance since 1955 has been about 6.5 billion dollars, with the Middle East and North Africa receiving the largest amounts. Soviet economic aid during the same period was in excess of 7 billion dollars with approximately one-half of this amount going to South Asia.

Two major Communist recipients of USSR aid during this same period have been North Korea and North Vietnam, where more than 5 billion dollars in military and economic aid has been provided. Significant to the success of the Russian military assistance program are three main features: It has been immediately responsive to most requests; the arms supplied have been modern, first class weapons; and the assistance extended has been concentrated in support of well-defined goals.

Another means of spreading Soviet influence has been in the field of aviation where Aeroflot, the national air carrier, has increased its air routes by 40 percent in the last 5 years and now touches down in 59 countries. USSR military aircraft are stationed in the Egyptian Arab Republic and spread Soviet visibility in areas of the Mediterranean. Also, the USSR is making a determined effort to gain a share of the

world aircraft market. Most significant are their efforts to market the supersonic transport.

The USSR has a fleet of about 1300 merchant ships which ranks it as the 6th largest merchant fleet in the world. This fleet also spreads Soviet influence. These ships are currently carrying cargo between an estimated 800 ports of 85 countries annually. Of significant note is that 80 percent of this merchant fleet is less than 10 years old. The fishing fleet also aids in worldwide influence. The recent establishment of a joint Soviet-Spanish company to service the Russian fishing fleet off the Canary Islands will substantially assist in expanding their influence in this strategic area. This is the first such official joint company since the Spanish Civil War.

The Soviet advisory assistance program has generally paralleled that of monetary assistance and during the past 5 years over 50,000 economic and military advisors and technicians have been dispatched to Third World countries. Currently, these personnel are located in approximately 17 countries and the advice furnished by them goes well beyond the requirements for instruction in the operation of Soviet weapons and material.

The Soviet have also increased diplomatic ties in recent years and today Moscow has representation in all but a few countries of the world. For example, ten years ago there were fewer than 100 Soviet diplomats in South America, accredited to three countries. This figure has now increased to 349 embassy officials in all countries, except Paraguay.

Another example of the results of the expansion of USSR influence is the recent establishment of a global network of Optical Geodetic Satellite tracking stations. Stations known to exist outside of East Europe and the USSR are located in Antarctica, Egypt, Cuba, Kerguelen Islands, Mongolia, Somalia, Mali, Chad and Peru.

While the Soviets are pursuing this strategic island concept to project their influence into the Indian Ocean area and Asia, certainly the major potential source of danger in the Western Pacific and the SEATO area is Communist China. Although the motivations and intentions of the Communist Chinese leaders are matters of conjecture, their capabilities can be fairly accurately measured.

The Communist Chinese Army of approximately 2.5 million officers and men is the largest standing army in Asia and it is equipped with modern weapons. Communist China's air force numbers nearly 3,000 combat aircraft, including MIG-21's and other sophisticated weapons systems. The navy is limited but growing, and includes the world's third largest fleet of 40 attack submarines and a growing missile patrol boat force. Another half-million men make up an impressive paramilitary force.

The Peoples Republic of China has extended territorial claims to parts of India and occupied Tibet. Their forces also have clashed with Soviet troops—on the Kazakhstan-Sinkiang frontier, which featured major fighting, comparable to that of March 1969 on the Ussuri River frontier, 2,000 miles to the east.

As to intentions, the Chinese Communist forces appear at present to be defensively oriented in make up and deployment. However, we must assume their nuclear capability will before long be able to span most of Asia and the Soviet Union.

The Chinese moved closer to the day when they will launch their first ICBM with the successful orbiting of their first satellite. This event proves the Chinese have the capability to put in orbit a considerable payload. It also confirms their technological progress and, as Secretary Laird has pointed out, we must credit them with the near term capability to fire their first ICBM. They could

have an operational ICBM capability in the mid-1970's. They have worked on an MRBM (Medium Range Ballistic Missile) capable of delivering a 20 kiloton warhead up to 1,000 miles for a number of years, and appear to be capable of a limited deployment at any time, even this year.

It appears that Communist China presently seeks to dominate its neighbors through political pressure, subversion and so-called "wars of national liberation." It has been cautious in risking its own resources; however, to expand its influence, it may add nuclear blackmail to its pressure on its neighbors. Communist China's continued support of insurgencies and "wars of liberation" remains a paramount threat to U.S. interests in East Asia and the Western Pacific despite hopes for improved relations.

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization continues to play a most vital role in meeting this threat. If this organization did not exist we would have to design a similar arrangement to assist in providing security for the Pacific area. I believe that one of SEATO's most important functions is in providing established channels of communications through which we can solve our mutual problems.

Turning now to other areas of the Pacific, a look at Korea reveals that the North Korean threat has not diminished. There is continuing infiltration to the South, a record of aggressive actions taken against U.S. reconnaissance vehicles, and bellicose statements by North Korean leaders which reflect a continuing truculence.

North Korea makes no secret of its goal to unify Korea by force under its control. Clearly, North Korea will not hesitate regardless of the measures required to achieve its objective. Hundreds of North Korean-initiated incidents have erupted in the Republic of Korea. During 1968, there were 220 major incidents provoked by North Korea along the Demilitarized Zone. The period since reflects a downward trend of incidents. Nevertheless, the threat of the Pyongyang regime persists and is underlined by its continued efforts to infiltrate armed bands along sea routes into the South. Notwithstanding this threat, I do not believe that North Korea will initiate a major attack on South Korea in the near future.

In comparing the military forces of North Korea and the Republic of Korea, we find that the North Korean Army, though much smaller in number than the ROK Army, maintains a large and well trained guerrilla-type commando force. North Korea's Navy is also smaller in numbers than South Korea, but its naval force in part consists of a large fleet of patrol and coastal craft which can and is frequently used to land guerrilla forces on the South Korean shores.

With respect to air supremacy, the North Korean Air Force outnumbers that of South Korea in the neighborhood of 3 to 1. Additionally, there are about double the jet capable airfields in the North than are located in South Korea. However, with assets available within the Pacific Command, the United States can provide sufficient air power to more than offset this numerical imbalance.

A most positive development in Northeast Asia is the Republic of Korea's improved relations with Japan, resulting in closer economic ties and a beneficial commercial exchange between the two countries.

Economically, Japan is third among the nations of the world. Following a long period of reconstruction and domestic investment and development, Japan is now turning its attention and resources toward assisting the economic and social development of the free nations of Asia. Japan remains firmly aligned with the family of free nations of Asia. This is exemplified by the November 1969 agreement between President Nixon and Prime Minister Sato on the reversion of Okinawa

to Japan by the end of 1972 and the indefinite continuation of the mutual security agreement between our two nations.

Moving south to another area of communist pressure, let us examine the Taiwan Strait area. A communist Chinese attack on Taiwan in view of our firm commitment under the Mutual Defense Treaty of 1954 and of our combined defense capability would be a foolhardy venture. But the possibility of such an aggressive act can never be excluded. "Liberation" of Taiwan continues to be a cardinal Chinese Communist objective.

Significant Chinese Communist military forces are tied up on the mainland coast opposite Taiwan. Opposite Communist China is a significant Republic of China Army, an air force of over several hundred fighters, and a small navy of destroyer-types and patrol craft. Facing the Republic of China defense on Taiwan is a Communist army of over 150,000 men, an air force of over 1,000 fighters and bombers, and a significant naval force including destroyer-types, submarines and a large coastal patrol force.

Looking further southward, the South China Sea separates the Philippines from the mainland communist aggressive threat. Conscious of the long-term danger, the Philippine Government continues to provide important support of the Free World stand in Vietnam, SEATO, and ultimately, the security of the Philippines themselves. The Republic of the Philippines forces have participated in the effort to repulse communist aggression in Southeast Asia, and proven to be a valuable ally and a key SEATO member.

In Indonesia, the Suharto Government has made definite progress in raising the country up from the depths to which it had sunk under Sukarno. Effective measures have been taken to prevent the Peking-oriented communist party of Indonesia from reviving on an important scale. Economic recovery and development are underway and there has recently been a marked resumption of foreign investment in the development of Indonesia's vast oil and other vital resources. While remaining unaligned, Indonesian foreign policy has been marked by growing readiness and desire to work with other free nations of the area for mutual economic, social and security interest.

In Malaysia a generally promising course of development was briefly interrupted by 1969's communal disturbances and riots. However, another similar outbreak is becoming less likely. Despite communist efforts to exploit racial unrest, the 1971 anniversary of the riots passed without serious incident. Nevertheless, the still unsettled situation provides fertile ground for communist subversion.

While Singapore has thus far remained little touched, extension of communist inspired instability to that tiny island nation would imperil freedom of passage through the Malacca Straits which are crucial to Asian petroleum imports for its industry and maritime trade. The new accord reached by Britain, Australia, and New Zealand provides for continued defense arrangements to protect Singapore and Malaysia. Its significance is that the British will continue to keep a military force in Southeast Asia to help maintain the peace of the region.

Turning now to Burma, we have a country which is presently suffering from a stagnant economy and insurgent control of large areas of the country. Chinese Communist aid to insurgents in the northeastern areas of the nation poses an ominous threat. A Communist Chinese goal may be to connect their road system with the Burmese system which would open new avenues of approach to Thailand and Laos. The next 12 months may be critical in determining the nature and probable success of their intervention in Burma. The Burmese Army is hard pressed to deal with internal security, and it would be

unable to offer effective resistance to a major attack by Red China.

The stability and peace of the Southeast Asian area is further threatened by the communist-inspired insurgency in north and northeast Thailand which is supported and encouraged by both Peking and Hanoi. The Royal Thai Government is moving to meet this threat and there are grounds for confidence that the situation will progressively be brought under control unless the external basis of the insurgency is magnified. We know the fighting ability of the Thai forces which has been displayed in Vietnam is more than a match for insurgents.

Turning now to Vietnam, where North Vietnam continues its aggressive intent to dominate South Vietnam and the countries that formerly comprised French Indochina, we have made significant gains.

The enemy's capabilities have declined steadily since President Nixon's 1970 to move into Cambodia to protect allied forces by destroying enemy sanctuaries and supply areas. This mission was accomplished, and the Republic of Vietnam air force "came of age" and proved they were capable of handling enemy forces on a better than equal basis; the enemy was denied use of his previously inviolate sanctuary areas and Lines of Communication (LOC), and the continued denial of Kompong Som to the enemy was assured.

With the loss of this vital port, Hanoi faced two alternatives: (1) To significantly increase the material throughput down the panhandle LOC's in Laos, or (2) to drastically reduce his offensive activities in South Vietnam and Cambodia. He has been forced to pursue the latter course of action because of his inability to accomplish the first. He has so far been unable to input into Laos the levels of material he was previously able to provide through the combination of Lao and Cambodian LOC's.

Prior to 1 April 1970, and the crossborder operations into Cambodia, the Ho Chi Minh Trail network was essentially supporting only I and II Corps areas, with most support for III and IV Corps being transshipped from Kompong Som across Southern Cambodia. Today the Ho Chi Minh Trail network supports: I and II Corps forces in RVN, troops in the Laotian Panhandle, troops in Northern Laos, troops in action in Cambodia, plus III and IV Corps in RVN, and the enemy is continuing to face increased logistical problems. The Lamson operations of this year created much havoc in the logistical operations of the enemy and hurt him badly in both men and supplies. The enemy is feeling the effects of these crossborder operations on his ability to effectively continue the war on his own terms in the south and in Cambodia and Laos.

Across the Vietnam border in Cambodia, Cambodian troops are also taking the war to the enemy. I continue to maintain close contact with Cambodia's Premier Lon Nol and other top government and military leaders, and I am impressed with their growing ability and determination to counter North Vietnam's aggression. Cambodian forces are putting U.S. and other Free World equipment to good use in their efforts against the communist forces invading their country.

Regarding the future of Cambodia and Laos, President Nixon has said we are exploring "methods through which neutrality of countries like Cambodia and Laos, who cannot possibly defend themselves," will be "guaranteed without the intervention of foreign forces." In this regard our efforts in South Vietnam are bearing fruit. Vietnamization is progressing well. The Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces will reach their maximum strength of approximately one million men well ahead of schedule. Six Vietnamese air force squadrons were activated ahead of schedule in fiscal year 71 and we hope to have three more accelerated activations in fiscal

72. New Vietnamese naval facilities are being constructed on schedule and, as you know, all but a few naval activities were turned over to the Vietnamese Navy last year.

Pacification too is progressing. Effective crossborder operations against enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia and Laos have helped the Government of Republic of Vietnam improve its position over 1970 in the field of pacification. The resultant weakness of the enemy effort within the Republic of Vietnam coincided with the growth to maturity of many territorial forces and People's Self Defense Forces. The enemy's protracted war tactics have failed to stall the pacification drive. During 1970 the nature of the war began to change from a territorial struggle to an internal security struggle. This struggle has continued in 1971.

Successful Vietnamization and pacification programs have permitted continued disengagement and redeployment of U.S. forces. Reductions will continue at a carefully calculated rate. By 1 December of this year, our forces in South Vietnam will have been reduced from a level of 549,500 in 1969 to 184,000.

In summary, ladies and gentlemen: Throughout Southeast Asia, the enemy is faced with problems that he has not encountered in the last decade. In Laos, he was forced to expand his lines of communication to compensate for the loss of Kompong Som; LOC's have been disrupted by the crossborder operations into Cambodia and Laos. He is now faced with the urgent need to resupply his forces in the South. Lamson operations have disrupted the enemy's logistic timetable. The effects of this disruption upon North Vietnam fiscal year 72 plans may be amplified by the need for Hanoi to anticipate possible future Army of the Republic of Vietnam out-country incursions. In Cambodia, the change of government in 1970 obliged the enemy to reassess the situation and reorient his efforts in an attempt to replace vital supply lines. To accomplish this, he diverted main force units from South Vietnam, further limiting his offensive capabilities. In South Vietnam, the Vietnamization and community defense and local development plans continue to make progress. The enemy's future military effectiveness throughout Southern Indochina is directly related to his ability to solve his logistical problems.

Despite many unresolved problems, the enemy maintains a limited capability for offensive operations. He will retain the ability to conduct limited ground attacks in selected areas of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. The Viet Cong/North Vietnamese Army will retain the capability to conduct attacks by fire throughout Indochina, and to conduct sapper, terrorist, and guerrilla attacks on populated areas in South Vietnam and in Cambodia. Increased enemy emphasis will probably be given to the development of a communist infrastructure and the formation of indigenous communist forces in Cambodia.

The enemy is very concerned about the progress of the pacification and Vietnamization programs. Hanoi's objectives are still to wear down the resolve of the free world, discredit the pacification program, disrupt the Vietnamization progress, and most importantly, to continue to exert pressure on United States and world public opinion.

President Nixon's plans to reduce the total U.S. troop commitment in South Vietnam is a result of confidence that the South Vietnamese can develop the capability for their own defense. As President Nixon has reported to the American people, the enemy's strategies have failed. He has not won, and cannot win, a military victory in the Republic of Vietnam.

At the heart of the Nixon Doctrine—which has been readily recognized and accepted by our allies—is the principle of partnership, of shared responsibility for peace and security.

The President has stated the United States will keep its treaty commitments with the expectation that our friends and allies will assume greater responsibility for their own defense.

This evolutionary development is a major change in U.S. foreign policy. Its significance is two-fold: It means continued U.S. leadership of the Free World but with a reduced American presence. And secondly, this new phase in American foreign policy will mean a future savings to us all in terms of American lives as well as dollars.

Although some question the need for a strong, realistic war-deterrent force, I would remind all that no battles have been fought on Continental United States soil since the Civil War. In World War II the mood of the country reflected the knowledge that the Republic was beset by trials as grave as any it had faced in its history. There was an unquestioned acceptance of the need to sacrifice to insure the survival of an ideal. We felt intuitively that our society offered man his best hope of a way of life by which he could fulfill himself in freedom.

Over the decades since then, however, the issues have been many and complex, and the rightness of our actions on the world scene has not been so easily demonstrated as in World War II. There is some disenchantment with the military today among certain groups, giving rise in turn to criticism not notable for its amiability. In point of fact, even a superficial look at recent history gives us reason to be proud of what our defense forces have accomplished over these years.

It is easily forgotten that United States strength and commitment were indispensable elements of the economic and political resurgence of Western Europe. The United States has responded to a series of challenges to freedom in the Far East, and the fact that freedom survives under the shadow of aggressive communism is testimony to the effectiveness and perseverance of our armed forces.

Despite the determination of world powers to extend by force a political system which scorns freedom, the Free World alliance remains a symbol of hope to nations where freedom has died.

The task ahead is formidable. Some of our countrymen are immune to the realities of the war in Indochina. Many are tired of strife and seek an easy way. My conviction, formed by four decades of military service in war and peace, is that there is no easy way. History will record that America's sons and daughters served Freedom well in Southeast Asia. They have helped defend 200 million people of the free nations of this area. And the Vietnam war is being ended in such a way that we can win a just peace for all the people of this region.

Our Nation must not be turned aside from its proper course in Southeast Asia. The pressures of some public frustrations with the war must not, I repeat, must not, cause our people to abandon what we have helped to win for the free people of Southeast Asia. We must not initiate an abrupt, and consequential pull back of U.S. forces in Vietnam.

I am convinced the months immediately ahead are critical for the preservation of all that United States and Allied Forces have achieved in Indochina. In the confusion of the public debate we must remember we have performed the tasks delineated by every President since President Eisenhower first announced support of the Vietnamese government.

It is a fact that today South Vietnam has an excellent chance of survival. We have prevented external conquest and encouraged internal progress and regional cooperation in Southeast Asia.

It is important, as we reduce our force levels, that we not leave a total vacuum which would affect the security of the American people or their vital interests in the

continued security of our Free World allies. Even as we reduce the American presence and the risks to our servicemen and the strain on our economy, we must not lose sight of an urgent necessity to help nations we expect to shoulder more of the burden for their own defense.

The Nixon Doctrine's success as an evolving part of U.S. foreign policy depends on a viable U.S. Military Assistance Program. The goals of reduced direct American involvement can only be met by providing means for self-defense and encouraging self-reliance by our allies; filling political and military voids that would otherwise tempt would-be aggressors; and maintaining U.S. credibility by demonstrating our resolve to honor our treaty alliances.

Free World defense against the continuing communist threat throughout East Asia continue to rest on a combination of U.S.-allied bilateral treaties and SEATO. This year the SEATO nations solidly reaffirmed their adherence to SEATO as an indispensable instrument of allied mutual security in Southeast Asia.

There is another major task ahead for the Free World in Asia and that is the vital role it must assume in nation building activities to give internal strength and security to the more than 200 million free people of the area. Business and industry has a tremendous stake in this venture and a great opportunity, too.

The peace and prosperity of the Pacific is of special importance to the United States. The Pacific—its shores, its islands, and the vast regions beyond—is a chief theater of world events.

As President Nixon has stated, the United States is a Pacific power and it will continue to maintain a presence in Asia as a vital national interest. I have no doubt that our assistance will be required and will be forthcoming in Asia in the years ahead. Our ultimate goal is the encouragement of strong, viable economies and democratic political processes in the nations of the region.

We as a people abhor war. And our first obligation or loyalty is to try and prevent war. But the peace we all seek today will only prevail in the generation ahead by maintaining realistic, strong military forces to prevent potential aggressor nations from making war on us and our allies.

TRIBUTE TO NORTH CAROLINA JAYCEES FOR SPONSORSHIP OF A STATEWIDE ENVIRONMENTAL RALLY

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, it was my high privilege and pleasure last night to join with members of North Carolina's congressional delegation and members of our State's general assembly to rally 'round an issue that has become one of the most crucial ones of our times—the protection of our environment.

Last night, several thousand North Carolina citizens responded to the Jaycees' call for action to improve the quality of the physical world we inhabit. Gathering at the giant Memorial Coliseum in Greensboro, N.C., people from every walk of life rallied behind the Jaycees in their efforts to focus statewide attention on our environmental problems.

I want to call to the attention of my

colleagues, Mr. Speaker, this energetic and dedicated group of fine young Tar Heels. They are to be heartily commended for taking this vital issue in hand and sponsoring this unique rally—the first of its kind in the Nation.

The response of the Old North State's lawmakers and citizens is a tribute to the zeal of North Carolina's Jaycees. So too was the appearance at the rally of three stalwart leaders in the fight to save our environment: former astronaut John Glenn, former Secretary of the Interior, Stuart Udall, and our colleague from the other body, Senator ROBERT PACKWOOD.

These gentlemen, guided by the North Carolina Jaycees, spent the entire day yesterday flying from one population center in our State to another, holding a series of airport rallies to emphasize the importance of environmental awareness.

Last night's rally heralded a new battle in the relatively recent war on pollution. Pollution has grown to crisis proportions, a crisis that has been deepening on every front. With their usual approach—a meld of the imaginative and the energetic—the North Carolina Jaycees have set out to win this war in our State, and the initial battle—the environmental rally itself—was a decisive victory.

For sounding this urgent battle cry and for convincingly relaying its urgency to a host of Tar Heel citizens, I believe the Jaycees deserve the recognition and tribute of this body.

Our "Young Men of Action" have succeeded in bringing widespread public attention to the urgent need for upgrading the quality of the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land upon which life flourishes. In so doing, the North Carolina Jaycees have evidenced anew their belief, set forth in the Jaycee Creed, "... that service to humanity is the best work of life."

H.R. 10367—ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS BILL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska Native land claims bill (H.R. 10367) will soon be before the House for a floor vote. I am greatly concerned that the bill, as reported, will adversely affect national wildlife refuges. In this regard, the bill would allow Native villages to select up to four townships in the refuge in which the village is located, thereby eliminating thousands of acres of valuable wildlife habitat from the refuge system.

It was because of this concern that prompted me to ask the Secretary of the Interior to advise me of the possible effects of the then Alaska Native land claims bill (H.R. 7432) on national wildlife refuges in the State of Alaska. Following is a copy of the letter I received from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Nathaniel Reed, dated June 17, 1971, together with a copy of a letter from his Deputy Assistant, Mr. Curtis

Bohlen, dated September 3, 1971, concerning H.R. 10367, which I would like to include in the RECORD at this point:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1971.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: This is in reply to your request for information regarding legislation on Alaska Native Land Claims and the possible effects on national wildlife refuges in that State.

As we interpret the Administration's proposal it could reduce our holding at seven refuges in Alaska. Of course, as you know, under the terms of this proposal only the surface estate of lands within refuges will be patented to native villages or individuals. All mineral rights will be retained by the Federal Government.

Highest reductions could occur at Kodiak and Clarence Rhode Refuges, Nunivak, Kenai, Cape Newenham, Aleutian Islands, and Arctic Refuges would be subject to smaller reductions. The remaining refuges would experience little or no reduction.

The enclosed map delineates the areas subject to reduction at each refuge. The areas plotted on the map, you will note, do not provide for conflict resulting from overlapping claims. Also, many native villages are somewhat mobile. Consequently, the village locations shown and estimated acreages provided are based on the best information currently available and should not be considered as final.

The following listing sets forth, by refuge, the possible effects of H.R. 7432. The acreages given do not include the 160 acre claims that individual natives living within refuges might take.

Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge

| | |
|--|---------|
| Number of villages inside refuge---- | 3 |
| Number of villages outside refuge---- | 2 |
| Number of townships to be withdrawn----- | 16 |
| Approximate acreage to be withdrawn----- | 368,000 |
| Approximate acreage subject to patent----- | 322,000 |
| Percent of refuge subject to patent-- | 18 |

List of villages within the refuge: Larsen Bay, Old Harbor, Uyak.

Outside, but affecting refuge: Karluk, Port Lions.

The Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge is the primary refuge concerned with the preservation of the habitat of Alaska brown bear. This unique ecosystem—wilderness with an interspersed of salmon spawning grounds—cannot be replaced. Lands subject to reduction are in coastal regions, and past studies have shown that these areas include the most important bear habitat as well as streams providing substantial support to the multi-million-dollar salmon industry of Kodiak. The effects upon these resources would depend upon land uses under the administration of the natives.

You will observe that the villages on Kodiak Refuge are along the shore and presently provide the access route into various parts of the refuge. It is possible that lands patented to villages could block access to refuge lands inland from patented tracts.

Also, future land use patterns of patented lands could have an indirect adverse effect on refuge management. For example, if livestock husbandry were established on patented lands, an immediate incompatible situation would exist between domestic interests and bear.

It is not only the amount of land withdrawn, but, also the subsequent development and use of that land which could have an impact on refuge objectives.

Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Refuge

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Number of villages within refuge---- | 4 |
| Number of villages outside refuge---- | 5 |

Number of townships to be with-
drawn ----- 40
Approximate acres to be with-
drawn ----- 920,000
Approximate acreage subject to pat-
ent ----- 644,000
Percent of refuge subject to patent-- 22

List of villages within the Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Refuge: Chefornak, Nightmute, Chevak, Newtok.

List of villages outside but affecting the range: Hamilton, Kotlik, Toksook, Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay.

The Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Refuge contains some of the finest waterfowl production habitat in North America. Over 83,000 lakes of 23 acres or more in size are located in the refuge, and vast numbers of waterfowl and shore birds nest here. The resulting effects on production of these species would depend on uses by the natives.

NUNIVAK ISLAND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

There is one village on Nunivak Island and the inholding, patented to the village of Mekoryuk, could reduce the refuge area by 92,160 acres. It is our opinion that the reduction would not affect the primary objectives of the refuge.

CAPE NEWENHAM NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE

There are no villages within the refuge, but the villages of Platinum and Goodnews could patent about two townships within the refuge. If these lands are contiguous with lands surrounding the two villages, there will be no significant impact on primary refuge objectives.

KENAI NATIONAL MOOSE RANGE

No villages in this bill are within the Moose Range. Salamtof could patent approximately 6,000 acres of the range but would have little effect if any.

ARTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE RANGE

The village of Kaktovik would be entitled to patent 69,000 acres of the wildlife range and would in itself have no adverse effect. Here again, use of the land will ultimately determine the impact and magnitude that loss of this land would have on the primary refuge objectives.

In accordance with the Wilderness Act of 1964, all of the above refuges and ranges that will be affected by the native claims bill are being studied for wilderness potential. We intend to continue the wilderness studies as scheduled but, of course, any lands ultimately patented by the natives would be excluded from consideration as wilderness.

SUMMARY

In summary, the bill would pose significant reduction in holdings at two major refuges—Kodiak and Clarence Rhode; it would have little effect on five other refuges—Nunivak, Kenai, Cape Newenham, Aleutian Islands, and Arctic. Tuxedni, Izembek, Semidi, Simeanof, Bering Sea, Hazen Bay, St. Lazaria, Hazy Island, and Forrester Island National Wildlife Refuges, to our knowledge, would be unaffected by the bill. While we recognize that certain reductions could occur, we believe that the Administration's proposal to settle the aboriginal claims of the Alaskan natives is fair and equitable for all interests concerned and urge its enactment by the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

NATHANIEL REED,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., September 3, 1971.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DINGELL: Recently you requested that we determine the effect the native land claims bill, H.R. 10367, would have on national wildlife refuges in Alaska.

The acreage which can be patented within national wildlife refuges under H.R. 10367 and H.R. 7432 is the same. H.R. 7432, on which we commented by letter dated June 17, 1971 (copy attached), provides that each native village could select and patent four townships on national wildlife refuges.

H.R. 10367 provides that native villages shall select "the township in which all or a part of the village is located, plus an area equal to three townships, or the maximum acreage to which the village is entitled under Section 11, whichever is less." Since all villages located on refuges have populations in excess of 100, they are limited to 4 townships.

Please let us know if we can provide any further information.

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS BOHLEN,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out in the Secretary's letter, seven refuges would be affected by this legislation. However, I would like to call to the particular attention of the Members of the House two of the refuges mentioned in his letter, the Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge and the Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Refuge. Mr. Speaker, approximately 322,000 acres or 18 percent of the Kodiak Refuge and as much as 644,000 acres or 22 percent of the Clarence Rhode Refuge would be subject to patent under this legislation. Furthermore, it is my understanding that if the most productive waterfowl habitat is selected within the Clarence Rhode Refuge, then such selections could result in a reduction of waterfowl production within the refuge by as much as 50 percent.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, having jurisdiction over wildlife refuges and conservation, I feel compelled to offer amendments to H.R. 10367, which would direct the Secretary of the Interior to take the necessary steps to see that these refuges are given the protection to which they are entitled. Briefly explained, the amendments I plan to offer on the floor of the House would require the Secretary of the Interior, within 15 months after enactment of the legislation, to purchase at fair market value such interests in the selected land within a refuge deemed appropriate to preserve the range or area, or exchange for any selected land within a refuge public land of equal acreage which is withdrawn and not otherwise selected, or choose for inclusion within the refuge system suitable public land which is equal in wildlife habitat value to any lands selected within a refuge. In the alternative, the Secretary would be authorized to take any of the aforementioned combinations deemed appropriate. In the event none of the above actions is deemed adequate, then the Secretary would be required to reserve to the United States such interests in the selected lands as he deems necessary to preserve the refuge values and pay just compensation for any areas reserved. The Secretary of the Interior would be given the first option to purchase any interests in selected lands later disposed of within a refuge.

Mr. Speaker, I will also offer an amendment which would give protection to selections on the islands of Saint George and Saint Paul in order to protect the

sealing operations carried out on these islands pursuant to the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention and the Fur Seal Act of 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point copies of my amendments and a copy of my letter to the Members of the House requesting their support of these amendments:

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10367, AS REPORTED— OFFERED BY MR. DINGELL

Page 18, strike out lines 19 through 22, inclusive.

Page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(3) At such time as all selections have been made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection in each range and area within the National Wildlife Refuge System, the Secretary shall immediately determine the probable impact of each such selection upon the range or area, and shall, after consultation with appropriate Federal agencies including the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and after taking into account all relevant factors, but not later than the close of the 15th month after the month in which this Act is enacted—

(A) purchase at fair market value such interests (including easements) in the selected land as he deems necessary for the preservation of the range or area concerned; or

(B) exchange, for any selected land which in his judgment should be retained in order to preserve the range or area concerned and after consultation with the Native village or Native concerned, public land of equal acreage which is withdrawn under subsection (b) of this section but not otherwise selected under that subsection, and any land received by a Native village or Native in exchange from the Secretary pursuant to this subparagraph shall be deemed to be, in all respects, an authorized selection made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(C) choose for inclusion within the National Wildlife Refuge System within the State of Alaska suitable public land which is equal in wildlife habitat value to all or part of the land selected within the range or area concerned pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection; or

(D) take any such combination of the actions provided for in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) above as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this paragraph; or

(E) in the event any action under subparagraph (A), (B), or (C), or any combination thereof, is not adequate to protect the values for which the range or area was established, (i) reserve to the United States such interests (including easements) in the selected land as he deems necessary for the preservation of the range or area concerned and the patent issued pursuant to section 11 with respect to such land shall be subject to such interests of the United States, and (ii) pay just compensation to the Native village or Native concerned for any interests in land selected by that village or Native which are reserved to the United States under this subparagraph.

(4) Each patent issued pursuant to section 11 with respect to any land selected within a range or area in the National Wildlife Refuge System shall be subject to the condition that in the event the patentee decides to dispose of any interest he has in such land by sale, lease, exchange or otherwise, then—

(A) the Secretary shall be given written notice by the patentee of such intended disposal;

(B) no such disposal may be made of such interest during the 60-day period after the day on which the Secretary receives such notice; and

(C) during such 60-day period, the Secretary shall have the right of first refusal to acquire such interest at fair market value thereof determined as of the date of notice.

Page 19, line 9, strike out "(3)" and insert "(5)".

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 10367 OFFERED BY
MR. DINGELL

Page 19, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(3) At such time as all selections have been made pursuant to this section on St. George and St. Paul Islands, Aleutians, the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate Federal agencies, shall determine if any such selection will adversely affect the sealing operations on such islands pursuant to the Interim Convention on the Conservation of North Pacific Fur Seals, dated February 9, 1957, and the Fur Seal Act of 1966. If the Secretary finds that the conveyance pursuant to section 11 of all or any part of the surface estate of any land selected within St. George Island or St. Paul Island would have such an adverse effect, the Secretary shall purchase at fair market value, or reserve to the United States, such interests (including easements) in the selected land as he deems necessary for the efficient conduct of sealing operations. In the case of any reservation made under the preceding sentence, (i) the patent issued pursuant to section 11 with respect to the land concerned shall be subject to such interests of the United States, and (ii) the Secretary shall pay just compensation to the Native village or Native concerned for any interests in land selected by that village or Native which are so reserved to the United States.

Page 19, line 9, strike out "(3)" and insert "(4)".

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 13, 1971.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: As I am sure you are aware, the Alaska Native Land Claims bill, H.R. 10367, will soon be before the House for a Floor vote. The bill, as reported, will adversely affect national wildlife refuges by allowing native villages to select up to four townships in the refuge in which the village is located, thereby eliminating thousands of acres of valuable wildlife habitat from the refuge system.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, having jurisdiction over wildlife refuges and conservation, I feel compelled to offer amendments to the bill which would extend to these refuges the protection to which they are entitled.

Briefly explained, my amendments would require the Secretary of the Interior, within 15 months after enactment of the legislation, to purchase at fair market value such interests in the selected land within a refuge deemed appropriate to preserve the range or area, or exchange for any selected land within a refuge public land of equal acreage which is withdrawn and not otherwise selected, or choose for inclusion within the refuge system suitable public land which is equal in wildlife habitat value to any lands selected within a refuge. In the alternative, the Secretary would be authorized to take any of the aforementioned combinations deemed appropriate. In the event none of the above actions is deemed adequate, then the Secretary would be required to reserve to the United States such interests in the selected lands as he deems necessary to preserve the refuge values and pay just compensation for any areas reserved. The Secretary of the Interior would be given the first option to purchase any interests in the selected lands later disposed of within a refuge.

I will also offer an amendment which would give protection to selections on the Islands of Saint George and Saint Paul in order to protect the sealing operations carried out on these Islands pursuant to the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention and the Fur Seal Act of 1956.

My amendments have the endorsement and

strong support of all National conservation organizations. I sincerely hope that you will support these amendments. Since there may be a number of follow-up calls from interested individuals and organizations, it would be helpful if you would advise me or my Subcommittee Counsel, Mr. Ned Everett, at your very earliest convenience if you intend to support my amendments. My telephone number is Ext. 54071, and Mr. Everett's is Ext. 56785.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Fisheries
and Wildlife Conservation.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the Members of this distinguished body will assist in preserving these valuable wildlife habitat areas by supporting my amendments.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings I recently held in Minneapolis, Mr. G. Richard Slade, the chairman of the Metropolitan Health Board, discussed the need for building incentives for cooperation into the existing medical-care system. He testified in favor of more consumer activity at the county level. He pointed out that the biggest problem is communication among the various professional and nonprofessional organizations. He favors increasing the cooperation among these groups.

Dr. Recht, a private practitioner connected with the Nicollet Clinic, discussed some of the problems facing private practitioners in our present health-care system. He pointed out that doctors are knowledgeable about the maldistribution problem and the fact that the health delivery system is comprised of many competing systems. However, he urged in his testimony that private practitioners be involved in any changes. He favors a graded form of coverage since it is his belief that not everyone needs first dollar insurance coverage.

Dr. Recht's ideas are interesting and deserve the thoughtful consideration of all those directly concerned with the problem of medical care.

Mr. Steve Rogness, representing the Minnesota Health Association, made a number of suggestions in his testimony. He urged a strong Federal law in redesigning the present delivery system so as to provide strong incentives for health maintenance organizations or other types of group practices. Specifically he proposed that the Federal Government set standards, define the range of services and population served, and take a major role in the funding of these organizations. Second, he declared his support for a moratorium on licensure of health professionals not now covered by State licensure. He favored a national system of licensure as a means to remove barriers for those wanting to practice in various States. As a supplement to this, he urged loan incentives to encourage individuals to go to health

shortage areas. Finally, he came out strongly for the health planning programs established under Public Law 89-749. As has been shown, health planning is receiving a great deal of emphasis throughout the United States as one means to rationalize our present confused system. In general terms, Mr. Rogness came out in favor of strengthening the voluntary sector of the present system and urged the cooperation of all sectors in attempting to reach our goal of health reform.

Dr. L. W. Wattenberg, from the department of pathology at the University of Minnesota, submitted a number of recommendations for improving our present system. Among other suggestions, he came out strongly in favor of preventive medicine. His complete remarks follow.

Mr. Bill McFadzean discussed new ways to treat mental illness. He favors treatment on an outpatient basis. He testified as to the lack of health insurance that includes this kind of coverage and argued persuasively for reforms that would permit expanded coverage. He also indicated his support for efforts to be sure that children are covered under this type of insurance.

Mr. McFadzean also testified as to the need to rethink reasons for committing patients suffering from mental diseases to institutions. He argued against committing patients to hospitals solely on the basis that these facilities have sufficient beds in which to keep patients. He favors a more direct approach with facilities located in the community. In short, he presented a very incisive case for early and local treatment of mental diseases so as to avoid the costly commitment of patients to mental institutions.

Mr. McFadzean requested that, when thinking about mental illness, some thought be given to separating their problems from those of people suffering from physical illnesses.

The remarks of Dr. Wattenberg follow:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF PATHOLOGY,
Minneapolis, Minn.,
February 19, 1971.

Congressman DONALD M. FRASER,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DON: Thank you for the invitation to attend the hearings on health care on February 27th. Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately) it will not be possible for me to be there. In any event my expertise concerning these matters is quite limited. Having thus avoided responsibility for any suggestions, I can make a few with some abandon.

(1) Any plan should assure that the young get first rate medical care. Their diseases are frequently reversible and obviously the rewards are high.

(2) Preventive medicine should receive maximum attention.

(3) The delivery of medical care should not under any circumstances be left to chance. A total overall assessment of the needs for hospitals, clinics and doctors should be made for the entire country (if one does not already exist) including both numbers and distribution. In areas in which inadequate facilities exist they should be built with federal funds. Where a shortage of physicians exists, these should be provided by a series of incentives ranging from income supplement to something equivalent to a medi-

cal draft. This letter may seem somewhat extreme but it is of course being done for the Army and has not inhibited medical school applications. The "draftee" in this instance would receive a prevailing income and also would be acquiring quite valuable experience. His inconvenience would really be quite minimal and in addition, it might be possible, at least in some instances, to arrange specialty supervision and residency credits. Basically what I am saying is that it is necessary first to determine what has to be done and then go ahead and do it.

(4) I think that all existing hospitals and comparable facilities should be brought into a master plan by a series of subsidies so that they are properly distributed and operate at maximum efficiency. At the present time this is quite haphazard at least in some areas.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

L. W. WATTENBERG, M.D.

RETIREMENT OF JOSEPH BISIO OF THE COUNTY STREET MARKET

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, after some 43 years of work, Joe Bisio of the County Street Market in my 16th Congressional District in Massachusetts has decided to enter a somewhat inactive, but not complete retirement, and it is a pleasure for me to extend my warm congratulations on the very fine work that he has done during his many years at his County Street Market. Having worked long and successfully as he has, Joe Bisio richly deserves these golden years of retirement, with the opportunities these coming years will afford, for pleasure, and recreation, and travel, although it seems certain that being active and energetic as he is, Joe Bisio will continue to be only "semiretired" in fact. The vacation he has planned and looked forward to for some time will be a greatly rewarding one for him, and one he has well earned.

The closing of the market, for his many friends, customers, and elected officials who have frequented it, is somewhat regretted. The friendly social exchange it has afforded will be sorely missed.

It is a pleasure for me in offering the story of Joe Bisio's market, to bring to your attention, in doing so, just one example of the many fine business enterprises, deserving of credit, of which we hear so little. I would like to incorporate in my remarks a column which appeared in the Taunton Daily Gazette, October 2, about Joe Bisio, and his plans for the future.

The column follows:

BISIO CLOSING MARKET AFTER 43 YEARS
(By Joe Kenlan)

After 43 years "right in the same old place" Joe Bisio is hanging up his apron but with more optimism than regret.

Monday will be the last day of business at his County Street Market, which he started at the age of 23 and will finish at 66. "Oh, I'm not retiring," he says. "I'm going to start working for Trucchi's Market as soon as I get back from a little vacation."

Bisio will supervise operations at the various stores in the Trucchi chain, owned by his brother-in-law William Trucchi. "I'll travel between the three or four markets (three officially, they're thinking about a fifth but I'm not supposed to say anything about that)."

The third market, almost completed, looms behind Bisio's small store on County St.

"I guess I'll be a little sorry to leave, it won't be so personal anymore," he nods, like a bartender, he says he's learned "to listen to everyone's problems but keep my own mouth shut."

Ask him about politics and his face breaks into a broad grin. "Sure they all come in here, all the polls. They sit around and talk about the problems of the city."

"Let me go back a little," he says, "it all comes from when I served on the council, back in 45, during the war. I won one term but then they made it citywide and I got beat."

"I've been in and out of politics ever since, I was on the Board of Registration for 17 years and I served for a while on the License Board."

"Where are the polls going to go now? Well, I thought I might send them across the street to Big John's Place," he laughs. John's Place is run by former councilman John F. McCarthy.

"I'll start at the beginning," he says, "I came here from Italy, (I was born there, you know) in 1913 and worked at the McGee Furnace Co. for eight years, then I worked at the Keefe Car Works in Sagamore for a year before I opened up the store. I wasn't in this business when I started though, I built this later. The first store was just up the road a little," he says as he points to the gasoline station next door.

"Ever since then I've been right here. My wife has been helping out in the store for 30 years." They were married in the fall of 1928, the same year he opened the store.

"Business has always been good here but you just can't run this kind of store these days unless you're open 18 hours a day, seven days a week and I'm getting a little too old to keep those kind of hours."

"All the old regular customers I've had are dying off," he says somewhat wistfully, "and the younger ones just aren't taking their place. One by one I've watched old friends go."

On the young he says, "You know I've never seen a bad kid in here, oh some of them might be a little flip but I've never had any trouble with any of 'em."

"People here (the Yanks, he smiles, though I was French when I first came over) have always been real good to me and I've tried to be good to them."

And that's not a bad way to run a business.

WPIX SPEAKS OUT ON HEROIN AND THE FRENCH BOYCOTT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, WPIX, winner of the 1970 New York State Broadcasters Association award for the outstanding editorial of the year, recently spoke out on French inaction and failure to stop the processing and transporting of heroin. France is the major source of heroin illegally smuggled into the United States.

Dick Hughes, vice president of WPIX and a longtime warrior against the drug epidemic in New York City, delivered this

hard-hitting editorial on October 6. I am pleased to share it with my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

HEROIN: FRENCH BOYCOTT

There is an old saying that man can get used to anything except hanging by the neck. The narcotic problem in New York proves the point exactly.

If just one rat were to be found in New York which carried Bubonic plague, a national emergency would be declared. No price would be too great. No action which had even a reasonable chance of success would be overlooked.

But the narcotic problem has been with us for years, now, and we appear to have gotten used to it. It doesn't shock us to learn that 1,205 New Yorkers died last year from narcotics-related causes. It doesn't move us to know that 50% of all crime against property in New York is narcotic-inspired. It hardly interests us that thousands upon thousands of our citizens live desperate lives which make drug addiction appear to be a satisfactory solution to their problems.

The federal government has taken important steps such as the agreement with Turkey limiting the Opium poppy crop. But that action won't take effect until 1972, and the 1971 crop can be expected to be involved in the death of another thousand-odd New Yorkers before the agreement is felt on the street.

The federal government says that France is cooperating, but still the vast majority of heroin in New York comes from illicit processing plants in southern France, and we have heard of no raids on those plants.

In the face of this, the Management of WPIX likes the suggestion of Representative Charles Rangel that the American people boycott all products imported from France until the French government puts an end to the flow of drugs from its country to the United States.

Coming from Harlem, as he does, Representative Rangel knows well the catalogue of sorrows which drug abuse is causing, and has been at the forefront of those proposing legislative solutions.

His suggestion has the merit of giving every individual citizen something to do, some protest to make, about this plague which is upon our nation. We think the boycott is a good idea. What's your opinion? We'd like to know.

TWENTY CONGRESSMEN URGE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT TO END VIETNAM WAR

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, 20 of my colleagues and I called a news conference Thursday to announce our support of the Mansfield amendment calling for withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Southeast Asia within 6 months after enactment.

Specifically, we announced we would support the motion—to be offered in the House this week by Congressman WHALEN of Ohio—instructing the House conferees on the military procurement authorization bill to accept the Mansfield amendment.

We called on all Americans anxious to see an end to U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia to contact their Congressmen and urge them to support the Whalen motion.

On March 31 in the Democratic Caucus 100 Democrats voted for a December 31 withdrawal deadline.

On June 17, when the Nedzi-Whalen amendment to the military procurement authorization bill was offered on the floor of the House, 158 Members—135 Democrats and 23 Republicans—voted in favor of it.

On June 28, 176 Members—143 Democrats and 33 Republicans—voted against a motion to table the Whalen amendment to instruct House conferees to agree to the original Mansfield amendment.

So the vote to end our involvement has steadily grown. And with the help of the public—which is overwhelmingly in favor of getting out of Southeast Asia—hopefully next week we will have the necessary number of votes to put the House of Representatives on record in favor of a withdrawal deadline and subsequently in tune at last with the will of a majority of Americans.

The Representatives who joined in the news conference included JAMES ABOWREZEK, BELLA ABZUG, HERMAN BADILLO, JONATHAN BINGHAM, PHILLIP BURTON, JOHN CONYERS, RONALD DELLUMS, ROBERT DRINAN, BOB ECKHARDT, DON EDWARDS, DON FRASER, MICHAEL HARRINGTON, HENRY HELSTOSKI, BOB KASTENMEIER, EDWARD KOCH, ABNER MIKVA, PARREN MITCHELL, BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, WILLIAM F. RYAN, and JOHN SEIBERLING.

Following is a statement I read at the news conference:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN G. DOW

A score of like-minded Congressmen whom we will introduce to you this morning are holding this press conference in order to assert more emphatically our determination to persist early and often in efforts to end the war in Southeast Asia.

Specifically at this moment we want to reassert our support of the Mansfield Amendment in its most recent form calling for termination of United States military operations in Indochina not later than six months after its enactment.

Frankly, six months is not soon enough for most of us. We consider that the Mansfield Amendment is a compromise, but certainly the establishment of a specific date for U.S. military withdrawal would be a major departure from the shamefully vague and indecisive policy that has characterized our operations in the Indochina sphere for so many years.

We will support the motion offered by Congressman Charles W. Whalen, Jr. of Ohio to instruct the House Conferees to accept the Mansfield Amendment. We expect that the instruction to House Conferees will come to the floor early next week, more likely Wednesday than Tuesday.

The present situation in South Vietnam, in our judgment, is not at all hopeful for ending the war.

The bombing continues at a high level and evidently the ground war, too. The only evidence of the war's subsidence is the fact that American ground troops are less often committed to battle than heretofore.

The South Vietnamese election, which some news commentators called a "smashing victory" for President Thieu, was a charade. A smashing victory over what?

An incessant warfare has continued in Laos involving U.S. forces in a large way—involving mercenaries paid by us, and involving enormous commitments of money running into hundreds of millions of dollars. It is a clandestine war carried on by the President without as much as a "by your leave" to the

Congress. If Laos is a side issue, think how great by comparison is our involvement in the main theatre, namely, Vietnam.

We want our constituents and the nation to know that we are not going to slacken for one instant in our pursuit of peace in Vietnam. The high-price economy that engulfs us here cannot be cured until the U.S.A. is out of Vietnam.

Some of the members of this group were lone voices six years ago when the war's escalation commenced. For us it is heartening to have the support now of many new Members of Congress as well as many of our older colleagues who now perceive that the war's continuation must be relentlessly opposed.

We urge all listeners and viewers of this program to surely reach their Congressman over this weekend urging him to vote for the Whalen motion for the House to accept the Mansfield Amendment.

For our part, all of us here at this conference will continue to exert every influence on our colleagues who are not yet with us for an early end to the Indochina war and especially on our leadership here in the House. It is a source of deep regret that the leadership, while it is certainly not averse to a military solution to the war, does not yet go along with the majority of its own Party in the House. That majority was manifest by the 143 Democrats who voted last time for the earlier version of the Mansfield Amendment to end the war.

Our Party leaders and our House leaders should be leading us in this effort. We want them there at the head of the march for peace in Indochina.

CRIME VICTIMIZATION COMPENSATION PASSED IN NEW JERSEY

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the number of persons in this country who are victims of violent crimes is steadily increasing. Not many experiences can be more difficult for an individual and his family than to be a victim of violent crime. Few States offer any financial help to victims.

Last week, my friend and our former colleague, William Cahill, Governor of New Jersey, signed into law a bill providing up to \$10,000 compensation for the victims of violent crimes. I commend the Governor and the New Jersey Legislature for their action.

New Jersey is only the sixth State to begin such a program. California, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts and New York already have functioning programs. I would hope that more States take action to aid victims of crimes.

I insert the article, "Cahill OKs Bill To Help Pay Crime Victims," in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, October 5, 1971, which describes some of the particulars of the New Jersey program, in the RECORD.

The article follows:

CAHILL OKS BILL TO HELP PAY CRIME VICTIMS—3-MEMBER BOARD COULD AWARD \$10,000 FOR DAMAGES

(By Ronald V. Teunis)

TRENTON.—Victims of violent crimes in New Jersey may be compensated up to \$10,000 under a bill signed into law yesterday by Governor Cahill.

The bill, one of the first of its kind in the nation, establishes a three-member board to award damages for medical bills or loss of income as a result of a violent crime.

Covering victims of crimes committed after Nov. 1, the bill appropriates \$250,000, an amount which Cahill said may be increased if necessary.

FIRST TIME FOR STATE

The appropriation covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972.

In signing the bill, Cahill noted "that for the first time in the history of New Jersey, an effort will be made to help the innocent victims of crime, who all too often are left to their own devices to pay hospital and medical expenses."

The bill, sponsored by State Sen. Alfred N. Beadleston (R-Monmouth), allows victims of a kidnapping, assault, rape and lewd or obscene acts to file claims.

COMPENSATION PROCEDURE

In addition, claims can be filed by the dependents of a murder or manslaughter victim.

Under provisions of the new law, the three-member board in determining awards may require examination of the victim by an impartial medical expert.

They also will give consideration to any other compensation received by the victim.

Persons filing claims—they may not live with or be related to the criminal—must do so within one year.

MUST BE REPORTED

Offenses must have been reported to the police within three months.

Governor Cahill, noting that most of the small appropriation goes towards administration expenses and salaries, said he would appoint only two of the board's three members in an effort to stretch funds needed for awards.

MORE BENEFITS FROM SPACE PROGRAM

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, on October 12, a column by Claire Sterling appeared in the Washington Post which once again illustrates the many spin-off benefits of the space program. The ERTS program which is described, will be of immeasurable benefit to the United States and other countries around the world. The article follows:

SEEING THE WHOLE WORLD—REMOTE

SENSING AT 492 MILES UP

(By Claire Sterling)

ROME.—By next March a satellite called ERTS-A will be able to tell us how fast the Sahara is advancing northward and southward along a 4,000-mile front, where underground water is rising toward the surface beneath half a million square miles of Libyan desert, whether to expect shortfalls or bumper crops of grain in the northern or southern hemisphere, where prospectors ought to look for oil or molybdenum, whether potato blight is about to break out in Maine or coconut wilt in Kerala, who is dumping how much mercury into some Yugoslav river or the Gulf of Mexico, which Antarctic icebergs might be towed to California to cool hot water from atomic power plants.

Alas, ERTS-A will not be able to take the temperature of plants coming down with a fever. But ERTS-B will, a year later.

The procedure is known as remote sensing, which it literally is. The sensing will be done

from orbit 492 miles above the earth, with a battery of scatterometers, infra-red scanners, laser profilers, side-looking radar, anti-lurch, shudder and yaw installations, antennae to communicate with earth sensors sending up ground truth, multi-spectral camera windows and Hasselblad cameras.

You don't really need all this to sense remotely. Any bush pilot can do it if he can fly a straight line in a Cessna two-seater, with infra-red Ektachrome film and filters he could buy anywhere. Armies do quite a bit of it too, with more expensive lines of equipment (the U-2 senses very well remotely), and astronauts have inevitably done some in the course of doing other things. But there has never been anything like the earth mission satellite Ert's-A, which is going to sense every corner of the world every 18 days—10,000 square miles in a single instant of time—for a year, with such stunning accuracy that it can learn more than a farmer knows about his own 10-acre field within a 1 per cent margin of error.

This will give the human race its first chance to take an inventory of the planet; what exactly is on it in the way of plants, animals, forests, land, water, minerals, people; what stresses nature, and we, are putting on it.

The project is NASA's and with it the credit for putting Ert's-A's singular talents at the world's disposal. Everybody was invited to submit projects in a dozen fields—forestry, geology, hydrology, geography, cartography, meteorology, climatology, oceanography, demography, environmental quality—for its 350-odd experiments. Thirty-two countries did, and even those who didn't will be free to buy prints of any 10,000 square-mile picture for about \$6.

It is not so much the versatility of this satellite as the harmony of the world it will explore that makes so many simultaneous and often revolutionary experiments possible. All objects on earth with temperatures above absolute zero (-273°C) radiate electromagnetic energy, and receive radiation from their surroundings. All of this shows up somewhere on the electromagnetic spectrum, and can be sensed at enormous distances by laser or radar, or infra-red and panchromatic film.

On an Indian coconut plantation in Kerala, for instance, the crowns of healthy coconut palms show up red on infra-red false color film, jacktrees a brighter red, cashews pink, and some trees that look perfectly all right to the naked eye turn pale on film, meaning they have a virus. There is hardly a limit to what Ert's-A will be able to "see" like this: vigorous and ailing crops anywhere on the globe, moisture in soil, overgrazed land, lost or uncounted people, geological faults or folds suggesting, respectively mineral and fuel deposits, oil slicks on the sea, smoke plumes in the air, pollutants in lakes or rivers. It can even see which rivers can survive pollution better than others; and what it doesn't see it will hear, by radio, from the earth sensors.

If it did nothing but tell countries what they are actually doing with their own land, Ert's-A would be a godsend. No country really knows, though all of them really must. The United States, for instance, simply cannot keep track of changing land use tending, among other things, to form megalopolis such as Bosnywash (Boston, New York, Washington) which will soon be needing three billion gallons of water daily. Yet for all the Americans' technological ingenuity, the federal government took 10 years to prepare a detailed land use map selling for \$100 and hopelessly out of date on publication. Even the U-2, sensing remotely, would need to take a million pictures to do the American job. Ert's-A can do it with 550.

For poor countries who often don't know not only what they're doing, but what they're not doing with their land—what rich soil may lie unused or timber uncut, what water

may be waiting underground to be tapped, what dazzling natural wealth they may be sitting on—Ert's-A is a pearl beyond price.

They are evidently aware of it too, since they are willing to pay. NASA, which has invested \$100 million in Ert's-A and B, is not giving its product away for nothing. The data will be free, but all 32 countries taking part will have to pay for the interpreting, which costs an arm, and make the findings available to NASA. Nobody seems to mind, not even indigent Mali, which hopes to develop the Niger Basin's water resources with Ert's-A's help. Furthermore, when an international workshop was held at Ann Arbor last summer to teach people how to interpret Ert's data, 400 showed up from 53 countries, at their own expense.

Still, there's a limit to how much they can spend. Interpreting is nearly everything where remote sensing is concerned, an art as much as a science. Scientists and managers can be oriented in use of the data in only five weeks, at the University of California. But it takes a year and a lot more money to train a really good interpreter. Scholarships are reportedly on the way, which the FAO hopes to administer and certainly ought to, if only to avoid giving the whole enterprise a too-sticky American label.

TRIBUTE TO BISHOP JOHN J. BOARDMAN

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended the golden jubilee celebration dinner, marking the retirement of one of the most distinguished churchmen in the United States, His Excellency Bishop John J. Boardman. Bishop Boardman was born in Brooklyn in November 1894 and most of his life has centered around the Brooklyn community where he attended St. John the Evangelist Parochial School, St. John's Preparatory School, and St. John's College. Immediately following his graduation from St. John's College, young John Boardman successfully passed the examination for admission to the seminary. With the approval of the Diocesan Chancellor, he was assigned to pursue his theological studies at St. John's Seminary attached to the college from which he had just graduated. On May 21, 1924, John Boardman was in the first class to be ordained by the Most Reverend Thomas E. Molloy, D.D. at that time an Auxiliary to the Bishop of Brooklyn.

Bishop Boardman's priestly assignments included St. Mary, Mother of Jesus, from 1923 to 1931 where he served as curate under Father Theodore King; his first pastorate at St. Anne's in Brentwood from 1931 to 1937; the parish of St. Catherine of Fenoa where he succeeded Msgr. John M. Hilpert until June 1944; the pastorate of Holy Name Parish; and in 1959 he was appointed pastor of Our Lady of Angels where he served until his retirement in 1970.

In the spring of 1937 Bishop Boardman was named as Brooklyn diocesan director of the Propagation of the Faith. He was simultaneously named to direct for the Diocese of Brooklyn the work of the Holy

Childhood Association and served in both capacities for nearly 30 years. Bishop Boardman also served as a contributing columnist on the Tablet, he was elected to membership on the national board of the Propagation of the Faith and also to membership on its finance committee, and became national treasurer of the Propagation of the Faith.

Bishop Boardman made outstanding contributions to the missions, having been elected secretary of the board, of Catholic Medical Missions, launching the Diocesan Cooperative Mission plan and serving on the Bishops' committee for the implementation of the missionary directives of Vatican II.

Pope Pius XII Bishop Boardman Papal Chamberlain with the title of very reverend monsignor and also raised him to domestic prelate with the title of right reverend monsignor. In 1969, he was named by Pope Paul VI as assistant at the papal throne.

Bishop Boardman has conferred the Sacrament of Confirmation on more than a quarter of a million children and adult converts. His work and dedication to his church have been an example and an inspiration to young and old alike. I am deeply honored to have Bishop Boardman as my friend and mentor and wish him every happiness during his golden years.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the challenge of water quality control today envisions massive, almost superhuman feats of engineering—projects are needed not only to sanitize the flow of waste from huge industries, but to purge whole bodies of lakes, rivers, bays, even oceans.

However, as we all know, a large part of the pollution crisis we face today can be overcome through local projects of a much more approachable dimension.

Today, thousands of small towns in the United States still lack elementary or basic sewage disposal systems. They are, regrettably, unwilling but substantial contributors to the raw waste flowing into our rivers, lakes, bays, and coastal waters.

What we cannot lose sight of is the fact that a local sewage disposal system not only prevents the pollution of an area stream, and ultimately of a larger body of water down the line, but it also enhances the living conditions within the community, thereby increasing its chances for future improvement in the development of modern homes and industry.

There is no doubt in my mind that we can and must place increasing emphasis on programs which afford our rural areas the means to develop these vital systems. And, in the rural community facilities program, made available through the Farmers Home Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, we have

such a program. This facilities program provides a means of loan financing, supplemented where necessary by grants, for smaller towns and settled areas of the countryside, to install central water systems and waste disposal systems that have been delayed for lack of any other available source of financing. This program has begun to show its effect in our First Congressional District along the northernmost section of coast, including our beautiful redwood country.

Several projects in the area typify how local communities, working with their Farmers Home Administration county offices, can and have contributed to cleaning up and protecting our rivers.

For a total of \$145,000 in loans, Farmers Home has enabled the towns of Blue Lake and Ferndale, in Humboldt County, to bring inadequate sewer systems up to date. Blue Lake's improved system affords antipollution protection to the Mad River and, at Ferndale, the same protection will be realized for Francis Creek and the Salt River, which are important sources of irrigation water, fine fishing, and natural habitat area for wildlife.

In Sonoma County, a new sewer system for the Occidental community employing \$40,000 in FHA loan and grant assistance, has successfully checked a flow of raw sewage into Dutch Mill Creek.

In another situation, the Windsor community, one of our substantial towns of Sonoma County, has cleared up a serious pollution problem of its domestic water supply—one that would have continued to exist as long as no sewer system was present to check contamination of the drinking water from wells in time of wet weather. Windsor now has both a water system and a sewer system, developed through the rural community program. Loans account for \$635,000 of the \$913,000 in FHA financing.

Administrator James V. Smith of the Farmers Home Administration reports that the nationwide field forces of his agency have identified 30,000 rural communities of the United States still lacking safe and adequate sewer systems, and 31,000 lacking modern central water systems at this late date in the 20th century.

Administrator Smith, State director Douglas Young, and the field forces of Farmers Home are doing a highly commendable job in their work to alleviate this great shortcoming, and we are gratified that President Nixon has taken a lead in doubling the allocation of loan authority available to Farmers Home this year as compared with only 2 years ago. Three hundred million dollars is available to FHA for rural water and sewer loans this fiscal year.

Congress has presently appropriated \$100 million for grants to supplement the loan program, and we urge the Administration to make full use of that authority.

Many more projects such as Blue Lake, Ferndale, Occidental, and Windsor are needed, not only to protect the communities, but to enormously reduce the damage done to the fresh and coastal water of the United States.

Dollar for dollar, no program today is producing faster progress nor better effects in the cause of water pollution control than this FHA program of mod-

est, local projects. I commend Farmers Home most highly for their efforts in this vital field of pollution control.

CORRESPONDENCE TO CHAIRMAN OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE COMMISSION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. JACOBS, Mr. Speaker, I insert the following correspondence between one of my constituents, Mr. Bruce H. Mason and Mr. William J. Casey, Chairman of the Securities Exchange Commission:

G. & M. INVESTMENT CENTER INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., September 17, 1971.

Mr. WILLIAM J. CASEY,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASEY: This letter is directed to you as comment on your proposal to amend Rule 15c3-1 as stated in release number 9288, dated August 13, 1971.

It is also directed to you because of a quote attributed to you in the August 16, 1971 issue of "U.S. News and World Report" which was: "Today just about anybody with \$5,000.00 and a telephone can become a broker-dealer." Curiously, this is almost word for word the same quote attributed to the Chairman of the Board of Merrill Lynch Pierce Fellen & Smith, Inc. some time back in "The Wall Street Journal."

I demand an immediate and public apology for the above statement. One could expect such a remark from one who holds a vested economic position in the industry, but from the purported, unbiased Chairman of the SEC it is unquestionably defamatory, and if not completely misrepresentative of the facts, it certainly is not a full disclosure of the facts.

SEC-NASD-Congressional activity has resulted at last count, I believe, in six financial reports we have been required to file with the SEC and, or NASD since the first of the year, pay a fee to insure each customer of this firm for \$50,000.00, etc., etc. In addition, everybody must pass a regulatory test and fill out applications which disclose past history (under threat of perjury, etc.) of all financial and, or public past activities, etc., etc. This as you know, or should know, is just a partial disclosure of the requirements to get into and stay in this business in addition to the financial requirements.

You and the Chairman of Merrill Lynch are simply continuing a distortion perpetrated on the public by the SEC-NASD-New York Stock Exchange complex which is that the greater the net capital the greater is the safety to the public. Nothing is more false and I challenge you to publicly debate the question. Your failure to either publicly apologize or to confront me in a public debate on the subject is a reflection on your own moral integrity.

The real atrocity here is, in the view of the performance of many large net capital firms for the last two years, the never ceasing SEC-NASD attack on the small broker-dealer should again revert to net capital as the target.

It would seem patently obvious that one Goodbody bankruptcy dwarfs the potential danger to the public, if all firms with net capital less than \$25,000.00 were to go to the wall simultaneously. If you won't accept that, how about all the NY Stock Exchange firms that went bankrupt over the last few years versus those firms less the \$25,000.00 net capital both deceased and surviving?

Your proposal devotes only a brief justification for the elimination of all firms with less than \$25,000.00 net capital. Wouldn't it be morally and ethically honest to publicly state what percentage of firms with less than \$25,000.00 net capital had "liquidation proceedings or were adjudged bankrupt" versus those that "survived," and of those that were problems how many were in business prior to 1966? How do these percentages compare with the percentages of those firms, the ones who for the present, are to be allowed to stay in business because their net capital exceeds \$25,000.00?

This whole affair is sickeningly familiar to the Commission's previous 1965 promulgation of minimum net capital requirements. If those weren't enough, why will these be sufficient? It would seem very probable that you will be back again, and the likely end result will be a handful of \$100,000.00 plus net capital firms, all members of a single national stock exchange.

If, Mr. Casey, there is the remotest chance you are still with me, and if you and the rest of the Commission are only interested in protecting the public and not eliminating the small broker, then here is the way you can do it and simplify enforcement at the same time!

Exempt from minimum net capital requirements and the 20-1 rule too, any broker-dealer who does business in the following manner:

Hypothecates none of the public's securities or cash in any way. In no other way may he use the public's money. Holds securities for customers for safe-keeping only if they are already registered in the customers name. Holds no negotiable securities or "street name" securities except in transit for delivery or transfer. Doesn't sell short, long, puts or calls, nor use margin accounts for his own portfolio, or as principle if it in any way involves the customer's money or securities. Doesn't make a market in any stock. Sells and buys for the public as agent only. (Mutual funds and municipal bond funds are principal transactions in theory only.)

Makes no free deliveries or shipments, and segregates the public's monies until deliveries are made by bank-draft. Here there should be an exception so that the very small investor is not penalized and that is, a broker would be allowed \$1,000.00, or some such figure justified by his net capital, to be in free delivery and, or shipment at any other time.

I have in the past challenged both staff members of the SEC and the NASD to show how the public is endangered if a firm operates as above. They have agreed there are only two ways. One is a bad trade, but the public is the cause of the bad trade; I've got a problem with another broker, not the public. The other is by fraud and conversion. Mr. Casey, net capital is no protection against fraud and conversion, and I believe you know it.

This firm has been registered with the SEC since December 1962. I've been licensed as a securities salesman since February 1959. At no time has this firm had any problem with the SEC-NASD or Indiana Securities Commission. The same applies to me as an individual. We've never even had a customer complaint.

Once when I was complaining to a NASD staff member about double-standards in their enforcement, he said there was no basis for my complaint because Merrill Lynch was fined more a month (I think he said a week) by the NASD than my entire Net Capital.

Once in 1965 and again in 1967 the SEC denied me exemption from the minimum net capital rule, although the rule states exemptions are permissible, and staff members admitted to me orally that the public's money would not be endangered if the exemptions, as requested, had been allowed.

Mr. Casey, perhaps you and Merrill Lynch

can see the public endangered by this firm being allowed to continue in business under the above basis. I cannot! If you can, then show me!

Mr. Casey, one more personal comment, please. It is my sincere hope that you will not take personal affront to this letter. I have long been a personal admirer of your career, and subscriber to your publications. Very simply, this proposed amendment forces me to fight for my life. I cannot do that confined to the language of a Harvard lawyer submitting a diplomatic brief for the State Department.

Very sincerely yours,
BRUCE H. MASON,
President.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1971.
MR. BRUCE H. MASON,
President, G&M Investment Center, Inc.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

DEAR MR. MASON: I appreciate your comments on our proposal to amend Rule 15c3-1 and I can assure you that your views are going to receive my fullest consideration prior to any final action by the Commission in this matter.

I regret that my statement in the August 16 issue of U.S. News & World Report was interpreted as showing bias against small broker-dealers and I apologize for this. I am fully aware of the importance of the small-broker-dealer to the market place and I am firmly convinced that the Commission has and will continue to recognize the necessity for their continued existence as we perform our regulatory responsibilities.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM J. CASEY,
Chairman.

A. CARTER MYERS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

MR. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, east Tennessee has lost an outstanding citizen, A. Carter Myers, a man who gave moral and material support to his community throughout his life. I would like to pay tribute to his memory by inserting in the RECORD the following statement from the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel of September 30:

A. CARTER MYERS

Many people will remember and revere A. Carter Myers as the guiding hand for many years of the Tennessee Valley A&I Fair, and the horse show facility at Chilhowee Park which bears his name will perpetuate that memory. But there was so much more that Carter Myers did and embraced, mostly in the agriculture and farming world, and in Community Improvement projects, that he became a legend in East Tennessee.

Born on a farm, with a probing spirit that led him throughout his life to fields of agricultural research and perfection, from Future Farmers and 4-H Club leadership to Master Farmer, and from livestock judging and Ag Club engrossment to burley and fertilizer refinement and marketing, Carter Myers forged constantly ahead to make farming and agriculture the scientific blessing it is today. His interests in agriculture were as great as the range of agriculture itself, and his vitality thrived with the years. He was also a valued director of Park National Bank, the Nashville branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, and had been a director of Robinson Supply Co. and

of Bradley Supply Co., both of Cleveland; was a past trustee of Second Presbyterian Church and was active in other civic and urban as well as rural organizations.

East Tennessee is particularly fortunate in its heritage of Carter Myers' pioneering spirit and insatiable drive, but agriculture the country over is better because of him. He leaves a life of accomplishment for which we all are thankful.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BANK PROPOSAL

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress consider the urgent need for redirecting a portion of the Nation's resources to put them to work more effectively for our nonmetropolitan areas, I have found encouraging some of the efforts these areas are making in their own behalf. Many of the steps that have been taken in sparsely populated States and small towns and counties have been in response to the establishment of Federal programs. Others are the result of innovation and courage on the part of the residents themselves.

There are two most important conclusions which may be drawn from these efforts. The first is that our people want to be able to choose to continue to live where they are and make it possible for their youth to have that choice. So, with the very slim resources available to them, they are trying to keep their economies vigorous or to revitalize them. The second is that even though they have learned through bitter experience that many of the existing Federal programs are not realistically geared to their use, they are making an effort to comply with participation requirements.

These areas have demonstrated good faith; that they are willing to do their part. I would hope that we in Congress can devise the programs which we must have to help them and our Nation accomplish its goals of making it possible for our people to live a satisfying, meaningful life in the place of their choice.

During the community development hearing I conducted in Brinkley, Ark., on August 30, William S. Bonner, chairman of the city planning division of the University of Arkansas, and Bertram F. Wakeley, assistant director for State planning and program development of the Arkansas Department of Planning, presented testimony relating to the needs of nonmetropolitan areas and to the work which is being done in Arkansas.

I believe my colleagues will find what they had to say of interest:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM S. BONNER

Congressman Alexander, I am William S. Bonner, Professor and Chairman of the City Planning Division, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville. I am a member of the Board of Governors, American Institute of Planners and a Member of the Board of Directors of the Community Development Society of America. I would like to thank you for the opportunity to appear and present some

views that are pertinent to rural development here in Arkansas.

FACTORS INHIBITING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Arkansas is basically a rural or nonmetropolitan State. We have two Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas wholly within the State and share three others with adjacent states. When we speak of these metropolitan areas we are referring to areas with central cities of 50,000 or more population, their counties and those adjacent that are socially and economically tied to the central city. Seven of the State's 75 counties are part of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas—the remaining 68 counties of relatively dispersed population make up nonmetropolitan Arkansas. When we speak of nonmetropolitan areas, we are speaking of urban places with less than 50,000 population, a network of smaller communities, and the individual living units dispersed over the countryside.

There are a number of factors that affect the development of the State. One is certainly its dispersed population and the relatively small number of larger urban centers. In 1970, Arkansas had only five cities with over 35,000 population and four of these were in the metropolitan areas. Of the 432 incorporations in the State, 362 were under 2,500 population—thus the incorporations of Arkansas are predominantly small communities which the U.S. Census depict as nonurban places.

One must recognize that individualism is still a strong characteristic of much of the State's population. There is still a strong belief that the application of the police power to control use and development of land unduly limits one's freedom. There are many who live in small communities and the rural countryside to escape not only the more crowded environment but also the formalized controls and higher taxes found in larger urban centers. Many of these individuals look upon governmental planning and development as a threat to their way of living and thus may oppose any governmental effort to influence community development.

A third factor in community development is a generally low level of financial resources due to millage limitations for general and special purposes. This lack of resources results in a low level of community facilities and services.

Another factor in fostering interest in community development is that many do not see that their community will be the one that will be recipient of a major industry and thus experience substantial growth.

The organization and structure of Arkansas political institutions have not changed significantly since the adoption of the 1872 constitution to compensate for the technology explosion which puts our rural populations at a relative disadvantage in terms of either responding or reacting to their best potentials for social and economic development or to initiatives taken by State and Federal governments. Our smaller and more dispersed communities are today far less "masters of their fate" than the larger metropolitan centers as Little Rock, Pine Bluff, and Fort Smith. In particular, State law as it stands now does not provide adequate authority for elected county governments to organize and effectively control needed public development programs.

DIFFERENTIAL INDUCEMENTS FOR NON-METROPOLITAN AREAS

In discussing differential inducements, it is assumed that there is a desire to retain in nonmetropolitan America the natural increase in its population and not export it to metropolitan America.

Considering the need of raising income in rural areas and small communities, in my recent statement before the House Agriculture Committee, I pointed out that most differential inducements to industries are made by localities under State legislation. Should

all States make the same differential inducements available to their localities, the total result is the same as no inducement at all. In fact, the locality is the loser for the subsidy granted to the industry. State legislation for industrial inducement has not been a very effective development tool in terms of favoring areas of disparity. Within a State, the large city has the same inducement available as the small city.

It would appear that if we are serious about differential inducement and if we desire to encourage industry to locate in non-metropolitan areas then we must have a national policy to accomplish this. One such inducement might be a low discount rate on investment or operating capital by the Federal Reserve Board for industries that locate in designated districts of nonmetropolitan areas. If an industry is considering Little Rock and Brinkley as locations—the discount rate could be the factor to tip the scale in favor of Brinkley.

The point here is that if there is to be a national policy that seeks a favorable differential in economic opportunity for non-metropolitan America, then this must be reflected in the incentive programs. Increasing industry and industrial employment in Little Rock, Pine Bluff, Texarkana and Fort Smith will certainly be beneficial to those areas but will not help employment opportunities in any substantial manner for the remaining 68 nonmetropolitan counties in the State. In fact, a policy that aids metropolitan areas economically may in the long run require that the resources concentrated in those metropolitan counties be utilized to subsidize to an ever increasing extent the services of those who still reside in the non-metropolitan counties.

The location of a major employing industry in Marked Tree (pop. 3,216) will have a profound effect not only on Marked Tree but also on the cities of Lepanto and Tyrone and the communities of Black Oak, Payne, Judd Hill and Spear Lake. Even larger communities not too distant removed as Harrisburg and Trumann will feel the economic impact. What is suggested is that major employing industries located in the smaller urban centers will have a ripple effect in the economy of the area. The smaller communities and the rural areas provide the bedrooms for the employing centers.

I am also suggesting that if there is to be differential inducement for achieving desired development location decisions we should use, for administrative purposes, the metropolitan-nonmetropolitan dichotomy as the basis for development distinctions.

With such a dichotomy, it would then be possible to better plan for the future development of nonmetropolitan America and to assign the necessary resources to accomplish the job—not simply to redress the apparent imbalance in economic opportunity which has severely diminished individual citizen's choice in terms of place and style of life, but to provide for the nations metropolitan communities what they themselves cannot achieve alone—a respite from the constant influx of nonurban oriented people, to a degree which may allow the metropolitan communities to catch-up on the solution of the many, and severe, problems which past migration has accumulated.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth" indicated that there is need for more adequate social data and techniques of measuring social costs and benefits in living in our urban and rural areas. Such information will be of particular importance to decision makers, who are responsible for the allocation of scarce human and economic resources.

The methods of measuring effectiveness of planning programs (e.g. cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness) are quite complex and require

a substantial outlay of manpower, time, and money. A cost-effectiveness analysis involves two types of evaluation. One is cost analysis, which involves the delineation of all major system components. For example, in terms of nonmetropolitan industrial development, this would mean the identification of such factors as manpower and training, space requirements, capital cost parameters, materials, transportation and shipping, and power needs. The other type of evaluation is effectiveness analysis, which requires the development of criteria, based upon multiple considerations, by which effectiveness can be gauged. For example, in evaluating several industrial location alternatives, a multiple consideration set would include such things as employment cycle, number of jobs, wage scales, environmental quality control, contributions to tax base and availability of civic services such as police and fire protection. The results of cost-effectiveness analysis, generally expressed in terms of dollars, show which of several possible alternatives is most effective in relation to cost.

The evaluation of planning effectiveness in the nonmetropolitan areas of Arkansas and America would involve new research and development program efforts to establish effectiveness criteria. Effectiveness questions to be answered would include: What is the level of citizen satisfaction with planning programs? What is the value of new or expanding industries to the nonmetropolitan area? What are the most effective methods of capital-facilities budgeting? The effectiveness measurement approach, developed as part of the decision-making process, could contribute toward the minimization of possible negative impacts of development and change in nonmetropolitan environments.

It is recognized that we cannot await the results of such studies in making decisions. On the other hand, to delay initiation of such studies will only prolong development of effective programs to accomplish a national policy.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS

In Arkansas, the eight planning and development districts can be looked upon as the State's initial effort to overcome the disparities and disadvantages being experienced by local governments and populations in nonmetropolitan areas. The districts were established under provisions of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. In 1969, the Arkansas General Assembly made the districts multi-purpose by adoption of Act 118 and appropriated State funds for district operations on a dollar for dollar matching basis.

The disparities the districts are attempting to overcome are many including inadequate health services, education, community services and facilities and lack of job opportunities. The districts are seeking every possible means and resource to overcome these disparities. In addition, the districts are offering communities the "on call" services of qualified specialists. This does not mean that districts have or will have on their staffs all the expertise needed to solve both areawide and local problems. Rather, the districts seek to coordinate the use of the expertise available from other agencies.

Personnel working at the district level are in position to assist local communities seek aid for their needs and to argue the case for support of local needs with State and Federal agencies. The districts represent the major communication link between State and local governments.

There is considerable cost in maintaining district planning and development organizations. This cost may be justified by the fact that most contemporary problems transcend political boundaries, by the lack of professional and technical expertise otherwise unavailable in individual local communities, and by the lack of political "clout" of individual units of government.

The presence of district organizations may also be justified if they can improve the public's use of Federal, State, and local resources and programs to expedite solution to local problems and if they can provide supplemental expertise, lacking at local levels, for making more effective and efficient government and private developmental decisions on operations and management.

DISTRICT ROLES

A district organization may be viewed as having three distinct roles—catalytic, stimulative and service.

A district's catalytic role creates or intensifies cooperative action among area members—including local units of government. For example it provides for the assemblage of information necessary to identify, to analyze and solve problems of common concern to area residents. Some of these concerns may be economic well-being, transportation, health services, solid waste disposal, fire protection and the like. The strength of district planning and development organizations lie in the ability to provide a strategy forum for articulating programs that identify priorities for public and private development.

The district's stimulative role is in response to the need for developing and strengthening professional and technical expertise to help local governments and private enterprise in more effective application of up-to-date decision-making processes.

The service concept of district planning is built on the idea of utilization of professional and technical competence to supplement or to fill the voids found at the local level.

District planning requires active support and positive implementing action by Federal, State and local governments.

The Arkansas Department of Planning looks upon the district as one means of achieving the State's goals and objectives.

The University's City Planning Division has been assisting the Arkansas Department of Planning with the program design and annual work programs for the districts. In addition, the City Planning Division is undertaking a study of areawide and local planning roles and functions, which study may prove useful in developing new programs and approaches to nonmetropolitan development in Arkansas.

The district provides a mechanism both directly responsive to the needs and the will of the people and capable of concern and involvement with all aspects of community development that will help make possible the availability of economic opportunity and provide the attractiveness of living conditions in the rural areas of this State and of this nation.

STATEMENT BY BERTRAM F. WAKELEY

I appreciate the opportunity to present to you, Congressman Alexander, some aspects that concern, or are directly related to, the problems and ideas necessitating the Community Development Bank Proposal.

First, allow me to quote some excerpts of the presentation made by Governor Dale Bumpers to the President's Commission on Population Growth and the American Future at hearings in Little Rock on June 8, 1971. "In Arkansas we have achieved the sought after objective of relative population stability without the costs of heavy environmental pollution or over crowding." Further, this administration is . . . "committed to a policy of providing top quality services for the citizens of Arkansas."

Concerning future development, the Governor stated, "We do not intend to consciously promote a policy of undisciplined growth for growth's sake. But, we are in critical need of additional resources to enhance the standard of living of our citizens and the quality of life in our communities across the State."

Second, let's look at some major problems facing Arkansas:

1. **Jobs:** Sixteen percent of our total labor force is underemployed. The average family income in Arkansas is still only two-thirds of that of the rest of the nation. We have set a goal of 20,000 new jobs for Arkansas residents during the 1970's, to be created through a cooperative effort between government and the business community. The basic problem here is that the location of people is determined by the location of jobs. Thus, the major emphasis is on putting jobs in the right places.

2. **Education:** As of 1967, 11.9 percent of the State's population 25 years of age and over had less than a fifth grade education. 14.8 percent had less than an eighth grade education. Our public school teachers are 49th in the nation in terms of annual pay, receiving an average of only \$8,841 per year.

3. **Health:** Availability of health services is most equitable. In our medical centers we possess the finest skills, facilities and equipment available. However, in many of our rural areas, we not only lack doctors and other health personnel, but even the means of transporting the sick and injured to adequate service. Since one-half of the State's population is rural, this problem is especially critical.

4. **Highways:** Our transportation system does not serve the people of the State equitably. Traffic counts are the criterion most often used to justify four-lane roads, and consequently, Arkansas has an expressway system crossing the State from northeast to southwest, and east to west, leaving vast areas of north and south Arkansas inadequately served. Arkansas is in critical need of a system of developmental highways designed to open areas of the State that are relatively isolated.

I could continue, but all I want to do is get across the point that the major problems have been identified. The time is ripe for planning (such as you are doing through this Hearing process) and for action.

The State has goals in many areas, but you are mainly interested in the economic development activities. Before listing some of these, let me emphasize that they are State-wide in conception and for application purposes. We don't believe it has to be necessary for a person to move to find work. He should be given some choice.

1. To prepare a statewide plan for the balanced development of agriculture and our natural resources with special attention given to sound conservation and resources rehabilitation practices.

2. To promote the development of new industrial and commercial enterprise and encourage its location so as to: (1) maintain and protect the natural resources and amenities of the community; and (2) maximize utilization of the resident labor supply.

3. To expand the statewide system of employment and job counseling centers.

4. To sponsor, promote and develop suitable employment opportunities for the employable people of the state.

Let's step back a minute and agree that there is no such thing as a Federal or State program. Once money is given to a local government to be used with local funds to build, construct, alter, or otherwise cause change which will perpetually affect local citizens—then it becomes a local program. Looking at this from the local level these are tremendous problems.

1. Over 1300 Federal Domestic Programs—several State programs (mainly supported by Federal funds)—some are broad while some are very restrictive in use.

2. All, however, have red tape, varying matching ratios or eligibility formulas (which are often inequitable to small, less wealthy local governments.)

3. Many available programs are "too expensive" for local governments in Arkansas (ex.—the State turned back over four million dollars in matchable funds to the Environmental Protection Agency because of the close 50-50 matching ratio required for E.P.A. Title VIII facilities grants).

4. Arkansas State Government presently offers extremely limited assistance to local government for meeting their needs. (The Department of Planning has been charged with changing this unfortunate situation).

On the positive side, there is, in Arkansas, a willingness to take affirmative action on the local, regional, and State levels. This appears to be true of both the public and private sectors of the economy.

The Department of Planning is doing everything possible to support any and all affirmative action that will solve local problems, assist the State to meet its goals, and insure that the Governor's policies are carried out. The Department does not have an "ivory tower" approach. Planning can no longer be thick volumes that sit on the shelf gathering dust.

Planning must be those actions necessary to keep problems from occurring and, when necessary, solve existing problems.

Within this context, I believe that the Community Development Bank proposal is an action that is both beneficial to Arkansas and necessary to overcome several of the serious problems facing local governments in guiding and causing their own growth and development. If the Department can be of any assistance to you in this effort, we would be pleased to supply it.

This is the third insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other material which I have gathered during my search for ways to assist community development in areas of low population. Other material on this subject appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22, pages 32740-32741, October 1, pages 34505-34506 and October 6, pages 35409-35410.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. FRASER. We pay tribute today to the memory of one of history's greatest men, one of Italy's proudest sons, Christopher Columbus. Although Columbus never reached the shores of our own country on his voyages of discovery, his life is a precious symbol to all Americans. His insatiable curiosity to find out, to know; his unshakable faith and courage; and his indomitable will—these are elements of the spirit shared by all who have participated in the building of America.

These are the qualities, too, brought to the United States by the countrymen of Columbus, the Americans of Italian descent, whose sufferings and accomplishments are woven into the fabric of our national life. It is appropriate on Columbus Day that we note the achievements of Italian-Americans.

In their early days in this country, Italian-Americans performed backbreaking toil in heavy industry, as laborers and skilled craftsmen. But through their

loyalty to each other and to their families, through their native intelligence, and their unflagging aspiration, it was not very long before their children became doctors, teachers, judges, legislators, and businessmen. Their achievements are not surpassed by any other group. Their patriotic performance in the defense of our Nation stands as an example to all our citizens.

The legacy of the pioneer spirit, and the blending on the new continent of contributions of peoples from every land, are parts of the unique heritage of America. The tremendous achievements of Christopher Columbus is symbolic of that heritage. May we hope for ourselves and our children that Americans will always keep the spirit of Columbus in their hearts and his vision of a New World before them.

GREEK POLITICAL SITUATION EXPLORED

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention here once again the outrageous political situation which continues in Greece. "The Greek Colonel's Friend," by Evans and Novak which appeared in the Washington Post last September 19 is certainly worth the consideration of all Members interested in American involvement with the Greek dictatorship. The result of American support for this government—the overt antidemocratic and outright fascist nature of the present Greek regime—is further outlined in "Greece: Myths and Facts," prepared by the U.S. Committee for Democracy in Greece and I highly commend both articles to my colleagues:

THE GREEK COLONELS' FRIEND

A confidential memorandum now under avid scrutiny by a House Foreign Affairs subcommittee is certain to lead to a formal summons for testimony by Thomas A. Pappas, the mysterious, rich Greek-American who operates a multi-million dollar industrial empire in Athens and has intimate ties to both the Greek military dictatorship and the Nixon administration.

Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.), chairman of the Foreign Affairs subcommittee on Europe, specifically solicited the memorandum during his hearings on military aid to Greece in July. It raises grave questions about Pappas' role as confidant of President Nixon and as defender of the dictatorship. It is causing extreme nervousness in the Nixon White House.

Holding both U.S. and Greek citizenship, Republican Pappas and his more obscure brother, John, a Boston Democrat, are charged in the memorandum as follows: "They used their considerable political and economic clout in the U.S. to promote, simultaneously, their own financial interests as well as the interests of a ruthless military dictatorship—and all this at the expense of long-range U.S. interests in that crucial part of the world."

Author of the memorandum is Elias Demetracopoulos, a Greek exile leader. His central thesis is that Thomas Pappas used

his "strong connections" with both Republican and Democratic party officials here to obtain rich economic concessions from various Greek governments.

As partner, in a highly unusual relationship, of Standard Oil of New Jersey, Pappas consistently exploited his political connections in Washington to undermine the pre-junta Center Union parliamentary government of George Papandreu and gain more profitable economic arrangements, Demetracopoulos' memorandum states. Then, when parliamentary government was obliterated in the April, 1967, coup by the Greek colonels, Pappas became the junta's prime champion in Washington.

"It appears that on the basis of the public record alone," Demetracopoulos said, "Thomas Pappas and his brother became 'public relations men' for the junta at the highest levels of the Johnson and later the Nixon administration, as well as in Congress."

Ex-newspaperman Demetracopoulos quotes from an interview he taped with former Democratic Speaker of the House John W. McCormack on Aug. 9, 1966 (an interview arranged by McCormack's aide, Dr. Martin Swig, a Pappas intimate now in jail for perjury): "The contribution made by the Esso-Pappas complex under the leadership of my very dear friend Tom Pappas," McCormack said, "I know is of inestimable value to not only the people of Greece, not only of today, but in the years that lie ahead."

But Pappas' power to sway leading Democrats is a mere shadow of his persuasive influence on the Nixon administration. As an executive vice chairman of the Republican Finance Committee and a large contributor to Mr. Nixon's 1968 campaign, says Demetracopoulos, Pappas' "frequent, well-photographed warm public embraces" with Prime Minister George Papadopoulos and Vice President Stylianos Patakos convey only one message—that the dictatorship has the Nixon administration's secret blessing.

Far more significant, Pappas was the unofficial host of Mr. Nixon's brother, F. Donald Nixon, when he went to Athens in 1970 to arrange motel and restaurant concessions for the Marriott Corp. Pappas gave a dinner for Nixon attended by Patakos. At the time, the U.S. government was withholding military aid with the stated aim of forcing the dictatorship to lift martial law, release political prisoners and hold elections.

When Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans visited Greece early in 1971, he allowed Pappas to wine and dine him on a luxury yacht along with Greek Trade Minister Spyridou Zappas, U.S. Ambassador Henry Tasca and bigwigs in the junta.

Says Demetracopoulos: "The true Pappas influence in the various agencies responsible for U.S. policy in Greece may never be fully known, since by its nature the exercising of influence of this type is a clandestine matter."

That's what Rosenthal and his investigators of administration policy toward the dictatorship want to know more about. They want to put Pappas on the stand under oath.

GREECE—MYTHS AND FACTS

The myth—"Most importantly the Greek Government announced that in accordance with a specific timetable, to which it has thus far carefully adhered, the institutional structure of a democracy prerequisite to elections will be in place by the end of this year. This timetable is a public commitment on the part of the Greek Government. . . . Greece can be helped by sympathetic understanding rather than by censure." *Defense Department memorandum introduced by Senator Strom Thurmond in the debate on the Hartke Amendment, June 1970.*

The fact—"Certain conditions must be created before we can think of elections."

"What are they?"

"I cannot and will not say anything to you now about the political plans of the government." *Interview with Vice-Premier Stylianos Patakos in Der Spiegel, Oct. 5 1970.*

"We are not yet ready for responsible citizenship. When this has been achieved, and only then will be able to proceed to a broader application of the Constitution. And until those conditions have been achieved, however long it may take, let those who clamor for elections not hope that we will endanger all we have achieved in order to satisfy them." *Speech of Premier George Papadopoulos at Salonika, August 28, 1971.*

The myth—"From a high of over 6,000 in 1967, there are now approximately 300 political prisoners. The Prime Minister has pledged to free all remaining political detainees by the end of April 1971 if security conditions permit." *State Department leaflet "Greece: U.S. Policy," January 1971.*

"As of April 10, 1971, all persons described as 'political prisoners' have been released." *Letter of Greek Ambassador Basil Vitsaxis in New York Times, July 5, 1971.*

The fact—"In January 1971 there were still some 350 prisoners who had been held in concentration camps without any charges since the day of the colonels' coup, April 21, 1967. It was these prisoners who were released in April. (The junta announced that 50 of the last 200 freed were being sent to forced residence in remote islands or villages. No announcement was made on the number of those released earlier who were similarly confined, but this does not mean that none were. The total of those in forced residence, including a number of Center Union members of Parliament and royalist officers previously held, is probably at least 150.) In addition, hundreds of persons convicted of political crimes by courts-martial are still locked in Greek prisons; junta sources put the number at 450, while other estimates are two or three times as high.

Other hundreds—how many we do not know, since many arrests are not announced—are in prison "under investigation," some for many months, pending trial. Of about 200 persons arrested in Athens alone in the last two months of 1970, less than a fourth had been released or brought to trial by the end of July 1971. It is these prisoners who are the victims of systematic torture. One of those held since Christmas 1970 without trial is Christos Sartzetakis, the original of the incorruptible judge in "Z"; he has been badly tortured.

For still others, Greece itself has become a prison. The junta has denied passports—sometimes in defiance of court decisions—to many Greeks because of their political views.

The myth—"Withholding military or economic assistance is an ineffective tactic in persuading foreign governments to move in directions we consider desirable. . . . Responsible Greek opposition leaders have told us that as Greeks, they would resent this form of pressure." *Testimony of Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Roger P. Davies, House of Representatives Subcommittee on Europe, July 12, 1971.*

The fact—"The dictatorial regime which has been in power since 1967 has exploited the military assistance granted by the United States of America to oppress the Greek people, to violate human rights, and to trample underfoot the principles upon which the Atlantic Alliance, the European Union, and the Common Market are based. . . . The expression of solidarity amongst free peoples of whatever nationality towards each other does not constitute intervention in the internal affairs of a country. The frontiers of freedom are beyond the territorial powers of the various countries. The stand taken by the representatives of the American people that military aid should be linked to the restora-

tion of free institutions in our country is not even technically an intervention in the internal affairs of Greece, but is the exercise of their mission as defined by their constitution." *Message to the House of Representatives from Panayotis Kanellopoulos, last legitimate Premier of Greece and leader of the conservative National Radical Union; George Mavros, former minister and spokesman for the Center Union within Greece; John Zigdis, former minister at present in prison for urging the replacement of the junta by a government of national union; and Dimitrios Papaspyrou, last President of Parliament.*

The myth—"We in the United States Government, particularly in American business, greatly appreciate the welcome that is given here to American companies and the sense of security that the Government of Greece is imparting to them. . . . Given the continued economic stability and given the continued political stability, there is no limit to the growth that can take place in Greece." *Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans in Athens, April 23, 1971.*

The fact—"There has been no new major American investment in Greece since the coup; American businessmen realize that any investments in the junta's Greece are risky in the extreme. Thus Litton Industries, which had contracted to secure investments of about \$850 million for the junta, was able to find less than 1 percent of that amount and had to drop its contract. Similarly the much heralded \$600 million investment agreement with Aristotle Onassis has now foundered on his inability to get American concerns to put up the money.

The myth—"Greece's economic progress over the past few years has placed her in the forefront of rapidly developing nations." *Secretary Stans in Athens, April 23, 1971.*

The fact—"According to Greek official figures, industrial production in the four years after the coup grew at only about 70 percent of the rate of the four years preceding the coup. In four years the junta ran up a cumulative balance of payments deficit of some one-and-a-third billion dollars. It used up Greece's reserves and acquired several hundred million dollars in debts, including about \$300 million due within a year. For the first five months of 1971 the deficit was a record \$236.3 million; for the year it may reach \$700 million. This is probably one reason why, in August, Premier Papadopoulos fired all the ministers in charge of the various aspects of the economy.

The myth—"Greece is an important NATO ally and has consistently and loyally honored its treaty obligations." *Testimony of Roger Davies, July 12, 1971.*

The fact—"The Parties to this Treaty . . . are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." *Preamble of NATO Treaty.*

"Greece is to all intents and purposes a police state." *Resolution of the NATO Assembly, adopted 46 to 3, on October 20, 1969.*

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, U.S. NAVY

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on October 13, 1775, the Continental Congress, with John Adams leading, first authorized American naval ships.

Happy birthday, U.S. Navy.

THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY SYSTEM: SOME OBSERVATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, regents professor emeritus at the University of Minnesota, Dr. Maurice B. Visscher, called to my attention an article which appeared in the September 24, 1971, issue of Science.

Dr. Visscher, a nationally known and respected physiologist, feels that Martin L. Perl, author of "The Scientific Advisory System: Some Observations" makes some pertinent points and I agree. Dr. Visscher carefully marked for my attention the following paragraph which contrasts the science advice received by the Congress with that received by the executive department:

On the other hand, very little scientific advice is given to Congress. Some technical information and advice is obtained through panels or committees attached to congressional legislative committees, and a few individual congressmen, particularly senators, receive some unofficial advice and information. Finally, the Science Policy Research Division and the Environmental Policy Division of the Legislative Reference Service provide reports and summaries on technical questions. But the total amount of scientific and technical information and advice given to Congress is very small compared to that given to the executive branch."

My Minneapolis constituent, Dr. Visscher, recently testified before the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. ROGERS) Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare and spoke to this same issue. The scientific advice received by this body is a subject deserving of our attention. The Perl article which follows gives us a welcome look into the scientific advisory system:

THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY SYSTEM: SOME OBSERVATIONS—THIS SYSTEM HAS LITTLE EFFECT ON THE BROAD TECHNICAL DECISION MADE IN WASHINGTON

(By Martin L. Perl)

Since World War II, scientists and engineers have been going to Washington in increasing numbers to help the government make decisions on technical questions. These questions concern every aspect of our technological society—nuclear weapons, missiles, space travel, cancer research, pesticides, and mental health. Some scientists and engineers go for 1 or 2 days a month; others take a leave of absence from their institutions or corporations and spend several years in Washington. Some serve on committees attached to the executive branch of the government; others serve through semigovernmental institutions like the National Academy of Sciences. A few work with the Congress. All of these scientists and engineers, the committees they serve on, and the positions they hold in Washington together constitute the scientific advisory system (1). This article is about that system, or more precisely, about a paradox connected with that system.

The paradox is easily presented. Most people will agree that the United States is besieged with perilous technological problems—how to stop the arms race and bring about nuclear disarmament, how to stop the technological destruction of the natural environment, how to raise the standard of living, or at least prevent mass starvation, in the poor

countries. Most people will also agree that these problems have become much more severe in the last two decades. But in these same two decades, the United States has received enormous amounts of scientific and technical information and advice from the scientists and engineers of this country. This information is almost always technically correct and thorough; it is almost always given with the intention of solving or mitigating the problems sketched above. The paradox is simply this: How have we gotten into so much technological trouble while getting so much well-intentioned and correct technological advice?

A broad analysis of this paradox might require a study of the relationship between the scientific advisory system and the "techno-structures" postulated by Galbraith (2). Or one might examine whether the advisory system is an example of the "techniques" that Jacques Ellul (3) believes are the essence of our technological society. However, I restrict my analysis to a discussion of the role played by the advisory system in the technical decision-making processes in Washington. In addition, I do not attempt to present a complete description and evaluation of the scientific advisory system, nor do I discuss the role of the scientific advisory system in the larger decisions on military technology.

Few people realize the size and complexity of the scientific advisory system, and I know of no complete study of the magnitude and structure of this system. Therefore, I refer here to a recent, but not exhaustive, study (4) that was carried out by a group of Stanford graduates and undergraduates, for whom I was faculty adviser. The study notes that the Executive Office of the President has advisory committees that involve several hundred prominent scientists and engineers. The best known of these committees is the President's Science Advisory Committee. Outside the Executive Office of the President, but inside the executive branch of the government, is a much larger advisory apparatus. This apparatus consists of thousands of scientists and engineers who serve on hundreds of committees, as well as in various temporary positions. Primarily, they advise the Department of Defense and other departments concerned with scientific, technical, or medical questions.

Semipublic institutions also provide a great deal of advice to the executive branch. For example, the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, through the National Research Council, supervise the work of about 500 committees involving 7000 engineers and scientists. Other large sources of advice are the "think tanks." The Rand Corporation advises the Air Force, the Research Analysis Corporation advises the Army, the Center for Naval Analysis advises the Navy, and the Institute for Defense Analysis advises the entire Department of Defense. Taken together, these public and semipublic advisory groups involve more than 15,000 or 20,000 individual scientists and engineers.

On the other hand, very little scientific advice is given to Congress. Some technical information and advice is obtained through panels or committees attached to congressional legislative committees, and a few individual congressmen, particularly senators, receive some unofficial advice and information. Finally, the Science Policy Research Division and the Environmental Policy Division of the Legislative Reference Service provide reports and summaries on technical questions. But the total amount of scientific and technical information and advice given to Congress is very small compared to that given to the executive branch.

THE SCIENTIFIC ESTABLISHMENT

There is a large overlap between the scientists who lead the advisory system and the scientists who belong to what has been

called by a sympathetic observer (5) the "scientific establishment." The scientific establishment comprises most of the prominent scientists and research engineers in the United States. Many of these individuals are deeply involved in science administration and in the making of science policy, both public and private. But usually their prominence has been attained through research rather than through administration or teaching. The scientific establishment has five functions or attributes.

(1) Many members of the establishment are the heads of professional societies, the heads of university or industrial laboratories, and the chairmen of university science departments. Many are or have been university deans and presidents. Thus, the members of the establishment tend to be the administrators of the worlds of scientific and engineering research and education.

(2) Members of the establishment represent their professions, institutions, and organizations before the federal government in requesting funds for research and education.

(3) In the eyes of the press and the public, the establishment represents science and advanced technology. It is the members of the establishment who are most often interviewed and quoted. This comes about in part from their accomplishments and in part from their administrative positions.

(4) Members of the establishment are the models for young scientists and engineers interested in research.

(5) The establishment tends to guide the directions that research takes. This promotes the classification of a research subject as fashionable or unfashionable. This is a useful function in that it encourages researchers to leave unproductive fields, but it can also create difficulties for iconoclasts.

The scientific establishment is by no means a closed or fixed group. Not all eminent scientists and engineers are in the group, and individuals move in and out of the group as their attitudes and interests change. It should also be recognized that the establishment is not always united on issues—particularly on the allocations of funds for research.

EVALUATING THE ADVISORY SYSTEM

I am mainly concerned with evaluating what I call the specific effectiveness of the scientific advisory system. Specific effectiveness is the measure of how well the system carries out its specific functions in the government. As I have already indicated, these functions are set almost entirely by the executive branch and are carried out almost entirely for the executive branch. One specific function is the gathering of information and the presentation of recommendations on limited, purely technical problems. Thus, an advisory committee might be instructed to determine if a newly discovered physical phenomenon could be used to detect submarines. Another specific function is an advisory committee's being asked to recommend a general governmental policy on a technical issue, for example pesticides.

I am also concerned with the general effectiveness of the scientific advisory system. By general effectiveness I mean the total and overall effectiveness of the advisory system in relation to the general processes of making technical decisions. In this country, technical decisions, like other governmental policy decisions, are arrived at through a complicated process. Formally, the process involves the executive branch and the Congress, but in reality much more is involved.

Before a decision is made, the question may be argued in the press and by the public. The question may become an important issue in political campaigns for elective office. State and local governments may become involved and take the lead in making

a decision, or they may impede a decision. Often the crucial decision is made in the courts, and only later does Congress extend it in the form of legislation. This is by no means a linear process, and most issues have to pass through it several times before they are resolved. This totality, then, comprises the processes by which decisions, including technical decisions, are made in this country. By examining the relationships of the scientific advisory system to these processes, one can determine the general effectiveness of the advisory system.

An evaluation of the scientific advisory system is greatly impeded by the confidentiality of the advising process. The advice given to a government official or to a governmental agency is almost always received under the condition that it may be kept confidential by the official or agency. That is, the advice need not be released to the press, to the public, to Congress, or even to other parts of the executive branch. Large numbers of advisory reports are made public; but, unfortunately, it is just those reports which concern the most controversial and the most important technical questions that are often never made public, or only after long delay. This is unfortunate, not only for those who wish to study the advisory system, but, more important, for the process of making technical decisions in a democracy.

The largest portion of the work of the scientific advisory system is devoted to limited technical questions. "How does method A for water desalination compare in energy requirements to method B?" "How does missile guidance system A compare in reliability to missile guidance system B?" It is with these limited technical questions that the advisory system is most successful. This success results from the competency of the advisers and from the great amount of effort that is applied to these problems. Thus, the advisory system ranks high in specific effectiveness, with respect to limited technical questions.

But suppose the questions are not limited and are not purely technical. Suppose that another specific function of the advisory system, the recommendation of general technical policies, is involved. Or suppose that the technical decision has public policy, economic, or ideological implications. Such questions I shall call broad technical questions. These broad, technical questions severely test the specific effectiveness of the scientific advisory system.

ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS

The Stanford Workshop (4) studied six broad, technical questions related to the environment and public health: the supersonic transport (SST), cyclamates, the safety of commercial nuclear power plants, the safety of underground nuclear tests, pesticide regulation, and herbicide use in Vietnam. On broad technical questions, the work of the advisory committees may be divided into three parts. First, the committee studies the technical and scientific aspects of the question. Here, as in limited technical questions, the committee generally exhibits high effectiveness.

The second part of the committee's work is usually the development of a program for further study and research. In this, the local effectiveness of the advisory system seems to be reasonable but not high. For example, the 1963 report of the President's Science Committee, entitled *Use of Pesticides* (6), recommended an extensive research program to study the safety of pesticides. Many of those research recommendations appear to have been carried out. On the other hand, the government rejected an advisory committee recommendation that additional study be devoted to the safety of some types of commercial nuclear reactors before those reactors were licensed for use (4).

The third part of the advisory committee's work on broad technical issues usually involves recommendations that certain techni-

cal policies be adopted by the executive branch. *Use of Pesticides* recommended that there be an "orderly reduction in the use of persistent pesticides" and that, as a "first step," the government "restrict wide-scale use of persistent pesticides [such as DDT] except for the necessary control of disease vectors." With respect to such policy recommendations, which I call action recommendations, the effectiveness of the advisory system is low.

The executive branch will usually ignore the policy recommendations of the advisory committee if (i) the recommendation is contrary to existing policies of the executive branch, (ii) the adoption of the policy would expose the Administration to congressional or electoral difficulties, or (iii) there are strong pressures from special interest groups that are opposed to the new policy. These pressures may often be traced to industries, labor unions, or municipalities, which think their economic well-being depends upon the continuation of the existing policy.

In some cases, such as those related to atomic energy, the recommendations of the advisory committee may also be opposed by strong technological interests within the government itself. As an illustration of the failure of an action recommendation, consider the 1963 recommendation that the widespread use of DDT be drastically reduced: this "first step" has yet to be completed in 1971. Its beginning is the result of 8 years of public pressure and of litigation by environmental and consumer groups.

As another illustration of the fate of action recommendations, consider the SST (7). In the beginning of 1969, as the controversy over the SST began to increase, President Nixon appointed an advisory committee to study the issue. This was a rather high-level committee, involving the undersecretaries of many federal departments. The committee and its subcommittees were charged with studying not only the technological and environmental aspects of the SST, but also the economic, balance of payment, and international aspects. The appointment of the committee was attended by much publicity that emphasized the Administration's concern with the problem. In March 1969, the committee presented a report that was almost entirely unfavorable to the SST. Lee DuBridge, a committee member and the President's science adviser, wrote (8):

"Granted that this [the SST] is an exciting technological development, it still seems best to me to avoid the serious environmental and nuisance problems and the Government should not be subsidizing a device which has neither commercial attractiveness nor public acceptance."

In spite of this strong disapproval, the President and his Administration continued to support the SST fully and enthusiastically. To prevent the report from being used by the opponents of the SST, it was kept confidential, even though there is nothing in it having to do with national security or military matters. Not even Congress, which had to decide on future SST appropriations, was allowed to see it. Only in October 1969 was Representative S. R. Yates (D-Ill.) able to obtain partial release of the report.

It is reasonable to require, as one of the tests of the specific effectiveness of the scientific advisory system, that the executive branch be fairly responsive to the policy recommendations of its advisory committees. Furthermore, the crucial test is its responsiveness to action recommendations. By this test, the advisory system has substantially failed on broad technical issues.

FAILURE ON BROAD TECHNICAL ISSUES

While some observers will agree with me that the scientific advisory system has not done well on broad technical issues, they argue that the advisory system has accomplished all that could be done. These supporters point out that there are immense

political, economic, and ideological pressures that prevent rational decisions on the environment and public health. However, other groups have made progress against these pressures. For example, there is a strong environmental and consumer protection movement in this country. The originators and leaders of this movement are people like Rachel Carson and Ralph Nader, not members of any strong self-interest group. While there are scientists and engineers in this movement, few of them are members of the scientific establishment. Thus, we are still faced with the question of why the advisory system, with its large membership, its great technical and scientific competence, and its prominent men, has not been more successful on the broad technical issues.

There are a number of reasons for the system's lack of specific effectiveness on these issues.

(1) *The many functions of the scientific establishment.* The functions and attributes of the scientific establishment severely limit the influence of the advisory system. In a democratic country such as ours, important decisions are not made through a set procedure of debates and position papers, but through a long and messy process. The scientific establishment, because of its functions of representing and protecting research and technical education, is reluctant to take part in much of this process. Usually its members enter the decision-making process through the advisory system at only one point—when the Administration is considering a technical issue. For this reason, the influence of members of the scientific establishment is easily negated. The withholding of reports from the public is just one aspect of that process of negation.

(2) *Confidentiality and legitimization.* I have emphasized that the information and advice provided by the advisory system can be declared confidential by the official or agency that receives it, and that it is up to the official or agency to release the information. Although every government official is certainly entitled to some completely private and permanently confidential advice, the problem is that the use of confidentiality is so widespread that very often the only technical reports available on the subject are declared confidential. In that case, the press, the public, and the Congress are left with very incomplete technical information. Thus, on technical issues, the decision-making process is seriously impeded and, in many cases, the system of checks and balances nullified.

There is another aspect to the confidentiality of the advice given by the advisory system. The press, the well-informed citizen, and the Congress know that the executive branch obtains vast amounts of correct technical information and advice. They know that this advice comes from the best and most prominent scientists and engineers in the country. The final technical policy decisions made by the executive branch become associated with this knowledge. One thinks either that the technical advice has been followed or that it has been seriously considered and then overridden by other, more serious and more profound considerations. Thus the scientific advisory system, as presently constituted, provides a facade of prestige which tends to legitimize all technical decisions made by the President.

The executive branch is well aware of the legitimizing effect of the advisory system. For example, public concern about a technical issue can often be mollified by appointing a committee to study the issue in detail. There is often the hope that, by the time the report appears, public pressure will have decreased. Indeed, this technique extends far outside the sphere of technical issues. If the report appears and is favorable to the policies of the executive branch, it can be released with much publicity. Otherwise, the principle of confidentiality can be imposed.

Even an unfavorable report can be used by releasing not the report itself, but a distorted summary of it. Just such a maneuver was used (4) with the unfavorable report on the SST.

The legitimizing aspect of the advisory system is eliminated only when some members of the system directly or indirectly disregard the principle of confidentiality, for example in testimony before Congress on the antiballistic missile and the SST. However, such actions are still rare.

(3) *Socialization in Washington.* The basic way to get something done in the executive branch is to work from the inside. This means that one must be practical and hardheaded. One must work for small gains and progress in small steps. For the adviser it is a slow process, with respect to both his influence and his achievements. The adviser works first in less important committees on more restricted issues. As he demonstrates his ability, his reliability, and his reasonableness, he progresses to more important committees and to more important issues. But when he finally achieves a position of influence, his freedom to act is quite limited. This limitation comes not from any rules, but from the methods he learned while working with the executive branch.

Thus, in order to retain his position of influence, he may not protest some decisions he intensely dislikes. He wants to reserve his influence for some other issue upon which he has concentrated his interest. Ultimately, the adviser may fall into the trap of considering, above all else, the technique of preserving his influence in Washington [I use the term "technique" here as it is used by Ellul (3)].

Socialization explains a number of things. It explains, for example, why the principle of confidentiality is so universally honored in the advisory system. The socialization also explains why the legitimizing effect is so strong. I note again that this socialization in Washington is something that happens to economists, accountants, labor leaders, and businessmen as well as to scientists and engineers. I only emphasize it here because we scientists tend to think that our objectivity and our scientific training constitute a magic cloak that protects us from socialization. It does not.

It have given some of the reasons that the scientific advisory system has a great deal of specific effectiveness on limited technical questions, yet little specific effectiveness on broad technical questions. Now what about the general effectiveness of the scientific advisory system? How does it enter into the decision-making processes for general technical questions in this country? The answer is evident from my discussion: the advisory system does not usually enter into the decision-making processes for general technical questions. Thus its general effectiveness is very low, the only exceptions being when individual members of the advisory system testify before Congress or work with congressmen. But most members of the advisory system do not believe in working in the decision-making process outside of the executive branch. They believe that, if they increase their general effectiveness, they will decrease their specific effectiveness.

THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

My colleagues in the advisory system have sometimes agreed with the analysis I have presented. But they then say, "All right, we in the advisory system work from the inside doing what we can. Perhaps we are not as effective as you wish us to be. Why don't you work from the outside? There are 10 or 20 thousand people in the advisory system, but there are several hundred thousand scientists and engineers who are not in the advisory system. They can all work from the outside." There are, unfortunately, a number of reasons that this division of labor does not work.

(1) *The scientific establishment as a model for the scientific community.* Those members

of the establishment who are in the advisory system are models for the less well-known and younger scientists and engineers. An example of consciously setting a standard of behavior is the recruitment of young theoretical physicists into summer work with the Institute of Defense Analysis. Until recently, it was customary to ask the brightest and most promising young theorists to join in this summer work. Since the invitation was extended by some of the best of the older theoretical physicists, it was very flattering to receive one. Being invited to work with the Institute was, at least for a while, a mark of attainment in theoretical physics.

It is difficult for the scientific community to work on broad technical questions from the outside when the leaders are working from the inside. After all, only a few well-known scientists, men like Pauling, Lapp, and Compton, work on the outside. Therefore, scientists who wish to serve the country in the technical decision-making process have tended to join the advisory system. In the last few years, there has been some opposition to this tendency, primarily from the environmental and consumer movements and from the various student movements.

(2) *The "don't rock the boat" attitude.* I have pointed out that the multiple functions of the establishment and the overlap of the establishment and the advisory system cause a very cautious attitude among advisers. There is a widespread feeling that the advisers should not oppose the technical policies of the Administration too vehemently or too publicly. If they do, members of the establishment fear, federal or even public support for science research and education may be adversely affected. There is certainly some truth in this fear.

This "don't rock the boat" attitude extends into most of the scientific community. This is partly because of the model of behavior set by the establishment; but there is a more compelling reason for this attitude. The natural way for the scientific community to critically and publicly examine the government's technical policies is to use the independent scientific institutions—the professional and scientific societies and the engineering and science departments of universities. Yet these are just the institutions that are being protected by the "don't rock the boat" attitude. For this reason, the scientific community and the scientific establishment will not use independent institutions in the technical decision-making process. It is usually said that these institutions must be kept "neutral."

(3) *Professional rewards for service in the advisory system.* There is a grave imbalance between the professional rewards (other than direct monetary rewards) for helping the government make technical decisions from the inside and the rewards for helping from the outside. Almost all universities encourage the public service activities of their faculties if these activities bring honor or influence to the university; teaching or administrative duties may be reduced to allow for them. But almost always, these must be official public service activities. Working within the scientific advisory system is official public service, but, except for a very few universities, working with unofficial neighborhood or consumer groups to reduce the pollution from a local factory is not considered public service. Thus, for the energetic, ambitious young faculty member who wishes to help in the making of technical decisions there are strong career pressures that push him into the advisory system.

Even for the senior scientist the advisory system has career rewards. To be in Washington, to work with other members of the establishment, and to get to know government officials can be of help in a number of ways. It is helpful when seeking funds for a department or for the research of younger people. It also makes a scientist more influential in his home institution.

(4) *The "it's in good hands" attitude.*

Consciously and unconsciously the members of the advisory system often present the attitude that the role of the scientist and engineer in the technical decision-making process is completely filled by the advisory system. This often takes the form of such statements as, "Don't worry about it, it's in good hands." It is often implied that the members of the advisory system are professional experts on this or that technical question. Other scientists or engineers who are outside the advisory system are regarded as amateurs. This attitude depresses attempts by the scientific community at large to enter the technical decision-making process. It also encourages government officials to ignore scientists and engineers who are not in the advisory system.

SUMMARY

The scientific advisory system is effective on limited technical questions, and such questions provide much of its work. On broad technical questions, however, the scientific advisory system is not effective. Unfortunately this category includes most of the crucial environmental questions. Finally, the advisory system, as presently constituted, combined with the multiple functions of the scientific establishment, is detrimental in important ways to the process of technical decision-making in this country. This is because the combined effect of the advisory system and the establishment is to impede the development of a more effective and comprehensive role for the scientific community in the technical decision-making process.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. The scientific advisory system is described in several articles in *Scientists and National Policy Making* [R. Gilpin and C. Wright, Eds. (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1964)]; a description of other advisory systems is provided by *The Presidential Advisory System* [T. E. Cronin and S. D. Greenberg, Eds. (Harper & Row, New York, 1969)].
2. J. K. Galbraith, *The New Industrial State* (Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1967; reprinted, Signet, New American Library, New York, 1969).
3. J. Ellul, *The Technological Society* (Knopf, New York, 1964; reprinted, Vintage, Random House, New York, 1967); originally published in French as *La Technique ou l'Enjeu du Siècle* (Librairie Armand Colin, Paris, 1954).
4. F. Von Hippel and J. Primack, "The Politics of Technology, 1970" (unpublished report available from SWOPSI, Stanford University, Stanford, California).
5. D. K. Price, in *Scientists and National Policy Making*, R. Gilpin and C. Wright, Eds. (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1964).
6. *Use of Pesticides* (a report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, 15 May 1963) (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1963).
7. W. A. Shurecliff, *SST and Sonic Boom Handbook* (Ballantine, New York, 1970).
8. L. DuBridge, *Congr. Rec.* 31 October 1969, p. 32609.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 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?

DOW PROPOSES SUBSTITUTE TO PESTICIDE BILL

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, when the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act, H.R. 10729, comes to the floor next week I plan to offer a substitute to the House Agriculture Committee bill. My proposed amendments are contained in H.R. 11169 which I introduced last night for the information of my colleagues.

The Committee bill as it was reported to the floor has serious deficiencies which must be altered if the bill is to have any teeth and be an improvement over present law. The measure reported by the agriculture committee must be substantially improved or it should not be supported at all.

This morning I participated in a news conference with representatives of the Sierra Club, the Izaak Walton League, the Audubon Society, Friends of the Earth, Public Interest Research Group and the National Wildlife Federation, and the Wilderness Society. These groups support my substitute bill.

Because of the serious nature of this pesticide bill and its complexities I would like to share with my colleagues my statement at the news conference as well as the statements of William Futrell, a professor of environmental law at the University of Alabama and member of the board of directors of the Sierra Club and Joel Pickelmer of the National Wildlife Federation.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN G. DOW ON H.R. 10729, THE FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL PESTICIDE CONTROL ACT OF 1971, OCTOBER 13, 1971

I am very pleased to welcome you this morning to this press conference on the pesticide bill, H.R. 10729, which is anticipated to come to the floor Wednesday or Thursday of next week.

The bill as it came out of Committee has serious deficiencies which must be altered if the bill is to have any teeth and be an improvement over the present Act known as FIFRA (Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act).

Because there are several changes that must be made to the present bill I have put them together as a substitute bill. I have taken this approach to clarify the serious problems raised by the language in the present bill without waiting to offer several amendments piecemeal on the floor of the House.

The changes I am proposing would strengthen the bill sufficiently so that I could vote for the bill on final passage. I feel that the bill, as it stands, demonstrates the great influence of the chemical industry and the unwillingness of the Committee to write what I would consider to be a bill strongly supportive of the environment and fully protective of humans.

I am not proposing a major rewriting of the bill—that is too much—but with some important changes of wording in the bill, the EPA will be better empowered to do its job, the manufacturers will be required to come forward with all the data they have on the effects of the pesticide sought to be registered, and other parties will be able to challenge the Administrator through the courts.

Pesticide legislation is somewhat technical but not so much so that the problems I am raising can't be easily understood.

The present law, (FIFRA), either allows or disallows the pesticide sought to be registered. FIFRA's strength lies in its approach which requires the manufacturer to label his product with directions for use and with a warning statement.

Under FIFRA the Administrator must be assured that the article warrants the manufacturer's proposed claims based on the statement submitted by the applicant. If he is not satisfied, the Administrator denies registration. When he finds that his action is necessary to prevent an imminent hazard to the public, the Administrator may suspend the registration of the pesticide.

The Administrator is not unduly limited in his ability to disclose information surrounding the registration of the pesticide, but is properly constrained from releasing data on the business records and documents which he may require under the Act (FIFRA).

The Dow substitute would make the following changes:

1. Information submitted by the applicant for registration of a pesticide is subject to restrictions placed by the applicant, Sec. 3(c)(1)(D) p. 17. In the Committee bill this restriction was added to the language found in FIFRA and my amendment would strike the data restriction language.

The applicant's power to classify, for purpose of restriction, information submitted in support of an application suggests that these words should be stricken.

My purpose in striking these words is to insure that the burden of proof is not shifted to the Administrator. The applicant must be required to submit whatever data is considered important by the Administrator and should not be allowed any selectivity in this process. To further assure that all data is made available I have added a new section (6) to Sec. 3. *Registration of Pesticides*.

2. Data in the possession of the applicant which would tend to indicate a substantial adverse effect on the environment or the lack of such an effect should be available to the Administrator and I have added a one-paragraph requirement in the registration section, p. 17, after (F) to add this important requirement.

Here I am only seeking to do for pesticide applicants what is already required under food and drug legislation. Under title 21 of the U.S. Code, Sec. 355(6), new drug applicants must file "full reports of investigations which have been made to show whether or not such drug is safe for use and whether such drug is effective in use."

In the same Title, Sec. 346(d), petitions filed by the applicant seeking a tolerance for pesticides or requesting an exemption must include full reports of investigations on the safety and on the results of tests on the residues. I feel that a similar requirement is required for pesticide applicants.

There is every reason to require the full disclosure of data on the proposed pesticide act at the time of registration, in order to give the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency complete information on which to base his decisions.

3. In another instance, under Sec. 3, *Registration of Pesticides*, (c)(5), p. 19, the bill provides that the Administrator shall not make any lack of essentiality a criterion for denying registration of any pesticide. (Emphasis added.) This raises questions about the purpose of the bill itself.

According to the EPA the essential use doctrine has been applied in evaluating DDT, but has had little or no use prior to that problem. I feel that the negative language of the bill is a step backward at the very time when a balancing of all factors is highly justified and required if the EPA is to

truly perform effectively for the American people.

4. Under Sec. 6, *Administrative Review*, (c)(3) and (d), *Scientific Review*, I have eliminated the sections on scientific review in order to strengthen the hand of the Administrator. The language found on p. 29, lines 11 through 24, requires the hearing examiner to refer all relevant questions of scientific fact to a committee of the National Academy of Sciences.

I agree with the view that the Administrator of the EPA should be given full responsibility for the public hearing requested as a result of his action to suspend, cancel or change classification.

Present procedure for scientific review under FIFRA gives the EPA the power to select scientific committee members from a list prepared by the National Academy of Sciences. All relevant questions are not required to be submitted as now compelled by the Committee's proposed bill.

The language in the bill is a poor compromise, I feel. The referral of questions of a scientific nature has been used as a delaying tactic in the past and, in a more exacting form, can continue to serve that purpose even better.

A public hearing should adequately round out the divergent views on an issue. It should not be compromised by delays and referrals outside the hearing process. I prefer to give the authority to the Administrator here. His shoulders must be made strong enough to actually carry out the public hearing without getting other parties into the act whether he wishes or desires them.

Moreover, nothing in my amendment prevents the Administrator from seeking outside advice of any kind when he deems it essential.

5. I am offering two changes which will improve the sections concerning judicial review of EPA orders in this bill. My substitute would put back into the judicial review section on p. 49 the words "any person adversely affected" which appeared in the original Administration bill, H.R. 4152.

The Committee bill has replaced these words with the requirement that following a public hearing, any party "at interest" may obtain judicial review. This Committee change would seriously impair judicial challenges of an EPA order issued by the Administrator, if a challenge could be brought at all.

I feel, with the mounting evidence that our agencies often fail to carry out their charters, that they should be subject to challenge, that language which weakens the public's right of judicial review, must be stricken from the bill.

To conform to the above changes I have also eliminated the judicial review, Sec. 6(c)(3), p. 28, which gives District Court review of suspension orders at the same time administrative review is in progress. The section should be deleted because it is cumbersome and obstructive to the administrative review. It is a good example of the diversionary tactics made available in the bill to industrial interests.

6. The authority of the States under Sec. 24 (a), p. 56, of the Committee bill is to be changed to permit States to further regulate general use pesticides.

I cannot accept the proposition that the States are to be limited in this way as to their own local affairs. I agree with my colleague, Mr. Foley, who has said that this new provision would do violence to many effective State pesticide programs.

The language would bar State restrictions due to local conditions such as soil, crops, climate, and pest populations. To attempt to establish a national program when some States are already far ahead of the Federal Government seems to be a giant step backward.

The substitute I am proposing is the strongest legislation I feel that can be accepted at this time, although it is no panacea. It recognizes the basic failings of the bill and would give the House the opportunity to pass a bill with stronger language which would be a substantial improvement over FIFRA.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM FUTRELL, MEMBER OF SIERRA CLUB'S BOARD OF DIRECTORS ON BEHALF OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION, FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH GROUP, AND SIERRA CLUB

Congress will soon vote upon the House Agriculture Committee's Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1971, which they have described as regulatory legislation. We believe that the proposed legislation is not a reform but a retreat from effective pesticide regulation. If enacted it would turn the clock back to the 1950's and eradicate the gains made by conservation and consumer groups during the last decade.

We commend Congressman Dow for the amendments which he is proposing. If adopted the Dow amendments will serve to greatly strengthen the bill in most of the areas which we have found it to be deficient. We fervently hope that these amendments will be adopted by the House, but this will not be the end of the road. When the bill goes to the Senate, we intend to carry our efforts on there to seek correction for all of the bill's deficiencies, and it is hoped that the bill can be strengthened to serve the purpose for which it is intended. If it can not be amended, the bill should be defeated.

The bill is defective because it: 1) excludes the public from the decision making process, 2) lowers the standards for protection of public health and the environment, and 3) removes procedural safeguards designed to protect the public interest.

A serious defect of the bill is the exclusion of the public from the decision-making process. During the last decade the intervention of environmental and consumer groups in public hearings and in the courts has helped to represent the public interest in regulating pesticides. Participation in the registration process should not be limited to the chemical manufacturer, with his economic interest, and the agency administrator, who has to do double duty as both advocate for the public and judge for the entire proceeding. One of the most serious defects in the bill is that it restricts judicial review by barring environmental groups and other defenders of the public interest who do not have a direct economic interest in the pesticide under consideration.

The public interest is slighted by the restrictions on freedom of information which are imposed by this bill. We are dealing with economic poisons, and the limitations on disclosure of information should be governed only by the Freedom of Information act. In such a sensitive area, the public's right to know is greater than in the usual protection of trade secrets matters.

The act lowers standards for the protection of the public health and the environment. It puts a false economic analysis into the decision-making process. The committee has not seriously faced the question: How can an economic benefit outweigh a health hazard? As it stands now, the bill tempts the administrator to favor certain economic benefits over uncertain health hazards. Thus, the pressure will be on the administrator to register economic poisons whose financial benefit to the company and to the agri-chemical business can be objectively calculated but whose long-term impact on public health and the environment is only a matter of uncertain conjecture.

In the proposed act, the committee has lowered the objective legal test for registration of pesticides. The bill specifically strikes out the essentiality test as a criterion for reg-

istration. The evolution of the essentiality doctrine, which required that the more dangerous, persistent pesticides should be limited to essential uses only was one of the public interest victories growing out of extended litigation by environmental and consumer groups. The committee bill significantly omits a third category of pesticide classification which had been proposed by the Nixon Administration as a substitute for the essentiality doctrine. This third classification, the use by permit category, would have allowed use of dangerous, persistent pesticides only under a stringent control system. Thus, the committee's reform bill actually lowers standards and opens new loopholes for the use of dangerous persistent pesticides. Further, in certain instances, the bill closes the door on State initiatives and forbids the States to enact laws for tougher regulation of pesticides.

The bill removes procedural safeguards designed to protect the public interest. It is shocking in this day of increased environmental concern to see a retreat under the name of reform. A major change effected by this bill is the shifting of the burden of proof. Under the current law the manufacturer has the duty to show the Environmental Protection Agency that his pesticide could come within the limits of the regulatory system. Under the proposed law the Administrator of EPA has the duty and the burden of finding out if the product is environmentally unsound.

A new departure, in favor of the chemical industry, is the requirement of indemnification of the manufacturer and the user if a dangerous pesticide is put on the market which later has to be withdrawn. This provision rewards negligence. The public has only to remember the thalidomide tragedy several years ago to be warned against a use-now-test-later philosophy for chemical manufacturers. To insure these manufacturers from lawsuits and economic loss by changing the law as this indemnity provision does is a giant step backward.

The whole bill is a substantial retreat from the regulatory system now in effect, and it will serve only if substantially amended.

STATEMENT BY JOEL PICKELNER ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, OCTOBER 13, 1971

The National Wildlife Federation would like to thank Congressman John Dow for the invitation to comment on his proposed amendments to H.R. 10729 and commend him for his untiring efforts at securing an environmentally acceptable pesticide law.

The National Wildlife Federation has long supported the principles of new legislation to replace the outdated and increasingly ineffective Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. In hearings before the House Agriculture Committee earlier this year, when invited to testify, we gave our support to a bill put forth by the Administration (H.R. 4152). However, the bill reported out by the committee is a watered-down and weakened version of the original Administration proposal.

In order for it to effectively protect the environment from indiscriminate use of harmful pesticides, it is necessary that certain amendments be accepted. As we read them, the amendments offered by Congressman Dow would, first of all, eliminate that part of Section 24 which would pre-empt the state's authority to set stricter standards than those set by the Environmental Protection Agency. They would shift the burden of proof of safety more onto the manufacturer than does H.R. 10729. And, they would allow adversely affected individuals to appeal the registration of harmful chemical pesticides in the Federal Courts.

Even with the proposed amendments, the pesticide bill is not a panacea to environmentalists but we feel, that with proper ad-

ministration, it would be a material improvement over present law and it could be a big step toward preventing environmental degradation through indiscriminate use of chemical pesticides.

THE MAN YOU LOVE TO HATE

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, while debating consumer legislation I commend to my colleagues' attention the following speech by Thomas R. Shepard, Jr., delivered earlier this year before the Better Business Bureau of Eastern Massachusetts at the Sheraton Boston Hotel in Boston.

The speech follows:

THE AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN—"THE MAN YOU LOVE TO HATE"

(By Thomas R. Shepard, Jr.)

The following excerpts are taken from a speech by Mr. Shepard delivered May 7, 1971, before the 49th Annual Meeting of the Better Business Bureau of Eastern Massachusetts at the Sheraton Boston Hotel, Boston.

About 30 years ago, back in the days when motion pictures were not nearly as relevant as they are today, but infinitely more entertaining, there was a character actor—I think it may have been Sidney Greenstreet—who always played the bad guy and who came to be known as "the man you love to hate." Well, Mr. Greenstreet is no longer with us and even if he were, the chances are he would not be making movies.

For one thing, he would look pretty silly with his clothes off. And for another, he could never live up to that billing—"the man you love to hate." Not any more. No actor could. Today, the man everyone loves to hate with a passion no mere thespian could hope to arouse is that perennial patsy and ever-popular whipping boy, the American businessman.

I learned how deep-rooted this antipathy has become when, during the past year, I started making speeches in defense of businessmen and of their practices under our free enterprise system. Businessmen like the speeches just fine, but consumers definitely do not, as they have made clear to me in angry letter after angry letter. And let's face it, ladies and gentlemen, there are a lot more consumers in America than there are businessmen—a fact of politics that has not escaped the notice of many of our congressmen.

I cite this current anti-business trend because I believe it is the reason we are gathered here today. If it were not for the growing bias against businessmen, there would be no Ralph Nader, there would be no consumerism and obviously there would be no urgent need to discuss the problems of consumerism or, as your program puts it, "consumer-business relations."

CONSUMERISM CURE

What I propose to do today is give you my views on the causes of consumerism and the cure for it. Yes, I believe it must be cured, because to me, consumerism is not, as some businessmen seem to feel, a therapeutic movement that will keep us on our toes and, in the end, offer new opportunities for growth and prosperity.

To me, consumerism represents a major threat not only to the companies we work for but to the entire socio-economic system

on which this nation was founded and through which it has flourished.

And I'll go one step further. To me, consumerism is the most insidious peril ever to confront the American consumer himself.

Before I elaborate on that, I want to make it clear that when I refer to consumerism and consumerists, I am not talking about the many fine organizations—such as the Better Business Bureaus—that labor hard and constructively to protect the American consumer. I am alluding instead to a different breed of cat entirely.

My target is that small but vocal group of far-out activists who keep badgering the United States Congress and various federal agencies for additional controls over industry on the premise that without these controls, our nation is doomed to ecological and economic destruction. In a previous talk I called them "The Disaster Lobby," and that is precisely what they are.

Now, lest you believe that I exaggerated in my opening remarks on how the typical consumer feels about businessmen, permit me to indulge in a few statistics.

The first one goes back to 1967, when an Opinion Research Corp. study revealed that 55 per cent of all Americans—well over half—felt new laws were needed to protect the consumer from unscrupulous businessmen.

Two years later, in 1969, a follow-up study found that now 68 per cent of all Americans favored additional consumer-protection laws. Mr. Nader had done a fine job of brainwashing.

And how does the public feel about Mr. Nader himself? A recent Harris poll showed that 53 per cent believe he's doing more good than harm while only 9 per cent say he's doing more harm than good. That's a whopping 6-to-1 edge in his favor.

EARLY BRAINWASHING

One last set of numbers. Several weeks ago, Social Research, Inc., conducted a study on public attitudes toward the business community. Forty-six per cent of those polled agreed to the statement that "big business is dangerous to our way of life." Five years ago, only 28 per cent subscribed to that view. In summarizing the findings, Dr. Bureleigh Gardner, president of Social Research, declared: "The public will no longer rise to the defense of business against extremists or protest groups."

So the consumer isn't exactly enchanted with us businessmen. And why should he be? Almost from birth, he is taught that most businessmen are callous, greedy, unscrupulous blood-suckers who prey on the poor and are fair game for whatever retribution may be inflicted on them.

Take this blunt little commentary: "The merchants are the biggest fools of all. They carry on the most sordid business and by the most corrupt methods. Whenever it is necessary, they will lie, perjure themselves, steal, cheat and mislead the public."

Ralph Nader talking? Not at all. Those words were spoken almost 500 years ago by a Dutch gentleman named Erasmus, who was probably the most respected scholar of his day. For businessmen, it has been down hill ever since.

My generation, for example, grew up on a steady diet of books and plays and movies portraying the typical businessman as a bumbling "Babbitt," a rapacious "Robber Baron," a heartless "Huckster," the deliberate poisoner of "A Hundred Million Guinea Pigs" and the briber-fixer-slumlord responsible for the "Shame of the Cities."

Lately, the vilification of American businessmen has reached a new apogee. During the past two years the people of our nation have been bombarded daily by a multimedia barrage of anti-business propaganda.

Time and again they are told that businessmen are responsible for virtually every ill besetting mankind . . . that American in-

dustry is guilty of polluting the atmosphere to the point where we may all suffocate . . . of dumping so much mercury into the oceans that the fish we eat will damage our brains . . . of spewing out detergents that kill our rivers and lakes . . . of packaging products in a bewildering array of sizes for the express purpose of cheating the housewife . . . of enticing us through false advertising to buy products we don't really need . . . of making cars that fill the air with noxious fumes . . . of saturating the earth with DDT and killing the birds . . . and, most reprehensible of all, of causing and prolonging the Viet Nam war in order to build a market for military hardware.

THEIR REAL GOAL

And what do we do to counter all this? Well, we stammer a lot and we shuffle our feet and we say, "Gosh, fellas, we're doing the best we can," and then we form committees to cooperate with the consumerists in the hope that this gesture of good faith will get them off our backs.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it won't get them off our backs—not if we spend all of our time and our money doing it. Because the truth is that the nation's hard-core consumerists are not the least bit interested in having us cooperate with them. They don't want us to clean our own houses. What they want are the houses—from cellar to attic. What they want is for the government of the United States to take over our companies and operate them along consumerist guidelines.

Unfortunately, these champions of galloping socialism have the support of many thousands of influential Americans in and out of government—Americans who feel guilty about living in the richest, most powerful nation on earth and who have apparently decided that the best way to get rid of that guilt feeling is to turn us into the poorest, least powerful nation on earth. And they are making spectacular headway.

Indeed, their victories in Washington are nothing short of phenomenal. Last year about this time, Barron's magazine carried a story about the introduction in Congress of 150 bills designed to help the consumer.

FIVE HUNDRED BILLS

"Congress," said Barron's, "is on the verge of ushering in a new era of consumer legislation that is likely to wind up hobbling what is left of free enterprise."

But those 150 bills acted on by the 91st Congress are a trickle compared to the avalanche that hit the 92nd. Right now, the Senate and House are considering more than 500 bills aimed at regulating—or, to be less euphemistic, controlling—private industry.

Accompanying this activity in Congress have been ominous stirrings in the regulatory agencies. The Federal Trade Commission, for one, has been flexing its muscles with unprecedented abandon in response to goading by the consumerists.

The commission's new get-tough posture became evident last month at an American University conference on business-government relations. One of the speakers was a young man named Gerald Thain, who is acting director of the FTC's Food and Drug Advertising Division and who, in the argot of the day, told it like it is.

First of all, said Mr. Thain, the FTC will no longer crack down only on those businessmen guilty of making false statements. From now on, he declared, merchants and manufacturers are subject to what the FTC calls "the unfairness doctrine." Even if you tell the absolute truth in your ads and at point of sale, you will be prosecuted by the Federal Trade Commission if it feels your intent was to take unfair advantage of some consumer weakness.

And I use the word "prosecuted" advisedly. The FTC, said Mr. Thain, has decided to go to court to punish offenders. "The day of

the cease-and-desist order is over," he told the conference. "We now will see to it that penalties are invoked."

The commission has already invoked its unfairness doctrine. It filed a complaint against Wonder Bread, objecting to the slogan, "Wonder Bread Helps Build Strong Bodies 12 Ways." The fact at issue was not whether Wonder Bread actually helps build strong bodies 12 ways. The commission was ready to concede that it does. What disturbed the FTC was the suspicion that other brands of bread also help build strong bodies 12 ways, in which case, said the FTC, Wonder Bread—to avoid being unfair—should reveal that fact in its ads.

This kind of reasoning, fostered by the consumerists, would put an end to advertising and marketing as we now know it. An automobile company could no longer say its cars provide a quiet ride without adding that other cars also provide quiet rides. A beverage bottler could no longer claim its soft drink quenches your thirst without noting that other beverages do likewise.

Presumably you could not even advertise a 20 per cent discount on your merchandise unless you made it clear that the store down the street was offering similar discounts.

ALARMING FORERUNNER

But the activity of the FTC, as harmful as it may be to businessman and consumer alike by inhibiting the flow of product information, is not what troubles me most about the consumerist movement in America. Nor is all that legislation pending in Congress.

What alarms me is the conviction that all of this is merely a forerunner of things to come. The evidence I see indicates that our nation's front-line consumerists do not intend to stop with a handful of new laws and regulations affecting American business. Their final objective appears to be nothing less than the unconditional transfer of private industry into public hands.

Take Ralph Nader, for example. Some businessmen persist in regarding Mr. Nader simply as a defender of the common man—as a crusader for fair play in business. Well, he may be, but he is one thing more. Mr. Nader is a staunch advocate of the nationalization of industry. What is my source for that statement? The best source, Mr. Nader himself.

Last September, in a speech in Providence, R.I.—and I quote now from an Associated Press report—"Ralph Nader proposed that corporations that abuse the public interest should be transferred to public trusteeship."

The syllogism is inescapable. Ralph Nader says corporations that abuse the public interest should be taken over by the government. According to Ralph Nader, virtually all corporations abuse the public interest. Therefore, all corporations should be taken over by the government.

More recently, in an interview for the New York Times Mr. Nader called for federal chartering of all corporations, with the government empowered to set production standards, prescribe marketing procedures and hire and fire executives. He called the process "popularization of the corporation." Well, I call it nationalization of industry. By any name, it would mark the end of free enterprise, and make no mistake about that.

Other consumerists display similar leanings toward a public takeover of private industry. Betty Furness, for one. She's chairman of the New York State Consumer Protection Board and she wants a law requiring at least one consumerist on every corporate board of directors whose sole responsibility would be to represent the public interest. Today one seat on the board, tomorrow the world.

Still another consumerist with visions of Socialistic sugar plums is Arch Woodside, an assistant professor of business adminis-

tration at the University of South Carolina. In a letter to Advertising Age, he disputed the premise that businessmen could or should set their own houses in order. "Nothing less than a redefinition of the profit motive and the free enterprise system will have to be accepted," said Prof. Woodside.

And then we have the situation involving the American Advertising Federation and the Council of Better Business Bureaus. For more than a year now, these two organizations, spurred on by such progressive leaders as AAF President Howard Bell and Whirlpool Corp. Chairman Elisha Gray, have been working on ways to help advertisers police their own output. The programs they have come up with seem to be exactly what the consumerists say they want—self-regulation that would make government controls unnecessary.

But, of course, the consumerists don't want self-regulation. On the day the AAF announced plans for its ad-screening project, one of Ralph Nader's associates, Mrs. Aileen Cowan, summarily rejected them. She said nothing short of government intervention would be acceptable. . . .

WHAT CAN WE DO?

All right, then, we know the nature of the threat. What do we do about it? . . .

What we must do as concerned Americans, as well as businessmen, is go directly to the public with an all-out campaign of education. The people of this country have a long history of responding favorably to truth and logic and common sense. Let's see to it that truth and logic and common sense are what they get. . . .

Let's set the record straight on that hysterical talk about the environment that has scared so many Americans into supporting consumerist programs.

Let's show the public that there is no truth whatsoever to the charge that we are running low on oxygen as a result of fuel-burning by industry. The National Science Foundation recently collected air samples at 78 sites around the world and discovered that the amount of oxygen in the air—20.95 per cent—is precisely the same today as it was in 1910.

Then let's expose those lies about increases in air pollution. And they are lies. The truth is that the amount of pollutants in the air has been steadily decreasing in just about every major city in the United States for as long as records have been kept.

In New York City daily measurements taken by the Department of Air Resources since 1965 reveal a substantial, year-by-year decline in pollution.

Similar decreases have been reported in such other cities as Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis and, yes, Boston. What's more, all evidence indicates that urban air is significantly cleaner today than it was a hundred years ago, when homes and factories burned soft coal and the smog was so thick you could make soup out of it.

BLATANT FALSEHOODS

And let's clear up that confusion about water pollution. Sure, some of our lakes and rivers are not as pretty as they used to be, but our drinking water is the safest in the world. Back in the days when our rivers were a delight to the eye, they were also a source of the worst typhoid and yellow fever epidemics the world has ever seen. Just one of these epidemics, in 1793, killed one-fifth of the population of Philadelphia. We've come a long way in water purification.

Let us also identify as blatant falsehoods those charges about the mercury in tuna fish. The consumerists said the mercury came from industrial wastes, when it was perfectly obvious to marine scientists that it came from natural deposits in the foods eaten by fish. Game fish caught 42 years ago in a remote lake in the Adirondacks—scores of miles from the nearest factory—contained twice as much mercury as any fish processed this year. . . .

And let's speak up about the rest of the hokum circulated by consumerists who are out to stampede us into a new socio-economic system.

NO POPULATION THREAT

We are not—repeat not—on the verge of planetary overpopulation. The birth rate in every major country on earth has been declining since the 1920's, according to the World Health Organization. It has been declining so rapidly in some countries that there is serious concern about underpopulation.

Indeed, Poland expects a net loss in population of a quarter of a million a year beginning in 1977. In the United States, a current birth rate of 17 per thousand population is the lowest in decades and reflects a year-by-year drop that began in 1955. If it continues to fall, we too face a dwindling population. . . .

And let's tell the people of America something about ourselves and about free enterprise in general. About the expenditure last year by businessmen of over \$3 billion to help clean up the environment.

About the tremendous technological achievements by private industry that have given the average American comforts, luxuries and health standards beyond the reach of the wealthiest aristocrats of a hundred years ago.

About the convenience foods and labor-saving appliances that have cut the average housewife's kitchen chores from five hours a day in 1900 to an hour and a half today and, as a result, have done more to liberate women.

About the fact that, while consumer spending has skyrocketed from \$430 billion in 1965 to over \$600 billion in 1970—a gain of 44 per cent—corporate after-tax profits have actually declined by about 3 per cent.

And let's bury, once and for all, that nonsense about widespread corruption in the business community. How? By explaining to the consumer public that there is a perfectly ethical, honorable and practical reason for just about every aspect of business procedure.

Take the odd sizes in which many food products are sold. The consumerists say this is done to confuse and cheat the housewife. Nothing could be farther from the truth, as Charles Mortimer, former chairman of General Foods, once pointed out in an article for Look. He cited his company's vanilla pudding mix, which comes in a three-and-a-quarter-ounce package. It is sold that way because that is the precise amount of vanilla powder which, when mixed with two cups of milk, produces four half-cup servings of pudding.

If General Foods sold its vanilla mix in an even, three-ounce size, the housewife would have to add one and eleven-thirtieths cups of milk, and she would end up with three and seven-sixteenths servings.

Actually, it is absurd for anyone to believe that an established businessman—whether he is a manufacturer or a retailer—would deliberately cheat his customers. It costs so much money to introduce a new product or to build up a retail clientele that only an idiot would risk losing that investment by going after a dishonest dollar or two. He might get that dollar once, but his customer will never come back. And there isn't a businessman in the country who can make a go of it on one-time patronage. He simply must have repeat business, and the only way he can get it is by delivering a good product or service at a fair price.

I might mention in passing that, when it comes to dishonesty, you have to go a long way to beat out the good old consumer himself.

Management Safeguards, a company that specializes in security systems for retailers, recently spent six months studying customer traffic in one of New York City's biggest de-

partment stores. Its findings? One of every 10 persons entering the store did so for the express purpose of stealing something. Investigators in other cities have confirmed this ratio. So perhaps what we need more than consumerism is a movement to protect store owners. We might call it retailerism.

CONSUMERISTS' ATTITUDE

And, in talking to the public, let's set the record straight about the consumerists themselves. Let's reveal them for what they are—devout snobs who believe that the average man is too stupid, too naive and too deficient in culture and refinement to be allowed to make his own selections in a free and open marketplace.

He has to be taken by the hand and told which foods to buy, which cars to drive, which clothes to wear, even which TV shows to watch. And who are the people best equipped to show him the way? Why the consumerists, of course—the self-anointed corps of intellectual elite.

Above all, ladies and gentlemen, let's acquaint the people of America with the very solid fact that, if free enterprise disappears as a result of consumerist pressures, their freedom will disappear with it.

Their freedom to buy milk by the quart, even though some government economist has decided that quarts are impractical and that milk should be sold only by the gallon.

Their freedom to buy a red convertible in the face of a government determination that black sedans are more economical and red convertibles should no longer be made.

Their freedom to eat the least nutritious breakfast cereal if they happen to like the taste, despite the desire of some federal agency to permit on the market only those cereals packed with vitamins.

Their freedom to do business with the manufacturers and the retailers that serve them best because only in a system of free enterprise can the consumer select the people he wants to patronize.

Their freedom to sell their services as employees to the highest bidder, because only under free enterprise is there more than one employer with whom to bargain.

Their freedom, in short, to live their lives the way they want to—whether or not it's the most economical way or the most practical way or even the safest way, in the opinion of some paternalistic government bureau.

Let's explain to our fellow Americans that once the government begins to live their lives for them, they are in deep trouble. And the government, prodded by consumerists, has made a number of moves in that direction. . . .

We must show this negative side of government paternalism to the public. We must make it plain that there are drawbacks to consumerist boondoggling and that the nastiest of these is a loss of personal freedom. Permit Big Brother in Washington to dictate what you must buy and must not buy and you have sown the seeds of slavery.

HOW TO INFORM PUBLIC?

Our country was founded on the thesis that there are worse things than injury and death. Given a choice between loss of liberty and loss of life, a man named Patrick Henry unhesitatingly opted for the latter. I must say I prefer Patrick Henry's philosophy to Ralph Nader's. And so will an informed American public. . . .

And let's start fighting back, through our advertising and public relations departments, when the extremists of America sling mud at us. The time for accommodation and surrender is past. Zero hour is closer than some of us seem to realize.

While I regard the peril from hardcore consumerism as both real and serious, I have recently seen indications that the tide may be turning at last.

There was, for example, the exchange of letters last month between the New York City Department of Consumer Affairs and the president of a pharmaceutical company. The department wrote first, demanding scientific substantiation for some innocuous point in the company's advertising copy.

Instead of meekly complying, the company president wrote back asking the department to have Mayor Lindsay substantiate his advertising claim that New York is Fun City...

GM'S REACTION

And then, just the other day, James Roche, chairman of General Motors, took off the kid gloves and struck a telling blow against those who "crusade for radical changes in our system of corporate ownership, changes so drastic that they would all but destroy free enterprise as we know it."

Mr. Roche explained that, when someone else dictates what can be made, what can be sold and at what price it can be sold, free enterprise is dead.

And I was heartened indeed by the words of President Nixon, who, two weeks ago, in a speech before the United States Chamber of Commerce, denounced those who would destroy the free enterprise system—a system which, the President noted, "has made possible not only our standard of living but our standard of giving." He went on to say, "I will forever be amazed at those who cry 'repression of freedom' at the drop of a hat but who—in the next breath—advocate total repression of the economic freedom of businessmen and workmen."

Ladies and gentlemen, on the night of December 16, 1973, at a place less than two miles from where we are now assembled, a small group of local residents dumped 342 chests of tea into Boston Harbor because they didn't like having a meddling government tell them what kind of tea to buy, what company to buy it from and how much to pay for it.

Perhaps it is time once again for all of us—businessman and consumer alike—to assert our independence from those who, in the guise of protector and patron, seek to deprive us of our cherished freedoms.

NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT DISCOUNTS NATIONAL CONSERVATION INTEREST

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD a release from the Wildlife Management Institute, a national conservation organization dedicated to conservation of American natural resources, regarding the Alaska Native land claims legislation now pending before the House dealing with units of the National wildlife refuge system and other conservation values and the effect of the Alaska Native land claims legislation on fish, wildlife, refuges, and conservation values in Alaska.

I also insert the letter of all major conservation organizations to the President on this important matter:

NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT DISCOUNTS NATIONAL CONSERVATION INTEREST

The decade's sharpest conservation battle is shaping over the terms being recommended for settlement of the Alaska Native Claims issue, according to the Wildlife Management Institute.

Conservation leaders say the fight will be joined quickly, when the American people realize that their national interest in the public lands in Alaska stand to be subordinated to that of the State and the natives. Under claims proposals now moving in Congress, sizeable inroads would be permitted in major national wildlife refuges, and other millions of acres owned by all Americans could move into state and private hands without any assurance of their prior examination for retention in public ownership for wildlife, recreation, wilderness, park, and other national values.

The plans under consideration would leave the American people, the actual owners of nearly all of Alaska, in second place as far as their national conservation interest is concerned. This is because the native people and the state would select their land first and the rest of the nation's 200 million citizens would be left with the remains.

Under such a haphazard procedure, conservationists say, areas that logically should be retained in public ownership for wildlife refuges, wilderness, national parks and recreation areas, wild and scenic rivers, and other national conservation purposes will end up in private hands, sacrificing for all time the opportunity to protect and manage them in the public interest.

Few people object to granting the natives land and money to settle their claim of right against the U.S. Under H.R. 10367 and S. 35, House and Senate bills dealing with the issue, they could get 40 million acres and \$1 billion. Some argue that money, not land, should be the principal medium of settlement. But many people object to the manner in which national wildlife refuges and other public land would be opened to random selection. Only existing national park units are excluded from native selection under the bills. Other large expanses of public land, known to possess outstanding wildlife, wilderness, recreation, and scenic values, will not receive even temporary protection until studies can be completed and recommendations made concerning their fate. It is in this area, conservation leaders say, that the native claims bills give the American public the short end of the stick.

The drive for congressional enactment of a native claims settlement is proceeding with uncommon haste. The reasons for this, over and above the anxiety of the natives to settle an issue that has been around for years, are attributed to the State of Alaska and the commercial interests operating there. The State's land selections under the Statehood Act are being held up pending resolution of the native claims issue. This in turn blocks the aspirations of commercial interests, including major oil companies, who have invested hundreds of millions in exploring for and proving up Alaska's resources, but who have made scant profit on their investments to date. These forces, working to encourage early congressional removal of the native claims roadblock, are exerting great pressure on the congressional committees, the conservationists say. This pressure results in all the haste.

WILDLIFE REFUGES HIT HARD

A million acres or more of the National Wildlife Refuge System would be turned over to private interests under the bills reported by the House and Senate committees. The areas that would be axed under these proposals constitute some of the most valuable wildlife habitat known. That is why they were selected for refuges in the first place.

The Kodiak National Wildlife Refuge would be reduced by 18% with 322,000 acres taken. It was established to conserve the wilderness habitat of the giant Alaska brown bear. It cannot be duplicated elsewhere. If part of this refuge is given to private interests and if an anticipated domestic livestock program were established, an immediate incompatible

situation would occur. The bear and the public would be the inevitable losers.

The Clarence Rhode National Wildlife Refuge is an internationally important waterfowl and migratory bird nesting area. Birds produced there are valued by the U.S., Canada, Mexico and other countries. The current proposals would take 644,000 acres from this refuge to the detriment of both game and non-game species, including whistling swans. That is equal to 22% of the entire refuge in acreage, but more than 50% of its nesting grounds on a habitat basis.

Nunivak Island National Wildlife Refuge would lose 92,160 acres. Nunivak harbors the parent herd of muskoxen acquired from Greenland which is being used to restock the animal to its former Alaskan range.

Likewise, Cape Newenham National Wildlife Refuge would be cut by 46,080 acres, the Kenai National Moose Range by 6,000 acres, and the Arctic National Wildlife Range by 69,000 acres. Other refuges also may be adversely affected. These reductions understandably would be a serious blow to the wildlife refuge system.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

Because the bill fails to protect the national conservation interest, many of the nation's conservation and environmental organizations have sent a joint letter to the President expressing their concern.

The organizations urged the President to help protect the public's interest in Alaska which is shared by all Americans. It stated that the claims proposals accommodate the interests of the natives, the State of Alaska, and resource developers but "nowhere in either of these bills is the public interest accommodated—the interest of 200 million Americans who own most of Alaska."

The conservationists requested that the President use his existing authority to temporarily withdraw some of the land from selection by private interests and the State until they have been reviewed for possible retention. They said that known migratory waterfowl concentration areas such as the Yukon Flats, Selkirk and Teshekpuk Lakes, and the Koyukuk River are outstanding examples of areas needing careful review before disposal is permitted. Other sites are equally valuable, the conservationists said, for study for national parks and recreation areas, wilderness, and wild and scenic rivers. This opportunity, they said, must not be ignored.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1971.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have just returned from Alaska, and you undoubtedly have renewed awareness of what a national treasure it is. The undersigned share in this awareness, and because of it we feel compelled to ask you to intercede with those in the Executive Branch and the Congress who, however well intentioned, seem set on destroying much of that national treasure.

In recent months speculators and exploiters, never identified to the public but everywhere in evidence plying the halls of Congress, have been championing the cause of Alaskan Native Claims. Their theme has been: enormous grants of public land and some money for the Natives, but no restraints upon the commercial exploitation of the public lands of Alaska. To our deep concern, the legislation approved by the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives appear to respond to this point of view. The Senate Interior Committee seems ready to follow a somewhat similar course. Such legislation would not be a credit to your Administration, and on behalf of the environmental movement of this country we ask that you take steps to halt it until grievous defects can be corrected.

Looking at the House and Senate versions of Native Claims legislation we see that these

bills seemingly accommodate the interests of 1) the Natives, who are to receive some 40 million acres of federal land; 2) the state of Alaska, which will be free to resume its selection of 103 million acres of federal land; and 3) resource developers, who will be able to proceed with their plans for unrestricted exploitation of America's last frontier. But nowhere in either of these bills is the public interest accommodated—the interest of the 200 million Americans who own most of Alaska.

While we hesitate to take issue with representatives of the Natives who contend this legislation is good for their clients, we have grave doubts about the long-term benefit to the Natives from a settlement which will make them prey to the designs of exploiters while guaranteeing no specific and enduring benefit to the individual Natives now or in the future.

Now to one of the most serious problems we see in this legislation. In recent years, Mr. President, the American people have become increasingly aware of the need for more park and recreation land, wilderness, wildlife refuges, scenic rivers and the like. To acquire land for these purposes the federal government often has had to buy back at present day prices lands which once were part of the public domain. As you have pointed out on several occasions, demands for recreation, wildlife and other land acquisition far exceed the capacity of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and necessitate, in many cases, years of delay before acquisition can be made, if it can be made at all. We did not have the need nor the foresight to reserve adequate lands when many states were admitted to the Union.

We believe it would be the height of irresponsibility for the United States to repeat that kind of mistake in Alaska. To allow public lands to pass into private hands—either directly or through the channel of Alaska state selection—before they have been reviewed for possible retention to meet national needs is unthinkable. Needed extensions of the Arctic National Wildlife Range and Mount McKinley National Park are but two examples of lands endangered by these bills. The Gates of the Arctic National Park, under consideration for years, is another. The Yukon Flats, and Selkirk and Teshekpuk Lakes, and the Koyukuk River are other outstanding examples of areas needing careful review before they are made available for selection by the Natives, the state of Alaska or for appropriation by commercial interests.

Further, no provision is made at all for the coordinated development of a master plan for all of Alaska to assure that transportation, communications, settlement, development and other facets are accomplished in an orderly manner that is consistent with the best interests of all concerned.

The present approach to Native Claims legislation has these additional defects which we wish to call to your attention:

1. In transferring 40 million or more acres from public to Native ownership, it would set up a sequence of land selection and disposition that would relegate the national interest to the lowest priority. State, Native, and private interests would receive preference over the public's interest in areas of the highest aesthetic, cultural, scientific, wildlife and wilderness values. The present land management confusion in Alaska would only be intensified by this legislation.

2. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to classify unreserved public lands for mineral leasing and outright disposal to private parties in accordance with existing inadequate public land laws. And the House Committee's version fails to require the Secretary to identify and propose for Congressional consideration areas suitable for inclusion in national park and recreation areas, national wildlife refuges and national wild and scenic rivers. The Senate Committee's

version, while directing the Secretary to advise Congress, fails to provide adequate safeguards during this critical review procedure.

3. Under the House Committee's version, thousands of acres could be eliminated from the national wildlife refuge system in Alaska, including some of this nation's most critical areas of wildlife habitat. Preliminary indications of the final draft of the Senate version suggest the impact on the refuges could be even worse.

Mr. President, along with all other Americans, we share in the ownership of the federal lands of Alaska. We are shocked at what the pending proposal of the two Committees would appear to permit to be done to them. We believe a raid upon the public domain of Alaska must be prevented. And we call upon you to use the power and prestige of your office to help stop it until these defects can be corrected.

If Congress cannot be persuaded to recognize the larger public interests involved in this issue, we strongly urge that you make use of existing withdrawal authority to assure that the values of these unique and critical areas of public land in Alaska are not lost for lack of leadership.

As you stated at our last meeting with you on Washington's birthday in 1970, we should meet more frequently and keep up our communication about serious conservation issues. It appears to us that an early meeting on this critical subject would be most beneficial.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Brumm, Alaska Action Committee; Spencer M. Smith, Jr., Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Mary Hazell Harris, Executive Director, Defenders of Wildlife; Avery Taylor, Environmental Action; David R. Brower, President, Friends of the Earth; Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation; J. Michael McCloskey, Executive Director, Sierra Club; Stephen G. Saltzman, Washington Representative, Trout Unlimited; Stewart M. Brandborg, Executive Director, The Wilderness Society; Daniel A. Poole, President, Wildlife Management Institute; Carl Pope, Washington Representative, Zero Population Growth, Inc.; Frank C. Daniel, Secretary, National Rifle Association.

WOMEN VERSUS THE FBI

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, unfolding now in the courts is the latest episode in a series of blatant violations of equal protection of the laws as committed by the Federal Government. Two young women, Sandra R. Nemser and Cynthia Edgar, recent graduates of national law schools, decided they wanted to work as special agents with the FBI. They advised Mr. Hoover of their intent, but learned that females were not permitted to apply for the job. In stating the qualifications for special agents, the FBI specifically requires that the applicant "be a male citizen of the United States." (Form FD-257 (Rev. 1/19/71)).

This requirement is in apparent violation of 5 U.S.C. 7151 which provides that:

It is the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for

employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

Implementing this provision, Executive Order 11478 requires the executive departments and agencies "to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a continuing affirmative program."

The FBI attempted to justify its policy by telling the women lawyers that first, women do not command enough respect and second, women could not handle combat situations. These are very lame explanations for such a policy of discrimination. In this context, it is interesting to note that this past August, New York City Mayor John Lindsay announced the appointment of New York City's first woman police captain, Mrs. Gertrude Schimmel. It seems that local law enforcement agencies have been able to make good use of the so-called weaker sex.

It is also significant to note the recent handling of a sex discrimination charge leveled against the State Department by Miss Alison Palmer. After reviewing her claim that she was deliberately discriminated against by sex in appointment in the Foreign Service, Deputy Undersecretary William B. Macomber, Jr., recognized its validity and made efforts to rectify the past practices of the Department. See New York Post article inserted herewith. Unfortunately, the FBI has failed to make a thorough review of its hiring practices and has instead decided to fight the case in court.

As evidenced by the overwhelming vote on the Equal Rights amendment in the House yesterday, the Congress has made pointedly clear its determination to end discrimination based on sex. There appears to be enough legislation already in force to support these women; however, should the court fail to vindicate these women, then I shall consider introducing new legislation to support their claim. The shame of this entire affair is that the case got to court in the first place, because of the flagrant violation of equal opportunities by the FBI.

At this point, I would like to insert into the RECORD FD-257 (Rev. 1/19/71), an FBI form which details, among other things, the qualifications for special agents. It is ironic to note that at the conclusion of the form is the inscription "The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an equal opportunity employer." In addition, I am including a copy of the plaintiffs' complaint in their case against Mr. Hoover et al, as well as the New York Post article on Miss Palmer. The articles follow:

INFORMATION CONCERNING THE POSITION OF SPECIAL AGENT IN THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is the primary investigative arm of the United States Department of Justice and as such has jurisdiction over some 185 Federal investigative matters, which include general investigations of a criminal and civil nature and domestic intelligence operations dealing with the internal security of our country. An additional responsibility is the correlation of information concerning the internal security of the United States and dissemination of such data to interested agencies in the Executive Branch of the Federal Government.

Applicants Must Possess the Following Qualifications:

1. They must be male citizens of the United States.

2. They must be willing and available to serve in any part of the United States or Puerto Rico in which it is determined that their services are required.

3. Education and experience. Applicants must be:

(a) Graduates from state-accredited resident law schools.

Note: Graduates of law schools must have successfully completed at least two years of resident, undergraduate college work. A resident college is one requiring personal attendance.

(b) Graduates from a resident four-year college with a major in accounting with at least three years of practical accounting and/or auditing experience.

(c) In addition, the Bureau is presently considering for the Special Agent position, on a limited basis, applicants possessing a 4-year resident college degree with a major in a physical science, fluency in a language for which the Bureau has a need, or 3 years of specialized experience of a professional, executive, or complex investigative nature. No assurance can be given, however, that these requirements will remain in effect.

4. Age: They must have reached their twenty-third but not their forty-first birthday on the date the application is filed.

(a) Height—Must be at least five feet seven inches without shoes.

(b) Vision—All applicants for the Agent position must have uncorrected vision of not less than 20/40 (Snellen) in one eye and at least 20/20 (Snellen) in each eye corrected. No applicant can be considered who has been found to be color blind.

(c) Hearing—No applicant will be accepted if found by audiometer test to have a hearing loss exceeding a 15 decibel average in either ear in the conversational speech range (500, 1000, 2000 cycles).

All applicants must be in excellent physical condition and can have no defects which would interfere with their use of firearms or with their participation in raids, dangerous assignments, or defensive tactics. An applicant's physical and visual condition will be ascertained through a rigid physical examination conducted at a Government examining facility.

(6) All applicants must have a valid license to drive an automobile.

(Omitted are sections dealing with Examinations, Training and Salary and Benefits of FBI Employment)

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is an equal opportunity employer.

[U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

SUIT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND FOR DAMAGES

Sandra Rothenberg Nemser, 1305 Elizabeth Street, Denver, Colorado 80206; Cynthia Edgar, 2414 37th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C., (On behalf of themselves and for all other women similarly situated) Plaintiffs, v. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; John N. Mitchell, Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; Leo Fellerzi, Director of Equal Employment Opportunity, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; Richard G. Hunsinger, Equal Employment Opportunity Officer of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; Kenneth J. Stallo, Director of Personnel, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.; James B. Adams, Personnel Officer of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., (And their successors and assigns), Defendants.

COMPLAINT

I. Jurisdiction

1. This is a civil action seeking a declaration of the constitutionality of and a permanent injunction against the exclusion of women from the position of F.B.I. Special Agent. Jurisdiction is invoked under the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution, and the equal protection guarantees arising therefrom; and under 28 U.S.C. §§1331, 1343, 1361, and 2201; and under 5 U.S.C. §§702, 703, and 7151.

2. The plaintiffs bring this action on their own behalf and on behalf of all other women similarly situated pursuant to Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The prerequisites of subsections (a), (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of that rule are satisfied. There are common questions of law and fact affecting the several rights of women not to be deprived of due process and equal protection of the laws through the unreasonable and arbitrary exclusion of women from the position of F.B.I. Special Agent. The members of plaintiffs' class are so numerous as to make it impractical to bring them all before this Court. The claims of the plaintiffs are typical of the claims of the plaintiffs' class, and the relief sought against the defendants is typical of the relief sought by all members of the class. The interests of the class are adequately represented by the plaintiffs and the defendants.

The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the plaintiffs' class would create a risk of: (a) inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the class; or (b) adjudications with respect to individual members of the class which would as a practical matter be dispositive of the interests of the other members not parties to the adjudications. Furthermore, the parties opposing the class have acted on grounds generally applicable to the class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive and declaratory relief with respect to the class as a whole.

The questions of law and fact common to the members of the class predominate over any questions affecting only individual members, and a class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy.

3. The matter in controversy exceeds the sum of ten thousand dollars.

II. Parties

4. Plaintiff Sandra Rothenberg Nemser is a member of the District of Columbia Bar and a citizen of the United States presently residing in Denver, Colorado.

5. Plaintiff Cynthia Edgar is a graduate of George Washington University Law School and a citizen of the United States residing in the District of Columbia.

6. Defendants maintain their official places of business in Washington, D.C., and have command and authority over all hiring policies and practices of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

III. Cause of Action

7. In 1970, plaintiff Sandra Rothenberg Nemser wrote to Defendant Hoover informing him of her interest in becoming a F.B.I. Special Agent. In the same letter she also asked whether, in light of the F.B.I.'s published policy of considering only men for the position of Special Agent, any application on her part for the position would be a futile gesture, since she is a female.

8. By return letter defendant Hoover affirmed the F.B.I.'s strict adherence to its published policy of excluding all women from the position of F.B.I. Special Agent.

9. Subsequently, plaintiff Sandra Rothenberg Nemser met with defendants James B. Adams and Richard G. Hunsinger to discuss the F.B.I.'s exclusion of women from

the position of Special Agent. Defendants Adams and Hunsinger reaffirmed the fact that the position is limited to males.

10. On December 30, 1970, plaintiff Sandra Rothenberg Nemser filed a formal complaint of discrimination against the F.B.I., based upon the F.B.I.'s continuing refusal to consider women for the position of Special Agent. By letter dated January 19, 1971, defendant Hunsinger rejected the plaintiff's complaint.

11. In accordance with federal regulations, on February 1, 1971, the plaintiff appealed this decision to the United States Civil Service Commission Board of Appeals and Review. By letter dated March 17, 1971, the Board of Appeals and Review affirmed the decision of the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer to reject the plaintiff's complaint and advised the plaintiff that the decision of the Board was final and that there was no further right to appeal.

12. In April, 1971, plaintiff Cynthia Edgar contacted defendant Adams regarding the policy of the F.B.I. of not hiring female agents. Defendant Adams affirmed this policy stating that (1) women do not command enough respect, and (2) that women could not handle combat situations.

13. The policy and practice of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of refusing to consider women for the position of F.B.I. Special Agent arbitrarily discriminate on the basis of sex and thereby deprive the plaintiff and the class she represents of the due process of law and equal protection of law guaranteed by the due process clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

14. The arbitrary policy and practice of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of refusing to consider women for the position of F.B.I. Special Agent are in violation of Title 5, § 7151 of the United States Code, which provides that "It is the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin," and also in violation of President Nixon's Executive Order 11478, which implements this statutory policy by requiring executive departments and agencies "to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a continuing affirmative program."

Wherefore, the plaintiffs respectfully pray:

a) that this Court take jurisdiction of this cause;

b) that this Court enter an order declaring that the exclusion of women from the position of F.B.I. Special Agent is unconstitutional;

c) that the Court enjoin the defendants, their successors and those acting in concert with them, from continuing the practice of discriminating against women in the employment of Special Agents and ordering that the plaintiffs be offered opportunity for position of Special Agent at a salary and rank commensurate with their background; and

d) that the damage suffered by the plaintiffs be determined and the defendants be ordered to pay the same together with interest, reasonable costs and attorney's fees.

Respectfully submitted,

SANDRA ROTHENBERG NEMSER,
CYNTHIA EDGAR,

Plaintiffs (by Counsel).

Counsel for Plaintiffs: Philip J. Hirschkop, 503 D Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001, 836-5555.

Of Counsel: Ralph J. Temple, American Civil Liberties Union Fund, 1424-16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

[From the New York Post Aug. 28, 1971]

FEDERAL SEX BIAS ADMITTED

(By Jeannette Smyth)

WASHINGTON.—The first sex discrimination case filed against the State Dept. has been decided personally by Deputy Undersecretary

tary William B. Macomber Jr. in favor of the complainant, Foreign Service officer Alison Palmer.

Macomber conceded that Miss Palmer had been discriminated against because of her sex in three instances and that there was "a pattern of discrimination" in the Foreign Service.

Acting on recommendations made Aug. 19 by Civil Service Examiner Andrew B. Beath, who held closed hearings on the case, Macomber's decision also struck down the State Dept. policy of excluding women from foreign assignments "for compelling reasons of foreign policy."

It was formerly held that in countries where women are considered inferior, a female diplomat's sex might interfere with her ability to operate effectively. If it is literally applied, yesterday's ruling abandons that consideration.

OPPOSED BY ENVOY

Arguing against Miss Palmer's appointment to a post at the embassy in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1966, Ambassador Edward M. Korry wrote to the State Dept. that the position she was to fill dealt with Ethiopian labor leaders.

"Believe me," Korry wrote, "the savages in the labor movement would not be receptive to Miss Palmer, except perhaps her natural endowments."

Macomber says the State Dept. will no longer exclude women even for such "compelling reasons."

Miss Palmer, 39, will be given her choice of "a desirable African assignment."

Macomber also accepted Beath's recommendations that Miss Palmer's personnel file be amended to include a statement that her career had been adversely affected by sex discrimination and that she be considered for promotion with "strong recommendation" from Macomber when the next promotion board meets this fall.

However, both Beath and Macomber rejected Miss Palmer's plea that letters of censure be placed in the personnel files of the people she contends were responsible.

THE TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is little debate that narcotic addiction is one of the gravest problems facing the Nation today. An article entitled, "The Treatment of Narcotic Addiction in Philadelphia: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," appeared in the September 5 issue of Philadelphia Medicine. The essay details history, frustrations, competition, and inadequacies in the treatment of narcotic addicts in Philadelphia—a situation similar to that faced by many other large cities throughout the country. I have the privilege of serving with one of the articles' coauthors, Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, M.D., on the board of directors of Gaudenzia, Inc., a treatment house for addicts in Philadelphia. I include this informative article in the RECORD:

THE TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA: YESTERDAY, TODAY, AND TOMORROW

(By Frederick B. Glaser, M.D.; John C. Ball, Ph.D.; Arthur D. Moffett, M.S.W.; and Freda Adler, Ph.D.)

INTRODUCTION

It is no longer necessary to argue that the problem of narcotic addiction is one of the most pressing problems facing the City of Philadelphia today. One might almost wish that there could be yet some doubt, some uncertainty about this; but that a problem exists has been conceded by a virtual unanimity of public and private opinion. Still, agreement upon this single point is almost the only agreement one may find in this puzzling and complex field. Upon all other points there is wide diversity of opinion. This is particularly the case in considering what is to be done about the problem.

Proposals for action which should be taken may be divided into two general categories: those having to do with prevention of the problem, and those having to do with treatment. Prevention is far and away the more controversial of these categories. No one who knows the difficulties involved in the treatment of narcotic addiction can doubt the importance of prevention. But proposals for the prevention of narcotic addiction often involve fundamental, far-reaching structural changes in society, on the theory that the root causes of the problem lie deeply imbedded within the social matrix. All such proposals for change engender considerable resistance and the probability that any of them will be effected in the near future is not great.

Therefore, although a search for feasible preventive measures must continue, the allocation of a high social priority to the treatment of narcotic addiction and related problems would seem a wise policy, both at the present time and for the immediate future. In order to channel the public effort in this direction it should be demonstrated that this problem has been a persistent one for Philadelphia; that past efforts have not succeeded in ameliorating it; and that current efforts in the treatment field are insufficient. Further, some reasonable suggestions about what may be done should also be forthcoming.

THE HISTORY OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA

If there is any one quality which distinguishes Philadelphia substance abuse down the years it is its variety, or perhaps it would be more precise to say, its peculiarity. Thus for example in 1832 "the lads of Philadelphia" were fond, it is reported, of inhaling ether for kicks. Philadelphia was also an early pioneer in the psychedelic experience. Our renowned author and physician, Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, was one of the first ever to experiment with self-ingested mescaline. Not only did his 1896 "trip" anticipate the more celebrated experiments of Aldous Huxley by almost sixty years, but he also "turned on" a younger medical colleague, who proceeded to ride his bicycle through Fairmount Park and down Broad Street while under the influence! In more recent years Philadelphia has witnessed the use of such curiosities as morning-glory seeds, stramonium-containing asthma powders, marihuana soaked in a solution of scopolamine, and an odd combination of glutethimide and codeine.

With respect to the somewhat less exotic subject of opiate abuse, Philadelphia also

has a long and eventful history. Various forms of crude opium were the first narcotics to be abused by man. In the early history of Philadelphia, and of our country, opium preparations were widely available as patent medicine. These were among the earliest importations of the Colonies from England, and Philadelphia was a center both of trade and of the domestic patent medicine industry. Not all such medicines contained opium, but many did, as well as alcohol, and (later) morphine, heroin, and cocaine. As early as 1828 the Philadelphia Medical Society found it necessary to issue a vitriolic report on patent medicines, but they continued to be widely available until well after the passage of effective federal legislation in 1906. Until then, it was not necessary for manufacturers to state that their preparations contained opium. Although such labeling might have prevented many cases of unwitting addiction, the oral ingestion of opium would still have been a problem. Thomas de Quincey published his famous Confessions of an English Opium Eater in 1821, and by 1840 opium eating as such was well established in the United States. Exactly one hundred years ago the Pennsylvania Sanitarium in Media reported on the treatment of two hundred "inebriates," most of whom were alcoholics but 14 of whom were "admitted for opium inebriety." The report commented further that:

"The extent of inebriety cannot be justly estimated. Street drunkenness as we see it, day by day, affords no criterion for a correct judgment in this respect. . . . Could we study the history of many more, we would find that they never enter a bar-room, or drink in society; but that they seek relief in the use of drugs, procured from the apothecary, in the form of bitters, elixirs, schnapps and cordials, as well as of opium and its several salts and tinctures."

The subsequent history of opiate addiction in Philadelphia closely parallels technological improvements upon crude opium, either in terms of the isolation of its constituent alkaloids or the development of synthetic or semisynthetic compounds related to the alkaloids. Morphine, the first and most important of these, was isolated in 1803. Its wholesale manufacture and distribution began in 1827. The history of its use and abuse is closely bound up with that of the hypodermic syringe, both because of the higher blood levels possible by comparison with the oral route and because of the interesting motion that, by bypassing the stomach, there would be no danger of addiction. Dr. Alexander Wood of Edinburgh introduced the syringe as a means of injecting medication in 1855, and within a year it had been used for that purpose in the United States.

During the bloody American Civil War which shortly followed, morphine by hypodermic injection was very frequently used. Weir Mitchell estimated that 40,000 injections of morphine were given in a single year to battle casualties for neuralgia alone, and this, of course, was not the most frequent indication for its use. Morphine addiction became so frequent among soldiers that it was referred to as "the soldier's disease."² Philadelphia, as a major hospital town and a prime contributor of manpower to the Union cause, was hard-hit. A part of the problem was due to a lack of appreciation of the addicting qualities of the drug until the early 1870's. In view of the fact that the addicting qualities of opium were well known, this is rather odd. But a failure to appreciate the addictive potential of new forms of opium has been a consistent feature of medical history up to the present time.

² Thus the association of addiction among soldiers with warfare is not new in the United States. This is true of heroin, which was abused by soldiers as early as 1913, as well as morphine.

¹ From the Addiction Sciences Center of the Department of Psychiatry of Temple University Health Sciences Center at Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, Henry and Abbot'sford Roads, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19129.

With the resurgence of national activity which followed the Civil War, thousands of Chinese laborers were brought into the West coast of the United States to work upon the railways. They brought with them the custom of smoking opium. Native-born Americans indulged in this habit as early as 1868, and by 1876 it had reached the East coast. Not until 1909 was the importation of opium for smoking forbidden by federal law. Although it was probably never as important in the history of addiction in Philadelphia as were other forms of opiate abuse, there were nevertheless three individuals habituated to smoking opium reported from Philadelphia General Hospital as late as 1916.

Diacetylmorphine was first synthesized in England in 1874. The hydrochloride salt of this combination and the industrial process for producing it were patented by Bayer and the substance was introduced into medical practice in 1898 under the trade name Heroin. Within six months a Philadelphia physician had published a paper outlining its possible clinical usefulness. Physiologic experiments with the new drug were performed in Philadelphia in the first year of the new century. During the following year it was used for post-operative analgesia in obstetrical cases at Howard Hospital in Philadelphia and was recommended by a Wilkes-Barre physician for the treatment of addiction to morphine.

Recognition of the addictive potential of Heroin existed from about five years after its introduction but, largely on the strength of the proprietor's claims that it was non-addicting, it was enthusiastically taken up by the medical profession. Between 1913 and 1915 it supplanted morphine as the drug of choice among addicts admitted to Philadelphia General Hospital. It is of interest that Heroin was at this time used almost exclusively intranasally, in spite of the availability of the hypodermic syringe. It was not until approximately 1925 that the intravenous injection of drugs, now particularly associated with Heroin, began among addicts in the United States.

By the early years of the twentieth century, then, addiction to opiates had gotten out of control. Indeed, all available evidence indicates that even in terms of absolute numbers the problem at that time was far greater than at the present, even given the enormous growth in national population which has occurred. By 1913 there were approximately 782,118 addicts in the United States. A survey contemporaneous with this estimate indicated that Pennsylvania ranked fifth among states in the number of addicts. Vigorous law enforcement based primarily upon the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906 and the Harrison Narcotic Act of 1914 was the primary means utilized in combatting the drug problem.

Philadelphia institutions, especially hospitals, were sorely taxed by the large numbers of addicts seeking treatment in consequence of this legislation and its enforcement. Series of cases numbering 335, 147, and 861 were reported from Philadelphia General Hospital alone. "After March 1, 1915," recalled the Chief Resident at PGH about the effective date of the Harrison Act, "they came to us in floods. In the course of a few days, 200 patients were under treatment." A citizen's committee which surveyed all of the institutions in the city of Philadelphia during the year following the Harrison Act identified 1,026 separate individuals admitted for the treatment of addiction. They also noted that admissions of addicted individuals to "hospitals for the insane" in the rest of the state had jumped from 33 during the previous year to 244, or better than seven-fold. All of these observers commented independently that the known and identified cases represented only a fraction of the total population of the addicted.

There is every indication that in the face of a problem of extraordinary magnitude

this approach through enforcement was highly successful. So far as is known the United States has never since been faced with a problem of comparable magnitude with respect to opiate addiction. But the problem was not eliminated. Many of the addicts up to this period were individuals with medical problems whose narcotic addiction arose from their treatment for physical illnesses, and among this population there was a very substantial reduction in illegal use. However, a substantial number of non-medical addicts, who used drugs primarily for "pleasure" or for reasons other than the relief of pain, were less affected by the changed legal status of narcotics and remained a problem throughout the 20's and 30's. This experience indicates both that legal restraints are an important and indispensable factor in limiting the extent of the addiction problem and that in themselves they are insufficient to eliminate the problem.

World War II was a period during which opiate abuse declined throughout the United States. Wartime controls and the global scope of the conflict are believed to have disrupted the international traffic in illicit drugs. But during the postwar period there was a precipitous rise in the incidence and prevalence of opiate abuse in the United States. Between 1945 and 1950 the number of addicts known to local, state, and federal authorities doubled; the number of addict admissions to the Lexington and Fort Worth Hospitals, which had been established in the 1930's, increased from 1,312 in 1945 to 3,769 in 1950. As a nation, we were involved in a migration to the metropolitan centers, increased industrialization, prosperity, and growing racial conflicts; these changes were associated with a marked increase in Heroin addiction. There was a corresponding change in the character of the addict population, which was now for the first time concentrated most heavily in our largest cities. It now included a disproportionate number of Blacks and Puerto Ricans. The age of onset had decreased, and drug use often involved marihuana and barbiturates as well as Heroin.

Rapid growth of the problem continued throughout the 1950's and 1960's. The first large-scale police raids in Philadelphia directed against the drug traffic were conducted in 1954; the first such raid resulted in over one hundred arrests and indictments. Figures 1 and 2 illustrate graphically the narcotic situation in Philadelphia during the 1960's. It appears that the addict population both in Philadelphia and Pennsylvania climbed steadily and rapidly, while the drug-related death rate in Philadelphia rose exponentially.

CURRENT EXTENT OF THE NARCOTIC ADDICTION PROBLEM IN PHILADELPHIA

Philadelphia has been, as we have seen, one of the leading cities in the United States with regard to opiate addiction; and at the present time it continues to have this distinction. In 1970, the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs ranked Philadelphia as the eighth city in the nation with respect to the number of known addicts. Over half of Pennsylvania's narcotic addicts active in the Bureau files in 1970 were residents of Philadelphia. The total 1970 population of Philadelphia was 1,938,609 and that of the Commonwealth was 11,669,565. Thus, most of the current Pennsylvania addicts live in one city which contains only 16.5% of the state's population. Philadelphia has a disproportionate share of the contemporary addict population in the state.

That the total number of addicts listed by the BNDD represents only a part of a given addict population is well known, though they probably afford the best available comparative data over the years or between localities. The Bureau listed 1,406 addicts as active in Philadelphia during 1970. But 1,509 addict patients have been treated at one city hospital clinic during a recent 34-month period; 904 drug cases were received

by the City of Philadelphia Probation Department during a nine-month period in 1970; there were 2,848 drug cases disposed of by the Court of Common Pleas in 1970 (of which 1,419 were acquitted, 1,220 were guilty as charged and 209 were found guilty of a lesser offense); and there were 6,612 arrests in the city on drug charges during 1970.

Although these figures vary as to the incidence of the problem which they would predict and the extent of duplication is unknown, it seems reasonable to maintain that the actual extent of the drug abuse problem in Philadelphia exceeds by far even a composite calculation based on these data. The principal inadequacy of such figures, which are based on medical and police reports, is that they do not include addicts who are not arrested or who do not seek treatment. In addition, these official tabulations refer primarily to Heroin addicts and consequently grossly underestimate persons who are dependent upon non-narcotic drugs.

Given the limitation of our present reporting procedures, the only feasible means of obtaining valid information concerning the extent of drug abuse in Philadelphia is through a careful and rigorous survey of the general population. Such a study would involve interviewing a stratified sample of respondents from all segments of society. These survey results would provide a means of measuring the extent of the drug use problem as well as analyzing its incidence in various socioeconomic groups and ecological areas.

THE TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA: YESTERDAY

Having taken a broad look at the scope of the problem (which by even the most conservative estimate must rank as a very considerable one) we have now to consider the measures which have been taken to deal with it. Unfortunately, this section will be very brief. Although (as we have seen) there is evidence of a problem since the founding of the Republic, and of a problem of major proportions for a minimum period of one hundred years, few attempts have been made to cope with it in an organized manner, and these have been mainly in response to external circumstances rather than to any recognition of the chronic and severe nature of the problem.

Thus it would appear that, prior to the passage of the Harrison Act, no general measures in the area of treatment had been mounted by the City of Philadelphia. With the influx of patients resulting from the passage of that legislation, beds were set aside for the treatment of addicts at Philadelphia General Hospital. Passage of the Harrison Act left open the question of whether a physician might maintain an existing addict on his medication if the physician felt it best. This required litigation to be resolved. When several Supreme Court decisions indicated the answer might be negative, a series of narcotic clinics were opened, in the period 1919-1923, in order to supply drugs to addicts under municipal government auspices when they could no longer obtain them from their physicians. We have been unable to find evidence that such a clinic operated in Philadelphia, though it is known that "tentative experiments" toward this end were made in Scranton and Harrisburg. A total of 44 such clinics in operation for variable periods of time throughout the nation.

Highly controversial, all of these clinics were closed by 1923, under pressure from the medical profession. In that same year, the Supreme Court handed down the Behrman decision, which irrevocably barred the physician from maintaining the addict. Since the problem of dealing with the addict still remained, it seems at least possible that it was the Behrman decision which led to the founding, in 1925, of the Philadelphia Committee for the Clinical Study of Opium Addiction. This group was established with the support of the Committee on Drug Addiction of New

York City and had wards in Philadelphia General Hospital. 861 patients were admitted for study and treatment over the next few years. The results of these studies were published in a series of papers and have been described as "the first attempt to apply modern clinical laboratory techniques to the study of addiction."

Unfortunately there was little follow-up to this achievement. Although private practitioners continued to treat addicts occasionally, the initiative now passed to the Federal government, and the Lexington and Fort Worth Hospitals were opened in the 1930's. 32 Pennsylvania addicts were admitted to Lexington during the first year of its operation. With the availability of this treatment with Supreme Court decisions limiting the medical role (but not eliminating it, as the work at PGH demonstrates) and with the well-known difficulties involved in having addicts under treatment, neither Philadelphia nor any other major urban center has had a conspicuous record of providing treatment for the addict up to the present time.

THE TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA: TODAY

The increment in narcotic addiction in Philadelphia in recent years has once again prompted a response in the treatment area. This was stimulated in some measure by the Federal decision that the burden of narcotic addiction treatment no longer fell alone upon the national government and its specialized hospitals. Philadelphia currently possesses a large number of programs devoted to the treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse. One cannot but be impressed by the diversity of approaches to the problem which are now available.

There are diverse modalities, ranging from the drug-free therapeutic community to programs which see as their major tool the administration of drugs. There are correspondingly diverse notions about what kinds of activities are therapeutic for the addict or abuser. There are diverse categories of personnel in use; some programs depend heavily upon mental health professionals with extensive academic training, while others utilize ex-addicts who often lack both uniform training and formal credentials. Treatment programs operate under diverse auspices. Some are associated with universities, others with federal, state and/or local governments, some with grass-roots movements, and some are entities unto themselves and operate as private corporations, either for profit or not for profit. Sources of funding are equally varied. The programs operate in different areas of the city and serve different kinds of populations, with respect to such variables as age, race, sex, drug of abuse, and so forth.

Conceivably, such a diverse approach might have advantages. Although the essential nature of the addictive process is in many of its critical particulars unknown, it would appear to be a diverse rather than a unitary process. Many different kinds of persons are involved in narcotic addiction and drug abuse. In most respects the only thing they have in common at all is substance abuse. It seems likely that the difference between a white physician addict in Chestnut Hill, a black adolescent addict in North Philadelphia, and a brown Puerto Rican addict in the Spring Garden Street barrio are more compelling than the similarities. Applied to the treatment process, this might indicate that no one program or approach to the problem would be likely to have universal efficacy. Therefore diversity in approach may be indicated.

However, closer inspection reveals that what characterizes the Philadelphia drug treatment approach at the present time is not so much diversity as it is chaos. The difference is that true diversity is playful, harmonious, and complimentary, while chaos is unplanned, acrimonious, and competitive. We have the latter.

Existing treatment programs in Philadelphia, for example, compete with each other in a variety of ways. There is competition for patients. Most programs will grant theoretically that not everyone who enters their portals can be successfully treated by them. Nevertheless, they can give no specific criteria which differentiate those who do well from those who do poorly in their program. No program has any criteria which would identify any given case as untreatable, though in the nature of things such cases must exist. An operational analysis of these programs suggests rather an underlying commitment to the ideology that all kinds of addicts, and even in some instances non-addicts, can benefit more from their ministrations than from those of any other program. Cross-referral between programs is extremely rare, if it exists at all.

Competition also exists for funds with which to operate programs. Indeed, there is not only competition for funds between treatment programs themselves, but between treatment programs as a group and other kinds of human services agencies, many of which may be serving the same individuals. The funding of treatment programs in the addiction and drug abuse areas is currently high on the scale of political expediency. But the converse of this possibly happy circumstance is that, political expediencies being what they are, the order of priorities is likely to change at any time without any necessary reference to the status of the problem in realistic terms. This already appears to have happened in New York City. In a word, the potential politicization of treatment programs is fraught with hazards to the enterprise as a whole, especially in the long run.

Further evidence of the chaos in the treatment situation in Philadelphia lies in the fact that enormous gaps exist in the pattern of services. Some key aspects of treatment have been almost entirely neglected. There is a disproportionate lack of detoxification facilities in comparison with facilities for post-detoxification treatment. To our certain knowledge there are but 20 beds in all of Philadelphia specifically allocated for this purpose, and all of them are for males. Yet for many addicts detoxification is an essential first step toward successful treatment. Moreover, certain significant groups of addicts and drug abusers are not being treated at all. This is especially the case with respect to the abuse of non-narcotic drugs, the high-dosage intravenous methamphetamine abuser ("speed freak") and the barbiturate addict being specific cases in point.

Certain fundamental treatment procedures are provided only in a spotty fashion, if at all. However one may conceive of the addictive process it would seem reasonable that, as this population utilizes drugs which may have a profound effect both upon the mind and the body, a systematic evaluation of the prospective patient's mental and physical health prior to the decision on how his problem ought to be managed (or indeed whether it requires management) would be indicated. Generally speaking this does not occur. It is only one among many possible examples. In addition to their obvious practical value in individual cases such evaluations, especially if uniform, would provide valuable data concerning the addictive process.

Some promising modalities of treatment are not being provided in Philadelphia. There is no program, for example, which makes use of narcotic antagonists such as cyclazocine and naloxone. More importantly, Philadelphia has no multi-modality treatment program. A multi-modality program is one in which diverse kinds of treatment are offered rather than a single kind of treatment. Various combinations or sequences of treatments may be offered at different times, according to the needs of the patient. For example, a given individual may need methadone maintenance during one phase of his treatment, and subsequently may be placed in a drug-

free therapeutic community. Or an individual can be placed in a therapeutic community at the same time that he is being maintained on methadone. There is no inherent contradiction between these two modes of treatment, though in practice they are rarely utilized together. The basic theory of multi-modality programs is that the various permutations and combinations of treatments offer more hope for more individuals than could a single modality alone. One of the great ironies of the Philadelphia treatment situation is that most of the necessary components exist within the community but still there is no multi-modality program.

There are also problems with respect to the gathering of data on the treatment process. Currently there is no provision to check between programs as to who is in treatment. There is probably a significant degree of overlap, with a number of patients receiving treatment from more than one program. In a few instances this may represent a patient's attempt to construct his own multi-modality program. More often its aim will be less admirable: to obtain twice as much methadone, for example. In addition, there has been no systematic follow-up of patients discharged from treatment programs in Philadelphia. Admittedly, such studies are complex and costly. But there is no other way to find out whether the programs are effective. Without this basic information, there is no rational way to plan extension or alteration of the treatment program for the future.

These difficulties are neither an exhaustive catalogue of the problems in Philadelphia, nor are they problems which are exclusive to the treatment of addiction. Many other agencies deal with the addicted individual: the schools, the police, the courts, the welfare apparatus, and so forth. Ideally there ought to be a smoothly worked out, cooperative scheme among all of these agencies and the treatment programs. Such is not the case. The tension between treatment and enforcement personnel, to give but one example, is often very great. Of course, this is but a specific instance of a general social problem. Serious disorganization exists in our society with regard to the delivery of human services generally.

THE TREATMENT OF NARCOTIC ADDICTION IN PHILADELPHIA: TOMORROW

Philadelphia, then, has had a serious, well-documented problem with narcotic addiction for at least one hundred years; and it is probable that the problem was a major one even before 1800. The most evident conclusion to be drawn from this is that narcotic addiction (and drug abuse) is likely to continue to be a major problem for many years. Its history in the Commonwealth and in Philadelphia provides no grounds for any hope that this problem will recede in the near future or that it will ever entirely disappear. It is likely, rather, that the problem will not only continue to be present but will increase in scope. Among the circumstances favoring its increase is the development of the so-called "youth subculture" which at least in part views unrestricted use of drugs as a basic human right. It has not previously been the case that a large and influential segment of the population has viewed an increase in the use of drugs with pleasure and approbation rather than alarm.

Moreover it would appear from our history that, unless some unprecedented and vigorous action is taken, the treatment response to this continuing problem will be sporadic, crisis-oriented, and inadequate. It is painful in this regard to note that the two major recommendations made in 1916 by the Philadelphia Narcotic Drug Committee are still appropriate today: that there be provided adequate treatment and better controls on the manufacture and distribution of drugs. The entire history of narcotic addiction and its treatment suggests the presence of some deadly inertia which has effectively precluded a realistic approach to the problem.

What approach is needed now to meet the drug problem. First, an unflinching acceptance of the persistence and tenacity of the problem and the essential ineffectiveness of all approaches to date. Second, a rationally planned and coordinated approach on a broad scale and over a prolonged period of time.

The constant input of two critical kinds of information are basic to such an approach. Some means must be devised which will provide an accurate and continuing measurement of the size and shape of the problem. Without this basic knowledge no reasonable response is possible. Such a system has been implemented elsewhere (Great Britain) which effectively covers an entire nation. Thus it is quite feasible, either for Philadelphia or for the Commonwealth or both. Beyond this, some means must also be devised which assures a knowledge of all activities in the treatment area and a continuing method of evaluating the effectiveness of all that is being done. Here again the problem is not so much one of development of appropriate techniques—there are some problems, but they will yield to sustained effort—as it is one of developing sufficient priorities and resources to put such techniques into effect.

With the extent of the problem known and the extent and efficacy of countermeasures also known, and both continuously monitored, a rational basis for proceeding is assured. As a practical matter it is not now necessary to await this information. Though it must be elaborated, our current knowledge unequivocally indicates a need for immediate and thoroughgoing changes in the existing treatment system. Once these are effected, however, such information will be critical in evaluating the effects of the changes and in proceeding farther.

Essential changes in treatment system would include preeminently bringing an end to competition between various programs for patients, staff, funding, and other matters. All of these items should be allocated on the basis of demonstrated need and proven efficacy, rather than being left to chance. Likewise, careful planning should assure a treatment system with no gaping holes. It should reach all populations of patients, making all relevant services available to them as they are needed, and coordinating these services with those of all other involved agencies. Finally, there should be firm assurance that the provision of these services will depend solely upon the need for them and not upon their potential for utility in the political arena.

Implementation of such a program entails many difficulties. For what we are suggesting requires in all likelihood the exercise of a greater degree of authority and restraint over the provision of services than that to which we are generally accustomed. For example, it seems highly unlikely that the desired result will be forthcoming without direct and unitary control of all sources of funding for treatment programs. Many will deplore the creation of such authority and point out that it contains great potential for abuse. Yes, it does. But it seems unlikely that any abuses such a system might engender could result in a worse situation than the one which exists right now. Avenues can be found which combine the essential element of centralized planning and control with an acceptable level of respect for individual initiative.

Problematic as it may be, the future is not altogether dark. A variety of recent developments indicate that coming to grips with this problem may be more than a pious hope. At the highest Federal level the President has appointed a Philadelphia-born, Philadelphia-trained physician to coordinate the national effort. At the level of the Commonwealth there are many knowledgeable officials, and the drug problem has received the Governor's highest priority. The City of Philadelphia has recently appointed an experienced physician as coordinator of the local effort. Those groups which represent the medical profes-

sion are aroused and interested, as are many citizen's groups. A statewide survey of treatment facilities is well under way, together with basic research into such important questions as the attitudes of both patients and staff of treatment programs toward the treatment enterprise. Very importantly, the City and the Commonwealth already possess in considerable strength many basic components of the treatment approach. Secular and non-secular therapeutic community programs and chemical programs which are among the largest and best in the nation may be found here.

We must rectify and finally expunge the historical record which hangs heavily upon our heads. It should be possible to weld this profusion of ability, intelligence and determination into a meaningful, coherent and effective whole. There is much to be done, but there is much with which to do it. Are we equal to the task?

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce, along with 34 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle, a resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for the direct election of the President and Vice President.

A similar resolution was passed by the House in the 91st Congress (H.J. Res. 681) following extensive hearings, but the Senate failed to act before the session ended.

The merits of direct popular election are as persuasive today as they were at the time of the first Constitutional Convention, when it was urged by James Madison and Benjamin Franklin. The prospects of electing a President who received less popular support than his opponent is no easier to live with today than it was 190 years ago. Perhaps that explains why there have been a total of 485 attempts during our brief history to amend this article of our Constitution.

The 1968 election provides a recent reminder of the vagaries of the electoral college system. A plurality of the voters of North Carolina voted for Richard Nixon in November 1968, but when the electoral college met after the election, Dr. Lloyd Bailey—one of North Carolina's electors—cast his electoral vote for George Wallace. He was not bound by law or by the Constitution to follow the expressed preference of the voters. Under the present electoral college system, the voters are not given the power to elect their President—merely to express their preference, in the hope that it will be followed when the electors meet.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States should be elected by the people of the United States. That is what most voters believe happens, and that is what should happen. Unlike the present electoral system, direct popular election insures that it will happen.

Let us consider who it is that benefits from the present distorted electoral college system, who loses and who stands

to gain if we adopt the proposed direct election approach.

It has been argued that the present system benefits the small States, since they have a voice in the electoral college disproportionate to their share of the population. On the other hand, election analysis has shown that it is actually the voters in larger, more populous States who have the greatest chance of influencing the outcome of presidential elections under the present system. Since all the electoral votes of a State go to the winner, a small change in the popular vote in a large State can shift a substantial number of electoral votes from one candidate to the other. This explains why presidential candidates campaign so hard in the large industrial States—their electoral votes are the ones that count in the end.

There are similar misconceptions about the impact on minority voting blocs of a shift to direct election. The election results of the past simply do not support the theory that minority voting blocs have been able to exercise a great deal of leverage under the winner-take-all system. In fact, it is just the opposite. To the extent that the black voters of Illinois voted as a bloc for HUBERT HUMPHREY in 1968, their votes had no effect on the choice of the President in Illinois. The same is true of urban liberals, union members, and any other voting blocs which made up part of the 2 million votes for HUBERT HUMPHREY in Illinois. The 100,000 people who constituted Richard Nixon's plurality in effect wiped out the 2.4 million voters who voted for other candidates.

The electoral college system dilutes the voting power of minority voting blocs by restricting their power to a State-by-State base. Direct election would enable voting blocs to combine their strength in various geographical areas, and not have it wiped out in each State by a winner-take-all system.

The extent to which the electoral college method distorts the popular vote can be seen in the election of 1968. The popular vote difference between the two major candidates in that election was approximately 500,000 votes out of a total of 73 million votes cast—a difference of less than one-half of 1 percent. In the electoral vote, however, the difference was almost 20 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is people who vote for the President, not States. Whether an American lives in Delaware or Mississippi or California or New York or Illinois, he is still an American and his vote should count as much as any other American's. It is his President that is being elected, not the President of California or Mississippi or New York or Delaware or Illinois.

When all the arguments are made, when all the special interests have been appealed to, one single all-important question remains. Can the proposal that is being advanced guarantee that a man rejected by the voters at the polls will not become President? The only plan which answers yes to that question is direct popular election, as embodied in this resolution. It assures that winners will be declared winners, and that losers cannot be declared winners.

There is only one system that guarantees that the man who receives the most votes becomes the President. There is only one system which guarantees that the basic democratic principle of one-man, one-vote will be carried forth in the selection of our Chief Executive. There is only one system that gives all Americans an equal voice. That system is direct popular election.

I would like at this point to insert in the RECORD the complete list of the 34 cosponsors of this resolution—colleagues from both sides of the aisle, from large States and small, from rural and urban districts:

LIST OF COSPONSORS

Gerald R. Ford, Frank J. Brasco, James C. Corman, Joshua Ellberg, Hamilton Fish, Jr., William D. Ford, Donald M. Fraser, Seymour Halpern, Lee H. Hamilton, Julia Butler Hansen.

Orval Hansen, Michael J. Harrington, Margaret M. Heckler, Henry Helstoski, William L. Hungate, Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Peter N. Kyros, Robert L. Leggett.

William S. Mailliard, F. Bradford Morse, Claude Pepper, Bertram L. Podell, Melvin Price, Thomas M. Rees, Fernand J. St Germain, Charles W. Sandman, Jr.

James H. Scheuer, Fred Schwengel, James W. Symington, Morris K. Udall, Jerome R. Waldie, Charles W. Whalen, Jr. Wendell Wyatt, Jim Wright.

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in noting the significant fact that Columbus Day was celebrated as a national holiday for the first time this year.

Christopher Columbus, one of the greatest seamen and navigators of all time, is one of the few men in history whose memory we honor not on their birthday, but on the anniversary date of the crowning achievement of their lives—in his case, the discovery of America on October 12, 1492. Moreover, it is considered to be relatively unimportant that other explorers may have preceded him, as it is sometimes reported, in the discovery of the New World. What is of paramount importance is that Columbus demonstrated, in very difficult times and under most trying conditions, unfaltering courage, unswerving determination, and undoubting faith in the righteousness of his cause. These characteristics took Columbus westward over uncharted seas. The same characteristics were to appear many years later in such men as Washington and Franklin, Jefferson and Payne, Adams and Madison, helmsmen in a very real sense, who steered a young new nation through uncharted political seas.

The saga of the Nina, the Pinta, and the Santa Maria is indeed a source of strength and promise today. The observance of Columbus Day every year is a fitting occasion for all Americans to rededicate themselves to the great expedition upon which this Nation is embarked. The

obstacles may be many and the seas may be rough, but in the same dauntless spirit of the great navigator we too can help to guide the Ship of State through ignorance, poverty, disease, discrimination, divisiveness and fear until at last we shall, in truth, reach a "New World."

WOMEN ELECTED IN NORWAY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a letter in Tuesday's New York Times describes electoral coups accomplished by women in Norway's two largest cities, Oslo and Trondheim.

Mr. Speaker, the well-organized write-in campaign which resulted in many women being elected to municipal office in Norway can be repeated in the United States on all levels of government. Women are in the majority in this Nation. If we fail to respond to the expressed needs of women and if women continue to be underrepresented in our political institutions, the changing of the guard will be abrupt.

We must not ignore the talents of either women or underrepresented minorities in our political processes. Our problems are too grave. The passage of the equal rights amendment October 12 is a positive step. The ERA is a constitutional statement of what ought to be the case in our society—equality of the sexes. We must now work to make this moral imperative a living reality.

The article follows:

WOMEN, LOOK TO NORWAY!

To the Editor:

During World War II, in a sentence proudly remembered in Norway and thoroughly forgotten in the United States, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "Look to Norway!" He was referring to the fighting spirit of the Norwegians in the common struggle against Nazism.

As one who has followed the struggle of American feminists against the cruel oppression of male chauvinism with great interest—and considerable amusement—I would like to revive Roosevelt's advice for the benefit of the champions of Women's Liberation in this country: "Look to Norway!"

On Sept. 20, Norwegians went to the polls to elect municipal councils for the next four-year period. When the results were in, Norway's sturdy males were in a state of shock. Their women had taken over. Throughout the country, the women had moved into the local governing bodies in force, and numerous municipal councils, large and small, were completely in their hands.

The two major casualties in the great battle of the sexes were Norway's two largest cities, Oslo and Trondheim. When the smoke cleared, the women had occupied 48 out of 85 seats in Oslo's City Council and 46 out of 85 seats in Trondheim's City Council. In suburban Asker west of Oslo, 27 women controlled the 47-member municipal council. Even tradition-bound rural communities experienced the relentless onslaught of female politicians.

How did they do it? By a well-organized write-in campaign. They did not form a new party, they simply took over their respective political parties by bumping off the nomi-

nees on their party lists. In Oslo, for instance, Mayor Brynjulf Bull, nominated as number one on the Labor party list, came in fourteenth among 35 Labor representatives, swamped by most of the eighteen women who won election on Labor's list. And of the 31 Conservative representatives, nineteen women took most of the top spots, relegating the male top nominee to eleventh place. All the Liberal party representatives were women.

I wonder why this story has received no noticeable publicity in this country. For what it may be worth, and at considerable personal risk, I pass it on to American Womanhood.

Take note, Gloria Steinem.

H. PETER KROSBY,

Professor of History, State University at Albany.

DEDICATION OF GARRETT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week in McHenry, Md., it was my privilege to participate in the dedication of Maryland's newest community college, the Garrett Community College. The dedication was an impressive ceremony. The college is beautifully designed with the latest in education facilities. I feel it will be a great asset to Garrett County, Western Maryland, and the surrounding area, and I wish its president, Luther G. Shaw, his faculty and students a success filled future.

I would like to share with my colleagues the tribute in the dedication program to those citizens who helped make Garrett Community College a reality. I add my congratulations and thanks to these diligent citizens.

The tribute follows:

A TRIBUTE

Garrett Community College has become a reality because of the efforts of many citizens of the county, particularly those listed below, who worked diligently with considerable sacrifice of time and effort to establish a college in the area.

Special recognition must be afforded also to Mr. B. O. Aiken, Delegate to the State Legislature from Garrett County, who was instrumental in obtaining the appropriate enabling and financial state legislation which made the college a possibility.

A debt of gratitude is extended also to many other citizens and governmental officials who, while not members of the formal study committee, contributed greatly in the initial and continuing support of the college.

ORIGINAL CITIZEN'S STUDY COMMITTEE FOR ESTABLISHING A COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN GARRETT COUNTY

Mr. Gordon Douglass, Chairman; Mrs. Gordon Douglass, Mr. Elza Bray, Mr. Earl Opel, Mr. William Platter, Mr. George Hanst, Mr. Stephen Pagenhardt, Mr. Earl Haenftling, Mrs. Wayne Hamilton, Rev. William Carlson.

Mrs. Guy William Hinebaugh, Mr. Ralph Beachley, Mrs. Charlotte P. Barnard, Dr. Robert Gibson, Mrs. Bessie Price, Mr. Kenneth Johns, Rev. Emory McGraw, Mrs. Edward Crowe, Mr. Charles Strauss, Mr. Lawrence Groer, Mr. Dwight Stover, Mr. Willard Elliott.

Mrs. Ray Jenkins, Mr. Robert Bender, Mrs. Esther Yoder, Mrs. Clinton Englander, Mrs. Bernadine Friend, Mrs. Lois Mosser, Mr. Irvin

Feld, Rev. Shelby Walthall, Mr. Dan Herberger, Mrs. B. I. Gonder, Sr., Mr. Robert Garrett.

Mrs. A. E. Mance, Mrs. Louise Seggie, Mr. James McHenry, Mrs. Beeson Snyder, Mrs. Gerald Giotfelty, Mr. Maurice Brookhart, Mr. George Edwards, Mrs. George Brady, Mr. Willard L. Hawkins, Mrs. Edward Smouse.

OLD IN YEARS, BUT YOUNG IN SPIRIT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the precious but untapped sources of our national wealth of ingenuity is in the skills and talents of our senior citizens. My deep belief in the capacity of our senior citizens to contribute in countless ways to the well-being of community life, as well as to their own self-growth as individuals, motivated me in my introduction of legislation establishing programs for the utilization of their talents.

Perhaps no more vivid illustration of the enormous vitality, talent, and enthusiasm of our senior citizens could be offered than the insights afforded into the makeup of the senior citizen in an illuminating and most interesting article which recently appeared in the Fall River Herald News on October 2 concerning the activities of William Boutin, a retired 71-year-old, who, in retirement, is more active, than many in professional life.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to include in my remarks the contents of the fine article which appeared:

71-YEAR-OLD RETIRED FALL RIVER MAN MAKES TOYS, WRITES SONGS AS HOBBY

William Boutin is a man with many ideas and many talents. Retired now, the 71-year-old former machinist and woodworker, uses these attributes simply to pass the time away in his small apartment at 100 Niagara St.

Boutin is a man capable of building toys that are not even on today's market. He comments: "This ability is probably a gift, because I've been doing it since I was a kid."

He remembers in his younger days when he built a kite of plastic, with a propeller to give it quick elevation, and nearly send it into orbit. Another was a parachute that was fired into the sky by means of a slingshot.

But recently he has put together some bigger and better things. These include a unique pull-carriage for children that may be used all year because it is equipped with both wheels and skis.

Also, a water bicycle, sailboat, and two other riding vehicles for children, none of which are on today's toy market, he said.

Boutin said that the reason he has not used his ideas for the purpose of financial gain is because he does not have enough money to back himself. "All I need is a break," he commented.

He recalls some years ago when he called a fellow in Akron, Ohio to tell him of an idea he had for a tic-tac-toe game which consisted of a large board placed on the floor and wooden X's and O's that were tossed onto the board.

Boutin said the man in Akron told him he could not use the idea. However, some time later, Boutin picked up a catalog and

noticed his game, which someone had manufactured in California.

"This is what I'm afraid of when revealing an idea," Boutin noted. "I know I made that game, but it's gone," he claimed.

Indicating he has hoped for the chance to meet some manufacturer who may be interested in his toys and games, Boutin said, "It's hard for a newcomer."

A time when his ability did come in handy was when, instead of having to buy expensive toys for his three children, he would simply go to a store to observe, then go home and "make them better and for a lot less money," he said.

One toy Boutin was quite fond of was a pair of roller skates he devised that consisted of croquet balls on axles instead of wheels. He remembers allowing a 7-year-old boy to test them on Townsend Hill. "He went down that hill like a house afire and it was a good thing he grabbed onto a fence, or he'd have never stopped," Boutin recalled.

Another of Boutin's talents is song writing. He has written many, including "Love that Breaks No Hearts," "Sunshine and Rain," "You Pushed Your Luck Too Far," and "I Was Not Whistling Dixie."

A verse from "Sunshine and Rain," which he wrote about a year ago, is: "Through each one's life there is sunshine and rain, each one must have his share of joy and pain."

As a child, Boutin would play the piano by ear. Today, he does the same on a simple, little harmonica.

The life of this inventor and song writer is not one of complete loneliness because the neighborhood children constantly visit him, anxious to see what new toy he has assembled. One of those curious little tots he is most proud of is his granddaughter, Debra Ann Boutin.

YOU CANNOT HAVE FREEDOM WITHOUT HAVING RESPONSIBILITIES

HON. GEORGE E. DANIELSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DANIELSON. Mr. Speaker, the Elysian Heights Elementary School, in my district, under the direction of Beverly Mason, principal, annually invites students to express their thoughts about our country in an essay contest.

The winning essay, written by Brenda Kanno, an outstanding sixth-grade student, is one that I would recommend that all of my colleagues should read. The essay follows:

YOU CAN'T HAVE FREEDOM WITHOUT HAVING RESPONSIBILITY—WHAT DOES THIS MEAN

(By Brenda Kanno, age 11)

You can't have freedom without having responsibility. This means that with freedom comes responsibility, and it is to us to fulfill this responsibility.

When our forefathers founded this country, they had many responsibilities. They had to fight for their country if they wanted to keep it. They also had to govern and guide it. Our forefathers did all this because they knew that it was their responsibility.

Now it is our turn, our responsibility, to guide, govern, and guard this country—our country. The United States is a country that is of the people, by the people, and for the people. This means that the United States government is made of United States citizens, that it is governed by the people and it is for the people not against them.

Since the United States is all for us, we

should be all for it. It is our responsibility to study and think, and if we feel that some laws should be different, we vote. We do not have to vote as someone else wants us to.

We have many other rights, but we also have an accompanying responsibility for each right. We, as our country, should at least try to fulfill those responsibilities and not abuse the laws.

NEW POSTAL SERVICE IS EYED BY THE CONGRESS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the new U.S. Postal Service has been in operation fully since July 1.

Just after the end of the first 90 days, Peter Andrews, Washington bureau chief for the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express, rounded up his views in an article which I include with my remarks:

CONGRESS HAS EYE ON POSTAL SERVICE: SOME SUSPICIONS CAST ON MOVES; CHARGES DENIED

(By Peter C. Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—The new U.S. Postal Service is looking less and less like Caesar's wife these days. In its three months of existence it has become, for members of Congress at least, not only the subject of suspicion, but a prime example of what many of them feared would happen if the Post Office was removed from direct congressional control.

The Postal Service vehemently denies the charges it has done anything wrong, but the fact that such charges are being made at such an early date in the existence of the organization is bad in itself.

While the Postal Service operations were turned over to an independent organization under the Postal Reform Act, the power to scrutinize these operations remained with Congress and two of the postal subcommittees working this summer have turned up embarrassing evidence of the Nixon Administration apparently favoring certain firms with sizeable business deals despite their seeming lack of qualifications to handle these transactions. It is strongly implied in the latest disclosure made last Monday that these business favors were given in exchange for large campaign contributions.

It happens that the leaders of the two Postal Committees in Congress are both Democrats. Sen. Gale McGee of Wyoming heads the Senate Committee and Rep. Thaddeus J. Dulski of Buffalo heads the House Postal and Civil Service Committee. Rep. Morris K. Udall, from Arizona and brother of the former Secretary of Interior, happens to be chairman of the House subcommittee which has raised the latest charges against the new Postal Service.

BIPARTISAN WARINESS

However, the feeling of wariness that exists between the Congress and the Postal Service is shared by many Republicans as well as Democrats. There have even been murmurings about bills that might be introduced to return the Postal Service to its former status as a Postal Department completely under the control of Congress—and some of those murmuring loudest are Republicans.

This is not going to happen. But it shows the feeling of at least some of the congressmen.

One embarrassing disclosure by the congressional committee was an award to Westinghouse Corp. of a \$3.4-million contract to evaluate the 750,000 jobs in the Postal Service despite the fact it was the highest

bidder of five and its bid was about double the bid of the lowest qualified firm.

The capabilities of Westinghouse in this field are subject to challenge, too, since it has never done any work of this type for outside companies before and its own record of labor troubles revealed that at least one fifth of all grievances involved job classifications. Evidence also was introduced at the hearings that Westinghouse would have been given the job without * * *, Peabody against the \$500 in even bothering to bid against others had not a last minute legal opinion ruled that outside bidders must be brought in.

BIG MONEY INVOLVED

Meanwhile, the Postal Service announced it was going to float a \$250-million bond issue using the investment banking industry rather than selling them to the U.S. Treasury which in turn would have sold treasury notes backed by the U.S. government to the public. Since the bonds will not have a direct government guarantee, it was estimated they would have to yield at least $\frac{1}{4}$ of one per cent higher than the treasury bonds would have been. This may not sound like much but since the eventual issue may be \$10-million, it amounts to a lot.

Since the independence of operating as an outside agency rather than as a direct arm of the government was one of the objectives of establishing the Postal Service, the intention to use Wall Street firms rather than the Treasury was announced long ago in the hearings on the Postal Reform Bill. The fact that this may cost an additional \$25-million in interest was not emphasized.

However, what brings the matter under Congressional scrutiny is the fact that President Nixon's and Atty. Gen. John Mitchell's old law firm, Mudge, Rose, Guthrie and Alexander was chosen as attorneys for the issue. As the subcommittee said in its recommendations: "No firm which has a direct relationship, either previous or current, should be allowed to participate in this issue, if that relationship was with any senior manager of the Postal Service."

Nixon's and Mitchell's old firm is an acknowledged leader in the field of the legalities of bonds. The committee recognized this but said, "This has nothing to do with the well recognized ability or integrity of the firm but rather with creating public trust in the decisions of its officials and establishing beyond any doubt the nonpolitical, independent nature of the new Postal Service."

TWO LACK EXPERTISE

Another major point made by the subcommittee report is that two of the five firms selected in the underwriting apparently have little comparative expertise in the field of large public bond issues, while at least one of the firms left out of the syndicate was an acknowledged leader in the field. The charge was made that one of the prime reasons the firm of Kidder, Peabody and Co. was included was the fact that members of that firm had contributed \$47,893 to Nixon's campaign. It also was implied in the report that the firm of Dillon, Read and Co. was included because of cronyism with top administration officials.

The man in charge of handling the bond issue for the Postal Service was James W. Hargrove, senior assistant postmaster general. Prior to joining the government, he had been vice president of the Eastern Texas Transmission Co. and had extensive contact with Dillon, Read. His contact was so close, in fact, that in Oct. 1969 he wrote the president of Dillon, Read, August Belmont IV, a letter enclosing a draft of testimony Belmont was to give the following week before the Senate Committee on Postal Reform. He was supposed to be the industry spokesman supporting the financing proposals.

Another connection was through Peter Flanagan, one of President Nixon's top White House advisers, who also happened to be a

vice president of Dillon, Read for 15 years prior to joining the administration.

While the Kidder, Peabody firm had never handled an issue of this kind, First Boston Corp., the industry leader, was left out of the syndicate. The committee arched its eyebrows at this when it compared the \$47,000 political contributions of Kidder-contributions it was able to trace to First Boston executives.

INDICATION OF EVIDENCE

Udall, in making his report to Rep. Dulski, his full committee chairman, stated: "There is no compelling evidence at this time of violations of the criminal code. We are faced rather with a lesser degree of misconduct and impropriety."

Another area of congressional inquiry is that concerning the decision of the Postal Service to use the Army Corps of Engineers for all contracting activities rather than its own established Bureau of Facilities.

The Post Office based its decision to a certain extent on the fact that the Corps of Engineers, which had been handling a huge amount of NASA work, has excess capacity now that NASA's activities have been cut back. The Post Office, which needs \$10 billion in new facilities in the near future, could do much to take up this slack.

The only trouble, said the Congressman, is that the Engineers do their work for a charge of 8 per cent of overhead, while the General Services Administration handles the same kind of work for 5½ per cent of overhead. Salt was rubbed into this wound when it was learned that Postmaster Gen. Winton M. Blount announced the agreement after it was signed, rather than consulting with any members of Congress about it prior to the signing.

This tendency of Blount's not to take Congress into his confidence has caused him some strained relationships on Capitol Hill. He has been searching for someone to take the deputy postmaster general's job since last January—it has been turned down by several to whom it has been offered—and yet when he found someone to accept, his method of telling congressional leaders was poor.

NEW DEPUTY INTRODUCED

For example, he called Dulski and said he wanted an appointment to see him in Dulski's office on Sept. 23. When he arrived he had with him Merrill A. Hayden, whom he introduced by saying "Meet the new deputy postmaster general." That afternoon he sent Hayden around to McGee's Senate office with Elmer G. Klassen, former deputy postmaster general who is on the Postal Service board of governors, where the introduction was repeated.

The problem is that the board of governors who select the deputy postmaster general, did not meet until the following day, and the congressmen were not impressed with such rubber-stamping by the board.

(Klassen, by the way, is one of those who turned down the deputy job with the Postal Service).

Sen. McGee's Postal Committee has not confirmed President Nixon's appointments to the Postal board of governors, thus causing the President to resort to the device of recess appointments for the board. McGee has indicated he wants to see them perform for a year before he gets around to holding confirmation hearings.

SURGE OF PRIVATE SERVICES

While much of the attacks on the Postal Service happen to involve Democratic officials heading congressional committees, there is no concerted Democratic attack on a broad front. Perhaps one of the reasons for this is that former Postmaster Gen. Larry O'Brien is now national chairman of the Democratic Party and was an outspoken advocate of the separate Postal Corporation.

While the attacks continue, however, Blount's new Postal Service will stay in the

center of controversy. There is a surprising surge in the growth of private mail delivery services which are guaranteeing delivery faster and cheaper than the Postal Service. Meter mailers are complaining about curtailed collection hours and the latest regulation which makes them post date bulk mail if it will not be completed until after the last collection of the day stamped.

These and other attacks undoubtedly will continue, but Blount is giving every indication he will not stay around long. He has his eye on being senator from his home state of Alabama and has had several polls taken to test his voting strength there. His administrative assistant has left to take a new job in Birmingham and perhaps to start building a political base for his old boss.

Some congressmen will not be sorry to see him go.

THE RED CHINESE AND THE DRUG TRAFFIC

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as early as 1954, Mr. Harry Anslinger, former director of the U.S. Narcotics Bureau, was warning the American public that the Red Chinese were exporting opium to undermine the free nations. However, Mr. Anslinger, in a Washington Post article recently, was quoted as saying that the drug traffic from Red China had stopped.

In 1963 U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Henry Giordano stated that at that time the Chinese Reds were still extensively engaged in the exportation of drugs.

Today, however, if one inquires of the Federal agencies most likely to have information on this issue, the answer is that there is no evidence that Red China is still engaged in this nefarious trade.

The Washington newsweekly, *Human Events*, in its October 16 issue provides some provocative arguments for the position that the Chinese are still doing business at the same old stand.

In an exclusive article for *Human Events*, Mr. DeWitt S. Copp, a Washington-based free-lance writer and an expert on national affairs and the subject of China, cites various sources which claim that the Chinese have not suddenly "got religion" on the drug issue.

With our Nation's concerted effort to stamp out the use of narcotics both here and among our troops in Vietnam, this issue deserves serious consideration based on the best information available on this subject.

For this reason I insert at this point in the *RECORD* the article, "Do Chinese Reds Push Drug Traffic?" by Mr. Copp as it appeared in the October 16 issue of *Human Events*.

SECRET BRITISH REPORT—DO CHINESE REDS PUSH DRUG TRAFFIC?

(By DeWitt S. Copp)

A shocking British government document has come into this reporter's hands; it is Great Britain's 1969 estimates of the contribution Communist China makes to the world's illicit production of opium. According to the British, as of two years ago the total illegal world production of the drug from which heroin is derived was "5,000 tons, 1,000

tons coming from the Middle East and minor producers," the remaining "4,000 tons" emanating from "Southeast Asia (including Burma, Thailand and Laos)" and the "Chinese Peoples Republic." Of this amount, the official British estimates is "3,500 tons" coming from Red China!

The confidential document goes on to point out that all opium grown in Red China is illicit, that the average yield of opium per hectare of poppy field is seven kilos and that the total area under cultivation is estimated at a half-million hectares or 200,000 acres. The poppy-growing provinces are listed as Yunnan—where production is figured at 1,000 tons, Szechwan, Kwangsi, Kwangtung, Hopei and Honan. The annual revenue to Peking is placed at a half-billion U.S. dollars.

In view of the Nixon Administration's large-scale efforts to curtail illegal drug traffic at the source and the attitude of its experts with regard to Red China's part in this trade, the British figures are astounding and require immediate answers in Washington and London.

Congressional inquiry as well as press efforts to gain information on Peking's role in the most vicious of all trades, have been met at the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics by inconclusive and evasive replies. "No intelligence on the matter, no evidence. People on the spot cannot verify, can only give an opinion."

When this reporter approached the U.N. Narcotics Commission recently to discuss a detailed article on Red China's dope trade published in the March 1971 edition of the Taiwan publications *Issue & Studies*, the response could only be described as scoffing. The article had never been heard of and there was simply no evidence whatever that the Chinese Communists were any longer engaged in the production and sale of narcotics.

At an international drug conference held in Ottawa last month the delegate from the Republic of China presented a statement of his government's investigation into Communist China's drug activities. So far as is known, the statement was ignored.

The official attitude was best summed up by a noted British drug authority when he said: "We do not have any information that the Peoples' Republic of China is involved in illegitimate narcotics traffic, but we are not doing any work in Red China. We are, of course, always interested in information about any country."

Because the subject is so important, the contradiction so broad, and the need for clarity so great, the following chronological account of Red China's known involvement in illicit narcotic smuggling is offered. From it, we believe, a conclusion can be reached.

At the time that the Chinese Communists conquered Mainland China in 1949 the production of opium had been outlawed by the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek since 1934.

In 1950 the United States added an annex to the U.N.'s Narcotics Commission report giving an analysis by the U.S. of the illicit drug traffic throughout the world during 1949 and the first nine months of 1950. The analysis said in part:

"It is reported that Chinese authorities are marketing large quantities of raw opium abroad. The ringleaders are attempting to remain out of the picture. From the account given of raw opium seizures in Burma, it is quite evident that very large quantities of raw opium are smuggled into that country from China."

Earlier Great Britain had informed the commission that Peking representatives had offered to sell 500 tons of opium to a British firm in Hong Kong. When this offer had been declined an attempt was made to sell 300 tons of opium to the U.S. in exchange for cotton.

During the Korean War much evidence was amassed to show that Peking was intent

upon injecting the drug habit upon our GIs. Two examples will suffice. In October 1950 U.N. forces in North Korea discovered 300 boxes of opium which had originated in Red China containing several tons of the drug. In 1952 another seizure was made amounting to 6,000 pounds.

Dr. Harry Anslinger, director of the U.S. Narcotics Bureau for many years and a member of the U.N. Commission, stated in 1954 that Red China was spreading narcotics addiction to obtain funds for political purposes. He told the commission that this was the practice of the "entire regime" and that the United States was a key target of illicit traffic from China. The Soviet representative, Mrs. V. V. Vasilyeva, objected and said the accusation was a "slander" calculated to ruin Peking's reputation.

Dr. Anslinger later declared: "As pointed out in my reports to the United Nations over the past several years, trafficking in narcotics for monetary gain and to undermine and demoralize free peoples has been a policy of the Communists in China from the beginning."

Nearly a decade later, in 1963, U.S. Narcotics Commissioner Henry Giordano charged that the Red Chinese were extensively engaged in drug traffic and he saw no reason to believe that this traffic was declining.

The following year Tsusai Sugawara, chairman of the Japanese National Committee for the Struggle Against Drug Addiction, stated that Peking "has become the world's principal producer of opium poppies which yield opium, morphine and heroin." He estimated that Red China was realizing \$170 million annually by smuggling narcotics to Japan, or about one-third of the Communists' production. "Most drugs," he added, "are shipped to Southeast Asia and large consignments also reach the United States."

On Sept. 13, 1964, Moscow, via *Pravda* and its world radio broadcasts, openly accused Communist China of being a major supplier of illegal drugs. "The smuggling of drugs annually yields \$500 million to the present Chinese leaders," *Pravda* said, "This trade has become one of the main sources of convertible currency for the leadership of the Chinese Communist party."

In supplying background, *Pravda* stated that in late 1952 Mao and his cohorts had decided at a secret conference to go into the narcotics business on a large scale. The industry was to be directed under the innocuous heading of the "Board for the Procurement and Sale of Special Goods of Local Production."

Pravda gave production figures of 8,000 tons, within a few years, and more than 1.5 million acres under poppy-growing cultivation. It also gave the location of processing factories and termed the whole business "abominable" and "monstrous."

A USIA publication in October 1964 commenting on the accusation said: "The Soviet expression of outrage represented a sharp turnaround in the Kremlin's position of defending Communist China and the international narcotics racket, a position it reiterated for years as a member of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs. . . .

"As late as mid-1962, during the 17th session of the commission, the Soviet Union had entered 'categorical objections' to evidence presented regarding the quantities of illicit narcotics being smuggled from Yunnan Province."

The USIA article also said: "The narcotics that pour out of Mainland China are smuggled to free countries by every means of transportation available, including pack trains, railroads, surface ships and aircraft. Chinese Communist officials have been known to act as drug couriers."

Previously, Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat, then prime minister of Thailand, alleged that

Chinese Communists were peddling narcotics as a part of a campaign of subversion against the free world. At a still later date Bangkok accused Peking of flooding Thailand with narcotics.

In the April-June 1965 *Bulletin on Narcotics*, the U.N. Consultative Group on Narcotics Problems in the Far East and Asia, reported large quantities of morphine (derived from opium) coming from somewhere near the Chinese Communist border.

In Hong Kong a doctor to the Anti-Narcotics center was quoted as saying "There are upwards of a half-million addicts in the British Colony supplied with narcotics flowing out of Communist China."

On Sept. 8, 1965, under a Washington date-line, a European news service reported: "American officials are studying press reports from Asia reviving year-old charges that Peking is profiting by \$500 million a year from traffic in narcotics. Washington officials saw no reason to view the estimated figure as an exaggeration."

Two years later, on March 16, 1967, the noted columnist, Victor Riesel, reported a bizarre and disturbing case of a Chinese laundry in the Bronx, whose workers were paid off in heroin. Riesel described the laundry as one of a number of "communes," the one in question netting over \$100,000 a year and three more under surveillance.

"What intrigues the authorities," wrote Riesel, "is the belief of international intelligence sources that opium is flowing from Communist Chinese fields in Yunnan Province in the mainland's southwest. This would be only part of Peking's annual overseas sales of some \$600 million worth of raw opium with which the Mao government helps to finance guerrilla and propaganda activity across the world. . . .

"Chinese leaders are just as concerned as the federal and local authorities over the possibility that far-off Peking may be reaching into big American cities. They do not want Communist infiltration of their law-abiding communities."

Thus up until five years ago there was a clear official record from a variety of sources and nations, showing that for nearly two decades Red China had been a leading purveyor of illicit drugs. Then somehow as the drug problem grew, less and less was heard about Peking's part in it.

Officially the major sources of opium growing were reported to be Turkey and an area in Southeast Asia referred to as "the Golden Triangle," embodying sections of Burma, Laos and Thailand. Various senators reported 80 per cent of all illicit narcotics coming from both places. Some accused officials in South Viet Nam, Laos and Thailand of being involved in smuggling operations that makes heroin readily available to U.S. GIs in the area. Sen. George McGovern (D-S.D.) using *Ramparts* as his guide, pointed his finger at the CIA and the Nationalist Chinese. His accuracy was as reliable as his source.

However, since the beginning of the year, with few exceptions such as Reps. John Monagan (D-Conn.), Philip Crane (R-Ill.) and John Schmitz (R-Calif.) no one in Congress and no one in the Administration has had anything definitive to say about poppy growing in Red China.

In June, John E. Ingersoll, director of the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics, writing in response to queries made by Sen. Clifford Hansen (R-Wyo.) and Congressman Charles S. Gubser (R-Calif.) about the false accusations in *Ramparts* attempting to implicate the CIA in the Southeast Asian drug traffic, included in his reply a comprehensive background report on the "Golden Triangle." He gave considerable detail on drug operations in Burma, Thailand and Laos, but the only reference to Red China was this one sentence: "Opium produced in the Communist-controlled areas

also finds its way into the regular marketing channels." In Burma mention was made of "Chinese Communist-backed insurgents." But that was all.

On June 17, President Nixon sent a special message to Congress urging the prompt enactment of legislation, creating a new Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention within the Executive Office of the President. He requested \$155 million in new funds to help finance what he termed "a worldwide offensive," dealing with sources of supply abroad. He stated the offensive would be government-wide, concentrating all federal efforts in one new office. Appointed to head the new office was Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, who formerly served as director of the U.S. Drug Abuse Program.

The following excerpt from a report by an official of an international agency with 25 years experience in Southeast Asia and China shed some light on the matter. "By far the largest amount of Chinese illegitimate narcotics is transported to world markets through SEA [Southeast Asia]. Here again, Communist China has a built-in security in the Golden Triangle which borders on China. This vast Communist and bandit-controlled area is indeed beautiful cover for China's opium and heroin export. The heroin is produced in government-owned and controlled factories in Communist China and transported to their agents in the Golden Triangle for delivery to seaports, airports and couriers in diplomatic missions. . . ." The reader should note the similarity in the last sentence of this statement and that quoted earlier by USIA in 1965.

According to Ingersoll, the total world production of illicit drugs amounts to approximately 1,500 tons, with between 500 and 700 tons coming from Southeast Asia. The Ingersoll estimate is actually comparable to the figures contained in the confidential British document, save for the curious fact that the British claim that an additional 3,500 tons come from Red China while American officials make no reference to illicit supplies from Red China at all. Why is there such a baffling discrepancy?

No doubt the authenticity of the British document will be challenged. For obvious reasons, the source cannot be revealed. However, supportive evidence is offered from a ranking official of the Dutch Narcotics Bureau and Jacques Kiere of the French Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Both statements were made within the last month.

From the Dutch official: "Smuggling of Red Chinese narcotics is on the increase in Holland. The main port of entry is Rotterdam and Amsterdam in that order. Most of the drug seized is heroin. Ninety per cent of the crew members apprehended have been Chinese. Several of the ships involved have been Red Chinese. Our laboratories have verified that the drugs originate in Communist China."

From Kiere: "The Bureau has always stated that Communist China is involved in poppy cultivation and illicit drug trade. We have much evidence on that."

With the concerted move afoot to seat Peking in the U.N.—with the President's reaffirmation of his goal to journey to Communist China—with the drug problem one of the nation's most serious in its history, answers to the aforementioned figures and statements must be forthcoming right now.

Are the British estimates correct, or aren't they? If they aren't where are they wrong? Further, if it is officially maintained that Communist China is no longer in the drug trade, why did it depart? When was departure made? Where is the proof?

The American public has every right to know

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Columbus Day, 1971, is, for me, one of the very special national holidays. This is the first time in history that Americans have had the opportunity to officially honor "the great navigator." I am especially proud, this year, not only because I am fortunate to share the great heritage of Columbus, but because my efforts towards recognition of this day have been successful.

Many nationalities have claimed Columbus. Certainly the Spanish claim him as one of their own and one Spanish writer, Salvadore de Madriaga claims that Columbus was Jewish. I for one, as an American of Italian extraction, am willing and proud to share Columbus with the world. Without question, although he was raised in Genoa and the heritage which formed his early life was Italian, Columbus is too great a figure in history to be confined by man's arbitrary political boundaries. While many of us claim him as an Italian, we are proud to share the greatness of Columbus with all who recognize in him the greatness of the human spirit.

The heritage of Columbus is the striving for achievement and success among all men, who seek the undiscovered and would sail beyond the frontiers of knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, the late President John F. Kennedy expressed this same idea on October 12, 1963, when he welcomed "all the successors of Christopher Columbus. And you do not have to be of Italian extraction to be able to claim that inheritance." He added:

All of us who followed the great navigator to the United States have prospered and benefited, and I am sure that you take the greatest pride in the work that has been done, the families you have raised, the children you have educated, the position of responsibility that they have achieved.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other aspect of this first national holiday honoring Columbus which too few people have mentioned. In the last few years there has been among Americans of all national extractions a reawakening of their cultural identities. I, for one, welcome this reawakening. There is great strength in the diverse cultures which make up American life, and we have too long denied for foolish reasons the strength and beauty of our cultural roots.

The wide support for Columbus Day is a result of the tremendous new outspoken pride all Americans are expressing in their families. I think it is wonderful that Americans of Italian extraction are looking back into their history and finding so much for which to be so proud. Italian culture has given liberally to the world in the way of philosophy, exploration, music, culture, and politics. Americans of all cultures—Italian,

Polish, Slavic, Negro, Jewish, and Indian—are looking back at their heritage with new pride. They are finding and expressing new-found identities. Just as the 1960's expressed the vitality of youth, I think the 1970's are going to express the vitality of America's diverse cultures.

The myth of the "American melting pot" has finally given way to the truth that each of us has retained the traits and virtues of our forefathers. And it is a good thing. As we understand ourselves and the rich cultural heritage that is responsible for much of how each of us is put together, I think there is going to be a greater harmony in America. We are going to discover that we are really not all the same and we are going to accept each other's differences. Once we do that, there is going to be less prejudice and hate. I believe that the truth is going to make us free of the antagonism many of us feel toward one another.

CONGRESS MUST MEET THE CRISIS AT PANAMA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in a statement on September 22, 1971, before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I strongly opposed the surrender by the United States of any of its treaty-based sovereign rights, power, and authority over our territorial possession known as the Canal Zone and urged prompt favorable action on House Resolution 540 and other pending identical resolutions sponsored by some 100 Members of Congress. That statement was published in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 23, 1971, at page 33207 under the title of "Panama Canal Belongs to the United States."

Since then much has happened. On October 6, Panama, in line with earlier threats by its officials, placed its case for new canal treaties before the membership of the United Nations. Also, on October 6, Harold Lord Varney, president of the Committee on Pan American Policy of New York, published an illuminating article in which he answers this question: "Why is Mr. Nixon Giving Away the Canal Zone?" In this article, Mr. Varney gives realistic interpretations of the dangers at Panama that have been denied the people of our country by the mass news media of the United States.

As the culminating events in a long agitational campaign of hatred in the Republic of Panama by its revolutionary military government against the United States, there were mammoth demonstrations on October 11, in support of Panamanian demands for full sovereignty over the U.S.-owned Canal Zone territory and the Panama Canal. While no disorders occurred during the demon-

strations, the Panamanian strong man, Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos, made demagogic appeals with open threats against the United States of future violence in the event Panama does not secure its objective of full sovereignty over the Canal Zone.

The unreasonable demands by Panama for the surrender of the Canal Zone to that country, does not conform to realities. Panama exists as an independent country solely because of the Panama Canal. Until November 3, 1903, it was part of Colombia. If there is to be any turning back of the clock of history, which most thoughtful Americans oppose, the Canal Zone should be returned to Colombia, which country in 1914 recognized the title to the Panama Canal and Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States, without any encumbrances or indemnities whatsoever."

The United States bought all the rights, powers, and authority of sovereignty over the Canal Zone from Panama, which country was the successor to Colombia as the sovereign of the Isthmus, and purchased all privately owned land and property in the zone from individual property owners. It would be just about as sensible for Mexico to demand the return of the Gadsden Purchase or Soviet Russia to demand the return of Alaska as for Panama to persist in its unreasonable demands for cession of the Canal Zone. As the body of the Congress closest to the sovereign people of the United States, the House should act promptly and favorably on this premise.

Moreover, our Government cannot surrender by treaty or otherwise its control over the Canal Zone and canal to any other sovereign government or to any international agency, including the U.N., without specific authority from the Congress, which includes the House as well as the Senate.

The framers of our Federal Constitution were men of rare wisdom and vision. They foresaw the need for a provision in that great instrument to prevent the Executive from disposing of any territory or other property of the United States by pretext of a treaty except with the approval of both the Senate and the House. Accordingly, that was included in article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of . . . the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.

As far as the record shows the current negotiators for the proposed Panama Canal treaties have never referred to this constitutional requirement and have acted with complete duplicity and insincerity by ignoring our Constitution and apparently never bringing it to the attention of the Panamanian negotiators. Whatever the Senate may do as regards the projected surrender at Panama, the House has thus far been adamant and will likely so remain. Yet our negotiators have gone merrily along ignoring the vital constitutional provision with Chief Negotiator Robert B. Anderson and his associates evidently try-

ing to sweep the proposed giveaway of the Canal Zone under the diplomatic rug.

The people of the United States, to the extent that they know these facts, are violently opposed to any such surrender. As the actions thus involved have become better known, the people have expressed their views, which are overwhelmingly hostile as shown by an extensive correspondence from many parts of the Nation.

In view of these facts, it is difficult to understand how President Nixon could have been so hoodwinked as to accept the weak and timid 1967 Johnson canal policies and to retain the Anderson outfit in positions affecting the Panama negotiations. This action by the President is beyond the comprehension of rational thinkers, who oppose assuming the burden of responsibility without authority.

The Johnson-Nixon negotiators seem to be utterly ignorant or indifferent to the relationship of the Panama Canal and the security of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States and Panama. The fact that Cuba is already under U.S.S.R. control, the further fact that Chile has recently passed under the Communist yoke, and the added fact that Soviet power is infiltrating every Latin American country in a design aimed at wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States seems to make no impression on our negotiators. Hence, their conduct cannot be explained alone as one of stupidity for the effect of their action is in complete betrayal of the freedom of Western nations, including Panama, which has been following a suicidal policy that could affect its independence.

In order that the Congress may have the story of Panama's action at the United Nations and the cited article by Mr. Varney, as well as a report on the October 11 demonstrations, I quote the Varney article and two news stories from the New York Times as parts of my remarks:

WHY IS MR. NIXON GIVING AWAY THE CANAL ZONE?

(By Harold Lord Varney)

Despite angry public protests, Washington persists in its insane course in Panama. The looming end of the road will mean the loss of United States control of the Panama Canal. A graver effect can be the crash of all American defenses in Latin America.

The Nixon Administration is deliberately inviting a crushing disaster on the isthmus. Surely no American President has ever driven to perdition so heedlessly and needlessly.

When Mr. Nixon entered the White House in 1969, the Panama difficulties were as nearly a dead letter as is conceivable in Latin American relations. The headlong rush of three successive Administrations—those of Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—to surrender American sovereignty in the Canal Zone seemed to be a bad nightmare of the past. Johnson, who had been badly bruised by the fight over the proposed treaty of 1967, had with a genuine sigh of relief fled away the draft treaties which his inept negotiators had handed him. The surrender treaties were tabled and almost forgotten.

But now they are back again—and back with a bang.

President Johnson had been saved at the gong by a completely unforeseen event—the seizure of the Panama Government by a

military junta led by Colonel Omar Torrijos. Overnight the Ariases, the Chariis, and the Eletas of the Panama ruling elite, men who had irresponsibly encouraged the Communist-led violence of 1964, vanished from the political scene. Torrijos, an adventurer with no known convictions, was too anxious to secure Washington's acceptance of his unconstitutional regime to continue the anti-gringoism which such misleaders as President Arnulfo Arias had so long encouraged. A strong stand by the Nixon Administration would have frozen Torrijos into compliance. Never did an American Administration have a better chance to terminate the challenge to our control of the U.S. Canal Zone and our Panama Canal.

Unfortunately, President Nixon never gave Torrijos any indication that America meant to defend American interests.

Worse, he appointed men to handle the situation in Panama from among the crumbling and mentally petrified artifacts of the Johnson Administration. Instead of firing Robert B. Anderson, who headed Mr. Johnson's negotiating team, and who had authored the notorious giveaway treaty proposed in 1967, he reappointed Anderson as his top negotiator. John N. Irwin, the Leftist who had been Anderson's deputy on the Johnson negotiating team, was elevated to the powerful post of Undersecretary of State. And Robert M. Sayre, who had been a member of Anderson's staff under Johnson, and had helped to draft the proposed 1967 treaty, was appointed U.S. Ambassador to Panama.

The Anderson appointment was simply incredible. On July 16, 1970, Robert Anderson had been the object of a full-dress exposé by Bernard D. Nossiter in the *Washington Post*. It was revealed that, while serving as Secretary of the Treasury under Eisenhower, Anderson had solicited and received a \$290,000 payment from Texas oilman Sid W. Richardson. At the time, Anderson was the top member of the President's "Special Committee to Investigate Crude Oil Imports," and was in a position to make decisions favorable to Texas oil interests. Nossiter explained that the agreement with Richardson was that Anderson would receive a total payment of \$900,000. How President Nixon could disregard the exposure of Anderson as being on the take for nearly a million dollars, and retain him as our Panama negotiator, boggles the mind.

No hint of the truculence which was to come was given by Torrijos during his early months. It was pointed out at the time that the United States would not negotiate a binding treaty except with a constitutionally elected Government in Panama. Torrijos promised elections, but the date was far off and uncertain. It was assumed in the United States that treaty negotiations would soon lapse.

But it did not take Torrijos long to realize that Nixon had sent him a team of weaklings. Discovering that he could get away with it, the dictator began to show Washington the steel mitt inside the snakeskin glove. The demand for resumption of treaty negotiations, regardless of their legality, began to be heard loudly in Panama.

Another Nixon agency now got into the act to provide Panama with a new line of attack. President Johnson had set up an Atlantic-Pacific Inter-Oceanic Canal Study Commission to consider the building of a new sea-level canal. This Commission was also headed by the egregious Robert B. Anderson. It had spent \$60 million of the taxpayers' money making surveys of possible routes for a new canal. While Torrijos's buglemen were in full cry against the United States, Anderson's Commission recommended the building of an unneeded sea-level canal in Panama on a route about ten miles distant from our present lock canal. It would require a new treaty and would cost, at a minimum, \$2,880,000,000.

At the same time, a bill was slyly maneuvered through the Senate repealing our long-standing treaty with anti-Communist Nicaragua which had given us the right to construct a canal, if we wished, through Nicaraguan territory. By surrendering our Nicaraguan rights, we placed ourselves at the mercy of Torrijos.

Dictator Torrijos seized this opportunity to apply more pressure. He issued a statement hinting that he had received an offer from Japanese interests willing to build a sea-level canal across Panama. Of course, this would have been a direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine, but Torrijos was now contemptuous of that as Mr. Nixon has been.

This was followed by a world tour by Panama's President Demetrio Lakas, who is only an obedient figurehead for the dictator. Lakas proclaimed at every stop that Panama was ready for a showdown with the United States. He declared: Our position is based on the demand for absolute sovereignty in the Canal Zone, recognizing the private character of the firm operating the waterway."

Having reduced United States sovereignty over the Canal and the Canal Zone to the status of a mere "firm" operating in the isthmus, Lakas was soon quoted as threatening that the Republic of Panama would recognize Fidel Castro's Cuba if the Nixon Administration proved difficult.

Panama's Foreign Minister, Juan Tack, now joined in the defiance of the United States. Interviewed in Panama he declared that his country would not tolerate "a government within a government. What we want is full jurisdiction in the Zone—political, administrative, judicial, labor and all else." But even these declarations were topped by Dr. Carlos Lopez Guevara, a member of Panama's three-man negotiating team. Dr. Lopez, in a public speech on June 2, 1971, declared that the present Canal treaty with the United States is contrary to the charter of the United Nations. The implication was that if the United States proves unwilling the U.N. will be invited into the "negotiations" to decide the fate of our vital Panama Canal.

Dictator Torrijos is now whooping up dangerous anti-gringoism in the Panama City press. Since his accession the press there has, of course, been completely censored and controlled. Only newspapers which strictly follow the Torrijos line are permitted to be published. And their attacks on the United States border on madness. Congressman Daniel J. Flood recently voiced in the *Congressional Record* an amazing list of anti-American quotations from the Panama newspapers, covering a single two-month period following July 2, 1971. The Panamanian mobs are being conditioned to make another assault, similar to that of 1964, should the United States hold out against demands that our Canal and the U.S. Canal Zone be turned over to the Panamanian dictator.

A more certain indication of Panama's intentions is the agitation now being carried on among students there. In past anti-gringo riots in the isthmus, students have always been used as the physical spearhead. It was the students, under Communist leadership, who precipitated the bloody 1964 assault on our Canal Zone. Since Torrijos seized power, the students have been quiescent. It served his purposes, at the outset, to emphasize anti-Communism. The old Communist leadership in the student organizations has now been displaced, but the student anti-American agitation has been resumed. Student organizations, under new leadership, have inaugurated a campaign for Panamanian sovereignty over the U.S. Canal Zone.

Meanwhile, there has been much scurrying and gumshoeing by Robert B. Anderson and his staff. Anderson has visited Panama and conducted hush-hush conversations with the

top officials. The new Panamanian negotiating team appointed by Torrijos has visited Washington and has had numerous unpublished discussions with the State Department, where they found a friendly host in the person of John N. Irwin. All these talks and soundings are only the curtain-raiser. They forecast resumption of the formal negotiations to surrender our Panama Canal.

Informed Americans in Washington have not been idle. Under the determined leadership of such notables as Senator Strom Thurmond, and Congressmen Daniel J. Flood, Leonor K. Sullivan, and Durward G. Hall, a Resolution (H.R. 540) asserting that the United States should "maintain and protect its sovereign rights and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal" was introduced in the House. The strong support in Congress for the safeguarding of American interests in the Canal and isthmus is evidenced by the 102 signatures of Congressmen supporting this Resolution.

But so certain are the Nixon negotiators that they will prevail that they have already adopted a tentative timetable calling for the completion and signing of the new treaty this year, and its submission to the Senate for ratification in the present session. Anderson and his associates are confident that the new surrender treaty will be operative, with Mr. Nixon's signature, by the beginning of 1972.

The spinelessness of the State Department leadership in the present emergency was painfully exhibited by a recent statement by Charles A. Meyer, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Published on July 23, 1971, in the Torrijos-controlled *El Panama America*, it contained the following incredible admissions:

... the time of United States military intervention into other countries is past, even in the most serious circumstances. Not even Communist takeover of a country would change the United States' attitude. ... If the Communists should cut off Venezuelan oil shipments, or if the Santo Domingo incidents should be repeated, or if Communists took over Panama, the United States would not intervene. There will be no United States intervention in Panama.

Never before has there been such a shameless invitation to the Communists to violate and outrage American rights in Latin America. And this by a high official of the Nixon Administration. It lays us wide open to a Communist takeover of the Panama Canal. Dictator Torrijos cannot have missed the point.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 7, 1971]

PANAMA PUTS CANAL ISSUE BEFORE U.N. (By Henry Rayment)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Panama has placed its case for a new canal treaty with the United States before the United Nations membership.

The unusual procedure was immediately interpreted by diplomatic officials as placing Washington on notice that if the new talks failed Panama might seek international mediation.

United States' officials indicated concern over demonstrations planned in Panama Monday, which they fear could produce incidents along the Canal Zone.

In an interview yesterday, Panama's foreign minister, Juan Antonio Tack, said:

"We are anxious to reach a fair and equitable arrangement with the United States. But the role of Panama in world trade and navigation is of such crucial importance that we believe the issue deserves international attention."

Tack delivered a comprehensive report of Panama's protracted negotiations with the U.S. for new canal treaty to Secretary General U Thant on Tuesday with a request that it be circulated among all member nations.

Negotiations between Panama and the U.S. for a new treaty affecting the administration of the Panama Canal and the possible construction of a complementary sea-level waterway across the isthmus were renewed in Washington June 29 after being suspended for almost four years.

In the 17-page memorandum to Thant, the Panamanian minister expressed hope that the talks would result in "the early elimination of the causes of conflict" between his country and the U.S. At the same time, the memorandum insists that a new treaty must lead to the elimination of any U.S. "jurisdictional profile from Panamanian territory."

The document represented the first time that Panama formally reported on the negotiations to the U.N., since it charged the U.S. with aggression following clashes between Panamanians and U.S. troops in the Canal Zone in January 1964.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 7, 1971]

PANAMA INFORMS U.N. OF U.S. TALKS (By Henry Rayment)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Oct. 6—Panama has placed its case for a new canal treaty with the United States before the United Nations membership.

The unusual procedure was immediately interpreted by diplomatic officials as placing Washington on notice that if the new talks failed Panama might seek international mediation.

United States officials indicated concern over demonstrations planned in Panama Monday, which they fear could produce incidents along the Canal Zone.

In an interview today, Panama's Foreign Minister, Juan Antonio Tack, said:

"We are anxious to reach a fair and equitable arrangement with the United States. But the role of Panama in world trade and navigation is of such crucial importance that we believe the issue deserves international attention."

DELIVERED MEMO TO THANT

Yesterday, Mr. Tack delivered a comprehensive report of Panama's protracted negotiations with the United States for a new canal treaty to Secretary General Thant with a request that it be circulated among all member nations.

Negotiations between Panama and the United States for a new treaty affecting the administration of the Panama Canal and the possible construction of a complementary sea-level waterway across the isthmus were renewed in Washington on June 29 after being suspended for almost four years.

United States officials close to the negotiations said in Washington today that the talks were progressing "in a constructive, serious way."

"Although major problems have yet to be decided, we feel there is a good atmosphere," one State Department official remarked. "We sincerely hope nothing will happen to change this."

PANAMA STATES HOPES

In the 17-page memorandum to Mr. Thant, the Panamanian minister expressed hope that the talks would result in "the early elimination of the causes of conflict" between his country and the United States. At the same time, the memorandum insists that a new treaty must lead to the elimination of any United States "jurisdictional profile from Panamanian territory."

The document represented the first time that Panama formally reported on the negotiations to the United Nations since it charged the United States with aggression following clashes between Panamanians and United States troops in the Canal Zone in January, 1964.

Although the charges have technically remained on the agenda of the General Assembly, the dispute was mediated with the help of the Organization of American States,

which led to direct negotiations between the two countries for a revision of the 1903 treaty under which the United States has virtual sovereignty "in perpetuity" over the Canal Zone.

TALKS BROKE DOWN IN 1967

The negotiations, headed for the United States by Former Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, broke down in 1967 and languished until last June.

In view of the anxiety created in the State Department by reports that the Panamanian Government was preparing to stage a mass demonstration near the Canal Zone Monday, the report of Mr. Tack's communication to the United Nations was received with interest in Washington, although officials declined to speculate on its significance.

During the interview, Mr. Tack disavowed any connection between his representation to Secretary General Thant and the scheduled rally.

The demonstration, he said, is simply intended to mark the third anniversary of the seizure of power of the Government of Brig. Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera.

"We have advised the United States Government that we have taken every measure to prevent any disturbances that would threaten the Canal Zone," Mr. Tack declared.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Oct. 11, 1971]

ANTI-U.S. STANCE HARDENING

(By Jeremiah O'Leary)

The celebration today of the third anniversary of Panama's military revolution comes as the isthmian republic's aspirations for a whole new relationship with the United States are nearing the flash point.

Panamanian demands for total sovereignty over the Canal Zone are probably more inflexible now than they were in 1964 when anti-American riots led to a shoot-out with U.S. troops at Panama City.

This mood is reflected in Panama's disclosure that it does not support the U.S. resolution at the United Nations for retention of Taiwan's seat when Red China is admitted.

It also comes to the surface through the intensity of public declarations in Panama and the wave of rumors that the Panamanian Students Federation (FEP) intended to turn today's patriotic rally into a march on the Canal Zone. FEP denied this and called it a CIA plot to lead Panamanians into providing an excuse for a Yankee invasion.

Thousands of peasants were being bused to Panama City to hear a speech by Gen. Omar Torrijos, the Panamanian leader.

NEGOTIATIONS VEILED

New negotiations between the United States and Panama are going on now but both sides are silent about the scope of the progress of the talks.

Three draft treaties were drawn up by negotiators in 1967 but were not ratified by either nation. These treaties covered arrangements for the existing canal, arrangements for a proposed sea-level canal to be built by the United States, and arrangements for the U.S. bases in the isthmus.

TORRIJOS SEEKS GAINS

A hard-line group in the House sees predatory designs by Russia and Cuba on the canal and resists any form of concession to Panama. There is no significant congressional grouping in favor of loosening the U.S. grip.

Torrijos, who really runs Panama as a strong-man although the nominal chief executive is a civilian, Demetrio Lakas, is not believed to share the zeal of Panamanian hotheads for ouster of all U.S. military from the isthmus.

In general, Torrijos knows defense of the canal is not negotiable and the U.S. military bases are a goodly source of income for Panama.

TROUBLE IS FEARED

But Torrijos, who overthrew President Arnulfo Arias three years ago today, does want a greater share in the running of this, or any other canal, through national territory and a greater share in its earnings as well.

Panama's position against the Taiwan resolution in the U.N. and for readmission of Cuba to good standing in the Organization of American States are tactical stands.

It is a fair assumption that Panama would quickly switch on these issues if assured of a new deal on the canal.

What worries responsible Panamanian and American citizens is that the rhetoric and public sentiment may get out of hand.

There are many American officials who see no reason for the United States to retain so many of the trappings of sovereignty in the Canal Zone, where there are separate courts, postal systems and police forces. If a new treaty is not concluded soon, they fear, Panamanians may precipitate a crisis that even the republic's leaders would rather avoid.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 12, 1971]

PANAMA'S LEADER WARNS ON CANAL

PANAMA, October 11.—Gen. Omar Torrijos Herrera, the National Guard commander who rules Panama, told a cheering crowd of about 200,000 supporters today that the time might soon come "for one generation to offer its lives" to recover sovereignty over the United States-controlled Canal Zone.

At a rally in the Fifth of May Plaza, just two blocks from the Canal Zone where United States troops were on alert, General Torrijos warned that "we are reaching the limit of our patience."

"What people can bear the humiliation of seeing a foreign flag planted in the very heart of its nation?" the leader asked.

Panama is claiming sovereignty over the 500-square-mile Canal Zone in current negotiations for a new treaty with the United States in Washington. Under a 1903 treaty, the United States, which pays about \$1.9-million a year in rent to the Panamanian Government controls the zone "in perpetuity."

REGIME MARKS ANNIVERSARY

The rally was called to mark the third anniversary of the coup d'etat that overthrew the 11-day presidency of Dr. Arnulfo Arias and brought General Torrijos to power. Posters and songs proclaimed that Panamanians would "never go on our knees" in the struggle to end United States control of part of Panama.

However, despite the strongly nationalist tone of the general's speech, no anti-United States disturbances were reported. Well-armed Panamanian guards lined the road beside the Canal Zone.

The United States and Panamanian authorities agreed that if anyone entered the zone, the Panamanian police would be invited in to remove them, rather than having United States troops expel them.

Twenty-two Panamanians and two United States citizens died in riots that began in January, 1964, when Panamanian students pulled down a United States flag.

"Our enemies want us to go to the Canal Zone today," General Torrijos told the crowd of Government employees, workers and peasants. "But we are not going there. I'm not going to be a hero with other people's blood. When everything fails, Omar Torrijos will say 'Let's go,' and Omar will lead you."

ELECTIONS ANNOUNCED

"The moment Panama feels let down at the negotiating table," the general said, "I will come and tell you they are deceiving us—that the moment has come for one generation to offer its lives so that another generation can live in a free country."

General Torrijos, apparently conscious that the United States Congress would be reluc-

tant to ratify a renegotiated treaty with a regime that was not democratically elected, announced steps toward representative government. He said elections would be held by next August for an assembly of 500 "corregidores"—a combination of mayor and magistrate—"who will decide what path the country will follow."

But the character of the regime is not expected to change. "We have to be sure that the revolution is not a revolution of only three years," General Torrijos said. "We have to make sure that this goes on for a long time."

EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, part of the American dream is being able to live in a decent house, in a decent neighborhood. To the naive, it would seem that the acquisition of such a house merely involves saving enough money for the downpayment and being able to meet the mortgage payments thereafter. Unfortunately, minority groups are daily being denied the right to such housing.

There have been half-hearted attempts, through various kinds of fair housing legislation, to erase restrictions bordering on color, religion, and national origin. But we are daily confronted with evidence proving that equal opportunity in housing is not yet a reality.

Numerous public interest groups responding to the administration's pronouncements on equal housing opportunity, are pressing toward full enforcement of laws which can make the impossible dream possible.

I would like to submit a copy of a "Response by Public Interest Groups to Administration Pronouncements on Equal Housing Opportunity" for the RECORD:

RESPONSE BY PUBLIC INTEREST GROUPS TO ADMINISTRATION PRONOUNCEMENTS ON EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITY

On June 11, 1971, President Nixon issued a statement on Federal Policies Relative to Equal Housing Opportunity—which candidly recognized the consequences of ill-housing and racial segregation. On June 14, 1971, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, together with the Department of Justice and the General Services Administration, supplemented this statement by announcing several new steps in the implementation of the fair housing law, actions not less welcome for the fact that they were long overdue.

We respond to the President's statement and the initiatives announced by HUD, the Justice Department and GSA in order to place these recent actions in perspective so that we may determine what they might accomplish if vigorously enforced, and to identify steps that remain to be taken if significant progress is to be made.

Our major concerns, spelled out in detail later in the statement, are as follows:

(1) the Administration makes no commitment to overcome the obstacles to securing decent housing outside the ghetto for people who are poor and members of minority groups. By creating artificial distinctions between "racial" and "economic" discrimination, the Administration has handcuffed itself in efforts to overcome the principal barrier to progress—exclusionary land use

policies which are ostensibly economic in purpose but which have a racial impact.

(2) while taking a few steps forward in prohibiting discrimination by housing developers, the Administration still has not utilized the authority it possesses to assure that developers, lending institutions and real estate brokers carry out their obligations under Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

(3) even with respect to the rules and guidelines it has adopted, the Administration still has not demonstrated a will to enforce the law vigorously, e.g., by initiating its own investigations rather than awaiting complaints.

(4) the Administration's statement fails to recognize that, particularly on an issue as controversial as housing opportunity for people who are poor and members of minority groups, the major responsibility for political and moral leadership rests with the President of the United States. We are particularly troubled by the denials of Federal leverage and responsibility and by the failure to deal forthrightly with the prejudices of affluent white citizens.

THE EXTENT OF DEPRIVATION AND DISCRIMINATION

We share with the President the conviction that the continued denial to the poor and racial minorities of access to decent housing in an open market is the nation's most serious domestic problem. As the President's statement recognizes, the continued confinement of racial minorities to ghetto areas is not simply a denial of decent housing. It also denies them access to jobs, to good schools, to public services and a healthy environment. It results in "wasted human potential and stunted human lives." It engenders unwarranted mistrust, hostility and fear.

The 1970 Census figures show a dramatic increase in racially segregated housing patterns—statistics which the President calls "compelling."

Growing racial isolation is evident in the 66 largest metropolitan areas which account for more than half the U.S. population. As the President cites: "the central city white population declined . . . about 2 million (5%)—while the black population increased about 3 million (35%). These statistics reflect decades of denial and restrictions in freedom of housing choice to minorities. They represent "a history of hardship" in which the Federal government played a substantial role—through FHA sanctioned restrictive covenants; urban renewal projects which "cleared out but did not replace housing which, although substandard, was the only housing available to minorities"; and officially sanctioned segregation of public housing.

After long years of helping to establish and entrench patterns of residential segregation, the Federal government reversed course. With President Kennedy's Executive Order in 1962, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 1968 and the Supreme Court's decision in *Jones v. Mayer*, the law was clarified and new tools given to the Federal government to prevent discrimination.

But progress under these new laws has been infinitesimal, as the census figures on continued racial separation confirm. The Department of Housing and Urban Development, the agency chiefly responsible for implementing the laws, has been weak and lethargic in fulfilling its duties. It failed to initiate its own investigations, relying almost exclusively upon complaints of discrimination, and thereby placing the burden on individual victims. It did not set down clear standards to give content to the fair housing law. It did not require affirmative action by the housing industry to undo the effects of past discrimination. It had to be called to account by Federal Courts in several cases for failing to adopt or implement

rules to avoid racial concentration in subsidized housing.

Perhaps most tragic, the patterns of racial isolation established in old programs have been carried over to new programs. New housing built for low and moderate income families in the suburbs has been occupied for the most part by whites. Black citizens, offered the hope of home ownership for the first time, have often found themselves relegated to old houses in the inner city. Some of the transactions for this housing have been tainted with fraud in which the FHA has been implicated and minority citizens have been the victims. While the President speaks of "dramatic progress in increasing the supply of housing," there is increasing evidence of the creation of new ghettos and instant slums.

It is in this context that the President's statement was issued and new steps taken. In the light of this history it is imperative that the most careful scrutiny be given to what these measures are likely to accomplish. Will they "correct the effects of past discrimination" as the President desires? Will they reverse the trends of racial separation? Will there be an end to "wasted human potential and stunted human lives?"

ACTION TAKEN TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES BY THE HOUSING INDUSTRY

First, with respect to removing barriers traceable to industry practices, the President states: "Racial discrimination in housing is illegal, and will not be tolerated." Further, Federal policy "must be aimed at correcting the effects of past discrimination." "And it must be results-oriented so its progress toward the overall goal of increasing housing opportunities can be evaluated." Two of the chief components of the program are the "development of information programs" and "policies relating to housing marketing practices."

On June 14, Secretary Romney, Attorney General Mitchell and General Services Administrator Kunzig released announcements to amplify these general policy statements. Those pertaining to industry practices are the proposed affirmative marketing guidelines and site selection criteria for Federally subsidized housing.

The affirmative marketing guidelines seek to give content to the concept of "fair housing" by setting forth specific steps for developers to take to assure that minority home-seekers will know of and have access to housing opportunities. Although the new guidelines are a step forward, their shortcomings are substantial. One major defect is that transactions on existing housing are not covered. Thus, out of a housing inventory in excess of 60 million units, fewer than one million new FHA assisted starts will be covered each year. In addition, it is not at all clear that these projects will be monitored to insure compliance by developers or whether FHA will continue to rely almost totally on the receipt of complaints.

Furthermore, real estate brokers who play a major role in the sale and leasing of housing are not subject to the requirements of affirmative marketing criteria. If these new criteria are to have any effect in eliminating the dual market, coverage must be extended to include a far greater proportion of housing and to bring brokers within its provisions.

In addition, HUD should condition Federal assistance on satisfactory assurances from developers and brokers that they are not discriminating in any business transactions whether or not federally assisted.

To carry out the promise to develop information programs the affirmative marketing guidelines direct local FHA insuring offices to make available upon request lists of projects or subdivisions on which FHA commitments have been issued during the preceding 30 days. Although billed as a new program, this procedure was established under E.O. 11063 and is not an innovation. (In

fact, these lists included repossessed housing, FHA insured multi-family housing and were not limited to projects of 25 or more units.) What is plainly needed is an information program along the lines recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in its report on the "235" housing program. Merely making this information available in local FHA insuring offices is totally unrealistic in the area of low and moderate income housing. As the Commission emphasizes, "one of the serious impediments to the successful operation of federally assisted programs that serve lower-income families has been the lack of information . . ." The Commission recommends the establishment of local offices where the people whom the program is designed to serve can be assisted and counseled. This step is essential.

While the adoption of site selection procedures is welcome, it should be recognized that there are limitations on what those procedures can achieve. The fundamental weakness is that they cannot compel the building of low and moderate income housing where exclusionary land use policies prevent it. Stronger measures are needed to make sites available, measures that are discussed in the next section.

Site selection policies can only assure that where developers do have sites available, HUD will give preference to those which provide the best opportunity for achieving racial and economic integration. But under the rating system established by HUD it is not all clear that such sites will be favored. Whereas a superior rating is awarded for a site promoting racial and economic integration under the category "nondiscriminatory location" the same site may be at a disadvantage under criteria for "neighborhood environment" and "employment and utilization of employees and business in project areas." Thus it will still be possible to continue assisting housing constructed in a manner to perpetuate and exacerbate racial concentration.

Site election is only a part of the process. Tenant and owner selection is of equal significance. Under the present system the private developer or sponsor determines who shall buy or rent a unit. He certifies their eligibility and applies his own standards for acceptance. The Commission on Civil Rights in its report on the 235 program found segregated patterns were attributable in part to the brokers and developers. No program comparable to public housing tenant selection procedures has been proposed to ensure equal opportunity to eligible families desirous of participating in the 235 and 236 programs.

It is also discouraging that no other specific measures directed at the housing and home finance industry were set forth or proposed. For example, although the President's statement refers to the responsibilities of Federal agencies that regulate lending institutions, neither President Nixon nor Secretary Romney stated that these agencies would be expected to develop an effective program, backed by sanctions, to prevent lending discrimination. Nor have these agencies made any commitment to promulgate such a program. Whether or not law suits are brought by the Department of Justice to restrain discriminatory lending practices, (and none have been brought to date), it is imperative that the Federal regulatory agencies act to establish a system for collecting the necessary racial data and enforce the fair housing law with respect to their member banks and savings and loan associations.

In short, the Federal government has not yet provided effective guarantees that minority citizens will be treated fairly at the hands of builders, brokers, and lending institutions. Even with respect to Federally subsidized housing we cannot be sure that the disgraceful pattern found by the Civil Rights Commission—blacks going into existing housing in ghetto areas, whites into new housing in the suburbs—will be terminated. The policies adopted are a small step forward, but there is much yet to be done.

EXCLUSIONARY PRACTICES OF LOCAL COMMUNITIES

While the President's statement and the new policies promulgated by Secretary Romney promise some improvement in the implementation of civil rights laws against discriminatory industry practices, one of the most formidable barriers to equal housing opportunity is that posed by the exclusionary practices of local communities, particularly zoning ordinances. It is here that the Administration's statement is most ambiguous and its policies most deficient. Federal agencies followed the President's statement with two policy steps: (1) entry into housing litigation involving *Black Jack, Missouri* and (2) the announcement of new housing criteria to be taken into account in awarding water and sewer grants to local governments (with the indication that such criteria may also be applied to other "community development" grants). These steps fall far short of what is required to make any real contribution to solving the problems of housing deprivation and racial concentration that the President so eloquently described.

In *Black Jack*, the Department of Justice, after almost seven months of study and the public declaration by a member of the President's cabinet that the situation involved a "flagrant violation of the Constitution," decided to institute a law suit. *Black Jack* is a case where neighbors of a proposed moderate income project incorporated themselves and passed a zoning ordinance for the specific purpose of preventing the construction of integrated housing. In short, the basis for Federal action was clear and powerful evidence that the exclusionary action of the newly created local government was *racially motivated*. Since it is rare to find such overwhelming evidence of racial motive (in most cases zoning ordinances existed long before efforts to construct low income housing), the question remains: what legal action will the Administration take in situations where the effect of zoning ordinances or other exclusionary action is racial, although there may not be available legal proof that the purpose was racial?

In this respect, the President's message is most discouraging, for it seeks to drive a wedge between race and poverty and to maintain an artificial distinction between "economic" and "racial" discrimination. It is true, as the President says, that "the term 'poor' and 'black' are not interchangeable" and that there are "far more poor whites in America than there are poor blacks."

But these statements, while true, are irrelevant if the issue is meeting the housing needs of people who live in the major metropolitan areas of the Nation. In these metropolitan areas, substantially more than half of the poor who are confined to the inner city poverty areas are members of minority groups. Seventy-four percent of poor white families do not live in poverty areas.

This is not to say that many white poor do not have housing needs. But it is clear that in major metropolitan areas the major impact of exclusionary zoning ordinances is upon black, Puerto Rican, and Mexican American citizens. (Indeed, in its affirmative marketing guidelines, the Administration's position is that every subsidized housing project will be open to minority citizens. It follows that every exclusion by a suburban community of subsidized housing has a racial impact and should be opposed by prompt and vigorous Federal action).

At one point in his statement, the President frames a proper legal test.

"If the effect of the [purportedly economic] action is to exclude Americans from equal housing opportunity on the basis of their race, religion or ethnic background, we will vigorously oppose it by whatever means are most appropriate—regardless of the rationale which may have cloaked the discriminatory act" (emphasis added).

In short, the appropriate legal test is racial effect, not racial purpose. If the government were prepared to follow the logic of its legal position, it would now be investigating many cases for the purpose of establishing the racial effect of exclusionary local actions and we would be highly encouraged. Instead the Administration continues to maintain the fiction that poverty and race are separate problems—a position which, except for a few unusual situations—will lead to continued racial concentration.

The President's statement in this connection, should be compared with his statement on the same problem a little over one year ago, in his Second Annual Housing Goals Report to the Congress. In that message he pointedly stated: "Community opposition to low- and moderate-income housing involves both racial and economic discrimination. . . . (I)t is difficult, if not impossible, in many communities to find sites for low- and moderate-income housing because the occupants will be poor, or will be members of a racial minority, or both. The consequence is that either no low- or moderate-income housing is built or that it is built only in the inner city, thus heightening the tendency for racial polarization in our society." The President, in that report, also requested legislation "which would prohibit states and local public bodies from discriminating against housing subsidized by the federal government, whether through legislative or administrative action."

It is quite apparent that these statements were motivated by concern that the lack of good sites for subsidized housing would severely cripple HUD's efforts to attract more highly capitalized entrepreneurs who might utilize industrialized methods of construction in the federal programs. This problem may, indeed, be the Achilles Heel of "Operation Breakthrough," widely heralded as a major administration initiative in this direction in 1969, or any other program to increase the production of housing.

The second Administration initiative is essentially a reaffirmation of existing policy, that "to qualify for Federal assistance, the law requires a local housing or community development project to be part of a plan that expands the supply of low- and moderate-income housing in a racially non-discriminatory way." The defects of this policy are (1) that the guidelines issued for water and sewer grants are inadequate to assure that an application will be funded only if there is a pledge to provide low and moderate income housing and (2) that the policy will be applied only to a few programs, not those which would provide real inducements to communities to meet the housing needs of the poor and racial minorities.

The first deficiency is exposed by the guidelines that Secretary Romney has issued governing water and sewer grants. These make clear that the provision of low and moderate income housing is only one of a great many criteria to be considered in determining whether a community will receive a grant. In fact, a locality whose application is otherwise in order may qualify for funds even if it makes no commitment to meeting housing needs. We do not find, for example, anything in the criteria which would bar such grants to *Black Jack, Missouri*.

Even if the standards are strengthened and made mandatory, however, Federal policy cannot be made effective until responsibility for meeting the housing needs of the poor and minorities is made a condition of all Federal assistance, not just community development projects such as urban renewal, water and sewer and open space grants.

Under present policy, communities which exclude minorities and the poor may select among the various Federal programs to meet their community's needs irrespective of the conditions and needs of surrounding com-

munities. They seek financial assistance for transportation services and highway construction to encourage the introduction of industry and commercial enterprises to increase their tax base. Federal money also flows for programs of economic development, health, education and environmental protection. It is only because of these substantial kinds of assistance that such communities are able to maintain and even improve their standard of living while at the same time maintaining racial and economic exclusivity. The continuation of such Federal assistance unaccompanied by civil rights standards subverts our major national housing goal—to provide a decent home in a suitable living environment for all American citizens.

In addition, industry and Federal installations are much sought after sources of revenue for many suburban communities. Why, for example, would the Federal government continue to make large contracts with, or give favorable tax treatment to, employers which locate in communities that exclude poor and black people? Suburban communities are often very anxious to attract such employers; the property taxes they pay make it possible for the community to provide adequate public services without unduly burdening their own citizens. Yet, the location of employers in restrictive suburbs frequently makes a sham of equal employment requirements. Minority workers cannot live in the community, nor do they have adequate access to the jobs. A reasonable—indeed a necessary—condition of a government contract if equal employment laws are to be meaningful is that minorities and lower income employees must be able to live in the communities in which the jobs are located.

Until 1969, availability of housing for low and moderate income employees was not a consideration in relocating or establishing a Federal installation. In 1969, by internal regulation and later in 1970 by Executive Order, GSA was required to consider the housing element in determination to relocate. This order was silent on nondiscrimination. The memorandum of understanding between GSA and HUD on June 14th strengthens the government's policy. It is not absolutely clear, however, that GSA is prohibited from locating in communities which housing is not available to all.

Similar requirements should be applied to all government contractors. Further, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission should include availability of housing as a factor in determining equal employment opportunity.

On these, as on other crucial matters, the President's Housing statement is either silent or negative. It has diagnosed a cancer and prescribed aspirin as the remedy.

EXECUTIVE LEADERSHIP

Perhaps the most discouraging aspect of President Nixon's statement in its limited view of the responsibility the President and the Federal government must accept for correcting conditions which are admittedly very serious.

No one can dispute the fact that providing housing for the poor and for minorities is one of the most politically sensitive issues of our time. Mr. Nixon has recited the fears that exist in suburban communities—that poor people would "lower property values," that they would "contribute less in taxes than they consume in services," that their entry would "bring a contagion of crime, violence, drugs." But the responsibility of the President is not simply that of a good reporter (to describe prejudices that are held "rightly or wrongly") or even that of a good lawyer—but that of a political and moral leader. It is his duty to counter prejudices and fears, to make clear that the remedies are not to impose a quarantine or to reinforce the ghetto conditions that bred them in the first place; to place before the Amer-

ican people the hard alternatives they face in the cities; to offer programs responsive to legitimate concerns.

Nor can the Administration seek to avoid responsibility by pleading that the Federal government lacks "leverage" in the field of housing. As the statement itself acknowledges, the Federal government has been at minimum a willing partner in the development of ghettos and segregated suburbs. It is simply unacceptable for the Administration to suggest that the government, with all of the enormous resources it has at its disposal and with the detailed regulation it has employed in fields such as taxation, is powerless to correct a fundamental injustice which it has helped to create. It is particularly ironic that this Administration, so concerned with the power and influence of the U.S. abroad, seems content to assume the role of a "pitiful, helpless giant" at home, unwilling to assure equality to its own citizens.

The answer, it should be clear, is not a choice between Federal and local action, but a wise combination of both. Certainly there are "infinitely varied individual questions that arise as our thousands of local governments hammer out their individual local land use policies." No one has suggested that the Federal government impose a strict pattern of conformity on every community in the Nation. But, if the Federal government does not set down as a fundamental ground rule that the local governments in each metropolitan area must meet the needs of the poor and minorities in that area for decent housing, few localities will act on their own. Once the basic rule of equal housing opportunity is established, there can be great scope for diversity in the way that each locality fulfills its obligation.

As to the allocation of responsibility within the Federal government itself, we believe, as we have stated, that the Executive branch now possesses all of the authority necessary to surmount the barriers to providing housing for the poor and minorities throughout the metropolitan areas. If, however, the Administration determines that additional authority or assistance from the legislative branch would be useful, the President should present such legislation to the Congress promptly. It will not do for Secretary Romney to tell the mayors that they should seek legislation. The mayors will be regarded as special pleaders; the President speaks for all the people.

Further, the President's leadership is needed not only to create support and understanding among citizens but to mobilize the Federal bureaucracy itself. Time and again during the last decade, excellent policy statements on equal housing opportunity have been subverted by the unwillingness of the Federal housing officials to take vigorous action to implement them. Even the limited initiatives taken by this Administration will fail unless officials of the FHA and the other housing agencies are made to understand that they will have no higher responsibility than to carry out policies designed to meet the housing needs of the poor and minorities.

Finally, while we have focused principally upon the preeminent responsibilities of the President, it must be recognized that others also have an obligation to provide national leadership. It is somewhat discouraging that on an issue as vital and controversial as this one, few political leaders have articulated a clear position. We call upon national leaders of both political parties, not simply to react to the President's statement, but to spell out their own affirmative programs for securing decent, non-segregated housing for poor and minority citizens.

CONCLUSION

While we are greatly disturbed by the negative aspects of the President's statement and the failure of the Administration to take steps to assure equal housing opportunity,

we are not bereft of hope. The Administration has recognized for the first time the seriousness of the problem and has taken the first halting steps toward solution. Much will depend upon its ability to enforce the policies that have been adopted and its willingness to reconsider self-imposed limitations upon the adoption of policies that would promise genuine relief.

The President has asked in this field as in others that his Administration be judged by the results it achieves. That is precisely what we shall do.

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS OF LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Actor Equity.
African Methodist Episcopal Church.
African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.
Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.
Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, Inc.
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.
Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen.
American Baptist Convention—Division of Social Concern.
American Civil Liberties Union.
American Ethical Union.
American Federation of Labor—Congress of Industrial Organizations.
American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees.
American Federation of Teachers.
American GI Forum.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Newspaper Guild.
American Veterans Committee.
Americans For Democratic Action.
Anti-Defamation League of B'Nai B'rith.
A. Philip Randolph Institute.
B'Nai B'rith Women.
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church.
Church of the Brethren—Brethren Service Commission.
Church Women United.
Citizens Lobby for Freedom & Fair Play.
College YCS National Staff.
Committee for Community Affairs.
Congress of Racial Equality.
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority.
Episcopal Church—Division of Christian Citizenship.
Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity.
Franciscan Social Action Team.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
Frontiers International.
Hadassah.
Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union.
Improved Benevolent & Protective Order of Elks of the World.
Industrial Union Department—AFL-CIO.
International Ladies Garment Workers' Union of America.
International Union of Electrical Radio & Machine Workers.
Iota Phi Lambda Sorority, Inc.
Japanese American Citizens League.
Jewish Labor Committee.
Jewish War Veterans.
Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity.
League for Industrial Democracy.
League of Women Voters of the United States.
Lutheran Church in America—Board of Social Ministry.
Lutheran Human Relations Association.
Medical Committee for Human Rights.
National Alliance of Postal & Federal Employees.
National Alliance of Postal & Federal Employees—National Women's Auxiliary.
National Assembly for Social Policy & Development, Inc.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of College Women.

National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Market Developers.
National Association of Negro Business & Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Real Estate Brokers, Inc.
National Association of Social Workers.
National Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
National Bar Association.
National Beauty Culturists' League, Inc.
National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice.
National Catholic Social Action Conference.
National Community Relations Advisory Council.
National Council of Catholic Men.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Churches—Department of Social Justice.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Council of Puerto Rican Volunteers, Inc.
National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.
National Dental Association.
National Education Association.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation of Settlements & Neighborhood Centers.
National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.
National Jewish Welfare Board.
National Medical Association.
National Newspaper Publishers Association.
National Organization for Mexican-American Services.
National Organization for Women.
National Sharecroppers Fund.
National Urban League.
Negro American Labor Council.
Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers International Union.
Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc.
Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc.
Phi Delta Kappa Sorority.
Pioneer Women, American Affairs.
Poale Zion.
Presbyterian Interracial Council.
Retail Clerks International Association.
Retail Wholesale & Department Store Union.
Scholarship, Education & Defense Fund for Racial Equality, Inc.
Southern Beauty Congress, Inc.
Southern Christian Leadership Conference.
Textile Workers Union of America.
Transport Workers Union of America.
Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Unitarian Universalist Association.
Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation.
United Automobile Workers of America.
United Christian Missionary Society.
United Church of Christ—Committee for Racial Justice Now.
United Church of Christ—Council for Christian Social Action.
United Farm Workers Organizing Committee.
United Hebrew Trades.
United Presbyterian Church—Commission on Religion & Race.
United Presbyterian Church—Office of Church & Society.
United Rubber Workers.
U.S. Catholic Conference—Department of Social Development.
United States National Student Association.
United States Youth Council.
United Steelworkers of America.
United Synagogue of America.
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom.
Workers Defense League.
Workmen's Circle.
Young Men's Christian Association, National Board.
Young Women's Christian Association of the USA, National Board.
Zeta Phi Beta Sorority.

**THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND
HANDICAPPED MUST NOT BE
FORGOTTEN**

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times there is an editorial entitled "Aid for Retarded Children." It commends the Federal District Court in Philadelphia for requiring the State of Pennsylvania to provide free public education for all retarded children just as they do for children, who blessedly, are born normal.

We, in this Congress, as well as on every other level of government have failed miserably to provide moneys in many essential areas, but the most unconscionable failure is our refusal to adequately care for the hapless retarded and handicapped. To illustrate I am appending correspondence which I have had on this subject with New York State officials, as well as a copy of the editorial.

MAY 24, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KOCH: As per my conversation with you on May 21, 1971 at your office. This is in relation to Letchworth Village, where my son is a patient for the last twelve (12) years. He is in an infirm cottage, where the boys need individual care, they have to be feed, dressed, and have no control of toilet needs.

My husband and I visit our son every week, and we find that the cottage is very short in help more so in the past years. With the shortage of help there are more absentee's, naturally the children are neglected, and there seems to be more injuries to the children.

The infirm cottage where my son is a resident, when my husband and I visit there we find terrible odors which is a terrible health hazard. Of course there are other things which I will not mention which can be corrected.

I hope Congressman Edward Koch with your help you will be able to correct this terrible situation.

Thank you in advance, and for your personal interview.

May God bless you and yours.

Sincerely,

Mrs. _____

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 9, 1971.

HOLLIS S. INGRAHAM, M.D.,
Commissioner of Health, Department of
Health of the State of New York, Albany,
New York

DEAR DR. INGRAHAM: I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from Mrs. _____, a constituent of mine, whose son is confined to Letchworth Village. Mrs. _____ came in to see me several weeks ago and mentioned a number of conditions and situations which naturally upset her greatly. For example, she related an instance to me where her son, who I believe suffers from cerebral palsy, was left out in the sun for many hours and as a result received a bad sunburn.

I understand from Mrs. _____ that other parents have complained about the quality of service which patients at Letchworth receive. I would very much appreciate, subject to your regular procedures regarding matters such as these, if you would have someone investigate these allegations, and advise me of your findings and of whatever action you may decide to take to remedy the situation.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

STATE OF NEW YORK,
DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE,
Albany, N.Y., August 12, 1971.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: I do appreciate this opportunity to respond more fully to you concerning your constituent, Mrs. _____, and her son _____, a resident at Letchworth Village.

Members of my staff have discussed the incident regarding _____ with Dr. Oleh Wolansky, Director of Letchworth Village, and Dr. T. Smith, the physician in charge of the Lamba Cottage where _____ lives.

Residents in the infirm cottages are taken out-of-doors for short periods during the day when the weather permits. Although exposure to the sun is controlled as much as possible, a resident may occasionally get a slight sunburn. In _____ case, this was noted by the cottage staff and appropriate measures were taken. Within a couple of days the sunburn on the back of _____ neck had faded without blistering or peeling.

I share fully Mrs. _____ concern for the quality of care and living conditions at Letchworth Village, and would suggest that she discuss any specific question she may have about her son's treatment and care, or more general matters of interest to her, with the appropriate staff at the School.

Indeed, I am very much aware that some conditions at Letchworth Village are not entirely what I would like them to be. Letchworth Village has been and continues to be one of the most overcrowded and understaffed state schools in New York. In spite of some very real progress and continuing concentrated efforts to improve this situation, recent budgetary restrictions have severely handicapped these efforts. Unfortunately, these restrictions on new appointments to Letchworth Village have had the greatest impact on the staffing of the infirm cottages, where the needs are most critical.

When hiring has been permitted, the majority of employees have been assigned to the infirm cottages. However, due mainly to the attrition, it has been most difficult to maintain an adequate staffing level in these areas.

Let me assure you that I will continue to do everything in my power to improve conditions at Letchworth Village, and at the other State schools. Your interest and concern are very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM D. VOORHEES, Jr., M.D.,
Acting Commissioner.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 1, 1971.

HON. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of New York,
Executive Chambers,
Albany, N.Y.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Every Friday I meet with constituents and not very long ago I met with the mother of a young boy, _____, a resident of Letchworth Village. His mother complained that _____, who suffers from cerebral palsy, is not receiving sufficient attention at Letchworth.

The enclosed letter received from Dr. William D. Voorhees, dated August 12th, very candidly says: "Indeed, I am very much aware that some conditions at Letchworth Village are not entirely what I would like them to be. Letchworth Village has been and continues to be one of the most overcrowded and understaffed state schools in New York. In spite of some very real progress and continuing concentrated efforts to improve this situation, recent budgetary restrictions have severely handicapped these efforts. Unfortunately, these restrictions on new appointments to Letchworth Village have had the greatest impact on the staffing of the infirm cottages, where the needs are most critical."

Governor, it is just not acceptable that

budget cuts should affect the most handicapped of our citizens, and I ask you to undertake whatever is necessary to provide funds to adequately staff these schools for the handicapped.

I would appreciate your advising me as to what you can and will do so that I, in turn, may advise my constituent. Please reply to my New York office.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

[From The New York Times, Oct. 13, 1971]

AID FOR RETARDED CHILDREN

The ruling by a three-judge Federal court in Philadelphia that the state of Pennsylvania must provide free public education to all retarded children constitutes a historic step in an area that has suffered from public and professional neglect. Similar court tests will inevitably be instituted elsewhere unless school systems across the country move toward voluntary compliance with what will surely become the universal legal requirement.

The education of retarded children is a difficult task, but it is clearly a responsibility to be borne by school and society. For parents it is, under present chaotic and often callously inadequate provisions, both a personally heartbreaking and financially ruinous problem. School systems apply widely differing standards in categorizing youngsters ineducable. Even where districts nominally accept the responsibility for keeping such children in school, they often fail to provide effective instruction, thus adding frustration to disability. Yet the few existing private institutions of acceptable quality are beyond the financial reach of most families of even comfortable means.

The court ruling is humane and socially sound. Whatever the cost of educating retarded children, the cost of setting them adrift in the world without giving them the means to lead useful lives is far higher. It is also morally indefensible. With only about 3 percent of the school-age population in the retarded category, the Nation is surely able to provide the means to point these youngsters on a productive course.

A court order alone, however, is not enough. To translate the law into educational policy requires fully trained personnel and adequate staffing in existing schools and in special facilities. United States Education Commissioner Sidney P. Marland Jr. urges that 1980 be set as the target year for assuring all retarded children of a free public education. The Pennsylvania ruling provides a new legal basis for eliminating a glaring neglect.

**IS THERE A PLACE FOR INTEREST
RATES IN THE ECONOMICS GAME
PLAN?**

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, now that President Nixon has announced phase II of his new economics plan, I find much that is commendable but wish the President and his administration would show more interest in interest.

But although there are ambitious proposals for controlling wages, prices, and rents, the cost of borrowing has been generally overlooked in what the White House has proffered so far.

It goes without saying that interest costs represent a key to the future for many if not most of our citizens.

These rates determine whether we can

afford to pay for a house, a car or a major appliance—or the expense of young people in college. Yet, this administration has largely looked the other way while interest rates have soared.

I do not feel that at this point the voluntary restraints on interest rates called for by Mr. Nixon are sufficient. Back where I come from, that term "voluntary control," freely translated, has always meant, "Don't steal more than you can carry."

It is unfortunate, in my view, that borrowers are not represented on the committee which Mr. Nixon will set up to enlist the cooperation of lenders in holding down interest charges. Instead, the committee will consist entirely of Federal officials, including the Chairmen of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation—both of whom by the nature of their jobs are particularly receptive to the needs of bankers.

Few chicken coops ever have contained so many foxes.

Lest I sound carping, I would like to specifically praise the President for his decision to name representatives of management and labor as well as the general public to the crucial board charged with regulating wages.

The same irrefutable logic should apply in establishing a more representative committee to deal with interest rates.

Finally, I am puzzled by the apparent need for the President to ask for standby authority to impose mandatory controls on interest rates and dividend payments. I thought Congress had given Mr. Nixon this authority 2 years ago, and that he had just been loathe to use it.

In any event, more than standby power is needed now. The time has come for action to knock down interest rates across the board.

ANTIGUN LOBBY PROPOSES PEACEFUL SURRENDER BY DISARMING AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, concerned and informed Americans understand that regardless of United Nations treaties and moves afoot in our country to completely reverse our constitutional form of government, there can never be any peaceful takeover as long as the average American has the right to own and possess firearms. This being so, many of the present socialistic concentrations of power in Washington bureaucrats can never be fully implemented until the firearms are taken from the people.

A rough summary of the unfortunate deterioration of constitutional government in our country should impress everyone that our State and local governments are reduced to but powerless pawns under the Federal bureaucracy. The domestic regulation of our money has already been surrendered to the Federal Reserve Banking System and the regulation of the value of foreign exchange made dependent upon the manip-

ulations of the International Monetary Fund. The Post Office Department, an important link in communications, has been given to another Federal Reserve-like private monopoly, and we have watched nationalization of the railroads in the Penn Central case and of private industry in the Lockheed matter.

Federal judges have already assigned control of our children's minds to uniform treatment of mass education and by the implementation of busing, have proven that the Federal Government has a greater degree of ownership over schoolchildren than do the parents. To supplement the Federal thought control over our children, the House has now passed H.R. 10351, the Senate S. 2007, to lay the groundwork for complete takeover of the American child shortly after birth in order to teach them the art of growing up as faceless children of a collective society rather than chance their becoming individuals under parental training and supervision.

We are today considering the Consumer Protection Act of 1971, which if anything will be adverse to the consumer because it will serve as the Soviet for nationalization or bankruptcy of all small businesses in our country. As small business declines and producers become less competitive, unemployment can be expected to increase; and prices, unless frozen under a continued socialist type economy, can be expected to soar. The consumer can expect a smaller variety of goods, less competition, more standardization, and even higher costs.

This then brings us to the necessity to control and regulate food. And by chance, next week the House is to consider the Federal Pesticide Control Act (H.R. 10729) delegating to the Director of the new Environmental Protection Agency almost unlimited powers to decide what agricultural chemicals can be manufactured and used by American farmers in supplying our food. Concentration of such power in one location can but establish a nerve center for repeated attacks by the environmentalist enthusiasts, which can be expected to result in serious handicaps to our food-raising capability. A relatively small number of Americans in the agricultural segment of our society have been able to make us one of the few countries in the world able to produce an abundance of foodstuffs for our citizens. Food and fiber production in such large quantities have been made possible only because of advancements in agricultural chemicals. Any sudden prohibition of the use of these chemicals can only result in food shortages in our country. In any centralized dictatorship, control of food has always been regarded as essential for control. In the United States, after this bill is enacted, political justification of planned famines will be possible under the guise of curbing pollution and safeguarding environment.

And then we come to the inevitable hurdle—the last step for complete nationalization—the denial of the right and ability of the individual American to defend himself and his family. The firearms have got to go—so the leftwing liberals say.

At present, firearm control bills are

pending in both the House and the Senate. The authors of the antigun bills in the House are from New York State where, under the provisions of the Sullivan Act, all firearms are registered. According to a New York Daily News account of August of this year, there has not been one homicide in New York City with a legally owned firearm since the firearm bill went into effect in 1968. There are, of course, many homicides, but they are all with illegal guns or stolen weapons. And ironically, those paranoid over the antigun movement have been outspoken with concern for the inmates of Attica where of the 30 convicts killed in the riot, six were serving murder sentences and four serving sentences for manslaughter.

And then in our Nation's Capital, Washington, D.C., which has a police force larger in number than some of our States, crime-riddled merchants are banding together to hire private security guards to help insure "better citizen protection." Our Nation's Capital, 62.7 square miles in area with a population of 764,000, employs six police for every 1,000 people and also has stringent firearm laws which were enacted by the U.S. Congress. As of October 4, 1971, there have been 207 murders, 31 of which remain unsolved; the local paper issued a monthly crime report headlined "D.C. crime rate drops." An analysis of the report indicates that misdemeanors and probably speeding tickets and parking tickets may have declined, but that reported rapes had increased 13.3 percent and murders increased 15 percent as compared to a year ago.

Another significant report delivered to the American Public Health Association annual meeting in Minnesota this month covered a 5½-year study of rape victims in the District of Columbia. The report indicated a sharp increase in violence and the frequency of gang attacks. With such frightening statistics as these, where many of the criminals are repeaters, it is absurd to even consider that any thinking American citizen would ever give up his firearm and his right to self-defense. The statistics but prove the thinking of many that in none of these criminal instances would denial of firearms to the victims have prevented the violence. But, on the other hand, if the criminals were given greater assurance that their victims were unarmed, the incidence of crime could be expected to be even higher.

The petty arguments offered by the antigun syndrome are feeble. There can be no solution to the violence problem until we are rid of the soft-on-criminals judges and bleeding-heart foundations which are so active in the protection of the welfare of criminals and adamant against law enforcement and the safety of law-abiding citizens. Massive expenditures of taxpayers' money for law and order and safe streets go for naught. Crime continues to flourish and seemingly the victim has no rights under our presently perverted administration of justice. The chaotic conditions manifested in our country are revealed in the form of violence and crime hurt many decent law-abiding, and honest American

men and women. The liberal's dreams of guaranteed civil rights and equality have become a nightmare that threatens the sanity of our land.

By now, experience must have convinced the American people of the wisdom of our forefathers who wanted us to have the right to keep and bear arms. The excuses offered for taking the guns from the American people are exactly the reasons why American people want guns and will keep their firearms.

The right to keep and bear arms is the last stronghold of constitutional government. Its loss would herald the final step—the dissolution of the Republic and our constitutional form of government.

I ask that several related newsclipping follow?

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1971]

AUGUST 1971 D.C. CRIME RATE DROPS

(By Paul W. Valentine)

Washington's serious crime rate for August inched up .3 per cent over July but was 9.7 per cent below the rate for August, 1970, the metropolitan police department reported yesterday.

The department's regular monthly statistical report showed there were 4,520 serious crimes reported for August this year, 16 more than the 4,504 reported for July but almost 500 fewer than the 5,003 reported in August last year.

Continuing a general pattern of recent months, reported murders and rapes increased substantially compared to a year ago, while decreases were reported in the other five major crime categories—robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, auto theft and larceny over \$50.

The number of reported murders more than doubled from 11 last August to 26 this August. Reported rapes increased 13.3 per cent from 45 to 51.

Police officials have attributed the increase in murder to the greater availability of firearms on the street, more shooting of persons during robberies and an increase in narcotics underworld shootings.

The rape figures, on the other hand, have gone up as a result of a recent change in police reporting methods, officials say. Formerly, a complaint was classified as a rape only after an assistant U.S. attorney screened the case to see if it contained sufficient elements for prosecution. Since April this year, all cases are immediately entered as reported rapes upon the say-so of the complaining women.

While the numerically small categories of rape and murder were higher than in August, 1970, the other categories experienced moderate to substantial decreases:

NUMBER REPORTED AUGUST

| | 1970 | 1971 | Monthly change | |
|-------------------------|-------|-------|----------------|---------|
| | | | Number | Percent |
| Murder..... | 11 | 26 | +15 | +136.4 |
| Rape..... | 45 | 51 | +6 | +13.3 |
| Robbery..... | 939 | 913 | -26 | -2.8 |
| Aggravated assault..... | 400 | 351 | -49 | -12.3 |
| Burglary..... | 1,816 | 1,695 | -121 | -6.7 |
| Larceny over \$50..... | 666 | 654 | -12 | -1.8 |
| Auto theft..... | 1,126 | 830 | -296 | -26.3 |

Among the city's seven police districts, the first district, comprising commercial downtown, Capitol Hill and new Southwest, reported the greatest number of serious offenses in August with 868—31 less than in August, 1970, but 19 more than in July this year.

With its abundance of shops, restaurants and hotels, it led the city in reported robberies (191), burglaries (265) and larcenies over \$50 (192).

The second district, which takes in a western segment of commercial downtown and all of the city west of Rock Creek Park, reported the fewest serious crimes (454). The sixth district, which covers all of Washington east of the Anacostia River and north of Pennsylvania Avenue was next lowest with 472.

The inner city third district, containing the Cardozo and Shaw areas, led in reported homicides (6), rapes (12) and aggravated assaults (85). The sixth district reported the greatest number of stolen vehicles, 157.

Crimes against persons (murder, rapes, robbery and assault) accounted for 29.7 of all serious crimes reported in August, according to police statistics.

This marks a decline from 31.8 per cent in July and 33.1 per cent in June this year.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 13, 1971]

GANG RAPES INCREASE SHARPLY IN D.C.

(By Stuart Auerbach)

MINNEAPOLIS, October 12.—The latest chapter in a 5½-year study of rape victims in the District of Columbia shows a sharp increase in violence and the frequency of gang attacks.

Dr. Charles R. Hayman told the American Public Health Association's annual meeting here today that during the latest period studied—from July, 1969, through December, 1970—30 per cent of all rape victims were assaulted by more than one man.

"More of the group rapes are occurring than previously," Hayman said.

These generally are committed by young men, between 18- and 24-years-old, who often have a different motivation than men who commit rapes alone. Gangs of two to four men committed 22 per cent of the rapes and gangs of five or more men committed 6 per cent of the rapes.

"The first one in a group may be a rapist," said Hayman, "but the others join in just to be in the peer group."

"What we are seeing," he said in an interview, "is an increase in violence in our society. While rape has always been with us, it is increasing—not because of an increase in sexual drive, but because of an increase in aggression."

"The availability of sex is not a factor. The rapist is looking primarily for violence."

The latest study covers 1,233 rapes that the metropolitan police investigated out of the 2,248 reports that they received over the 18-month period. In itself, the number of rapes investigated is 50 per cent greater than expected on the basis of earlier studies.

Hayman said that practically all the rapes were committed by black men. But a greater proportion of the victims are white in the latest report than when the study began in 1965.

At that time, with a female population of Washington that was 65 per cent black, 87 per cent of the rape victims were black. Now, said Hayman, the city's female population is 70 per cent black while 76 per cent of the rape victims are black.

"There has apparently been a shift toward a larger proportion of adult white victims, assaulted by black males," said Hayman.

The studies show that most rapes take place in spring and summer—when the weather is warm and the rapist can be more comfortable, said Hayman.

Most rapes are committed between 10 p.m. and 2 a.m., when the rapist has the cover of darkness. The rapist's second favorite time is between 5 p.m. and 10 p.m., with 2 a.m. to 8 a.m. the third most likely period. Working hours, from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., is the time when the fewest rapes are committed, but that number is increasing, Hayman said.

The ages of the rape victims ranged from 15 months to 82 years. About two thirds were more than 18 years old while 12 per cent were children and 25 per cent were between 13 and 24 years old.

As one indication of the increased amount

of violence that accompanies rapes, a higher percentage of victims during the past 18 months needed medical treatment for injuries than during the first four years of the study.

There was a dramatic increase—from none to 33—in the number of victims who needed psychiatric care during the past 18 months. Nine of the victims were admitted to hospital psychiatric wards as a result of the rapes.

Of the 1,223 victims, 21 became pregnant as a result of being raped. Fifteen of them received abortions. Another 20 women were pregnant when they were raped.

In addition, 55 victims got gonorrhea as a result of the rape.

About 95 percent of the rape victims received treatment at D.C. General Hospital, where they were given an antiseptic douche. But they were neither given a shot of penicillin to prevent venereal disease or a "morning after" birth control pill to keep them from getting pregnant. These are done in other cities for rape victims.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 6, 1971]

WOMEN IN MIAMI MARCH AGAINST RAPE

MIAMI, October 5.—Angered by a recent rash of rapes, some in daylight downtown, about 100 women say they will form vigilante committees if police don't give them better protection.

Businesswomen, political leaders, feminist activists and at least one recent rape victim took part Monday in "March against Rape."

The demonstration took place in the heart of the downtown area, where there have been five daylight attacks on women since mid-August. Police attribute the assaults to one man, whom they have dubbed "the downtown rapist."

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 4, 1971]

POLICE PUSH ON SLAYINGS

An autopsy has shown that Linda Ammidown, 47, one of three slaying victims here Friday, was raped and was shot twice in the skull, police said today.

A determination of whether 12-year-old Nenomoshia Yates was raped will be made by a Baltimore medical examiner today.

District police announced this morning that more than 50 detectives will work in three task forces day and night on the Ammidown and Yates cases and on the stab-slaying of Ritchie H. Reed, 30, in the New Executive Office Building a few steps from the White House.

The three deaths Friday swell the total of unsolved District killings to 31. There have been 206 murders here this year, compared with 170 at the same time last year, police said.

Deputy Chief Mahlon Pitts, head of the Criminal Investigation Division said each of the 7 police districts in the city has released three of its detectives to work on the Friday cases. Three unspecified "specialists" will also report to the Homicide Squad today. All days off on the squad have been canceled.

Pitts said, "Just about every available investigator is to concentrate on these three cases at this time." Asst. Chief George Donahue, himself a former Homicide Squad detective, has offered the resources of the whole department to Pitts, police said.

There have been no arrests, and in an unusual move police did not broadcast "look-outs" or descriptions of suspects sought in the investigations. Significant leads have developed in at least two of the cases, police said today.

HUSBAND WENT FOR HELP

Mrs. Ammidown, a government worker who was dining out with her husband Friday evening at a Southwest Washington restaurant, the Flagship, was found slain and raped under the East Capital Street Bridge.

She and her husband had been forced at

gunpoint to their parked car after leaving the restaurant at 8:15 p.m. and their lone assailant made the couple drive across the bridge and then under it. The intruder then took Mrs. Ammidown from the car, raped and killed her, police said. The husband, unharmed, drove to seek help.

Ritchie Reed of Cheverly, Md., was about to join his wife Friday at 4 p.m. for a weekend camping trip when he was accosted by an assailant in the fifth floor washroom of the new federal office building, where he worked as an economist for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

After a struggle that police said left the washroom smeared with blood, Reed died of numerous stab wounds. The body was found minutes after the attack, and Reed's wallet was missing. Reed's killer apparently walked past Executive Protection Service guards who were stationed at the building's entrance.

Nenomoshia Yates, of the 4900 block of Benning Road, had been sent to her neighborhood Safeway store at 7:30 p.m. by her father, a construction worker. She never returned, and by the time the family grew anxious, her body had been found, without visible marks, alongside Pennsylvania Avenue Extended, three-tenths of a mile on the Maryland side of the District line.

D.C. and Maryland police were working today in conjunction on the Yates case, which is similar to other recent cases involving young girls whose bodies have been dumped near major highways.

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 5, 1971]
\$1,000 REWARDS OFFERED IN THREE MYSTERY KILLINGS

The Metropolitan Police Department is offering a \$1,000 reward for information leading to the arrest of suspects in each of three apparently unconnected slayings which occurred Friday.

A beefed-up contingent of more than 50 District homicide detectives is working around the clock on the three killings. Police also released artists' sketches of suspects based on witnesses' description in two of the slayings.

The suspect being sought in the robbery, rape and shooting of Mrs. Linda Ammidown is described as being between 25 and 29 years of age, 5 foot 7 to 5 foot 9, and weighing 175 pounds.

Mrs. Ammidown, a 47-year-old Arlington woman, was abducted at gunpoint with her husband, Robert L., after dining at the Flagship Restaurant on the Southwest waterfront. The couple was forced to drive to a deserted point under the East Capitol Street Bridge, where, Ammidown said, his wife was forced out of the car and shot.

NOTE DISCOVERED

A man being sought in the slashing death of Ritchie Reed, a young economist who was slain in the New Executive Office Building, is described as 18 to 22 years of age, 5 foot 7, and about 150 to 175 pounds, with a pockmarked face.

Reed, who lived in Cheverly, was stabbed to death about 4 p.m. in the 5th floor men's washroom of the year-old red-brick building.

Sources disclosed yesterday that Reed's assailant left a handwritten note in a washroom. Police have refused to disclose the contents of the note, but the sources said that its contents contain a racial threat directed at white people and that it seems to indicate that the slayer may be mentally deranged.

The note, which was apparently ripped from a notebook, was found next to the body.

GIRL, 12, STRANGLED

Police did not release an artist's conception of a suspect wanted in the slaying of 12-year-old Nenomoshia Yates, of Southeast Washington. She was abducted about 7 p.m. Friday after she went to buy groceries at the Safeway Store at 4801 Benning Road SE. She was strangled and her body was dumped

along Pennsylvania Avenue, just across the District line in Prince Georges County.

Police last night would not release the finding of an autopsy performed yesterday in Baltimore to determine whether or not she had been raped.

District police said that witnesses in Miss Yates' neighborhood observed a blue compact car, possibly a Volkswagen, bearing a "Fauntroy for Congress" sticker in the area Friday night.

FIFTH GIRL SLAIN

She was the fifth District girl to be abducted and slain since May. In all five cases, the bodies of the young girls have been dumped near major freeways and highways.

The three deaths Friday swell the number of unsolved killings in the District this year to 31. There have been 206 murders here this year, police said. All days off in the homicide squad have been canceled in the effort to capture suspects in these unsolved cases.

Persons having information on the suspects wanted by police are requested to phone the homicide squad at 626-2572 or the police department's confidential number, 393-2222.

[From the Washington Daily News, Oct. 1, 1971]

PROTECTION FOLLOWING TWO MURDERS: EXTRA GUARDS ON MAINE AVENUE

Five owners of prominent restaurant and hotels on Washington's Maine-av waterfront have banded together to help insure "better citizen protection" in that area and offset the "bad impression" caused by two unsolved slayings there in the last 3½ months.

Watson Rulon, president of Hogate's Restaurant and spokesman for the newly organized Waterfront Progress Association said the five major redevelopers in the area plan to "pool their resources" in a "defensive move" to provide better guard service collectively rather than individually.

Mr. Rulon said he would meet this morning with the head of the Marriott Corporation's security force to seek advice on providing security service in the waterfront area. Marriott will operate a new Hogate's being built in the area.

Meanwhile, police say they still have no leads in connection with the murder-rape of Linda Ammidown Friday.

Mrs. Ammidown, an Arlington housewife, was driving home with her husband after dinner at the Flagship Restaurant, when a man got into the back seat of the couple's car, pulled a gun, and ordered Mr. Ammidown to drive to the East Capitol-st Bridge.

Once at the bridge, the gunman told Mr. Ammidown to sit in the back seat, and he dragged Mrs. Ammidown to the river's edge where he raped her, then shot her twice in the head.

On June 26, Diane Johnston, of Hillside, was killed by two men who abducted Mrs. Johnston and her husband as they walked to their car after dining at Hogate's.

The Johnston's were forced to drive to an alley near the Evening Star building in Southeast where the men tied Mrs. Johnston's hands behind her back, then tied a rope from her hands around her neck.

As Mr. Johnston stood helplessly, guarded by one, and then the other gunman, both men attempted to rape Mrs. Johnston before they fled.

Mr. Johnston ran for help, but when he returned, his wife was dead. Police are still searching for the killers.

Mr. Rulon appeared yesterday before the Redevelopment Land Agency, the city's urban renewal agency, and asked that construction along the new Maine-av sw be expedited to "give the aspect of a neighborhood that is finished." He said that street lights should be installed now and not in six months and that street improvements on curbs, gutters and sidewalks be completed quickly and "not next spring."

[From the Washington Star, Oct. 7, 1971]

RESTAURANTS WEIGH PRIVATE POLICE FORCE

A newly formed organization of restaurant operators on the Southwest Washington waterfront is considering hiring its own police force, if necessary, to reassure patrons of safety in the area struck by two slayings in recent months.

Watson Rulon, president of Hogate's Restaurant and spokesman for the New Waterfront Progress Association, appeared yesterday before the Redevelopment Land Agency to urge speedy completion of renewal work in the Maine Avenue area, including installation of new lights.

Meanwhile, he said, he planned to investigate on behalf of the five restaurateurs on the waterfront the best means of providing their own policing.

Last Friday, an Arlington woman was fatally shot when she and her husband were abducted at gunpoint after leaving the Flagship Restaurant, and on June 26, another woman was slain after she and her husband was abducted outside Hogate's Restaurant.

Rulon stressed that neither slaying took place at the restaurants, which have security personnel inside. But he said business has slumped as a result of the two unsolved murders in the vicinity.

He suggested that a uniformed guard or a policeman on a motor scooter with a police dog in the sidecar would give patrons more sense of security.

PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that it is now 7 years and 201 days since the first serviceman became a captive of the North Vietnamese in Indochina.

Many courageous Americans have not only been held as prisoners of war for years, but have also been existing under cruel and inhumane treatment. It is appalling that the Hanoi regime remains intransigent in refusing to fulfill its obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

The families of our captive servicemen have initiated numerous efforts seeking to ameliorate their treatment, obtain full information on those held prisoner or known to be missing in action by the North Vietnamese, and to win their freedom. Our Government has sought in the Paris negotiations to obtain some agreement on this issue, and we in Congress recently have approved a concurrent resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of our prisoners of war as provided for in the Geneva Convention.

We may hope that there is some indication of a thawing of Hanoi's adamant stand in the developments of the last few days. S. Sgt. John C. Sexton, taken prisoner by the Vietcong in 1969, was suddenly released last Friday. He carried into freedom a message from the North Vietnamese saying a reciprocal release would be welcome, though it asked for the release of two specific prisoners. I am glad that in response a North Vietnamese lieutenant was set free Monday, carrying

our message of hope that similar releases would continue to take place.

Mr. Speaker, the record over 7 years and 201 days certainly gives us no reason to express optimism in dealing with the North Vietnamese about the fate of our captive servicemen. However, we can hope and pray that this exchange may lead to developments that will bring eventual release of our gallant men. I know we are all united, however, we differ on tactics, in support of any efforts that will end the suffering and torment of our prisoners of war and their families.

ALLEGANY COMMUNITY COLLEGE MARKS 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, this week 10 years ago Allegany Community College in Cumberland, Md., opened its doors to the first 102 students. The school was then located in the old Carver School. Today it is housed in a new \$7 million campus outside of Cumberland. The college has played an active role in community affairs and community development in addition to its role as an educational institution. I congratulate the president, Dr. W. Ardell Haines, the faculty, and the students on this anniversary and wish them a successful future.

The future of Allegany Community College should be one of more community action and better education if Dr. Haines can carry out the programs he envisions. I would like to share an article from the Cumberland Sunday Times indicating Dr. Haines' view of the future of the school:

PRESIDENT HAINES LOOKING TO FUTURE

The tenth anniversary of Allegany Community College seems to be a proper time to reflect a bit upon not only the growth of the college but also upon the impact it has had in the community. During these ten years Allegany Community College has grown from a fledgling enterprise to a flourishing institution.

What would the community be like without the college, if the community leaders ten years ago had not pioneered the development of the community colleges? First, about 3,000 students who have been enrolled at the college would have had to go elsewhere, or would not have attended college at all. Approximately one hundred employees who have found the college to be their way of life would not likely be in the community. Furthermore, the Willow Brook campus area might still be a corn field or perhaps would have become an industrial park by this time.

As we look across the State of Maryland and find sixteen community colleges it becomes obvious that the community colleges of Maryland have become a very important segment of the tri-partite system of higher education in Maryland. One could also ask then, "What would Maryland be like without the community colleges?" At this time, in the fall of 1971, nearly 30,000 fulltime students would be crowding into some other kind of institution if they could find vacancies. Higher education in Maryland would be much like it was fifteen or twenty years ago with little or no provision for two-year career programs. Indeed there would be many young people who would not be able to profit from

post-secondary education were it not for the community colleges which are within commuting distance of nearly every high school graduate.

There can be little doubt that the community colleges have changed the face of higher education through their innovations and flexibility. The community colleges have dared to pioneer in open admissions and in grading procedures which challenge traditional practices. Instructors come to the community college to teach and are able to demonstrate an understanding of human relations. The community colleges have supplemented traditional instruction with innovations in audio-tutorial and other methods which meet the diverse abilities of students to learn. These approaches to education which community colleges have made are in effect re-forming education and are causing all segments of higher education to review its practices.

At the same time that Allegany Community College moved to its new campus two years ago, a new acceptance by the community of the role of the college began to emerge. The handsome campus, which is second to none in Maryland, continues to attract an increasing number of high school graduates and adults as well. Because of this growth the college is a place of change, and these changes are designed to provide increased services to its students, the faculty and the community. A new dimension to student personnel services is developing. Emphasis upon institutional research is emerging. And a data processing center is being established.

The services of the audio-visual department are being expanded. The public relations efforts continue to increase. The adult education program continues to thrive.

The college continues its outreach toward utilization of special federal funds wherever available. A new consortium with nearby colleges under Title III has begun a three-year sequence. A planning grant for the development of a curriculum in dental assisting has been approved. Federal assistance in the conducting of other health services is being developed.

The need for additional future space has been anticipated in the planning and development of a new Technology Building for which federal funds have already been approved. This new building will provide space for existing curricula that are already overcrowded and for the development of a few other specialized career programs.

Just as Allegany Community College is not the same institution it was in its infancy ten years ago, neither will it be like it is now a decade or two hence. What will the community college become in the years ahead? What will it be like?

Instruction will very likely be carried beyond the college classrooms into the entire community. The Adult Education centers will likely be more fully utilized. Instruction may be carried into the homes through increased use of instructional television. The greater use of instructional technology will provide the opportunity for credit by examination and deviations in the length of courses and programs to accommodate the varying abilities of students to learn. Academic procedures will be more flexible and liberal with emphasis upon individual accomplishment and achievement. There will surely be a multi-disciplinary emphasis in instruction. The college calendar will be more flexible and the academic year will be different. There will be a new emphasis on counseling which will reflect the emerging concern for the individual and his identity. Courses in higher education will become more interchangeable among the institutions in Maryland and there will be a concerted and organized effort toward full articulation.

The state will play an ever-increasing part in the operation and management of the colleges as the state assumes more and more

responsibility for post-secondary education. There will be increased emphasis on uniform accounting in the fiscal operation of the college. Increased federal support, particularly for specialized programs and services, will be an important adjunct to the financial operation of the college.

The governance of the college will remain the responsibility of the local Board of trustees. There will be a greater need for the college staff to continue its concerted efforts to work together and take advantage of the climate of democratic administration which is essential in these days. In addition, it will be essential that students participate in the activities of the college and become a part of the decision-making processes. Participation by all these members of the college community will serve to support the president of the college in the administration of the college under the policies formulated by the Board of Trustees.

If in the next decade, the changes projected here come to pass, the college will reach a new level of service to its students and the community by which Allegany Community College will offer new dimensions in learning to prepare men and women for the excitement and satisfaction of creative lives.

HUGO L. BLACK

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in the House and Americans everywhere in paying tribute to Justice Hugo Black. He believed that the Constitution, as written, stands above any considerations of public policy or fairness, and that no individual, be he policeman, President, or Justice of the Supreme Court, has the right to engraft his or her own notions of such elusive criteria onto that document.

Justice Black's unswerving devotion to the Constitution continued even in death, for at his request, mourners paying their respects at the funeral home last week were offered copies of the pocket edition which he carried with him day in and day out.

Though he was perhaps better known for the ringing dissents which later were adhered to by the Court, the opinions which he wrote on the Court's behalf cover the greatest issues of this century, issues which remain very much with us today.

Justice Black wrote the opinion of the Court in the *Everson* case, which reaffirmed the inviolability of the wall which the first amendment erects between church and state. In a few weeks' time, we will be asked to consider whether that wall should remain unbreached. Justice Black often voted to protect our Nation against such a breach, and I hope that we will have the courage to do the same.

Another Hugo Black opinion whose words are very much with us today is that rendered in *Youngstown* against Sawyer, the steel mill seizure case of 1952. There, he wrote that Presidential power extends only so far as the Constitution permits, and that there is no inherent authority of that office. Twenty-one years later, we are struggling daily with the assertion that the President can conduct a terrible,

seemingly endless war without a declaration of war by Congress.

In the field of criminal procedure, we have Hugo Black's opinion in the historic case of *Gideon* against *Wainwright*, which extended to the States the sixth amendment's guarantee of right to counsel in felony cases. Although he was never able to convince a majority of the Court that the 14th amendment extends the entire Bill of Rights to the States, his tenure on the Court saw most of its provisions so extended on the theory that they are elements of due process of law.

The crowning glory of Justice Black's constitutional philosophy was his belief that the first amendment's protection of freedom of speech is absolute—that "no law" means no law. This theory, too, never has commanded a majority, but its adoption—which I hope will someday occur—would be the greatest tribute to Hugo Black.

In a time when the phrase "strict constructionist" has become a euphemism for "conservative," the record of Hugo Black as a true strict constructionist is one which does our Constitution proud. His shoes will be hard to fill.

JOHN MADIGAN—NEWS
SSSSSSSEVENTY-EIGHT

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for more than 20 years John Madigan has been interviewing the biggest newsmakers of the world. There is probably no man who knows more about electronic journalism than John Madigan.

In an extremely interesting article in the September 19 edition of the *Chicago Tribune* magazine, Mr. Madigan recalls some of the memorable moments of his outstanding career.

John Madigan was a pioneer on CBS' "Face the Nation" and NBC's "Meet the Press." In fact, Mr. Madigan was the anchor panelist on the first "Face the Nation" back in 1954.

We in Chicago are fortunate that Mr. Madigan can be seen and heard often on the CBS affiliate—WBBM television and radio. There is nothing more familiar to Chicago radio listeners today than hearing John Madigan identifying his radio station in stentorian tones: "WBBM—News SSSSSSSSeventy-eight."

Mr. Madigan's insight, experience, and knowledge have made him one of our great reporters and commentators. His nostalgic recollections provide an outstanding journal of contemporary American history.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Madigan's article follows:

NIXON, KENNEDY, GINSBERG, ALI AND ME
VETERAN INTERVIEWER JOHN MADIGAN RECALLS
THE BIG NAMES AND MEMORABLE MOMENTS
FROM HIS 20 YEARS ON THE NEWS PANEL-TALK
SHOW CIRCUIT

(By John Madigan)

President Nixon didn't know how to smile
... President Kennedy played with his

tie ... Adlai Stevenson got angry at the questions ... Krishna Menon was the meanest ... Konrad Adenauer was the nicest ... King Hussein had the best voice ... Abba Eban the best diction ... Muhammad Ali was the most obnoxious ... Joseph McCarthy smirked ... Allen Ginsberg had the foulest tongue ... Gore Vidal was the bitchiest ... Dr. Martin Luther King was the calmest ... Adlai Stevenson III had the sweatiest palms ... and three guests were in a deadheat at overimbibing.

That's a sketchy sum-up of 20 years on the question-end of television and radio news-panel and discussion programs: *Face the Nation*, *Meet the Press*, *At Random*, *Target News*, *City Desk*, *At Issue*, *Press Conference*, *Reporters' Roundup*. I plan no award ceremony. Viewers and listeners may disagree with my selections. Several more categories could be included. Such as the windiest: Was it Hubert Humphrey or Wayne Morse?

Some future historian or political scientist will probably investigate the value of the role that news-panel and news-discussion programs have played in our government and society—from Whittaker Chambers' revelations ... so long ago ... to Sen. Henry (Scoop) Jackson's disclosure this past March, when he scooped his colleagues and the White House by reporting that the Soviet Union has been deploying a new generation of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

These programs have a way of making hard news, or dressing up an old story, or developing sharp controversy—all of which is frequently infuriating to print reporters. And sometimes to a guest. Or, in the case of the Kennedys, their relatives.

John Fitzgerald Kennedy, because of his hospitalization for his war-incurred back injury, was the only senator not on record on the censure vote on Sen. Joseph McCarthy in December, 1954. Amazingly, Kennedy's public position was still not known on that sunny Sunday evening, July 1, 1956, when we broadcast live on *Face the Nation* on the CBS network. At the time, Kennedy was maneuvering for the Vice Presidential nomination at the Democratic Convention just a few weeks away.

About two-thirds thru the program, I asked him how he would have voted on the McCarthy matter had he been on the floor. Kennedy's facial response signaled a trace of surprise, maybe anger. Boston, for obvious reasons, had been a strong McCarthy town. Kennedy wasn't anxious for any hometown enemies. He answered, but wasn't directly responsive. We pressed him and he finally said he agreed with the Senate's verdict.

After the program, sipping a drink in the producer's office, we talked politics. Kennedy gave no sign that he was upset, but he knew how the papers would play his answer, especially in Boston. And they did. Brother Bobby Kennedy, typically, didn't take it as well. A few weeks later, in the center aisle of the crowded convention in Chicago, Bobby challenged me on the matter. Told me I had thrown Sen. Jack a low blow. We argued briefly. Friends broke it up.

The Kennedy-McCarthy issue was more interesting than sensational. The latter word could describe Teamster Union president Dave Beck's confession of peculation on *Face the Nation* on March 17, 1957.

Sen. John McClellan's committee had been hammering away at the Teamsters. Beck (Jimmy Hoffa was to come later) was the major target. He was scheduled to take the stand on Capitol Hill a few days later. Our TV panel flew to Tacoma to do the program. In an ante-room before the broadcast we were tipped off by one of Beck's lawyers that if we asked Beck whether he had ever borrowed any money from the Teamsters Union, we would get some surprising answers.

So we did. Beck admitted that he had borrowed nearly \$400,000 from the union over

10 years, without paying a cent of interest and without any collateral. This was Beck's first public response to charges that he had used union funds for his personal use. The revelation made important news across the country. Beck and his strategists wanted it that way. They knew that McClellan and Bobby had uncovered the loans and were prepared to make them public with a bang when Beck took the stand. By volunteering the information on network TV, Beck was able to take the play away from his tormentors.

Thus, for a variety of reasons, the most unlikely guests—at least according to their image—can be uncommonly cooperative.

My wife answered the telephone on our home in Chevy Chase, Md., one Sunday night in 1953. It was Sen. McCarthy's wife, Jean. The senator wanted to talk with me. I picked up the phone, not knowing what to expect. In a cheery voice, so unlike his attack-stance at hearings or in speeches, McCarthy said he had really enjoyed appearing on the *Meet the Press* program on NBC which we had just broadcast a couple of hours earlier.

This surprised me, because I had really gone after him. McCarthy went on to explain that he liked my tough questions because they gave him a chance to come on strong and, he said, made him come off better with the viewers at home. Later, I learned that McCarthy had told Larry Spivak that, because I was also Irish-Catholic and working for Hearst [at the time], my tough questions to the world's most prominent and controversial Communist-hunter took on more validity than if they had come from a reporter of different background who worked for a liberal or leftist paper.

Gov. George Wallace of Alabama is another fire-eater who is extremely gracious and cooperative off-stage.

Channel 2's *At Random* shared him with another program several years ago. Producer Dan O'Connell didn't trust the opposition and sent associate producer Margo Nussbaum to their studios. Wallace's aide told her that someone had advised the governor not to appear on our program with Saul Alinsky. At the taping-break, Miss Nussbaum walked on the set and told Wallace that we would drop Alinsky if he insisted. She escorted Wallace out. Behind them the wife of the program's host asked, "How brazen can you get?" and someone reportedly muttered that if Miss Nussbaum ever tried that again she'd regret it. When Wallace arrived, I was able to talk him into appearing with Alinsky. They tore into each other. At one point Alinsky told Wallace he wouldn't vote for him for dog-catcher. Wallace replied that he had indeed once run for that position. Still angry as he left the studio, Wallace commented to Miss Nussbaum that he shouldn't have appeared with that "Communist" then quickly turned to her and said, "Excuse me, sweetie."

A few years later, in 1968, Wallace refused to tape with the Rev. Jesse Jackson and I couldn't persuade him. Jackson glowered in the wings, awaiting his turn.

There doesn't seem to be any pattern on whether people of different viewpoints will sit down together. I was surprised shortly after the sniper-killing of the two policemen at the Cabrini-Green project when HUD Secretary Romney said he'd leave the studios rather than go on with CHA Chairman Charles Swibel. The latter left instead, without making any fuss.

Some years ago far-right Kent Courtney walked off a live broadcast saying he would no longer sit next to Sid Lens, antiwar activist. Lens just laughed.

A delegation of American Legionnaires flanked the angry Selective Service Director Lewis Hershey the day we scheduled him to appear with Father Daniel Berrigan, now in prison and named as a co-conspirator in the Klasinger bomb-and-kidnap case. Her-

she said "No" and was going to walk out. We taped the two separately.

Dr. S. I. Hayakawa had no such qualms about appearing with Michael Klonsky, then head of the Students for a Democratic Society. He never lost his cool, not even when Klonsky called him a "racist pig." Replied Dr. Hayakawa, "At least you didn't call me a white racist pig."

Stokely Carmichael, surely more radical than Klonsky, indulged in no such outrageous behavior in a long exchange with George Lincoln Rockwell, leader of the American Nazi Party, in July, 1966. Both were delighted at the opportunity of confrontation. For more than an hour they debated the theories of "Black Power" and "White Supremacy." Seldom did either raise his voice. Both said that integration would never work, and disparaged white liberals who urged integration. "You and I will be shooting at each other one of these days," Rockwell predicted. Carmichael agreed. Instead, it was one of Rockwell's own followers who later shot him to death.

I considered their confrontation so dramatic that I later suggested to CBS officials that it be shown in other cities. A video-tape was sent to New York. Management decided against the idea. I was told they did not want to be accused of "sensationalizing and, perhaps, of stirring up racial hatreds." I asked a couple of times for permission to rerun it in Chicago. The answer was the same.

Another decision on rerun, but of a different nature, came after the bitter debate on At Random in 1964 between Charles Percy and William Scott, live on a Saturday night when both were running for the Republican nomination for governor. The two candidates accused each other several times of lying. Each finally wound up demanding that the other take a lie test. And the Democrats were watching! No sooner did the Kerner-Percy campaign get underway, than I received a call from Chris Vlahopoulos, the governor's press secretary. He wanted a copy of the program, anticipating with Democratic glee future showings of Scott and Percy calling each other liars and demanding lie tests. Company policy prohibited granting the request. Kerner didn't need it anyway. He won handily. After this Percy was so emotionally exhausted that he was still in his chair on the set some 10 minutes after Scott and his manager, Sam Witwer, had left the studio. His eyes seemed glazed. He kept asking aides, "How did I do?" But he soon regained his composure. Republican politicians generally credit that debate with giving Percy several thousand votes.

The recent death of Thomas E. Dewey recalls the time that our appearance together on network prime time almost cost me my job in the Washington bureau of Newsweek magazine.

Dewey was the guest on a CBS panel program broadcast the night of Oct. 17, 1956, just a couple of weeks before the Presidential election. The big issue was the continuing debate over the proposed cessation of H-bomb tests, first raised by Adlai Stevenson six months earlier in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors. Dewey and I got into a spirited exchange on the subject. I made the mistake of shaking my head "No" and of holding my hands to my face in disbelief at his answers. I didn't realize it at the time, but the program's director had switched to a split screen—Dewey talking, me reacting.

Newsweek's publisher Malcolm Muir asked CBS for a screening in New York the next day, after a Democratic elevator operator at Newsweek told him how Madigan "murdered" Dewey, and Republican luncheon companions asked him if that was some sort of a Communist he had in Washington, abusing Thomas Dewey.

Publisher Muir watched the screening in

suppressed rage, then ordered me fired. Cooler heads prevailed, warned that someone like Drew Pearson would use the firing to blast Newsweek for "its Republican bias." Instead, an all-staffer memo was sent out stating that Newsweek wanted to maintain its impartiality in the campaign—therefore, no employees should appear on any more panel programs until after the election. The order cost me \$125, the fee I would have received for questioning Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on Face the Nation the following Sunday. Peter Lisagor of the Chicago Daily News took my place.

There was another occasion about the same time when Anthony Lewis of the New York Times and some other Washington correspondents lost fees after they had appeared on a news panel. Martha Rountree, having sold Meet the Press to Larry Spivak a few years earlier, started a new program called Martha Rountree's Press Conference on ABC. The first guest was Atty. Gen. Herbert Brownell. There were 12 panelists. Looking for a new gimmick, Miss Rountree had talked Brownell into opening the program with a hard-news announcement.

The attorney general dropped a bombshell: He announced that the Justice Department would seek a monopoly indictment the next week against the motor coach division of General Motors. GM didn't like it, of course. Some newspaper and magazine publishers and editors agreed that such staging by government was highly unusual, if not unethical. We hadn't known that Brownell would open with any news announcement. Nonetheless, the Times ordered Lewis not to accept his \$125 fee, and a couple of other news shops did the same. Miss Rountree dropped the gimmick in future programs.

James [Scotty] Reston of the Times blew a newspanel fee just by not showing up for a live Sunday afternoon Face the Nation broadcast. It would hardly be worth mentioning, except the program was on CBS. Where was Reston, having forgotten about the program? At a party at the home of CBS' Eric Severeid!

Live programs can cause problems other than bad attendance. Particularly if they are late at night and guests show up somewhat free and easy in spirit.

The late Chicago Judge Augustine Bowe was a guest on At Random early Sunday morning when the discussion got around to whether a person should use "black," "Negro" or "colored." Judge volunteered that it didn't make much difference, went on to say that many nationalities even have acceptable nicknames, such as calling a Pole a "Polack."

Talk about an early-day Spiro Agnew! The switchboard operator ran out of hands trying to handle indignant calls from people of Polish extraction. And then the letter-writing started—not just to Bowe, but to Congressmen Rostenkowski, Klucynski, Pucinski and Derwinski. Judge Bowe wrote a letter of apology to each of the offended, explaining that he meant no offense and swearing that he would never appear on a late-night television program again.

Poet Allen Ginsberg is the type who takes advantage of the fact that today's discussion programs are taped. In one such session in 1968 he used the same four-letter word over and over, knowing full well that it would be bleeped out. Ginsberg wrote me later, complained that he has "shouted too little" on the program, pointed out that he had used the four-letter obscenity only in quoting Mayor Daley and police who had man-handled him, said the program had been loaded with people who collaborated with the "police state," described me as "a person of weak character, a 'good German.'"

With few exceptions, foul words have been the only cause for deletions in programs in which I have been involved. One exception was when Richard Cain was a guest and a few words were removed to protect the deli-

cate balance of Free Press and Fair Trial. [Cain is now in prison.]

Some people still have the idea that taped programs cause less lively discussions. Probably just the reverse is true. Guests are more relaxed and inclined to be less cautious in a taping session. But among the apparently nervous in the ranks of the prominent, live or taped, is Sen. Adlai Stevenson. His hands quickly become soaked with perspiration. But he handles himself well and I don't know whether his uneasiness is evident to the viewers.

Stevenson's late father gave the impression that he didn't care for panel or discussion programs at all. The Face the Nation panel flew to Chicago from Washington so Stevenson could give sort of an opposition "state of the Union" report on Jan. 8, 1956.

Behind his desk-top nameplate, Stevenson had a stack of research cards dealing with President Eisenhower's administration. The panelists, however, spent considerable time questioning Stevenson about his candidacy for a second Presidential nomination. He showed irritation when I pointed out that he had lost Illinois to Eisenhower by more than 350,000 votes in 1952. He responded that he had carried his home state by 575,000 for governor in 1948. Of course, the '48 race for governor had no relationship to the upcoming '56 Presidential run.

After the program, at a party given by Channel 2's Les Atlass, Stevenson asked me in the presence of several people, "Why did you ask such silly questions?" He was smiling. I smiled back and replied, "Why did you give such silly answers?" We parted friends and remained so.

But other encounters with guests weren't so fleeting. In 1964, Sen. Barry Goldwater and author Gore Vidal appeared together on At Random. Vidal seemed to get the better of it. Goldwater was obviously upset and complained later to the aides who had agreed to the scheduling. But last year at the conclusion of another taping, with which Vidal was displeased, he blurted out: "I shouldn't have come back on this program. The last time I was here you said, 'Has that sheeny playwright shown up yet?' I felt like slapping Vidal's wrist. Instead, I explained, politely but angrily, that the report was untrue, that the word wasn't in my vocabulary. But Vidal insisted, 'One of the people with me heard you say it, and I'm not even Jewish.'"

Sen. J. William Fulbright had a different objection. Face the Nation's producer, Ted Ayers, scrubbed me one Sunday, quoting Fulbright as saying I was "too tough." Rhodes Scholar Fulbright didn't fear me on intellectual grounds. He prefers panelists who are more esoteric.

The Rev. Jesse Jackson has attacked me in speeches at Operation Breadbasket meetings, has called me a "low-lifer" in objecting to views I expressed in commentaries on WBBM Newsradio 78. But we never had any problems on panel programs. In 1968, Jackson showed up to tape At Random the day after Dr. Martin Luther King was assassinated, with Dr. King's blood still on his shirt. It made for a dramatic program, but might have looked staged.

You can't control everything. Sybil Leek, the witch, wore a chameleon-pin on her dress; that is, I thought it was a pin until it started to crawl into my lap.

Perennial Presidential candidate Harold Stassen showed up with a reddish toupe in '68. I didn't realize it was a debut, and missed the scoop. The Washington press corps reported his "rug" as new, with pictures, three days later.

Former Ambassador John Lodge, brother of Henry Cabot, started to punch a friend of a draft-resister guest who accosted him in the hall, but said it was beneath his dignity.

In New York, December, 1955, cigar-chompin, gold-toothed, high-button-shoed, gravel-voiced George Meany reported on the

newly merged AFL-CIO . . . apparently oblivious of the makeup girl dabbing his head with a powder puff.

At the United Nations, October, 1958, India's V. K. Krishna Menon called us panelists "simple" on the air.

Police officers suddenly showed up during the live after-midnight taping of At Random to bodyguard Judge Hubert Will after a threatening telephone call to police headquarters from two men who said they were watching the program in their downtown hotel, room and were going to kill the judge when he left the studio. Nothing happened.

Richard Nixon laughed affably as the makeup man applied the pancake and I reminded him he was reenacting the Chicago scene of the 1960 debate disaster. But he couldn't seem to smile as well once we got on the set.

There is one simple formula for putting together a successful news-panel or discussion program: "Big Names and/or Important Topics." The "big names" is the big problem. The competition between programs is tremendous. And luck is a big factor. The most sought-after guests are available only occasionally. Thus you take them when you can get them. Yet events over which they have little or no control may make them more newsworthy the day after their appearance.

Men in public life usually try to stay on good terms with all the programs, seeking only wide exposure and fairness. But just as a few officials leak stories to newsmen sharing their views, so do they sometimes play favorites in deciding what TV or radio program to appear on. It used to infuriate one competing program when it had to share David Ben-Gurion and Abba Eban with At Random, while not being able to work out equal time when we booked King Hussein.

Some guests build up points by their ready availability. Hubert Humphrey, before becoming Vice President, was just such an ace-in-the-hole. Producer Ted Ayers of Face the Nation was always locked in competition with Larry Spivak of Meet the Press for a big-name guest. The one who failed to land him could call Humphrey out of his Chevy Chase bathroom and he'd hurry down to the studio. It paid off—building up obligations on which Humphrey could collect in the future.

The competition between programs can get a little rugged: telling a potential guest that the opposition program has a reputation for bias or prejudice . . . implying that hard-news or column coverage or advertising is part of the deal . . . promising a little-shot friend of a big-shot that you'll use him later if he helps land the big shot . . . playing up ethnic or religious connections.

The competition even extends to journalist panelists. May Craig, Dick Wilson and Pete Brandt were early regulars on Meet the Press. It was understood they wouldn't accept invitations on Face the Nation when it started.

Meet the Press began using me in 1953. CBS officials took note and offered to use me regularly on Face the Nation if I would agree not to appear any more on Larry Spivak's program. I agreed, but with a one-week delay. Face the Nation premiered in 1954 with the controversial Sen. McCarthy, and asked me to be the anchor panelist. I had previously agreed to fly to Chicago that weekend when Illinois candidates for senator, Paul Douglas and Joe Meek, would appear on Meet the Press. After that program, I told Spivak that I could not be with him anymore. He pointed out that he had given me the showcase where CBS spotted me, suggested I was making a mistake, indicated he didn't think Face the Nation would last. We parted friends and still are.

A network news-panel or discussion program differs from a Chicago program only in the pay scale being higher. The prescription is the same for both: Do your homework. Don't let the guest filibuster. Be tough without being rude. Use follow-up questions. Re-

member that a fellow panelist may be the "What Makes Sammy Run?" type. Cut him down early.

Moderating a discussion program is much more difficult than asking questions on a panel, as Random's 1966-67 Emmy cited its "careful balancing of opposing viewpoints on complex issues." The two questions viewers asked most frequently were: "Why is the show on so late?" and "How do you keep from getting involved personally?" The answer to the first question belongs to management. The second is mine.

It is frustrating to try and stay neutral, or at least to be prudent in laying on a heavy or light hand. I usually try to help the person in trouble, or outnumbered, to help regain balance. A moderator doesn't always succeed, in the opinion of advocate viewers. But if you don't struggle for fairness you most surely will upset the "careful balance" you hope you programmed. A troublesome situation occurs when you cover three or four issues on one program. The balance on the first couple of subjects may be perfect. Then you switch topics to find the lineup is now five to two. You slipped up in the prior screening! Also, in 20 years of news-oriented programs, I've always tried not to spend any time with the guests beforehand in order to avoid any conversation or request which might prejudice, or take the edge off, the broadcast.

News-panel and discussion programs are probably here to stay. It is unfortunate that they don't draw the audiences that the nightly network talk shows do, with their theatrical and sports stars sharing stage with more significant guests. We'll never know whether serious news-panel and discussion programs can draw larger audience [Sunday sports knocked the network's Meet the Press and Face the Nation out of the afternoon box] until someone gives them a prolonged test in better time spots.

Regardless, the satisfaction comes, at least to me, in knowing you have an involved and interested audience. Even if it isn't large in numbers.

OHIO RIVER VALLEY—RICHEST IN THE WORLD

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under the Virginia Compact, of 1787, whereby the Commonwealth of Virginia ceded to the United States, the great Northwest Territory, Virginia retained jurisdiction of the Ohio River throughout, except a small portion in Pennsylvania.

This noble stream starts at Pittsburgh and is formed by the confluence of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers. The stream extends from Pittsburgh to its joiner with the Mississippi at Cairo, Ill., and the adjacent Kentucky shores.

The Ohio River has about 30 locks and dams, and has a minimum 9-foot current depth throughout its 1,000-odd miles. Every portion of the stream is navigable. Thereby, a mighty volume of trade and commerce is provided, over which vast tons of steel, coal, and other minerals, as well as merchandise and other articles of commerce are transported in both directions.

The shores of the stream, for the most part, are lined by wide vales and high hills and ridges throughout. At all seasons, the outlook from steamboat, tow, and smaller craft is most picturesque and

rewarding. In the fall of the year, this is especially true because of the autumnal shades of color which flaunt above the hills and vales.

The Ohio River has become, with its valley, one of the greatest assets of the Nation, and its valley is now considered to be the richest in the world, as well as one of the most beautiful. The worth of its farms and factories is commanding.

The congressional district I represent begins on the east with Pendleton County and contains the Kentucky counties lining the southward shores of the river, to include Jefferson County—in which Louisville is situated—and to the low watermark of the northerly shores of the river.

A former Congressman from the Louisville and Jefferson County district, Maurice H. Thatcher, who reached his 101st birthday on August 15 last, yet survives and is very active in various lines of endeavor of general welfare character.

In the fall of 1929, while he was in Congress, during his five terms of tenure, he was chosen by Speaker Longworth as one of three Representatives of the House to represent that body in the formal celebration of the completion of the 9 foot stage of the Ohio River. In that capacity, he and his wife traveled from Pittsburgh to Louisville on the official steamer involved.

At every lock and dam site, large crowds, with one or more brass bands in attendance, a hospitable reception was given. This was true throughout the more than 1,000 miles of celebration.

President and Mrs. Hoover joined the official party at Cincinnati where a local program was rendered in which Mr. Hoover participated.

At Cincinnati, the Hoovers joined the official group and proceeded to Louisville, where a veritable deluge awaited them.

In January 1933, Congressman and Mrs. Thatcher visited the Isthmus of Panama and flew as far as Cincinnati on their return to Washington. The flight to them was of great interest throughout and most inspiring.

The first years of their married life were spent in the Canal Zone, where he served as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission and Civil Governor of the Canal Zone during the construction era of the Panama Canal. Their homeward flight, especially that portion where the Ohio River was contacted, inspired the Congressman to write a poem about the great stream in question. I believe it to be a worthy contribution to the literature concerning this great waterway and worthy of a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Accordingly, under leave granted, I include the poem as a part of these remarks:

OHIO RIVER

Most noble stream! O wondrous thoroughfare!

Thy sources lie in eastern watersheds;
A thousand miles southwest thy waters bear
To join the Mississippi. Thy Valley spreads
In fertile bounds; filled are its breadths
with beds

Of min'als, vast; in it the web is spun
Of great commerce; its transportation
threads

Lead ev'rywhere. Indeed, thy current run
Athwart the richest vale that lies beneath
the sun!

In traffic worth and beauty, a western Rhine
 Art thou; in all things else fully excelling.
 Lo! with a glory, all apart, does thou shine,
 With majesty and aspect all-compelling!
 Upon thy breast the fleets are ever swelling,
 And fruitage, rich, of mine, field and shop are
 borne
 Upon thy tides. The millions who are
 dwelling
 Along thy shores, in loyalty are sworn
 To thee, although the havocs of thy flood
 they mourn.
 Full thirty giant locks and dams control
 Thy sweep to aid our navigation's need;
 But many mighty streams their waters roll
 Into thine own. Our people thus must heed
 Thy flood-time force, and curb it as a steed,
 Untamed, to serve, alone, the gen'ral good.
 A broaden'd study and survey must lead
 To some solution of that which long has
 stood,
 A menace, which the nation may remove, and
 should.
 Adown the lordly Rhine the Mate and I
 One time did voyage thru a summer's day.
 We watched the mammoth tows of traffic ply
 Upon the stream. We saw the shadows play
 O'er castled height and vineyard slope.
 Away
 The scenes of beauty spread; o'er all the air
 Of legend and romance did rest. The sway
 Of epochs old and dim yet lingered there,
 And gave to all we saw appearance doubly
 fair.
 From Pittsburgh's famed triangle to the
 Falls,
 Upon the Stream the Trav'ler and his
 Mate
 Once journeyed. One of the various calls
 To duty brought him to participate
 In functions planned to mark and celebrate
 Completion of the nine-foot stage design
 Thruout the River's length. Thus, on a date
 Prescribed, aboard a vessel of the line,
 Official, the trip began, upon a morn benign.
 'Twas in the gentle Autumn; and its hues
 Enriched the field and forest. Thru each
 hour
 The eye was blest by wealths of lovely views
 Of stream and glade, and dear belated
 flow'r.
 Towns and cities greeted us; mill and
 tow'r,
 And warehouse lined the shores; many-a lock
 Gave us descent; the hills uprose in pow'r,
 And filled our hearts with awe. At last,
 to dock
 Above the Falls, we came, within a cloud-
 burst shock.
 Ah, how it rained, and rained, and rained!
 It seemed
 That Noah's Flood, at last, would lose its
 fame.
 Of such importance was the event deemed,
 That hither to the Celebration came
 The NATION'S President, to speak the aim
 Of the great work under commemoration.
 The folk at Louisville bowed low in shame
 At the inhospitable inundation,
 Which marred the night's address with sores
 desecration.
 The twain of us have sailed the Hellespont,
 That classic link which binds historic seas.
 Its lesser width our courage would not
 daunt,—
 For both of us have swum, with gentle
 ease,
 Ohio's broadest tides, when current, breeze,
 And chill of freshet, gave an added zest
 To that we did, adventure's urge to please,
 The crossing back and forth, with naught
 of rest,
 Brought no discomfort, nor e'en taxed us of
 our best.
 And so, methin', Leander's fabled feat
 At Abydos, and that of Byron's there,—
 Tho dramatized so well, cannot compete
 (But, like our own, dissolve in thinnest
 air!)

With Channel swims; nor may they e'en
 compare

With countless deeds which moderns may
 achieve
 In this, our day. Bold athletes everywhere
 Outstrip the ancients; but can scarce re-
 ceive
 The bright, immortal wreaths which fond
 romance may weave.

SLOVENIAN FESTIVAL DAY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 10, 1971, hundreds of Americans of Slovenian descent living in the city of Chicago celebrated the 53d anniversary of their independence gained from the Austro-Hungarian Empire on October 29, 1918.

Also observed on this day was the 21st anniversary of consecutive broadcasting for Dr. Ludwig A. Leskovar, producer of the Slovenian radio program heard weekly on WEDC in Chicago. I want to take this opportunity to extend to him my warmest congratulations on reaching this milestone in his broadcasting career, as well as to commend him for his many fine contributions over the years to the betterment of our community.

Dr. Leskovar not only has given outstanding service to the Slovenian-American Radio Club, but also has been active in many civic, educational, religious, and social endeavors in the Chicago area. His efforts have to a great extent helped to preserve the proud Slovenian heritage and to bring together the Slovenian people.

The other distinguished officers of the Slovenian-American Radio Club who have given years of devoted service to their fellow citizens are: Frank Mikec, vice president; Mary Foys Lauretig, secretary; Alma Helder, treasurer; Stephanie Osterman, recording secretary; Roman Possedi, Sr., sergeant at arms; Otmar Tasner, Michael Fleischhacker, and Minka Grasich, auditors; Frank A. Schonta, cultural narrator; Corinne Leskovar, director of special events; Joseph Osterman, Fred Orcek, Anna Tasner, Frank Karner, Frances Maxwell, Anton Skamperle, Ludvik Jelenc, Jerome Soukal, Ursula Krzysnik, and Frank Gerzel, directors.

Slovenia is located in southeastern Europe and is one of six republics of Yugoslavia. During the course of their long and impressive history, the Slovenians have demonstrated time and again their courage in the face of adversity, their strength and intrepid fortitude, and their dedication to their religious and cultural traditions. They have fought with valor to preserve their identity, their independence, and their inherent right of self-determination. Although overshadowed by strong and dominant neighbors, the Slovenians have stood fast in defense of the values and traditions of their forefathers.

Many Slovenians have found their way to America and have demonstrated their abilities by contributing to the cultural, political, and social enrichment of our country. We are fortunate to have in

America today more than 400,000 Americans of Slovenian descent, many of whom have won recognition because of their dedicated service to our country. Among these distinguished Slovenian-Americans are the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, Congressman from the Eighth District of Minnesota, who is the chairman of the powerful Public Works Committee; the Honorable Ludwig J. Andolsek, able Commissioner of the U.S. Civil Service Commission; the Honorable PHILIP E. RUPPE of the 11th District of Michigan, who serves on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; the Honorable JOE SKUBITZ of the Fifth District of Kansas, who serves on the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; and the Honorable Frank J. Lausche, former U.S. Senator from Ohio and five-term Governor of the State.

In the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent, there are many hundreds of Slovenian-Americans. In Chicago last Sunday, the Slovenians celebrated their Festival Day with a cultural program of traditional Slovenian music, food, and costumes. Featured in their program was one of Europe's top performing and recording ensembles, the Slovenski Instrumentalni Kvintet with singers Danica Filipic and Inge Brugeman. Their program included traditional Slovenian folksongs and alpine melodies.

Also included in the program was the reading of a proclamation adopted by Chicago's City Council and signed by Mayor Richard J. Daley designating Sunday, October 10 as Slovenian Day in Chicago. That proclamation was read by this year's Miss Slovenian Day, or "Gospodichna"—18-year-old Margie Matkovich.

Honorable Vito Marzullo, sponsor of this proclamation and alderman and committeeman of the 25th ward, which is a part of the Seventh Congressional District where many Slovenians reside, joins me in extending best wishes to the Slovenian people on the occasion of their 53d anniversary celebration of the independence of their homeland. May they continue the traditions that have made the Slovenian-Americans a valuable addition to our great country.

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate Columbus Day as a national holiday for the first time this year, it is important that we recognize this day as an important event in the history of this great country of ours.

The year 1492 will certainly be remembered by everyone who gives any thought to history. The discovery of the New World by Columbus marked a milestone

in the record of man's existence on the earth. Let us not forget that Christopher Columbus has been a true inspiration for all men of adventurous spirit, since his fateful discovery 500 years ago. He has always been a symbol of adventure, courage, and triumph against adversity for all generations.

It was this spirit of course, adventure, and love for God that led Columbus into discovering a new world. By his inspiration others will be encouraged to discover new horizons, and thereby benefit all mankind. We should be thankful, on the first year of national celebration of this man's endeavor, that the determination of these men was strong enough to make this perilous voyage across the vast expanse of ocean to begin a new era in the history of the world.

JOBS AND INEQUALITY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Andrew F. Brimmer, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, gave an extensive economic progress report on blacks in America, when he spoke at the 62d convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People held in Minneapolis, Minn., on July 6, 1971. Governor Brimmer, an eminent black economist, spoke on the subject "Jobs and Inequality—Progress and Stagnation in the Quest for an Open Society." I am pleased to share the text of Governor Brimmer's remarks:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1971.

Hon. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIGGS: Shortly after you telephoned this morning, I talked to Governor Brimmer. He was indeed flattered and grateful for the gesture that you are going to take. He asked me to tell you that the mood of the Convention has been very good so far.

As you requested, I have enclosed a copy of his remarks at the 62nd Annual Convention of the National Association of Colored People.

Very truly yours,
TONSA FUQUA GOODMAN,
Administrative Assistant
to Governor Brimmer.

JOBS AND INEQUALITY

PROGRESS AND STAGNATION IN THE QUEST FOR
AN OPEN SOCIETY

(By Andrew F. Brimmer)

(NOTE.—I am grateful to a number of persons for assistance in the preparation of these remarks. Mr. William H. Brown, III, Chairman, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), arranged for me to obtain statistics reported to the Commission under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. At the Board, Messrs. Peter J. Peddor and James T. Campbell, III, displayed considerable imagination in designing and carrying out the computer programming which made it possible to use the EEOC data. Mr.

James R. Wetzel assisted with the analysis of the behavior of unemployment among non-whites over the business cycle. Miss Harriett Harper had the main responsibility of matching the detailed industry employment data from EEOC with data from the 1960 Census. She also helped at several other stages of the project.)

I would be honored at any time to receive an invitation to address an Annual Convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. I am especially pleased that I was asked to do so on this occasion—and to have the additional privilege of presenting the 56th Spingarn Medal. This Award—the highest mark of recognition that this Association can bestow—is reserved for Negro Americans whose accomplishments have been truly outstanding. The man singled out for the citation this year has registered his achievements in the field of economics—as well as in the fields of religion and social development. So in honoring him, you broadcast a message to this Nation—but especially to the black community—that is clear and unmistakable: genuine economic advancement is the key to the fulfillment of the most cherished aspirations of the Negro in America.

Since I share this conviction, I decided that the best way for me to respond to the NAACP's invitation is to share with you my own concern about the outlook for economic progress among black people in the United States. I am particularly distressed by the apparently declining emphasis on job opportunities—in contrast to a rising demand for expanded opportunities for blacks to own and manage their own businesses. In expressing this concern, I must hasten to add that while I personally have serious reservations about many of the numerous programs aimed (hopefully) at increasing business ownership by blacks—I believe that those black men and women who are convinced that they can succeed in business should have a chance to try their luck. At the same time, however, I must also emphasize that the vast majority of black people—as is true of the vast majority of the American people as a whole—must work for a living. This means that their true interest lies in the opening up of genuine employment opportunities and in accelerating occupational upgrading.

In citing this need, I am not overlooking the evidence of economic progress that is all around us: reflecting the considerable improvements in education and skills and the lessening of racial discrimination in numerous industries, black people have made noticeable strides in the last decade. These gains can be traced in their stronger employment situation and the decline in their unemployment rates, as well as in the relative improvement in their share of total income.

Nevertheless, a closer examination of trends in Negro employment in major industries and government service during the 1960's reveals a mixture of progress and stagnation which shows that we still have a long road to travel before black people—and other minority groups—achieve truly equal opportunities in an open society. During the last month or so, I have had underway such an examination, and the results of the inquiry suggest that the amount of progress has been most uneven:

In the last decade, Negroes made noticeable strides in total white collar employment, but the gains were concentrated among clerical workers. Sizable improvements occurred in professional and technical occupations. Their relative proportion as managers and officials was virtually stagnant.

The share of blue collar jobs held by Negroes also rose somewhat. However, the gains centered in semiskilled factory jobs. Small improvements were recorded among

craftsmen and other highly-skilled categories.

Among major industries, the pace of progress varied substantially. In general, where blacks have found a significant number of openings in particular industries, they have usually been in blue collar and service jobs. The few exceptions have included communications, banking, and insurance.

In the area of public employment, Negroes have gained somewhat more than their proportionate share of jobs in the Federal Government. Nevertheless, they have made little headway in moving into the higher grades. While the situation is hard to document in the case of State and local governments, it appears that blacks and members of other minority groups still have little chance to compete for the better paying positions on public payrolls.

Within the Federal Reserve System, Negroes and other minority groups constitute nearly one-fifth of the total employment. Here also, however, they are concentrated mainly in the lower end of the salary structure. With respect to managers and officials, the System appears to have made only slightly more progress than banking generally—and it seems to be about in line with industry as a whole.

But my assessment of the Negro's quest for equal employment has not been entirely backward looking. I have also looked ahead through the decade of the 1970's, and I see a number of reasons to be optimistic:

The present decade will bring considerable expansion in economic opportunities. However, these openings will require a much higher level of education, and many of them will be in fields which blacks traditionally have not entered. Consequently, young black people will have to acquire a wide range of new skills while striving to narrow the educational gap between Negroes and white.

But equally critical is the need to press on with the campaign to eradicate the remaining vestiges of racial discrimination. This need exists in government—at all levels—as well as in private industry.

In the short-run, however, I am less optimistic about the outlook for employment opportunities for blacks—along with others in the national economy. Unemployment among Negroes climbed relatively more slowly than it did for all workers during the recent recession, but the level for blacks is still almost double that for the total labor force. Moreover, reflecting the uncertain prospects for the total economy, I believe we should not expect to see a significant improvement in the employment situation for blacks—or for the total labor force—for quite some time.

Because of this rather pessimistic outlook for employment, a number of observers have been calling for greater effort by the Federal Government to stimulate the economy (by temporary tax or spending measures). In the face of persistent inflation, still others have urged the adoption of specific policies to restrain increases in wages and prices. In fact, the Federal Reserve Board has endorsed a number of times the idea of establishing some kind of machinery (built around a prices and wages review board) to strengthen the Government's hand in the fight against inflation.

Speaking for myself—and not necessarily for my colleagues on the Federal Reserve Board—I must say that I personally see a good deal of merit in the suggestions which hold that the economy does require an extra boost at this time.

I will amplify these general conclusions in the rest of these remarks.

Long-Run Trends in Employment

The economic progress of Negroes can be traced in the trends of the labor force, employment and occupational advancement during the last decade. In 1970, there were

9.2 million nonwhites¹ in the labor force—meaning that they were holding jobs or seeking work. This was a rise of about one-fifth since 1960, a rate of increase somewhat faster than for whites and for the total labor force. However, employment of nonwhites rose more rapidly than it did for all employees (by 22 per cent to 8.4 million for the former compared with 19½ per cent to 78.6 million for the latter). Expressed differently, while nonwhites represented about 11 per cent of the total civilian labor force in both 1960 and 1970, their share of the gains in employment during the decade was somewhat larger: they accounted for near 12 per cent of the employment growth, although they held just over 10 percent of the jobs at the beginning of the period. (See Table 1, attached.)

Advancement in the range of jobs held by Negroes in the last decade was also noticeable. This was particularly true of the improvements in the highest paying occupations. Between 1960 and 1970, the number of nonwhites in professional and technical positions increased by 131 per cent (to 766 thousand) while the increase in the total was only 49 per cent (to 11.1 million). Nonwhites had progressed to the point where they accounted for 6.9 per cent of the total employment in these top categories in the occupational structure in 1970, compared with 4.4 per cent in 1960. They got just over 9 per cent of the net increase in such jobs over the decade. During this same period, the number of nonwhite managers, officials and proprietors (the second highest paying category) rose two-thirds (to 297 thousand) compared to an expansion of 17 per cent (to 8.3 million) for all employees in this category.

In the 1960's, nonwhite workers left low-paying jobs in agriculture and household service at a rate two to three times faster than did white workers. The number of nonwhite farmers and farm workers dropped by 63 per cent (to 328 thousand) in contrast to a decline of about 40 per cent (to 3.1 million) for all persons in the same category. Nevertheless, in 1970, nonwhites accounted for about 21 per cent of employment in agriculture, slightly more than their share in 1960 when the proportion for nonwhites was 19 per cent. The exit of nonwhites from private household employment was even more striking. During the last decade, the number of nonwhites so employed fell by about 34 per cent (to 652 thousand); the corresponding drop for all workers was only 21 per cent (to 1.6 million). Although roughly half of all household workers were nonwhite in 1960, the ratio had declined to just over two-fifths by 1971. The number of black nonfarm laborers declined (by 9 per cent to 866 thousand) over the last decade, but the total number of laborers rose somewhat.

Nevertheless, as already indicated, the accelerated movement of nonwhites out of the positions at the bottom of the occupational pyramid did not flow evenly through the entire occupational structure. For example, nonwhites in 1970 still held about 1.5 million of the service jobs outside private households—most of which require only modest skills. This represented almost one-fifth of the total—slightly more than the proportion in 1960. Moreover, the number of nonwhites holding semi-skilled operative jobs (mainly in factories) rose by 42 per cent (to about 2.0 million) during the decade, compared with an expansion of only 16½ per cent (13.9 million) for all workers. The result was that nonwhites' share of the total climbed from 12 per cent to over 14 per cent. Taken together, these two categories of lower-skilled jobs (chiefly in factories or in non-household services) accounted for a some-

what larger share (42 per cent) of total nonwhite employment in 1971 than they did in 1960—when their share was about 38 per cent. In contrast, among all employees the proportion was virtually unchanged—27 per cent at the beginning of the decade and 28 per cent at its close.

While nonwhites made substantial progress during the 1960's in obtaining clerical and sales jobs—and also registered noticeable gains as craftsmen—their occupational center of gravity remained anchored in those positions requiring little skill and offering few opportunities for further advancement. At the same time, it is also clear from the above analysis that blacks who are well-prepared to compete for the higher-paying positions in the upper reaches of the occupation structure have made measurable gains. Nevertheless, compared with their overall participation in the economy (11 per cent of total employment), the occupational deficit in white collar employment—averaging 40 per cent—remains disturbingly large. These contrasting experiences within the black community emphasize strongly the point I made at the outset: the campaign for improved job opportunities is far from won—and must be pursued with renewed dedication.

Uneven Pattern of Equal Opportunity in Industry

The rate at which American industry has opened employment opportunities for blacks and other minorities have varied greatly over the last decade, and the overall picture is extremely mixed. In general, however, the representation of blacks remains heaviest in the relatively low-wage industries or in those industries with large concentrations of low- and semi-skilled occupations. The small number of exceptions to this pattern appear to be industries in which the leading firms have a substantial amount of direct contact with consumers. At the same time, some of these same industries are also ones in which public regulatory bodies play a major role in determining the framework within which firms operate. At the margin, this factor may also exert a slight influence in favor of lessening discrimination in employment.

Comprehensive statistics showing the current racial pattern of employment in American industry will not be available until the detailed tabulations of the 1970 Census have been completed. Comparable tabulations were prepared from the 1960 Census. Partly to bridge this gap—and to obtain a rough indication of the racial distribution of employment in principal industries—arrangements were made to draw on the information reported annually to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. These data are far from comprehensive, and they are also subject to a number of reporting limitations—including limited coverage of small firms and the lack of reports for governments and educational institutions.² Nevertheless, the EEOC data do provide a broad outline of employment patterns and—when compared with statistics from the 1960 Census—they also give a general indication of trends over the last decade.

We have used the EEOC data for 1969 to

² However, the reports do cover a substantial proportion of total employment in some industries. About three-quarters of total employment in manufacturing, transportation, communication, and electric and gas utilities are reported, and well over one-half of the total in mining, and in finance, insurance and real estate is covered. On the other hand, the reports cover only about one-third of total employment in wholesale and retail trade, and in services. Just under one-fifth of contract construction employment is covered. Coverage and other characteristics of the EEOC data are discussed further in the notes to the attached Appendix Table.

estimate the share of Negro and other minority group employment in twelve occupational categories in 50 industries. Similar calculations for nonwhite employment in 1960 were also undertaken. The results of both sets of calculations are shown in the attached Appendix Table.

The highlights of the results are illustrated in Table 2. The information shows Negro employment as a percentage of total employment in selected occupations in 20 industry groups. Each of these industries had at least 500,000 total employees in 1969.

These statistics seem to support the conclusion stated above: where blacks have found a significant number of openings in particular industries, they have usually been in blue collar and service fields. For example, in 1969, Negroes accounted for 9.5 per cent of the EEOC reported employment. However, they made up 13 per cent of all blue collar employees and 27 per cent of all service workers—but they held only 4 per cent of all white collar jobs. Within the white collar group, Negroes represented only 1½ per cent of managers and officials, 5½ per cent of the technicians and 6 per cent of all office and clerical workers. In the blue collar category, they constituted 5 per cent of the craftsmen, 13 per cent of the operatives and 22 per cent of the laborers.

The extent of black employment varied greatly from industry to industry. Of the 20 industries shown in Table 2, they were concentrated most heavily in steel and other primary metals (13.6 per cent of total employment) (textile mills (12.8 per cent), and food processing (12.4 per cent). They also had somewhat more than their proportionate share of the total jobs in transportation equipment manufacturing—mainly automobiles (10.4 per cent) and apparel and other textiles (10.3 per cent). However, in all of these industries, the fairly high employment ratios for blacks reflected almost entirely their concentration in blue collar and service occupations.

The lowest employment ratios for Negroes among the 20 industries were found in electric and gas utilities (5.2 per cent) and non-electrical machinery (5.6 per cent). The ratio in printing and publishing was also fairly low (6.3 per cent). Among these three groups, however, the Negro's share of white collar employment differed significantly. In non-electrical machinery, they held only 1½ per cent of such jobs (the second smallest proportion among the 20 industries), compared with 3.4 per cent in the utilities and 3.7 per cent in printing and publishing.

The industries in which blacks have made the largest relative gains in occupational upgrading are communications, banking, and insurance. In the case of communications (dominated by telephones and radio and TV broadcasting), Negroes represented 7.4 per cent of total employment and they held 8.8 per cent of the total white collar jobs; within the latter category, they had 11½ per cent of the office and clerical positions. Negroes also represented 7½ per cent of total employment in banking, and they held 6½ per cent of the white collar positions—including 8 per cent of the office and clerical jobs. Among insurance carriers, they occupied just over 6 per cent of all jobs, 5½ per cent of the white collar slots, and made up 8 per cent of the office force.

Still other features of the position of blacks in American industry are put into sharp relief by the data in Table 2. At least one of these should be mentioned before I conclude this part of these remarks. While none of the industries listed show an outstanding record of advancing blacks to managerial and official positions, the situation in electric and gas utilities, non-electrical machinery, textile mills, and railroad transportation is particularly distressing. In each of these industries, black managers and officials represent

¹ Negroes constitute about 93 per cent of all nonwhites; other races included are American Indians and Orientals.

only 1/2 of 1 per cent of the total employees in this category. The "best" record—which is far from "good"—was in educational services (where the ratio was 3.5 per cent).

Again, the results of this survey of racial employment patterns in American industry point to an inescapable conclusion: our industrial leadership—while they have made noticeable strides—is still failing in the effort to achieve equality of employment opportunities in this country. Thus, the task of devising—and enforcing—effective programs to reach this goal remains to be done. Black people and other minorities—and organizations such as the NAACP—must not slacken in their own responsibility to see that this goal is kept high on the agenda of the Nation's priorities.

Employment opportunities in the public sector

While I have dwelt on the employment status of blacks in private industry, we must not overlook the still unsatisfactory situation in public service. Historically, a larger proportion of employed Negroes (especially of those in professional positions) has been on the public payroll than has been true for the population as a whole. For example, while Negroes represented about 10 per cent of total employment in nonfarm occupations in private industry in 1970, they accounted for 15 per cent of all civilian employees in the Federal Government. Moreover, while Federal employment absorbed 3.3 per cent of the total civilian labor force, about 4.6 per cent of the Negroes in civilian jobs were on the Federal payroll.

Behind these overall statistics is an even heavier reliance by Negroes on the public sector for a disproportionate share of the better jobs they hold. The extent of this reliance was fully documented in the 1960 Census of Population. In that year, public employment at the Federal, State and local level accounted for about 10.2 per cent of total employment. The percentage of nonwhites so employed was roughly the same, 9.9 per cent. However, while just over one-third of all professional and technical workers were employed by public agencies, nearly three-fifths of nonwhite workers in the same occupations were employed by such agencies. Of course, in each case, public employment was heavily weighted by the large number of teachers in the public schools.

But aside from education, the much greater reliance of Negroes on the public sector for white collar jobs is still noticeable. For instance, in 1960, about 1 in 8 of all salaried managers worked for public institutions, but the ratio was 1 in 5 for nonwhites. About 17 per cent of the nonwhite engineers worked for government bodies compared with only 7 percent for white engineers. For accountants, the ratios were one-third for non whites and only 13 per cent for white accountants. Some 22 per cent of nonwhite chemists were employed by public agencies, compared with only 15 per cent of the white chemists.

Clerical workers provide the most striking example of all. In 1960, about two-fifths of all nonwhite women employed as secretaries, stenographers, and other classes of clerical workers were on the public payroll. Only 14 per cent of the white women employed as clerical workers were on the public payroll. Moreover, while nonwhite women represented less than 4 per cent of all women with such jobs, they accounted for 10 per cent of those employed in the public sector.

Although the details obviously have changed since 1960, the broad conclusions probably still hold. While private industry has greatly accelerated its hiring of Negroes in recent years, so has the public sector. For example, as shown in Table 3, in 1963, Negroes constituted 13 per cent of total em-

ployment in the Federal Government; by 1970, the ratio had risen to 15 per cent of the work force. In the seven-year period, the number of Negroes employed by the Federal Government rose from 302 thousand to 389 thousand, a gain of 87 thousand—representing 30 per cent of the increase in total Federal Civilian employment.

However, while great strides have been made in the employment of minority groups in the Federal Government, the vast majority of Negroes is still concentrated in the low- and middle-grade jobs. Again, as Table 3 shows, of the 389 thousand Negroes employed by the Federal Government in 1970, less than two-fifths (141 thousand) were in the regular civil service grades, and over three-fifths were in the postal field service or held blue collar (wage board) jobs. Moreover, in regular civil service categories, Negroes are heavily concentrated in the low to middle salary grades.

The employment status of blacks in State and local governments appears to be generally less favorable than it is in the Federal Government. The extent to which this is the case cannot be determined because of a lack of comprehensive information. However, a survey conducted in 1967 by the U.S. Civil Rights Commission casts considerable light on the situation.

The Commission collected information on government employment in seven major metropolitan areas—representing 628 governmental units. The areas were San Francisco-Oakland, Baton Rouge, Detroit, Philadelphia, Memphis, Houston, and Atlanta. In all, nearly 250,000 jobs were involved. About one-fourth of these jobs were held by Negroes.

Of the black workers in State and local governments, more than half were on the payrolls of central city governments. The distribution of Negro and other minority group employment in the seven central cities is shown in Table 4. In four of these areas (San Francisco, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Memphis) the percentage of total city jobs held by Negroes was equal to—or exceeded—their proportion of the population. In both Baton Rouge and Oakland, the city employment rate for Negroes was roughly one-half of their representation in the population.

The data from the survey also show that blacks are heavily concentrated in the low-skill, low-pay occupations in all of the central cities listed. In fact, in each of the cities (except San Francisco and Oakland), Negroes held 70 per cent or more of all laborer jobs. In three of the cities (Philadelphia, Detroit, and Memphis), they made up about one-third of all service workers. In only two cities—Philadelphia and Detroit—did the number of Negroes in white collar positions come near to reflecting their proportion of the population.

On the basis of these results from the survey, one must share the Commission's conclusion: State and local governments have fallen far short of meeting their obligation to assure equal employment opportunity to all of their citizens. Consequently, the quest for job equality must still be pressed at city halls and in State capitals—as well as in the Federal Government.

Equal opportunity in the Federal Reserve System

As mentioned above, the Federal Reserve System has made considerable strides in expanding job opportunities for minority groups. However, despite a strong endorsement by policy officials in the System, the performance is uneven at the Board and among the Reserve Banks.

At the Federal Reserve Board, minorities (all except a few of whom are Negroes) represent over one-fifth of total employment. (Table 5.) They constitute nearly one-fifth

of the total white collar group, but they are heavily concentrated in the lower grades. In contrast, Negro employees make up three-fifths of the blue collar and service workers. Among these, nearly three-quarters are in the lowest pay grade. In fact, a fairly large number of blue collar workers began even lower down the occupational ladder (e.g., as messengers) and were promoted to semi-skilled jobs. On the other hand, considerable progress has been achieved in recent years in the employment of Negro clerical workers and technicians. This improvement is the result of systematic recruiting efforts supported by a strong positive employment policy developed by the Federal Reserve Board.

Among Federal Reserve Banks also, considerable progress in the employment of minority group members has been achieved. Negro employment in the Banks increased by 72 per cent between 1968 and 1971, while the total rose by only 17 per cent. Negroes represented half the rise in total employment during the same period. The Reserve Banks employed more than 3,800 Negroes, representing 17 per cent of their total work force in early 1971. (See Table 6.) However, the pattern is quite uneven from one bank to another. Moreover, although not shown in the table, the pattern differs greatly even between the head offices and their branches. To a considerable extent, the differences in black and other minority group employment rates at Federal Reserve Banks can be traced to the differing representation of such groups in the local population (Minneapolis, for example). However, the situation in Kansas City—and perhaps in Boston—apparently cannot be explained on that basis.

Sadly, it seems that the Federal Reserve Banks have been able to do no better than industry as a whole—and only slightly better than banking generally—in the employment of blacks in managerial and official positions. As shown in Table 7, Negroes constituted 1 1/2 per cent of such officials in early 1971.

Clearly, even in the Federal Reserve System, a positive program of active recruiting is necessary to translate a firm policy of equal opportunity into action. This is especially true if any headway is to be made in expanding employment for minority groups in white collar occupations. Such a program is under way, and it was strengthened further early this year when the Federal Reserve Board appointed an official who will devote his full time to the promotion of equal employment opportunity. His task will not be an easy one.

Long-Run Outlook for black employment

As I look ahead to the Negro's employment prospects in the current decade, I am fairly optimistic. By 1980, there should be about 12 million Negroes in the labor force—constituting about 12 per cent of the total. The projection for the national economy as a whole suggests that the outlook for blacks will brighten considerably—if they can prepare themselves to take advantage of the emerging openings.

Thus, improvement in the educational attainment of the black community will be crucial. Sizeable gains were achieved during the last decade, and the prospect for further advances is quite hopeful. If these recent trends in schooling of both whites and Negroes do continue during the decade of the 1970's, the educational gap between the two will narrow considerably. Moreover, substantial improvement can also be expected in the quality of education received by Negroes over the next decade.

On the other hand, in the 1970's there will be a sharp increase in the demand for highly trained people. But at the same time, we can also expect a dramatic shift in the types of skills required. This prospect will be of critical importance to black students. As we

know, Negro college graduates have traditionally concentrated heavily in the field of education (especially in elementary and secondary teaching). The social sciences, business, and English and literature have attracted most of the remaining graduates. Only a small percentage (much smaller than among college students generally) has selected majors in the scientific fields; among these, biology and mathematics accounted for a sizable share of the enrollment.

Over the current decade, the demand for college graduates is expected to run substantially counter to the typical pattern of Negro graduates. Even before the decade is very far advanced, elementary and secondary education—long plagued by a shortage of classroom personnel—will be faced with a surplus of teachers—if recent entry patterns in this occupation continue. In scientific fields, there may also be a surplus of mathematicians and life scientists (especially of biologists) if students continue to concentrate in these areas in the same proportion as in the recent past.

In contrast, several other scientific and technical fields will continue to face shortages during the 1970's. These include chemistry, geology, geophysics, and engineering. Professional health occupations can also anticipate continued shortages. The shortfall in the supply of physicians and dentists may be especially serious, due to the limited capacity of existing medical and dental schools—which may be relieved only slightly by institutions scheduled to be launched during the 1970's. Outside the scientific and medical fields, other areas of potential shortages include counseling, social work, urban planning, and a number of occupations involved in the planning and administration of State and local governments.

Behavior of black employment during the recent recession

As I mentioned above, while I am fairly hopeful about the long-run prospects for black employment, I am less optimistic regarding their job outlook in the near term. My dampened expectations result from the somewhat uncertain outlook for the economy as a whole—and not from factors affecting blacks alone.

In fact, during the recent recession (from which the economy is—hopefully—recovering), the level of black unemployment rose somewhat less than one would have expected on the basis of historical experience. Partly reflecting the relative lack of skills

(but also reflecting the direct impact of racial discrimination), the unemployment rate among blacks has traditionally been about double the rate for whites. Moreover, in previous recessions changes in employment and unemployment among Negroes and whites have tended to be roughly proportionate—although the specific timing of the changes differed slightly. During the last year, however, employment of adult nonwhites (aged 20 and over)—of whom about 93 per cent are Negroes—edged up moderately, while employment among white adults has declined. Also, the level of white unemployment has risen more than the level of Negro unemployment—approximately one-third vs. about one-fifth.

Reflecting the relatively slower rise of Negro unemployment, their jobless rate has remained significantly below the rates prevailing in the early 1960's, whereas the rate for whites has been generally above those recorded in that period. For example, in 1962-63, the nonwhite unemployment rate averaged about 11 per cent, compared with roughly 5 per cent for whites. In June of this year, the nonwhite rate was 9.4 per cent, and the white rate was 5.2 per cent. (See table 8.)

Thus, the ratio of the Negro to the white unemployment rate diminished significantly during the recent recession, and it continues well below the historic 2-to-1 relationship that obtained between the mid-1950's and the late 1960's. A large share of the increase of unemployment in the last 1½ years has occurred in the aerospace-defense sector, a concentration of industries which have relatively few black workers. Of equal importance, however, has been the greater propensity for Negroes to leave the labor force during this period of slack demand. Participation rates for Negroes have fallen somewhat more than those for whites.

Short-term economic outlook

As I stressed above, the near-term employment prospects for blacks—as well as for the total labor force—is not very bright. The total unemployment rate declined from 6.2 per cent in May to 5.6 per cent last month, and the rate for nonwhites decreased from 10.5 per cent to 9.4 per cent. While the declines were widely distributed, they were particularly sharp for teenagers and young adults. However, these one-month declines may not be particularly significant. To some extent, they may reflect technical statistical (seasonal adjustment) factors. Similar

changes (although of a smaller magnitude) occurred last year, when the labor force fell and unemployment edged down from May to June—only to rebound in July.* More importantly, however, the depressed state of the labor market itself may have cut the large influx of young workers at the end of the school year. Overall, in the 12 months ending in June, the total labor force rose by about one-half million—only one-third of the growth normally expected on the basis of population change and long-run trends in labor force participation.

As I assess the present state of the national economy, I am personally convinced that there is a serious shortage of effective demand. Businesses nor households appear willing to step up their rate of spending for goods and services—which would in turn stimulate increased production, rising employment, and a decline in the backlog of unused plant capacity. Moreover, the sluggish propensity to spend on the part of consumers seems to reflect pessimistic expectations about future employment prospects and the likelihood of a foreseeable check to inflation. Businesses—too—seem to be suffering from a pessimistic view of the economic outlook. Caught in the severe profits squeeze and facing substantial excess plant capacity, they see little need for—and little chance to benefit from—a large increase in spending on new plant and equipment in the near term.

Under these circumstances, the situation may well call for direct measures to strengthen effective demand in the private economy. Since the major participants in the private sector (households and businesses) apparently are unwilling to provide the autonomous support required—that is, by spending more and saving less out of a given income—we may face a classic case that might call for action by the Federal Government. In my opinion, that action could take a variety of forms. However, a key requirement is that it work directly through the provision of inducements to consumers to spend and inducements to business firms to undertake fixed investment. For this purpose, fiscal measures—rather than further easing of monetary policy—are clearly the most promising.

*In passing, it should be noted that the Bureau of Labor Statistics recognizes these technical difficulties and is making an effort to improve the statistical measurements.

TABLE 1.—EMPLOYED PERSONS BY MAJOR OCCUPATION GROUP AND COLOR

[Numbers in thousands]

| Occupation | Total employment 1960 | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Total | | Negro and other races | | |
| | Number | Percentage distribution | Number | Percentage distribution | Percent of total number |
| Total employed..... | 65,778 | 100.0 | 6,927 | 100.0 | 10.5 |
| White collar workers..... | 28,522 | 43.3 | 1,113 | 16.1 | 3.9 |
| Professional and technical..... | 7,469 | 11.4 | 331 | 4.7 | 4.4 |
| Managers, officials, and proprietors..... | 7,067 | 10.7 | 178 | 2.6 | 2.5 |
| Clerical workers..... | 9,762 | 14.8 | 503 | 7.3 | 5.2 |
| Sales workers..... | 4,224 | 6.4 | 101 | 1.5 | 2.4 |
| Blue collar workers..... | 24,057 | 36.6 | 2,780 | 40.1 | 11.6 |
| Craftsmen and foremen..... | 8,554 | 13.0 | 415 | 6.0 | 4.8 |
| Operatives..... | 11,950 | 18.2 | 1,414 | 20.4 | 11.8 |
| Nonfarm laborers..... | 3,553 | 5.4 | 951 | 13.7 | 26.8 |
| Service workers..... | 8,023 | 12.2 | 2,196 | 31.7 | 27.4 |
| Private household..... | 1,973 | 3.0 | 982 | 14.2 | 49.8 |
| Other service workers..... | 6,050 | 9.2 | 1,214 | 17.5 | 20.1 |
| Farmworkers..... | 5,176 | 7.9 | 841 | 12.1 | 16.2 |
| Farmers and farm managers..... | 2,776 | 4.2 | 219 | 3.2 | 7.9 |
| Farm laborers and foremen..... | 2,400 | 3.7 | 622 | 8.9 | 25.9 |

| Occupation | Total employment 1960 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Total | | Negro and other races | | |
| | Number | Percentage distribution | Number | Percentage distribution | Percent of total number |
| Total employed..... | 78,627 | 100.0 | 8,445 | 100.0 | 10.7 |
| White collar workers..... | 37,997 | 48.3 | 2,356 | 27.9 | 6.2 |
| Professional and technical..... | 11,140 | 14.2 | 766 | 9.1 | 6.9 |
| Managers, officials and proprietors..... | 8,289 | 10.5 | 297 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| Clerical workers..... | 13,714 | 17.4 | 1,113 | 13.2 | 8.1 |
| Sales workers..... | 4,854 | 6.2 | 180 | 2.1 | 3.7 |
| Blue collar workers..... | 27,791 | 35.3 | 3,561 | 42.2 | 12.8 |
| Craftsmen and foremen..... | 10,158 | 12.9 | 692 | 8.2 | 6.8 |
| Operatives..... | 13,909 | 17.7 | 2,004 | 23.7 | 14.4 |
| Nonfarm laborers..... | 3,724 | 4.7 | 866 | 10.3 | 23.2 |
| Service workers..... | 9,712 | 12.4 | 2,199 | 26.0 | 22.6 |
| Private household..... | 1,558 | 2.0 | 652 | 7.7 | 41.8 |
| Other service workers..... | 8,154 | 10.4 | 1,546 | 18.3 | 19.0 |
| Farm workers..... | 3,126 | 4.0 | 328 | 3.9 | 10.5 |
| Farmers and farm managers..... | 1,753 | 2.2 | 87 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| Farm laborers and foremen..... | 1,373 | 1.8 | 241 | 2.9 | 17.6 |

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Report of the President, April, 1971, tables A-9 and A-10, pp. 215-7.

TABLE 2.—NEGRO EMPLOYMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EMPLOYMENT IN SELECTED INDUSTRIES AND SELECTED OCCUPATIONS, 1960 AND 1969
[Numbers in thousands]

| SIC and industry | Total employment (number) | Total | White collar | Managers and officials | Technicians | Office and clerical | Blue collar | Craftsmen | Operatives | Laborers | Service workers |
|--|---------------------------|-------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|----------|-----------------|
| 1960: All industries..... | 64,647 | 10.2 | 3.8 | 2.3 | (1) | 4.6 | 10.5 | 4.9 | 10.7 | 25.8 | 28.1 |
| 1969: All industries (EEO-1)..... | 28,739 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonwhite..... | | 10.4 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 6.9 | 7.0 | 13.3 | 5.6 | 14.1 | 22.9 | 28.2 |
| Negro..... | | 9.5 | 4.1 | 1.5 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 12.6 | 5.0 | 13.4 | 21.8 | 26.9 |
| (13) Food processing..... | 1,094 | 12.4 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 1.2 | 2.9 | 7.1 | 27.1 |
| (22) Textile mills..... | 784 | 12.8 | 1.7 | .6 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 14.3 | 6.1 | 13.8 | 27.7 | 33.4 |
| (23) Apparel and other textiles..... | 604 | 10.3 | 3.5 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 5.6 | 11.1 | 8.9 | 11.2 | 15.8 | 19.5 |
| (26) Paper products..... | 564 | 8.8 | 1.6 | .7 | 2.0 | 2.8 | 11.1 | 4.6 | 11.1 | 17.2 | 21.1 |
| (27) Printing and publishing..... | 541 | 6.3 | 3.7 | 1.0 | .8 | 4.1 | 5.7 | 7.6 | 2.1 | 10.4 | 32.7 |
| (28) Chemicals..... | 930 | 7.8 | 2.1 | .8 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 17.0 | 6.7 | 19.1 | 25.3 | 19.0 |
| (33) Primary metals..... | 1,079 | 13.6 | 1.4 | .8 | 1.9 | 2.3 | 11.6 | 4.5 | 13.0 | 17.5 | 17.8 |
| (34) Fabricated metals..... | 881 | 9.1 | 1.5 | .5 | 1.6 | 2.6 | 7.8 | 3.4 | 9.0 | 14.9 | 13.5 |
| (35) Machinery (Excluding electrical)..... | 1,394 | 5.6 | 2.3 | .9 | 3.1 | 3.9 | 10.2 | 4.2 | 11.5 | 12.7 | 19.2 |
| (36) Electrical machinery..... | 1,748 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 3.8 | 14.4 | 6.2 | 18.4 | 20.6 | 24.8 |
| (37) Transportation equipment..... | 1,670 | 10.4 | 2.2 | .5 | .6 | 2.6 | 8.8 | 3.0 | 5.7 | 30.0 | 47.8 |
| (40) Railroad transportation..... | 616 | 7.8 | 8.8 | 1.4 | 2.4 | 11.6 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 13.6 | 15.7 | 31.9 |
| (48) Communications..... | 853 | 7.4 | 3.4 | .4 | 1.6 | 5.3 | 6.4 | 1.9 | 8.6 | 25.3 | 32.8 |
| (49) Electric, gas, sanitation services..... | 569 | 5.2 | 3.1 | .8 | 3.2 | 4.1 | 13.9 | 6.3 | 13.6 | 22.7 | 23.2 |
| (50) Wholesale trade..... | 1,345 | 6.9 | 5.8 | 2.4 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 14.6 | 6.2 | 14.9 | 21.0 | 24.1 |
| (53) Retail and general merchandise..... | 1,554 | 7.8 | 5.6 | 2.0 | 7.6 | 5.2 | 10.7 | 4.3 | 13.4 | 13.8 | 13.4 |
| (54) Food stores..... | 731 | 6.5 | 6.4 | .9 | 5.9 | 8.0 | 13.6 | 6.8 | 15.9 | 20.9 | 28.6 |
| (60) Banking..... | 651 | 7.5 | 5.6 | 1.8 | 4.6 | 8.0 | 20.1 | 5.1 | 17.5 | 45.4 | 29.4 |
| (63) Insurance carriers..... | 837 | 6.2 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 10.2 | 6.5 | 14.2 | 5.5 | 18.2 | 19.8 | 32.9 |
| (82) Educational services..... | 863 | 9.7 | | | | | | | | | |

1 Not available.

Note: For sources and limitations of data, see notes at end of appendix table.

TABLE 3.—TRENDS IN MINORITY GROUP EMPLOYMENT IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 1963-70

| Pay category | Total full-time employees | Minority groups | | Negro | | Spanish surnamed | | American Indian ¹ | | Oriental ² | | All other | |
|---|---------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|---------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------------|
| | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total |
| 1963 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total, all pay systems..... | 2,298,808 | 374,321 | 16.3 | 301,889 | 13.1 | 51,682 | 2.2 | 10,592 | 0.5 | 10,158 | 0.4 | 1,924,487 | 83.7 |
| Total, general (or similar) schedule..... | 1,103,051 | 125,596 | 11.4 | 101,589 | 9.2 | 15,292 | 1.4 | 5,315 | .5 | 3,400 | .3 | 977,455 | 88.6 |
| GS-1 through GS-4..... | 355,329 | 78,170 | 22.0 | 66,169 | 18.6 | 7,520 | 2.1 | 3,373 | 1.0 | 1,108 | .3 | 277,159 | 78.0 |
| GS-5 through GS-8..... | 315,203 | 33,851 | 10.7 | 26,452 | 8.4 | 4,809 | 1.5 | 1,311 | .4 | 1,279 | .4 | 281,352 | 89.3 |
| GS-9 through GS-11..... | 243,325 | 10,433 | 4.3 | 7,016 | 2.9 | 2,178 | .9 | 481 | .2 | 758 | .3 | 232,892 | 95.7 |
| GS-12 through GS-18..... | 189,194 | 3,142 | 1.7 | 1,952 | 1.0 | 785 | .4 | 150 | .1 | 255 | .1 | 186,052 | 98.3 |
| 1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total, all pay systems..... | 2,592,956 | 501,871 | 19.4 | 389,355 | 15.0 | 73,968 | 2.9 | 17,446 | .7 | 21,102 | .8 | 2,091,085 | 80.6 |
| Total, general (or similar) schedule..... | 1,272,310 | 186,170 | 14.4 | 140,919 | 10.9 | 24,302 | 1.9 | 10,480 | .8 | 10,469 | .8 | 1,106,140 | 85.6 |
| GS-1 through GS-4..... | 308,315 | 84,078 | 27.3 | 67,253 | 21.8 | 9,258 | 3.0 | 5,655 | 1.8 | 1,912 | .6 | 224,237 | 72.7 |
| GS-5 through GS-8..... | 372,939 | 64,278 | 17.2 | 50,392 | 13.5 | 8,186 | 2.2 | 2,724 | .7 | 2,976 | .8 | 308,661 | 82.8 |
| GS-9 through GS-11..... | 318,077 | 25,572 | 8.0 | 16,272 | 5.1 | 4,663 | 1.5 | 1,472 | .5 | 3,165 | 1.0 | 292,505 | 92.0 |
| GS-12 through GS-18..... | 292,979 | 12,242 | 4.2 | 7,002 | 2.4 | 2,195 | .8 | 629 | .2 | 2,416 | .8 | 280,737 | 95.8 |
| GS-12 through GS-13..... | 215,720 | 9,736 | 4.5 | 5,723 | 2.7 | 1,700 | .8 | 477 | .2 | 1,836 | .9 | 205,984 | 95.5 |
| GS-14 through GS-15..... | 71,788 | 2,395 | 3.3 | 1,204 | 1.7 | 478 | .7 | 146 | .2 | 567 | .8 | 69,393 | 96.7 |
| GS-16 through GS-18..... | 5,471 | 111 | 2.0 | 75 | 1.4 | 17 | .3 | 6 | .1 | 13 | .2 | 5,360 | 98.0 |

1 Surveyed only in Arizona, California, Montana, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and South Dakota in 1963.

2 Surveyed only in California, Oregon, and Washington in 1963.

Source: U.S. Civil Service Commission, "Study of Minority Group Employment in the Federal Government," 1963 and 1970.

TABLE 4.—MINORITY GROUP EMPLOYMENT AS A PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EMPLOYMENT BY OCCUPATION, SELECTED CENTRAL CITIES, 1967 FULL-TIME NONEDUCATIONAL EMPLOYEES

| City and race | All occupations | White collar | | | | Blue collar | | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|----------|-----------------|
| | | Total white collar | Officials and managers | Professional and technical | Office and clerical | Total blue collar | Craftsmen and operatives | Laborers | Service workers |
| San Francisco-Oakland: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 19,745 | 6,850 | 256 | 4,357 | 2,237 | 5,206 | 3,947 | 1,257 | 7,689 |
| Minority (percent)..... | 26.8 | 18.7 | 4.7 | 19.8 | 18.2 | 29.5 | 27.8 | 34.6 | 32.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 17.9 | 9.5 | 3.9 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 24.4 | 23.0 | 28.7 | 21.0 |
| Spanish-American (percent)..... | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 1.7 |
| Oriental (percent)..... | 3.8 | 7.8 | 0.8 | 8.8 | 6.4 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 9.6 |
| Philadelphia: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 28,075 | 9,092 | 863 | 5,070 | 3,159 | 5,847 | 3,319 | 2,528 | 13,136 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 40.6 | 34.3 | 21.9 | 27.6 | 48.3 | 71.7 | 56.6 | 91.7 | 31.2 |
| Detroit: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 26,448 | 7,206 | 800 | 3,028 | 3,378 | 8,370 | 5,259 | 3,111 | 10,872 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 40.1 | 30.5 | 14.4 | 22.3 | 41.6 | 57.1 | 42.7 | 81.5 | 33.4 |
| Atlanta: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 6,001 | 884 | 65 | 397 | 422 | 2,997 | 1,450 | 1,547 | 2,120 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 32.1 | 3.6 | 0.0 | 4.5 | 3.3 | 53.0 | 16.7 | 87.0 | 14.5 |
| Houston: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 8,417 | 2,060 | 313 | 751 | 996 | 2,683 | 1,295 | 1,388 | 3,674 |
| Minority (percent)..... | 27.8 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 9.3 | 12.3 | 61.9 | 33.4 | 88.5 | 12.4 |
| Negro..... | 19.1 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 47.9 | 23.7 | 70.5 | 6.3 |
| Spanish-American..... | 8.7 | 6.6 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 8.1 | 14.1 | 9.7 | 18.1 | 6.1 |
| Memphis: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 10,729 | 2,783 | 433 | 1,311 | 1,039 | 3,980 | 1,486 | 2,494 | 3,969 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 41.7 | 20.9 | 2.8 | 32.5 | 14.0 | 65.8 | 13.9 | 96.7 | 32.2 |
| Baton Rouge: | | | | | | | | | |
| Total number..... | 1,990 | 597 | 97 | 230 | 252 | 702 | 401 | 301 | 709 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 16.4 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 41.6 | 20.0 | 70.4 | 4.2 |

Source: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "For All the People . . . By All the People: A Report on Equal Opportunity in State and Local Government Employment," 1969.

TABLE 5.—MINORITY GROUP EMPLOYMENT AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD, NOV. 30, 1970

| Category | Minority group employment | | | | | Category | Minority group employment | | | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | All employees | Negro employment | | Other minority groups | | | All employees | Negro employment | | Other minority groups | |
| | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total |
| Total employment..... | 1,018 | 226 | 22.2 | 8 | 0.8 | Wage board grades (total)..... | 95 | 58 | 61.0 | 2 | 2.1 |
| Board members..... | 7 | 1 | 14.3 | | | \$5,000 to \$5,999..... | 41 | 30 | 73.2 | 1 | 2.4 |
| Official staff..... | 66 | (1) | | | | \$6,000 to \$7,999..... | 26 | 16 | 61.5 | 1 | 3.8 |
| FR grades (total)..... | 850 | 167 | 19.6 | 8 | .9 | \$8,000 to \$9,999..... | 21 | 11 | 52.4 | | |
| FR 12 to 15..... | 273 | 12 | 4.4 | 4 | 1.5 | \$10,000 to \$11,999..... | 6 | 1 | 16.7 | | |
| FR 8 to 11..... | 202 | 6 | 3.0 | | | \$12,000 to \$13,999..... | 1 | | | | |
| FR 5 to 7..... | 232 | 60 | 25.9 | 2 | .9 | | | | | | |
| FR 1 to 4..... | 143 | 89 | 62.2 | | | | | | | | |

¹ In early 1971, 1 Negro officer (the Director of Equal Employment Opportunity) was added to the Board's staff.

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 6.—EMPLOYMENT IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS AND BRANCHES, BY RACE, 1968 AND 1971

| Federal Reserve Bank, including branches | 1968 | | | | | 1971 | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| | Total employment | Negro employment | | Other minorities ¹ | | Total employment | Negro employment | | Other minorities ¹ | |
| | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total |
| Boston..... | 1,203 | 68 | 5.6 | 6 | 0.5 | 1,475 | 141 | 9.6 | 33 | 2.2 |
| New York..... | 4,032 | 726 | 18.0 | 97 | 2.4 | 4,829 | 1,277 | 26.4 | 206 | 4.3 |
| Philadelphia..... | 899 | 85 | 9.4 | | | 1,048 | 184 | 17.6 | 6 | .6 |
| Cleveland..... | 1,381 | 102 | 7.4 | 2 | .1 | 1,404 | 148 | 10.5 | 1 | .1 |
| Richmond..... | 1,453 | 280 | 19.3 | 1 | .1 | 1,916 | 423 | 22.1 | 13 | .7 |
| Atlanta..... | 1,489 | 213 | 14.3 | 7 | .5 | 1,738 | 322 | 18.5 | 20 | 1.2 |
| Chicago..... | 2,613 | 233 | 8.9 | 36 | 1.4 | 2,965 | 483 | 16.3 | 91 | 3.1 |
| St. Louis..... | 1,176 | 195 | 16.6 | | | 1,427 | 321 | 22.5 | 9 | .6 |
| Minneapolis..... | 725 | 6 | .8 | 1 | .1 | 905 | 32 | 3.5 | 5 | .6 |
| Kansas City..... | 1,164 | 69 | 5.9 | 21 | 1.8 | 1,415 | 102 | 7.2 | 35 | 2.5 |
| Dallas..... | 977 | 78 | 8.0 | 44 | 4.5 | 1,131 | 167 | 14.8 | 99 | 8.8 |
| San Francisco..... | 1,866 | 155 | 8.3 | 214 | 11.5 | 2,021 | 212 | 10.5 | 348 | 17.2 |
| All Federal Reserve banks..... | 18,978 | 2,210 | 11.6 | 429 | 2.3 | 22,274 | 3,812 | 17.1 | 866 | 3.9 |

¹ Includes Spanish-Americans, Orientals and American Indians.

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 7.—MANAGERS AND OFFICIALS IN FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS, BY RACE, 1ST QUARTER, 1971

| Federal Reserve Bank | Total number of managers and officials | Negroes | | Other minorities | |
|----------------------|--|---------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total |
| 1. Boston..... | 71 | 0 | | 0 | |
| 2. New York..... | 372 | 6 | 1.6 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 3. Philadelphia..... | 107 | 1 | .9 | 0 | |
| 4. Cleveland..... | 105 | 2 | 1.9 | 0 | |
| 5. Richmond..... | 135 | 1 | .7 | 0 | |
| 6. Atlanta..... | 178 | 4 | 2.2 | 1 | .6 |
| 7. Chicago..... | 322 | 5 | 1.6 | 5 | 1.6 |

| Federal Reserve Bank | Total number of managers and officials | Negroes | | Other minorities | |
|------------------------|--|---------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | Number | Percent of total | Number | Percent of total |
| 8. St. Louis..... | 125 | 1 | .8 | 0 | |
| 9. Minneapolis..... | 89 | 4 | 4.5 | 1 | 1.1 |
| 10. Kansas City..... | 133 | 1 | .8 | 1 | .8 |
| 11. Dallas..... | 99 | 0 | | 3 | 3.0 |
| 12. San Francisco..... | 142 | 1 | .7 | 2 | 1.4 |
| Total..... | 1,878 | 26 | 1.4 | 14 | .8 |

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

TABLE 8.—NEGRO AND WHITE UNEMPLOYMENT RATES DURING RECENT BUSINESS CYCLES (SEASONALLY ADJUSTED)

| Cyclical peaks and troughs | Jobless rates | | | Ratio | Cyclical peaks and troughs | Jobless rates | | | Ratio |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|----------------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|
| | Negro | White | | | | Negro | White | | |
| July 1957..... | 7.9 | 3.7 | 2.14 | | November 1969..... | 6.3 | 3.2 | 1.97 | |
| April 1958..... | 13.8 | 6.7 | 2.06 | | November 1970..... | 9.0 | 5.5 | 1.64 | |
| May 1960..... | 9.7 | 4.6 | 2.11 | | June 1971..... | 9.4 | 5.2 | 1.81 | |
| February 1961..... | 12.8 | 6.2 | 2.06 | | | | | | |

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

APPENDIX: DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT, BY RACE, OCCUPATION, AND INDUSTRY, 1960 AND 1969

(Numbers in thousands; minority groups as percentage of total in each category)

(Note—See notes at end of table for sources and limitations of data)

| Occupation and race | Total, all industries | Oil and gasoline extract | General building contractors | Heavy construction contractors | Special trade contractors | Ordnance and other accessories | Food and kindred products | Textile mill products | Apparel and other textiles | Lumber and wood products | Furniture and fixtures | Paper and allied products |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| SIC code | (13) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (19) | (20) | (22) | (23) | (24) | (25) | (26) | |
| Total employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 64,647 | | | | | | 1,727 | 933 | 1,117 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 10.2 | | | | | | 10.1 | 4.6 | 8.6 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 28,739 | 117 | 197 | 223 | 144 | 252 | 1,094 | 784 | 604 | 385 | 278 | 564 |
| Minorities (percent) | 13.6 | 5.1 | 15.8 | 21.0 | 13.8 | 13.5 | 19.5 | 14.7 | 17.8 | 15.4 | 18.2 | 11.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 10.4 | 3.4 | 12.9 | 15.5 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 13.8 | 13.2 | 11.3 | 13.7 | 13.9 | 9.2 |
| Negro (percent) | 9.5 | 2.4 | 11.7 | 13.3 | 9.2 | 10.6 | 12.4 | 12.8 | 10.3 | 12.7 | 13.4 | 8.8 |
| White collar employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 26,578 | | | | | | 458 | 122 | 151 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 3.8 | | | | | | 2.4 | 2.1 | 5.9 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 13,608 | 58 | 54 | 63 | 28 | 107 | 346 | 119 | 81 | 125 | 51 | 144 |
| Minorities (percent) | 6.8 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 6.4 | 4.9 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 2.7 | 6.6 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 2.6 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 5.1 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| Negro (percent) | 4.1 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.7 | 3.5 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| Managers and officials: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 5,408 | | | | | | 107 | 22 | 30 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 2.3 | | | | | | .7 | .3 | .9 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 2,558 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 8 | 20 | 92 | 44 | 25 | 31 | 18 | 46 |
| Minorities (percent) | 2.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 3.8 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.4 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 2.1 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.9 | .7 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Negro (percent) | 1.5 | .1 | .8 | 1.3 | .8 | 1.3 | 1.7 | .6 | 1.8 | .8 | 1.1 | .7 |
| Professional: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 7,223 | | | | | | 45 | 18 | 12 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 4.9 | | | | | | 3.0 | .6 | 2.7 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 2,351 | 18 | 13 | 17 | 4 | 42 | 26 | 9 | 3 | 20 | 3 | 18 |
| Minorities (percent) | 5.1 | 2.0 | 5.2 | 7.0 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 1.5 | 5.4 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 1.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 4.1 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| Negro (percent) | 2.1 | .3 | .8 | .5 | .6 | 1.0 | 1.3 | .4 | 1.1 | 1.2 | .5 | .7 |
| Technical: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 1,248 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 16 | 17 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 13 |
| Minorities (percent) | 8.9 | 5.4 | 6.2 | 11.0 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 9.1 | 3.7 | 8.3 | 7.7 | 3.2 | 3.2 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 6.9 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 6.4 | 5.2 | 4.0 | 6.6 | 3.1 | 4.6 | 7.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 |
| Negro (percent) | 5.6 | 2.0 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 6.8 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
| Sales workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 4,644 | | | | | | 120 | 10 | 26 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 2.3 | | | | | | 1.4 | .6 | .9 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 2,491 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 113 | 6 | 12 | 8 | 6 | 16 |
| Minorities (percent) | 6.6 | 3.0 | 1.2 | 3.9 | 3.1 | .7 | 5.3 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3.8 | .7 | .9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 4.7 | 2.1 | .4 | 3.2 | 2.6 | .2 | 3.8 | .7 | 1.8 | 2.8 | .4 | .6 |
| Negro (percent) | 4.0 | .4 | .4 | .4 | 1.2 | .0 | 3.2 | .5 | 1.7 | 2.2 | .3 | .4 |
| Office and clerical workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 9,303 | | | | | | 186 | 72 | 83 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 4.6 | | | | | | 3.8 | 3.3 | 9.8 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 4,961 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 10 | 28 | 99 | 50 | 37 | 55 | 20 | 52 |
| Minorities (percent) | 9.4 | 7.0 | 6.1 | 7.8 | 6.8 | 6.3 | 7.1 | 4.3 | 9.8 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.5 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 7.0 | 5.0 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 4.9 | 4.5 | 5.3 | 3.2 | 6.3 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| Negro (percent) | 6.1 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| Blue-collar workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 23,766 | | | | | | 1,229 | 793 | 956 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 10.5 | | | | | | 12.4 | 4.4 | 8.8 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 13,257 | 58 | 124 | 157 | 114 | 139 | 714 | 648 | 511 | 250 | 223 | 412 |
| Minorities (percent) | 17.8 | 5.8 | 19.7 | 26.7 | 15.2 | 19.8 | 25.9 | 16.3 | 19.3 | 20.2 | 21.5 | 14.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 13.3 | 3.8 | 16.1 | 19.8 | 11.4 | 17.3 | 18.1 | 14.7 | 12.1 | 17.9 | 16.4 | 11.5 |
| Negro (percent) | 12.6 | 2.7 | 15.1 | 18.0 | 10.2 | 16.9 | 16.5 | 14.3 | 11.1 | 16.6 | 15.9 | 11.1 |
| Craftsmen: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 8,753 | | | | | | 254 | 116 | 59 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 4.9 | | | | | | 6.3 | 2.1 | 3.4 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 3,901 | 25 | 63 | 68 | 80 | 36 | 112 | 113 | 121 | 62 | 48 | 102 |
| Minorities (percent) | 8.3 | 3.3 | 8.1 | 13.2 | 7.5 | 8.6 | 14.8 | 7.9 | 15.6 | 7.7 | 13.0 | 6.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 5.6 | 2.4 | 6.2 | 8.9 | 5.2 | 6.2 | 9.8 | 6.4 | 9.9 | 6.1 | 9.1 | 4.8 |
| Negro (percent) | 5.0 | 1.2 | 5.5 | 7.8 | 4.0 | 5.8 | 8.5 | 6.1 | 8.9 | 5.4 | 8.9 | 4.6 |
| Operatives: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 11,920 | | | | | | 839 | 638 | 887 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 10.7 | | | | | | 12.6 | 3.8 | 9.0 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 6,739 | 25 | 29 | 43 | 20 | 83 | 305 | 450 | 346 | 102 | 107 | 202 |
| Minorities (percent) | 18.4 | 5.8 | 16.7 | 24.4 | 19.2 | 24.2 | 22.2 | 15.8 | 20.0 | 18.8 | 21.6 | 14.6 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 14.1 | 3.8 | 13.1 | 18.5 | 13.8 | 22.2 | 15.7 | 14.3 | 12.3 | 16.6 | 16.2 | 11.5 |
| Negro (percent) | 13.4 | 2.9 | 12.0 | 15.7 | 12.2 | 21.9 | 14.5 | 13.8 | 11.2 | 15.3 | 15.7 | 11.1 |
| Laborers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 3,093 | | | | | | 135 | 39 | 11 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 25.8 | | | | | | 23.1 | 20.7 | 19.5 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number) | 2,618 | 8 | 33 | 46 | 14 | 20 | 297 | 85 | 44 | 86 | 67 | 108 |
| Minorities (percent) | 38.4 | 14.0 | 44.1 | 48.7 | 53.1 | 22.1 | 33.9 | 30.2 | 24.1 | 30.8 | 27.6 | 22.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent) | 22.9 | 8.1 | 37.2 | 37.2 | 43.7 | 17.3 | 23.8 | 28.3 | 17.0 | 27.8 | 22.1 | 17.8 |
| Negro (percent) | 21.8 | 7.1 | 35.8 | 35.1 | 42.9 | 16.7 | 21.5 | 27.7 | 15.8 | 26.3 | 21.4 | 17.2 |

APPENDIX: DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT, BY RACE, OCCUPATION, AND INDUSTRY, 1960 AND 1969—Continued

[Number in thousands; minority groups as percentage of total in each category]

(Note—See notes at end of table for sources and limitations of data)

| Occupation and race | Total, all industries | Oil and gasoline extract | General building contractors | Heavy construction contractors | Special trade contractors | Ordnance and accessories | Food and kindred products | Textile mill products | Apparel and other textiles | Lumber and wood products | Furniture and fixtures | Paper and allied products |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|
| SIC code | (13) | (15) | (16) | (17) | (19) | (20) | (22) | (23) | (24) | (25) | (26) | |
| Service workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 7,172 | | | | | 40 | 18 | 11 | | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 28.1 | | | | | 27.8 | 30.2 | 30.3 | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 1,874 | 1 | 18 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 33 | 17 | 12 | 10 | 4 | 9 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 33.4 | 32.9 | 22.9 | 30.0 | 50.6 | 24.8 | 30.8 | 35.1 | 29.8 | 41.2 | 27.4 | 23.3 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 28.2 | 28.9 | 20.3 | 27.6 | 43.9 | 21.8 | 25.1 | 33.7 | 22.6 | 39.3 | 25.0 | 21.7 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 26.9 | 27.1 | 17.7 | 16.3 | 42.9 | 20.7 | 24.0 | 33.4 | 22.2 | 38.7 | 24.6 | 21.2 |
| Printing and publishing | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Chemicals and allied products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Petroleum and coal products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rubber and plastic products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Leather and leather products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Stone, clay and glass | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Primary metal products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fabricated metal products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Machinery (except electrical) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Electrical machinery | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transportation equipment | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Instruments and related products | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 1,131 | 833 | | 377 | | 1,198 | 1,246 | 1,524 | 1,445 | 1,733 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 4.2 | 6.2 | | 6.4 | | 11.4 | 5.1 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 7.5 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 541 | 1,930 | 180 | 377 | 205 | 461 | 1,079 | 881 | 1,294 | 1,748 | 1,670 | 339 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 9.1 | 10.3 | 8.4 | 13.2 | 11.6 | 13.2 | 17.6 | 13.3 | 8.3 | 11.1 | 13.4 | 10.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 6.8 | 8.3 | 6.6 | 9.6 | 6.1 | 9.8 | 13.8 | 9.6 | 6.1 | 8.0 | 10.9 | 6.6 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 6.3 | 7.8 | 5.8 | 8.9 | 5.7 | 9.1 | 13.6 | 9.1 | 5.6 | 7.3 | 10.4 | 5.8 |
| White collar employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 655 | 367 | | 96 | | 237 | 380 | 467 | 519 | 468 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.8 | 1.7 | | 1.6 | | 1.6 | 1.6 | .9 | 1.8 | 2.1 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 259 | 433 | 92 | 98 | 116 | 119 | 241 | 224 | 511 | 675 | 564 | 147 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 5.8 | 4.0 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 4.1 | 2.5 | 3.3 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 4.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 4.3 | 3.0 | 3.4 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 3.7 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 1.2 | 2.1 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.1 |
| Managers and officials: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 66 | 54 | | 17 | | 31 | 60 | 74 | 59 | 48 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.0 | .5 | | .2 | | .6 | .3 | .3 | .6 | .6 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 41 | 110 | 21 | 32 | 11 | 37 | 92 | 67 | 118 | 138 | 140 | 29 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.4 | 1.2 | .7 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 1.1 | .8 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 1.0 | .8 | .3 | 1.2 | 1.0 | .9 | 1.7 | .8 | .5 | .9 | 1.4 | .8 |
| Professional: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 100 | 134 | | 22 | | 67 | 124 | 147 | 225 | 221 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.3 | 1.8 | | 1.2 | | .8 | 1.5 | .7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 43 | 92 | 25 | 15 | 1 | 18 | 30 | 25 | 96 | 177 | 168 | 34 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 3.0 | 4.2 | 3.3 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 1.6 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.3 | .9 | .5 | .8 | .6 | 1.1 | 1.0 | .8 | 1.0 |
| Technical: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 14 | 58 | 10 | 11 | 1 | 15 | 30 | 30 | 88 | 125 | 75 | 26 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 8.2 | 6.1 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 6.5 | 3.9 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.2 | 6.5 | 3.8 | 5.6 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.8 | 4.8 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 4.5 | 2.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 3.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 4.1 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 2.6 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 3.1 | 2.1 | 2.6 |
| Sales workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 281 | 47 | | 9 | | 13 | 24 | 34 | 22 | 11 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 3.1 | .5 | | .2 | | .8 | .5 | .4 | .4 | 1.1 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 42 | 49 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 24 | 8 | 10 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 3.8 | 1.9 | 4.8 | 1.3 | .8 | 1.6 | .6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | .8 | 1.5 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.9 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 1.0 | .3 | 1.1 | .4 | .5 | .6 | 1.1 | .4 | 1.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 2.5 | 1.0 | 1.2 | .9 | .2 | .4 | .3 | .3 | .3 | .6 | .2 | .9 |
| Office and clerical workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 207 | 132 | | 47 | | 126 | 172 | 213 | 214 | 236 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 3.8 | 2.4 | | 2.6 | | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 2.3 | 2.3 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 119 | 123 | 32 | 33 | 15 | 40 | 89 | 82 | 175 | 211 | 172 | 48 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 8.5 | 6.1 | 8.2 | 3.5 | 5.9 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 5.9 | 5.5 | 6.0 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 6.5 | 4.4 | 6.1 | 2.5 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 4.3 | 4.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 5.7 | 4.0 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 1.8 | 3.1 | 2.3 | 2.6 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.6 |
| Blue collar workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 463 | 447 | | 274 | | 937 | 846 | 1,033 | 905 | 1,229 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.1 | 9.2 | | 7.6 | | 13.7 | 6.5 | 3.4 | 4.6 | 9.1 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 269 | 474 | 85 | 270 | 171 | 336 | 809 | 643 | 857 | 1,045 | 1,073 | 186 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 11.1 | 15.2 | 12.0 | 16.6 | 12.9 | 16.9 | 22.0 | 16.8 | 11.4 | 15.1 | 18.2 | 14.5 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.0 | 12.8 | 9.6 | 12.0 | 6.6 | 12.5 | 17.3 | 12.0 | 8.2 | 10.8 | 14.7 | 9.4 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 7.6 | 12.2 | 8.9 | 11.2 | 6.2 | 11.8 | 17.0 | 11.6 | 7.8 | 10.2 | 14.4 | 8.4 |
| Craftsmen: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 307 | 142 | | 55 | | 363 | 298 | 436 | 246 | 506 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.9 | 2.5 | | 2.7 | | 6.6 | 2.2 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 4.6 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 135 | 142 | 46 | 42 | 36 | 67 | 218 | 173 | 298 | 211 | 368 | 42 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 4.2 | 6.2 | 4.7 | 7.3 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 9.4 | 7.8 | 5.6 | 7.2 | 9.2 | 6.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.4 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 4.9 | 3.2 | 5.4 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 3.8 | 4.7 | 6.5 | 3.8 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 2.1 | 4.7 | 2.6 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 4.9 | 6.7 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 3.2 |

| Occupation and race | Printing and publishing (27) | Chemicals and allied products (28) | Petroleum and coal products (29) | Rubber and plastic products (30) | Leather and leather products (31) | Stone, clay and glass (32) | Primary metal products (33) | Fabricated metal products (34) | Machinery (except electrical) (35) | Electrical machinery (36) | Transportation equipment (37) | Instruments and related products (38) |
|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| SIC code | (27) | (28) | (29) | (30) | (31) | (32) | (33) | (34) | (35) | (36) | (37) | (38) |
| Operatives: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 143 | 256 | | 202 | | | 406 | 490 | 554 | 627 | 664 | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.4 | 9.6 | | 8.2 | | | 14.6 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 10.9 | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 93 | 252 | 30 | 173 | 103 | 185 | 432 | 351 | 449 | 665 | 616 | 109 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 15.1 | 15.6 | 16.9 | 17.1 | 12.7 | 16.2 | 24.3 | 18.4 | 12.9 | 16.3 | 22.3 | 15.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 11.0 | 13.2 | 14.2 | 13.3 | 6.8 | 11.8 | 19.5 | 13.5 | 9.4 | 12.1 | 18.8 | 10.6 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 10.4 | 13.0 | 13.4 | 12.4 | 6.4 | 11.2 | 19.1 | 13.0 | 9.0 | 11.5 | 18.4 | 9.3 |
| Laborers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 13 | 48 | | 18 | | | 169 | 58 | 43 | 32 | 59 | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 19.9 | 27.4 | | 16.2 | | | 26.6 | 16.9 | 14.9 | 11.1 | 28.0 | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 41 | 80 | 9 | 55 | 32 | 83 | 159 | 119 | 111 | 170 | 89 | 35 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 24.7 | 29.6 | 32.0 | 21.9 | 19.8 | 25.6 | 32.8 | 25.3 | 21.0 | 20.2 | 26.6 | 20.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 19.4 | 23.1 | 27.2 | 13.0 | 10.0 | 19.6 | 25.7 | 18.1 | 15.3 | 13.4 | 21.1 | 13.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 19.0 | 22.7 | 25.2 | 12.4 | 9.2 | 18.5 | 25.3 | 17.5 | 14.9 | 12.7 | 20.6 | 11.6 |
| Service workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 13 | 20 | | 7 | | | 24 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 35 | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 39.6 | 24.3 | | 25.8 | | | 19.3 | 14.9 | 13.3 | 16.5 | 24.0 | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 13 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 20 | 14 | 26 | 27 | 33 | 6 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 37.0 | 26.5 | 24.6 | 21.9 | 13.8 | 21.3 | 22.8 | 20.9 | 16.5 | 23.7 | 27.7 | 22.8 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 33.2 | 23.8 | 21.6 | 19.7 | 11.5 | 18.4 | 19.2 | 18.0 | 13.9 | 19.8 | 25.2 | 18.9 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 32.7 | 23.5 | 21.0 | 19.4 | 11.2 | 17.9 | 19.0 | 17.8 | 13.5 | 19.2 | 24.8 | 18.4 |
| Retail and general merchandise stores: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 933 | | 767 | | | 808 | 868 | 1,912 | 1,463 | 1,257 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.3 | | 7.7 | | | 2.9 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 5.7 | 5.9 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 616 | 118 | 491 | 94 | 327 | 853 | 569 | 1,345 | 1,554 | 731 | 159 | 167 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 11.1 | 23.0 | 10.2 | 32.2 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 7.1 | 10.3 | 11.3 | 9.5 | 12.6 | 16.4 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.2 | 20.3 | 7.8 | 23.6 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 5.7 | 7.7 | 8.7 | 7.2 | 9.3 | 11.2 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 7.8 | 19.6 | 7.2 | 19.5 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 5.2 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 8.1 | 9.8 |
| White collar employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 303 | | 170 | | | 578 | 303 | 1,228 | 1,222 | 809 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.7 | | 2.1 | | | 2.3 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 4.1 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 171 | 27 | 134 | 28 | 182 | 615 | 279 | 835 | 1,228 | 558 | 82 | 138 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 3.2 | 16.0 | 4.0 | 9.3 | 5.8 | 10.3 | 4.5 | 4.4 | 8.0 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 12.2 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.2 | 14.4 | 2.7 | 6.0 | 3.9 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 4.7 | 8.2 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 2.0 | 13.9 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 8.1 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 3.6 | 6.8 |
| Managers and officials: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 80 | | 44 | | | 61 | 45 | 268 | 176 | 136 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | .5 | | 1.1 | | | .4 | .5 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.2 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 31 | 6 | 41 | 6 | 25 | 101 | 68 | 166 | 182 | 73 | 18 | 25 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 1.0 | 5.1 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 3.2 | 2.6 | .9 | 2.0 | 4.2 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 7.4 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | .6 | 4.2 | 1.2 | 3.8 | 2.2 | 2.0 | .6 | 1.4 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 2.1 | 4.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | .5 | 3.8 | 1.0 | 1.3 | .8 | 1.4 | .4 | .8 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| Professional: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 18 | | 6 | | | 87 | 72 | 63 | 20 | 6 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | .7 | | 1.0 | | | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.9 | .3 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 7 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 46 | 71 | 39 | 70 | 14 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 1.9 | 6.8 | 3.7 | 6.0 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 3.2 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 2.8 | 5.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.3 | 6.2 | 2.4 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 2.7 | 3.7 |
| Negro (percent)..... | .5 | 5.7 | 1.8 | 1.3 | .4 | 1.2 | .8 | 1.2 | 2.6 | 3.4 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| Technical: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 8 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 28 | 35 | 72 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 1.8 | 12.4 | 4.1 | 13.2 | 5.2 | 5.2 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 11.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | .8 | 10.8 | 2.9 | 9.1 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 6.1 | 8.0 | 6.3 | 8.5 |
| Negro (percent)..... | .6 | 10.3 | 2.6 | 5.0 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 5.1 | 7.6 | 4.6 | 7.4 |
| Sales workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 2 | | 11 | | | 13 | 9 | 422 | 753 | 369 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.0 | | .4 | | | .3 | .9 | 1.1 | 2.2 | 4.8 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 7 | 9 | 11 | 1 | 56 | 15 | 13 | 251 | 722 | 432 | 42 | 82 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 1.8 | 32.0 | 1.6 | 5.7 | 7.1 | 3.7 | 1.9 | 3.0 | 7.8 | 8.4 | 10.4 | 11.3 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 1.6 | 29.8 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 5.6 | 6.2 | 6.6 | 7.4 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 1.6 | 29.6 | 1.0 | .3 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 4.7 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 6.0 |
| Office and clerical workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 203 | | 108 | | | 416 | 177 | 474 | 272 | 298 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.3 | | 2.7 | | | 2.9 | 1.8 | 4.0 | 7.3 | 4.0 | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 118 | 10 | 74 | 12 | 46 | 400 | 125 | 276 | 297 | 47 | 17 | 29 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 4.0 | 9.5 | 5.5 | 13.9 | 10.5 | 14.4 | 7.6 | 7.3 | 11.2 | 7.9 | 4.9 | 19.5 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.9 | 8.1 | 3.8 | 9.2 | 6.9 | 12.3 | 5.9 | 5.2 | 8.4 | 5.8 | 3.2 | 14.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 2.6 | 7.2 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 11.6 | 5.3 | 4.1 | 7.4 | 5.2 | 1.8 | 12.5 |
| Blue collar workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 591 | | 590 | | | 216 | 550 | 663 | 160 | 415 | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.9 | | 9.1 | | | 2.1 | 11.2 | 14.9 | 11.0 | 7.6 | | |

| Occupation and race | Railroad transportation | Local and suburban passenger transportation | Trucking and warehousing | Water transportation | Air transportation | Communications | Electric, gas, and sanitary services | Wholesale trade | Retail and general merchandising stores | Food stores | Auto dealers and service stations | Apparel and accessories stores | Furniture stores |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|
| SIC code | (40) | (41) | (42) | (44) | (45) | (48) | (49) | (50) | (53) | (54) | (55) | (56) | (57) |
| Blue collar workers—Cont. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 431 | 84 | 345 | 63 | 108 | 223 | 277 | 484 | 192 | 137 | 69 | 20 | 22 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 13.0 | 24.3 | 12.1 | 41.4 | 13.7 | 5.8 | 8.5 | 19.6 | 20.1 | 14.5 | 17.4 | 32.3 | 28.2 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 9.2 | 21.4 | 9.3 | 29.5 | 10.0 | 4.2 | 6.8 | 14.7 | 15.6 | 11.5 | 13.5 | 18.8 | 21.9 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 8.8 | 20.6 | 8.8 | 27.0 | 8.6 | 3.8 | 6.4 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 10.7 | 12.2 | 17.6 | 21.4 |
| Craftsmen: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 270 | | 61 | | | 205 | 295 | 146 | 70 | 31 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 2.1 | | 4.5 | | | 1.6 | 3.2 | 5.0 | 6.3 | 4.1 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 209 | 25 | 50 | 10 | 65 | 206 | 155 | 123 | 49 | 42 | 20 | 6 | 4 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 5.6 | 11.6 | 8.7 | 21.4 | 6.5 | 4.7 | 3.2 | 10.2 | 11.3 | 7.6 | 10.4 | 22.2 | 15.5 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 3.1 | 8.9 | 6.6 | 14.6 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 5.2 | 7.2 | 7.4 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 10.3 | 10.2 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 3.0 | 8.6 | 5.8 | 12.7 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.9 | 6.3 | 6.2 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 9.0 | 9.3 |
| Operatives: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 199 | | 444 | | | 7 | 138 | 391 | 60 | 266 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.4 | | 7.6 | | | 8.2 | 11.7 | 16.0 | 13.5 | 7.7 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 142 | 53 | 226 | 25 | 32 | 14 | 96 | 246 | 83 | 56 | 37 | 6 | 9 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 7.8 | 27.8 | 9.6 | 31.1 | 17.5 | 18.0 | 11.1 | 18.6 | 20.4 | 17.3 | 15.3 | 30.5 | 27.3 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.9 | 25.4 | 7.3 | 21.4 | 13.7 | 14.6 | 9.1 | 14.3 | 16.0 | 14.0 | 12.6 | 18.0 | 20.4 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 5.7 | 24.3 | 6.8 | 15.9 | 12.1 | 13.6 | 8.6 | 13.6 | 14.9 | 13.4 | 11.2 | 16.8 | 19.9 |
| Laborers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 122 | | 85 | | | 4 | 117 | 126 | 30 | 118 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 29.5 | | 20.7 | | | 18.4 | 30.8 | 23.2 | 16.9 | 8.1 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 79 | 6 | 69 | 28 | 11 | 2 | 26 | 115 | 60 | 39 | 13 | 7 | 8 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 41.9 | 44.5 | 22.6 | 57.8 | 45.8 | 25.6 | 30.0 | 31.8 | 26.9 | 18.1 | 33.7 | 43.3 | 35.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 31.4 | 37.1 | 18.0 | 44.4 | 38.0 | 18.6 | 25.9 | 23.6 | 21.8 | 14.6 | 27.8 | 27.2 | 30.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 30.0 | 35.6 | 17.3 | 42.0 | 34.2 | 15.7 | 25.3 | 22.7 | 21.0 | 13.8 | 27.1 | 26.2 | 29.7 |
| Service workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 38 | | 7 | | | 14 | 15 | 22 | 81 | 32 | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 52.9 | | 28.1 | | | 35.9 | 34.6 | 38.4 | 33.7 | 29.3 | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 14 | 7 | 12 | 3 | 37 | 15 | 13 | 26 | 134 | 35 | 7 | 10 | 2 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 49.2 | 34.2 | 24.4 | 46.1 | 17.6 | 36.3 | 35.8 | 28.3 | 28.6 | 18.1 | 25.9 | 42.9 | 51.0 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 48.2 | 30.1 | 21.0 | 37.6 | 14.1 | 33.7 | 33.1 | 24.1 | 25.0 | 14.8 | 21.6 | 38.3 | 42.6 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 47.8 | 29.1 | 20.4 | 18.0 | 11.2 | 31.9 | 32.8 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 13.4 | 20.2 | 37.2 | 42.2 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Occupation and race | Eating, drinking places | Miscellaneous retail stores | Banking | Credit agencies | Security, commodity brokers | Insurance carriers | Insurance agents, etc. | Hotels, other lodging | Personal services | Miscellaneous business services | Motion pictures | Medical, other health | Educational services |
| SIC code | (58) | (59) | (60) | (61) | (62) | (63) | (64) | (70) | (72) | (73) | (78) | (80) | (82) |
| Total employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 1,412 | | | | | | | 474 | | | | 2,196 | 3,265 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 15.2 | | | | | | | 23.7 | | | | 14.4 | 9.4 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 282 | 169 | 651 | 123 | 128 | 837 | 65 | 189 | 96 | 733 | 55 | 1,387 | 863 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 29.7 | 13.1 | 12.1 | 7.4 | 7.8 | 9.1 | 5.9 | 38.6 | 41.7 | 18.7 | 15.8 | 20.6 | 13.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 23.1 | 10.5 | 8.8 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 7.0 | 4.5 | 27.2 | 32.9 | 15.2 | 11.1 | 17.4 | 11.4 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 21.6 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 23.8 | 31.8 | 14.1 | 9.4 | 15.7 | 9.7 |
| White collar employment: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 150 | | | | | | | 119 | | | | 1,272 | 2,604 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 6.6 | | | | | | | 4.1 | | | | 6.6 | 7.5 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 52 | 121 | 614 | 118 | 125 | 809 | 63 | 42 | 29 | 416 | 32 | 813 | 661 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 12.0 | 8.1 | 10.9 | 6.1 | 7.5 | 8.4 | 5.5 | 11.8 | 10.3 | 7.8 | 13.0 | 12.1 | 8.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 9.2 | 6.0 | 7.7 | 3.5 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 4.1 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 6.9 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 8.2 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 2.7 | 4.0 | 5.6 | 3.4 | 5.3 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 7.2 | 7.8 | 4.9 |
| Managers and officials: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 74 | | | | | | | 42 | | | | 38 | 66 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 6.4 | | | | | | | 4.0 | | | | 3.6 | 4.8 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 23 | 20 | 114 | 26 | 12 | 103 | 8 | 11 | 7 | 63 | 5 | 60 | 45 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 10.3 | 4.4 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.4 | 11.1 | 7.7 | 4.6 | 5.8 | 6.7 | 4.6 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 8.3 | 3.6 | 1.8 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 7.8 | 5.6 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 4.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 7.3 | 2.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.5 |
| Professional: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 12 | | | | | | | 9 | | | | 842 | 2,194 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 13.7 | | | | | | | 4.8 | | | | 7.2 | 7.8 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 2 | 7 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 94 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 123 | 10 | 351 | 359 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 9.8 | 9.8 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.7 | 9.9 | 22.8 | 4.4 | 11.6 | 9.1 | 6.8 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 6.7 | 8.3 | 3.0 | 2.8 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 7.8 | 13.0 | 3.4 | 9.1 | 7.5 | 5.9 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 5.5 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 6.2 | 8.1 | 1.7 | 5.2 | 4.2 | 3.3 |
| Technical: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 1 | 4 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 39 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 60 | 3 | 191 | 65 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 26.3 | 4.7 | 10.8 | 8.0 | 8.4 | 7.1 | 4.0 | 17.7 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 24.1 | 20.4 | 14.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 13.9 | 3.9 | 8.0 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 3.2 | 14.9 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 15.7 | 17.4 | 12.5 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 11.0 | 2.6 | 5.9 | 4.2 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 12.2 | 5.2 | 4.6 | 13.2 | 15.7 | 10.2 |
| Sales workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 16 | | | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | 6 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.5 | | | | | | | 7.3 | | | | 6.9 | 2.4 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 11 | 69 | 3 | 4 | 33 | 168 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 32 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 13.4 | 8.4 | 4.5 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 6.9 | 8.2 | 5.3 | 7.6 | 10.9 | 6.1 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 10.4 | 6.0 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 3.9 | 6.8 | 3.9 | 5.8 | 9.5 | 5.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 8.5 | 5.2 | 2.2 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 3.2 | 5.1 | 7.7 | 3.8 |

| Occupation and race | Eating, drinking places | Miscellaneous retail stores | Banking | Credit agencies | Security, commodity brokers | Insurance carriers | Insurance agents, etc. | Hotels, other lodging | Personal services | Miscellaneous business services | Motion pictures | Medical, other health | Educational services |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| SIC code | (58) | (59) | (60) | (61) | (62) | (63) | (64) | (70) | (72) | (73) | (78) | (80) | (82) |
| Office and clerical workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 47 | | | | | | | 66 | | | | 389 | 338 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 5.5 | | | | | | | 4.0 | | | | 5.5 | 5.8 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 15 | 21 | 470 | 81 | 74 | 406 | 32 | 24 | 8 | 138 | 13 | 207 | 188 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 14.0 | 11.6 | 13.3 | 7.8 | 11.4 | 11.9 | 8.5 | 13.1 | 14.9 | 12.6 | 15.4 | 11.2 | 9.3 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 10.6 | 8.8 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 7.5 | 9.1 | 6.1 | 7.8 | 11.1 | 9.5 | 10.6 | 8.9 | 7.7 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 9.4 | 7.5 | 8.0 | 3.5 | 6.3 | 8.0 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 10.0 | 8.4 | 9.4 | 7.9 | 6.5 |
| Blue collar workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 31 | | | | | | | 51 | | | | 141 | 149 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 17.8 | | | | | | | 17.2 | | | | 13.8 | 10.8 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 30 | 25 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 1 | 31 | 61 | 166 | 11 | 99 | 81 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 37.8 | 20.0 | 28.8 | 30.2 | 18.9 | 26.8 | 9.9 | 39.9 | 55.5 | 27.2 | 10.0 | 25.2 | 18.6 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 30.0 | 15.8 | 22.9 | 28.9 | 14.5 | 22.7 | 9.2 | 27.5 | 43.9 | 22.2 | 5.0 | 20.0 | 15.3 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 28.5 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 24.5 | 10.7 | 20.1 | 7.7 | 25.3 | 42.6 | 21.3 | 3.7 | 18.8 | 14.2 |
| Craftsmen: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 14 | | | | | | | 28 | | | | 67 | 92 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 14.2 | | | | | | | 8.0 | | | | 6.2 | 6.8 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 7 | 5 | 3 | 1 | (2) | 5 | (2) | 10 | 4 | 46 | 5 | 22 | 29 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 37.4 | 10.8 | 33.8 | 16.5 | 22.7 | 11.9 | 9.5 | 20.8 | 37.0 | 10.1 | 6.4 | 13.9 | 8.2 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 28.6 | 7.4 | 30.3 | 15.8 | 20.5 | 10.6 | 8.3 | 13.4 | 29.3 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 10.8 | 6.2 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 25.9 | 4.6 | 6.8 | 4.6 | 9.4 | 5.1 | 5.3 | 11.3 | 27.7 | 5.8 | 2.5 | 9.2 | 5.5 |
| Operatives: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 12 | | | | | | | 15 | | | | 62 | 33 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 19.7 | | | | | | | 31.6 | | | | 19.9 | 16.0 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 9 | 12 | 6 | (2) | 1 | 4 | (2) | 9 | 45 | 70 | 5 | 47 | 23 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 33.1 | 18.0 | 26.6 | 37.5 | 24.2 | 24.1 | 6.1 | 41.2 | 55.5 | 28.4 | 12.7 | 27.6 | 22.8 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 27.7 | 14.1 | 18.9 | 34.5 | 17.5 | 18.7 | 0 | 30.1 | 44.7 | 22.6 | 6.0 | 21.6 | 19.0 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 26.6 | 12.3 | 15.9 | 32.8 | 14.6 | 17.5 | 6.1 | 28.2 | 43.5 | 21.8 | 3.6 | 20.6 | 18.2 |
| Laborers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 5 | | | | | | | 8 | | | | 12 | 24 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 23.6 | | | | | | | 20.8 | | | | 25.1 | 18.5 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 14 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | (1) | 12 | 12 | 50 | 1 | 30 | 28 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 41.1 | 28.8 | 25.8 | 36.5 | 10.9 | 42.1 | 31.2 | 54.8 | 62.2 | 41.3 | 16.6 | 29.8 | 25.7 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 32.2 | 23.6 | 21.3 | 35.8 | 7.6 | 45.6 | 0.0 | 37.1 | 46.2 | 36.0 | 10.6 | 24.0 | 21.5 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 31.0 | 22.0 | 20.9 | 35.2 | 7.2 | 45.4 | 31.2 | 34.8 | 44.8 | 34.9 | 9.9 | 23.1 | 19.8 |
| Service workers: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1960: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 1,231 | | | | | | | 304 | | | | 784 | 512 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 16.2 | | | | | | | 32.5 | | | | 27.3 | 18.7 |
| 1969: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total (number)..... | 200 | 23 | 27 | 3 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 116 | 6 | 151 | 12 | 475 | 121 |
| Minorities (percent)..... | 33.1 | 32.1 | 32.3 | 42.4 | 21.1 | 35.2 | 23.6 | 48.1 | 53.2 | 39.5 | 29.0 | 34.0 | 36.9 |
| Nonwhite (percent)..... | 25.7 | 28.5 | 29.1 | 40.0 | 15.8 | 30.1 | 21.4 | 34.4 | 42.8 | 33.3 | 22.1 | 29.5 | 33.8 |
| Negro (percent)..... | 24.1 | 27.9 | 28.6 | 39.4 | 15.2 | 29.4 | 19.9 | 30.2 | 41.4 | 32.2 | 20.6 | 28.5 | 32.9 |

¹ In 1960 census, professional and technical workers were not separated.
² Less than 500.

Sources: (1) Statistics on numbers employed in 1960 are from Bureau of Census, Census of Population, 1960, "Occupational Characteristics", Final Report PC (2)-7A, table 3, pp. 21-30. Percentage distributions were calculated in the Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Reserve Board. (2) Statistics on numbers employed in 1969 are from the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Report EEO-1. These data are collected annually under title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In most cases, reports are received from companies with 100 or more permanent employees. Consequently, the coverage varies substantially from industry to industry, depending on the prevalence of small firms. An indication of the degree of coverage, by broad industry groups, is provided by a comparison of 1967 EEO-1 reported employment with 1966 total employment reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics:

| | | Employment (in thousands) | | |
|---------|--|---------------------------|------------|----------------|
| SIC | Industry | December 1966 BLS | 1967 EEO-1 | Percent of BLS |
| (10-14) | Mining..... | 626.9 | 347.0 | 55.4 |
| (15-17) | Contract construction..... | 3,121.5 | 542.2 | 17.4 |
| (19-39) | Manufacturing..... | 19,418.9 | 14,831.3 | 76.4 |
| (40-49) | Transportation, communication, electric, gas, and sanitary services..... | 4,199.0 | 3,109.3 | 74.0 |
| (50-59) | Wholesale and retail trade..... | 14,254.4 | 4,373.5 | 30.7 |
| (60-67) | Finance, insurance, and real estate..... | 3,104.2 | 1,742.2 | 56.1 |
| (70-89) | Services..... | 9,731.0 | 3,224.1 | 33.2 |

PRESIDENT NIXON IS KEEPING HIS WORD

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, last week the President of the United States withdrew an additional 2,500 soldiers from Vietnam.

On January 20, 1969, there were 532,500 Americans enduring the perils of an Asian war. Today, there are 210,000 Americans in Vietnam who are planning to come home.

Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is keeping his word.

ALAN PATON OF SOUTH AFRICA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Alan Paton, a South African novelist and politician recently visited the United States after being exiled in his own country for 11 years. In a Washington Post interview, June 15, Paton revealed some of the sobering experiences of a white, liberal dissenter in a sovereign state. He warned that law and order is often a form of violence which is not necessarily limited to lawbreakers. In a separate speech made at Harvard, Paton further points out the

volatile nature of law and order when there is a polarization between law and order and individual rights.

The concept of law and order naturally has certain merits, but when carried to extremes it can be dangerously repressive as revealed in the Post article and Harvard speech which I submit for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, June 15, 1971]

ALAN PATON: ON THE MOVE AGAIN
 (By Michael Kernan)

On Dec. 5, 1960, the South African liberal dissenter, writer Alan Paton, touched down at Jan Smuts Airport in Johannesburg. He had just addressed the World Council of Churches in Geneva and had received the Freedom Award in New York, placing him in the company of Roosevelt, Churchill, Eisenhower and Hammarskjöld.

As Paton got off the plane he was met by South African government officials. They did not congratulate him. They took away his passport. Dissent is not appreciated in South Africa.

Last month, after 11 years of exile in his own country, Paton's travel rights were restored, and he set off on a world trip with his wife, Anne, gathering material for a biography and collecting some of the honors the world has waited so long to give him.

He comes here from an unhappy country, where a man can be forbidden to see his friends, to leave his neighborhood, to write or speak in public if he is suspected of being politically dangerous, a country where in the name of law and order fear has all but strangled the most elementary civil liberties.

"Why did they let me out? The reasons are shrouded in mystery," said Paton as he sat over breakfast in the Jockey Club yesterday. He was in Washington for a few days to see diplomatic friends and to visit Congress. Laconic but alert after a late night, he discussed his boiled egg with the waiter, settling upon 3½ minutes after Mrs. Paton reminded him Washington is at sea level, unlike his home.

The author of "Cry, the Beloved Country," a wrenching, eloquent novel of South Africa's racial tragedy later made into a Broadway opera-drama with Kurt Weill's haunting music, Paton for years has been the voice of individual liberty in South Africa. He is reportedly about to get honorary degrees from Harvard—he would say yesterday only that he is going to Boston to be honored by "an eastern university"—and from Trent University in Ontario and Edinburgh University in Scotland.

Politely posing for pictures outside the Fairfax Hotel, even while a State Department limousine waited in the drive, he said his next stop is New York to see actors Hume Cronyn and Jessica Tandy. They are considering a stage version of "For You Departed," his account of his 39-year marriage to his first wife, Doris, who died in 1967. Paton remarried in 1969.

Up in the hotel room he cajoled Mrs. Paton into another picture ("I always photograph so terribly," she said). They will tour France, Spain, Italy and Portugal, where they will see the widow of Roy Campbell, the South African poet whose biography Paton is writing. Then back to Botha's Hill, the author's aerie near Durban. Now 68, he hopes to finish the work in three years. Then, perhaps, he will return to fiction, which he sees as frequently more effective in conveying the truth about his country than nonfiction or polemic.

The Patons first flew to San Francisco, Las Vegas ("where we lost all our money"), Yosemite, Bryce Canyon and Grand Canyon. One notable difference in our national parks since Paton's last visit there: black tourists. There were none before.

"I see a polarization in this country between law and order and individual rights," he said. "It hasn't gone as far in America as in South Africa, luckily. In South Africa the law and order boys have won. I mean to speak about this."

A nation founded in fear—of Britain and later of the black continent itself—South Africa is run by Afrikaners, descendants of the Dutch Boer settlers, representing about half of the white population and one-tenth of the total population. Their domination of the huge nonwhite majority is complete and unrelenting.

"We never had anything like the Bill of Rights," Paton added. "The Magna Carta is not a part of our Roman-Dutch legal tradition. In South Africa Parliament is absolute sovereign, and security of the state has been exalted above freedom of the individual."

The myth of world Communism, still an article of faith for many Afrikaners, led to the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950

and since then ever more ominous power has been given to the Minister of Justice. The basic weapon is the ban.

The ban can be placed at the minister's personal discretion on anyone he so much as suspects of wittingly or unwittingly "furthering the aims of Communism."

Bans are for five years and are renewable. No appeal to the courts is allowed. On pain of prison sentence the banned person may not leave a specified area. He may not attend public or simple social gatherings: A man cannot attend his own birthday party. He may not publish any statement whatsoever. He also can be forbidden to enter schools, law courts, publishing offices, harbors or railroad stations. He may not belong to whatever organizations the minister specifies. He may not communicate with any other banned person. There is more.

In a 1964 essay in his collection, "The Long View," Paton says this:

"I should like to combat strongly the view that if you are a law-abiding person, you have nothing to fear. It simply is not true. . . .

"A leading member of the Liberal Party died in Northern Natal. At his funeral another leading member was taken away for questioning. He had broken no law. He could have been taken away on any other occasion. But he was taken away on this particular occasion so that as many people as possible could see that it was dangerous to belong to the Liberal Party.

"... Christopher Shabalala was traveling by train in the Underberg district on legitimate Liberal Party business. The police stopped the train in the middle of nowhere and removed him in the sight of all the passengers. No charge was ever laid against him. . . . Let no one believe that the terrible powers of the state are meant to frighten only the law-breakers. They are meant to frighten us all."

The Liberal Party, of which Paton is national chairman, has been stamped down repeatedly by a government which fears liberals as "the prime promoters of Communism" even as it fears the slightest whisper of opposition.

It is said that Paton has not been banned so far because of his world reputation, but so many party colleagues and friends have been banned or imprisoned that it amounts almost to the same thing, for he is not allowed to see these people.

"Of course, you always get a percentage of people who will say what they feel no matter what," the writer said quietly, peering over his glasses. "It is wrong to suggest that the whole population is cowed."

Nevertheless, he saw little chance of a black uprising, for all political organization by nonwhites has been forbidden, representation at the polls is virtually nonexistent, the growth of black national pride has been cut short by the Bantustan policy which separates various black groups into homelands. Leaders of these areas are beginning to make demands, Paton noted, but there is no purely political organization.

Paton has spoken repeatedly against violence, which he sees as another of the issues polarizing South Africans. Yesterday he cast new light on his views:

"If you're living in South Africa you can be banned—or put away—for even indicating you favor violence. So you can't say anything about it. A person like myself is temperamentally unsuited for violence; I don't see any solution through violence. But then, I'm not black.

"Law and order sometimes is itself a form of violence. You know the argument of black revolutionaries, that violence is being done to them, that they live in a violent society in the first place."

America's attitude to South Africa's escalating repressions he finds ambivalent. (In 1947 and 1952 South African Michael Scott

came to New York to address the United Nations. He was given a U.S. visa that restricted him not merely to New York City but to the route between his hotel and the UN Building.)

Even more ambivalent, says Paton, is South Africa's attitude toward the outside world. At a recent election Prime Minister Balthazar J. Vorster eliminated a right-wing extremist, and a more outward looking policy was indicated instead of rigid white supremacy.

"One looked forward to some changes," the writer said. "In actual fact, security has been tightened. Since I've been given a passport, we like to think the situation is easing up. But one is never sure. One never knows what will happen next."

(TEXT OF REMARKS OF ALAN PATON, NOVELIST AND LEADER OF THE LIBERAL PARTY OF SOUTH AFRICA, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATED HARVARD ALUMNI IN HARVARD YARD ON THE AFTERNOON OF COMMENCEMENT, JUNE 17, 1971)

It is a great honour, but it is also a considerable challenge to address the Alumni of Harvard University, of whom I am one of the very youngest. What should one say on such an occasion? It seems to me that it would be inappropriate to discuss writing or letters, even though it is because of these that I have become one of you today. It is clear to me that the theme which occupies our minds, even obsesses them, is the life of man in society. To discuss this as a philosopher should, is beyond my powers, nor would it be appropriate. To discuss the life of man in American society would be in me presumptuous, although I follow his contemporary history with great attention. A discussion of the life of man in South African society would be too specialised a theme. So I am going to talk on "Our Two Countries."

I first visited the United States in 1946, and was overwhelmed by it, by its size and its competence, and its extraordinary mood of optimism and confidence; the mood of doubt and anxiety was then rarely encountered. I left it with a multitude of impressions, of which one was easily the greatest and most easily remembered. That was the way in which the founders of your society had dared to set down in black and white a charter for the future, which was to be subscribed to then and there, which was to be amendable only in ways which were purposely made difficult, and which was not only to limit the power of the law-makers, but which was to subject their laws to the scrutiny of the highest court of the land. That there were defects in this fundamental constitution I have no doubt, but they did not obscure for me the majesty of the conception. And it was a natural consequence of your colonial history that the liberties of men should have been protected against the attacks of overweening authority.

The position in my own country is quite different. Parliament is sovereign, and this sovereignty has enabled it to embark on a programme of racial legislation the like and scope of which have never before been seen in the history of man. If one supports these laws, one calls them laws of racial differentiation, laws for the preservation of racial identity, laws ensuring the peaceful and harmonious social and cultural and political development of all the different racial groups in the country, laws enabling them to move side by side but separately to their own individual and autonomous destinies. If one does not support these laws, one calls them laws of racial discrimination, and one regards the ideal of separate autonomous development as unrealistic, particularly in a country whose economy has

brought together the people of all its races, even though their status within that economy is decided by ideological rather than by economic considerations. What is more, one does not believe it possible to implement such laws without inflicting hardship and suffering on voteless and voiceless people.

At this point there is something that I should make quite clear. When I am honoured by your University, and am invited to address its alumni, I have one overriding obligation, and that is to speak that truth which is the object of pursuit of every university which deserves the name. That is what I am trying to do now, and I am trying to do it as a university man should, soberly and clearly, without offensiveness. I might have chosen some safer subject, but I would much rather speak on a subject which is related to our lives and our aspirations. And this brings me to another issue that vitally concerns our two countries.

To what does one give one's highest loyalty? A religious person—which I myself am, though of no great quality—could claim that his highest loyalty is given to God, which is a just claim and a safe claim only when it is made humbly. A person who claims to have no religion could justly claim that his highest loyalty is to the truth, and that also is a safe claim only when it is made humbly. But in what way can one's highest loyalty be given to one's country? Surely only in one way, and that is when one wishes with all one's heart, and tries with all one's powers, to make it a better country, to make it more just and more tolerant and more merciful, and if it is powerful, more wise in the use of its power. I should add that I am stating a very high ideal, because it is seldom that one wishes a thing with all one's heart or tries to do it with all one's might, even though there are sometimes external observers who imagine one to be doing just that. But when loyalty to one's country means loyalty to some party or some government or some policy, or even to that mythical power known as the State, there are many people in both your country and mine who find it difficult, and sometimes impossible, to give that kind of loyalty. I would find it difficult to say what love of South Africa means to me. It certainly means a love of the place where I was born, a love of the physical land, of mountain and river and plain, a love of its infinite variety, a love of its peoples and especially of those who have suffered for the things that they believe in. South Africa is often called a land of fear, and so it is. But it is also a land of great courage—and so is this. A friend of mine was once asked at a symposium, "if you did not live in South Africa, where would you like to live?" to which he gave the totally unexpected answer, "if I did not live in South Africa that's where I should like to live." My own views and beliefs which are often called un-South African, were made nowhere else but there in South Africa, just as many of the views that are called un-American were made nowhere else but in America.

Now when people hold un-South African and un-American views, there is a great temptation on the part of rulers to take steps against them. I should say at once that protest in South Africa has never been as vigorous and as widespread as it is in the United States. And I should say at once that the reason for that is that one has to pay a much higher price for protest in South Africa. Therefore one is tempted to conclude that if rulers took a firmer line in the United States, protest would to some extent die away. And in order to take a firmer line, rulers would have to interfere with that charter that was subscribed to when your country achieved its independence, and would have to curtail that liberty

the entrenchment of which was the firm resolve of your founders, and would have to adopt the methods of Hitler and Stalin, which methods have rightly been held in such abhorrence by Americans.

So it is—in your country as well as mine—that there comes this schism between those who believe that the maintenance of law and order is the prime obligation of any good society, and those who believe that the preservation of civil liberty is the prime obligation. And this schism is made more bewildering by the coming into being of other schisms which are related but not identical—between the rich and the poor, the old and the young, the white and the black, the rulers and the ruled. The temptation to achieve conformity by legislation is very powerful, and I hope that the American people will never yield to it, because it will mean the erosion of liberty and the rule of law, and that is what it has meant in my own country, whose parliament has sovereign power, and whose government is representative of one-eighth of the total population.

It may distress you that the blemishes of your body are so visible to the outside world. But at least you lance your boils and suppurations. It would be a tragic error of judgment if you allowed yourselves to believe that a total bandagement would restore your body to health. You at least know you are sick. We do not believe that we are. It is true I think to say that we do not really know what goes on beneath the all-covering mantle of our law and order.

It is time for me to be drawing towards a close, but I want to note one more difference between our country and yours. We are both countries of many races, but whereas your policy—with many halts and hesitations—has been to aim at one American society, our policy—vacillating under earlier governments but determined under the Nationalist government—is to create a multi-racial society, with its African nations, which comprise 70% of the total population, allotted various portions of the country which total something like 13% of the total area, and the aim of the policy is to create homelands where these national groups will achieve cultural, social, economic and eventually—in ideal theory—political autonomy. To a person like myself the policy is a self-deception, a way of disposing of a problem by putting it somewhere else. The possibility of achieving economic independence, or even a healthy economic interdependence, by people whose average earnings are often one-tenth or less of the average earnings of white South Africa, seems totally remote. And it is a source of grief, frustration, and anger and hatred to many that the policy of separate development seems likely to make real economic advance improbable, if not impossible.

I was the President of the inter-racial Liberal Party which was made illegal in 1968, and we opposed uncompromisingly the policies of separate development, and the creation of what we would have called subservient sub-governments. Now I find myself hoping that all our people who are not white, will make the fullest use of these instruments of power which are being put into their hands by the architects of separate development, no matter how feeble they may be; for the creation of these instruments has made it possible for the leaders of these sub-governments to speak with authority to an audience they could never have reached before. And it would be my hope that this would be a stage in our development towards some kind of common society. For in my view no other kind of society could ever give to black men a just share in the fruits of their labour and the earth.

I am often asked the question as to whether Americans should withdraw all invest-

ment in South Africa. I know this view is strongly held by some, and I respect it, but it is not my own. If those American enterprises in South Africa—and there are not a great many—and here I am quoting from the statement of the Polaroid Corporation entitled "An Experiment in South Africa," would improve dramatically the salaries and other benefits of their non-white employees, then I have no doubt that this would exert a moral pressure on South African employers to do the same. It is my opinion—that apart from any colour of skin or difference of race and culture—the great disparity between white and black wages leads, paradoxically enough, to an intensification of white fear, for people of other colours and races, when they also, owing to their poverty, live a totally different kind of economic life, seem more alien and more other than ever. Therefore I stand not for the withdrawal of American investment but for this dramatic improvement in salaries and benefits.

Now I have reached my end. Your tribulations are known to the whole world. Some of us in the outside world derive satisfaction from them. Some of us in South Africa believe that your troubles are due to your policies of racial integration, and such people are trying anew to prove that separate can be equal. Yet you should not be discouraged by this. The problems of racial prejudice and friction, the problems caused by man's destruction and pollution of his environment, the problem of war and of deluding oneself—after all these centuries of experience—that war can make the world better, the problem of the terrible gulf that yawns between the rich and the poor, the problem of the impersonality and meaninglessness of human life, especially in the great city, they are our problems too, even if only in miniature. It is foolish of us to gloat when you appear to fail to solve them, for are we any better, any wiser than you? Therefore you must regard yourselves as the testing ground of the world, and of the human race. If you fail, it will not be America that fails, but all of us.

And may I say a word to the younger people of my audience? I understand well your dissatisfaction with the world that we have made. But I do not believe that one can make it any better by withdrawing from it. I understand your argument that if you take part in it, you are only prolonging its existence. I understand your argument that if you take part in it, it will corrupt you—just as it has corrupted us. But it is not a very good or a very brave argument. The only way in which one can make endurable man's inhumanity to man, and man's destruction of his own environment, is to exemplify in your own lives man's humanity to man and man's reverence for the place in which he lives. It is a hard thing to do, but when was it ever easy to take upon one's shoulders the responsibility for man and his world? So good luck to you all.

THE NATICK COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of legislation to establish a Standing Committee on the Environment, and aware as I am of the deep and pervasive concerns for increased environmental action, it was with much interest that I have followed the activities of the community improvement project of Natick, which is located

within my 10th Congressional District, in Massachusetts. Marjory West, the chairman of the community improvement project in Natick, has been in touch with me, reporting the results of a questionnaire distributed within Natick, and the findings are highly relevant, and worthy of widespread attention.

I would like to include the communication I received from Marjory West of the community improvement project in Natick in my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MARGARET HECKLER: As you no doubt remember, last Fall, the Evening Division Club of Natick sent out questionnaires to determine where the interest of the people lay as far as ecology projects were concerned. The results of the returned questionnaires indicated that the people of Natick wanted something done about waste paper, cans, and bottles. We have been working on this for almost a year, along with the Public Works Department Commissioners and other town committees interested in recycling.

The Bostonia Beverage Company on Mill Street has set up a center to recycle anything glass—to be delivered to them any day and put into separate barrels outside the plant. Glass should be separated by color (clear, green and amber) and deposited in the proper barrels.

The Ecology Club at Natick High School has been busy collecting cans for recycling and will continue these collections until January.

The Public Works Department has been most cooperative in arranging a separate monthly collection of cans for all town residents. They have also provided, through arrangements with Arena Brothers, a receptacle for these cans at the dump. The cans should be rinsed and flattened, and all labels removed. (This can be done easily by removing both ends of the can and stepping on it.) The reason for flattening the cans is that they take up less room in your trash barrel (plastic bags cannot be used) and require less space in the town trucks picking them up. Rinsing them keeps the bugs and animals away and is obviously done for sanitary reasons. This monthly collection will start in January and notice will be given as to the date of collection in your area.

With the amount of waste presently put in our dump, the life expectancy is none too great. Purchasing new land, with new routes to and from the dump site, will certainly be a nuisance and cost tax dollars we do not wish to spend. Isn't it worth a little more time and effort now?

I do hope that your members and friends will cooperate in making this a successful and rewarding project for the Town of Natick.

Sincerely,

MARJORY WEST,
Community Improvement Project Chairman.

OBJECTION TO SOUTH AFRICAN SUGAR QUOTA

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 4, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, this Congressman was deeply disturbed on Monday evening, October 4, when after a long session in which the House disposed of many bills, the conference report on H.R. 8866, Sugar Act Amendments of 1971,

was brought to the floor. This report was not on the printed agenda for the day, although it is well known that H.R. 8866 is one of the most controversial bills to be handled in this legislative year.

The reason is known to all. The bill contains a handout represented by a sugar quota of nearly 60,000 tons to the Republic of South Africa. As one who fought this needless benefit to a country that practices the world's most deplorable racist policy, I opposed the conference report because it reduced the South Africa quota by a nominal amount only.

Unfortunately, the parliamentary situation did not permit actual debate by any Member on this burning issue.

I have never advocated the elimination of the South Africa sugar quota merely as retaliation for the incidents of discrimination against Africans of black color and their American friends. My opposition has been based in part on the fact that almost alone among the nations benefiting from American largess, South Africa is a developed and prosperous country. It is unlike the others, which are underdeveloped countries and are deliberately selected as beneficiaries of the economic aid that the American sugar quota provides.

There is no justification whatever for granting this developed country a sugar quota when it practices the cruelest form of peonage and racial oppression, not only de facto but also de jure, that exists in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my positive opposition to the bill H.R. 8866.

TRIBUTE TO VOLUNTARY FIREMEN

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to four volunteer firemen from Middle River in my congressional district, Douglas Muller and Charles Hopwood of the Cowenton Volunteer Fire Department, and Warren E. Shaffer and Milton C. R. Desombre of the Bowley's Quarters Volunteer Fire Department, who drowned attempting to rescue four people trapped in a car in the Gunpowder River in Baltimore County during the August flood.

Hundreds of rescue personnel in the Baltimore area worked long hours to relieve the victims of this flood. Their courage and determination deserves the highest praise.

These brave men receive little reward. In Baltimore County, the widow of a volunteer fireman receives only a \$5,200 insurance payment and \$50 a month. This is obviously inadequate.

To remedy this, I am introducing a bill to make volunteer firemen, ambulance drivers, and rescue squads eligible for employees' compensation fund disability and death benefits. This is one way in which we can repay these men, if only partially, for the protection they provide for all of us.

SPECIAL REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN SCHMITZ ON OUR POLICY TOWARD THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, regarding the issue of the new course being taken in our policy toward the Republic of China and the Communist usurpers and killers who have seized the Chinese mainland, as one of overriding importance, I am sending a special letter and report on it to my constituents which I am also taking this opportunity of placing before you. The report follows:

REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN SCHMITZ

DEAR CONSTITUENT: Once in a great while an issue arises in public affairs of such critical importance that it should take absolute precedence over everything else. Such an issue is presented by our new policy of accommodation with Red China.

Even our severe current economic problems and new national economic policies, directly as they affect each one of us, do not compare in lasting significance with the real meaning of U.S. acceptance of Peking. We can make economic mistakes and survive, just as a man can go broke and survive. But you only die once. If we cease to regard communism as our enemy, it will bury us just as Nikita Khrushchev once threatened.

Neither the American people nor their elected Representatives in Congress were consulted in advance about the new China policy, the most likely effect of which will be to scuttle our longtime and faithful ally, Chiang Kai-shek—a man who has fought international communism with unwavering and almost incredible fortitude for no less than forty-four years, and also helped us defeat Japan in World War II. Neither the American people nor their elected Representatives in Congress were consulted in advance about making friends with the men in Peking who for years have been proclaiming to the whole world their hatred of America and everything America stands for—the men in Peking who are the slave-masters of 800 million and the destroyers of tens of millions of their own people. Nearly everyone here in Washington seems to be assuming that once Henry Kissinger had turned up in Peking, once our anti-communist China policy had been junked and the President's visit to Red China announced, we all must accept the new situation whether we like it or not.

I am in no position to consult with the whole American people, as the President can do. But I can consult with you, my constituents—and am using this means to do so. Most of you have not yet been heard from. It is time for you to speak—even, or especially, those of you who have always kept silent before. Let me know—let your President know—let everyone know what you really think about accepting Red China and abandoning free China. If you are for this, by all means say so, even though you know it means that we will disagree. I need to find out how many of my constituents I am representing—and not representing—on this issue. If you are against this policy, please wire, phone or write. The more vocal expression of your opinion on this subject that there is, the more hope there will be that the tide can still be turned—and that, with your help, I can play a part in turning it.

Above all, don't give in to the temptation of thinking that it doesn't matter which policy you prefer, that you have nothing to say about it. You do have something to say about it—through me, if nowhere else. I am

your elected Representative in the Congress of the United States. The President is a neighbor of ours. Suppose I could show him a thousand, or ten thousand communications from you vehemently opposing this course he is taking. He could not refuse to notice them. He has a long-standing anti-communist reputation. Whatever may be the reasons and whoever may be the individuals who have prevailed on him to take this step, in light of his past experience with our ultimate foe, he must have doubts about it. You can, if you will, help him crystallize those doubts to the point of re-examining his entire China policy before we have committed ourselves irrevocably and permanently to dealing with Mao Tse-tung and abandoning Chiang Kai-shek and all our friends and allies in the Republic of China.

There are some who feel that we have nothing to lose by the President's trip to Peking—that it is a mere "gesture for peace" which signifies no weakening of our moral position or abandonment of our allies. But, in fact, the announcement that the President will go to Peking has already sent a shock wave through Asia whose effects will be felt for years. For our Asian allies believe that it means abandonment of the Republic of China. They foresee no workable "two Chinas" policy, which both Peking and Taipei have repudiated over and over again. In the words of President Marcos of the Philippines, once American territory and since World War II our most trustworthy ally in the Far East:

"If this can happen to Nationalist China, there is no assurance that it won't happen to us. I am certain that this alteration and change in policy of the United States will now mean that every Asian nation and leader must now review the basis for all the agreements between the United States and their respective countries."

Does anyone really think that Red China is going to make an agreement with us that is to the advantage of Free China? If the President makes any other kind of agreement with Peking, he betrays our allies; if he makes no agreement, his visit there will then be regarded all over the world as a major defeat for the United States, evidence of our growing and serious weakness.

On April 19, 1968 President Nixon said: "I would not recognize Red China now and I would not agree to admitting it to the UN and I wouldn't go along with those well-intentioned people that said, 'Trade with them,' because that may change them. Because doing it now would only encourage them, the hardliners in Peking and hardline policy they're following. And it would have an immense effect in discouraging great numbers of non-communist elements in Free Asia that are now just beginning to develop their strength and their own confidence."

Nothing whatever has happened to change the nature of communism in general and Red China in particular, since the President made that statement. But something has happened to change the President.

Have you changed too? Remember that the Communists have not.

Let's think together for a few moments about just what kind of man Mao is and what kind of government in Peking we are dealing with.

In his book, *Out of Red China*, Liu Shaw-tong said: "If the rains of communism flood the world, humanity will drown. Would you understand me, dear friend, if I told you I saw an old woman weep because the sun had died in China?"

Millions of Chinese have died as a result of communism in China. The immensity of the crimes committed against the Chinese people by Mao Tse-tung, his long-time lieutenant Chou En-lai, and their entourage, is thoroughly documented in a study entitled "The Human Cost of Communism in China," prepared by Professor Richard Walker, Di-

rector of the Institute of International Studies at the University of South Carolina, and just released as a pamphlet by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

The magnitude of Mao's crimes is so appalling, the scope of his campaign to pulverize his own people so great, that even with the irrefutable evidence before us it is difficult to comprehend. This man has far outdone Hitler and even his mentor Stalin in sheer numbers of terror victims.

Since coming to power in 1949 the Chinese Communist policy has been divide, liquidate and rule. Total terror was and is their governing principle. A continuous succession of "purge-drive" campaigns such as "The Great Proletarian Revolution," "The Great Leap Forward," the "three-anti" and "five-anti" campaigns, and the like, each one claiming millions of victims, has been launched against the people of China by their present rulers. Businessmen, landowners, peasants, intellectuals, students—each in their turn has been branded "counterrevolutionary" and smashed.

In the following table extracted from "The Human Cost of Communism in China," it is important to note that approximately 90 per cent of the victims of Communism in China were killed after Mao seized power. The alternative to resisting the Communists is not bloodless peace, as some would have us believe. Professor Walker notes that even some of the high estimates given below are probably too conservative:

| CASUALTIES TO COMMUNISM IN CHINA | | |
|--|--------------------|------------|
| | Range of estimates | |
| First Civil War (1927-36)..... | 250,000 | 500,000 |
| Fighting during Sino-Japanese War (1937-45)..... | 50,000 | 50,000 |
| Second Civil War (1945-49)..... | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 |
| Land reform prior to Liberation..... | 500,000 | 1,000,000 |
| Political liquidation campaigns (1949-58)..... | 15,000,000 | 30,000,000 |
| Korean War..... | 500,000 | 1,234,000 |
| The Great Leap Forward and the Communes..... | 1,000,000 | 2,000,000 |
| Struggles with minority nationalities, including Tibet..... | 500,000 | 1,000,000 |
| The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution and its aftermath..... | 250,000 | 500,000 |
| Deaths in forced labor camps and frontier development..... | 15,000,000 | 25,000,000 |
| Total..... | 34,300,000 | 63,784,000 |

Every American should read this document, which may be obtained from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, for 20¢ a copy.

We must remember that communism is international and aggressive. It is not merely China's problem, or the problem of any one nation. Every country on earth is threatened, ours most of all because we are the greatest remaining obstacle to Communist conquest of the world. What has been done to China will be done to us if the Communists have their way. It can happen here, just as it did happen in China, in Russia, in Cuba, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, or in any of the lands and peoples the Communists have taken over. The more we accept them, the more we open our gates to them, the more we "learn to live with them," the more we abandon those who have devoted their lives to fighting them, the more likely they are to master us.

President Nixon, July 15, 1972, 10:30 p.m. (Washington time): "Premier Chou En-lai, on behalf of the government of the People's Republic of China, has extended an invitation to President Nixon to visit China at an appropriate date before May, 1972 (I) accept the invitation with pleasure."

Radio Peking, July 15, 1971, 10:45 p.m. (Washington time): "People of the world, unite and defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs."

Cable from Chou En-lai to Fidel Castro, July 25, 1971: "The Chinese Government and

people will, as they always have in the past, resolutely fight together with the Cuban people, and we will learn from each other, support each other and carry the struggle to defeat the U.S. aggressors and all their running dogs through to the end."

Sen. James L. Buckley (C.R.—New York): "I am deeply concerned over the implications which the President's extraordinary announcement will have both here and abroad. At home it will inevitably strengthen the hands of those seeking accommodations with the Communist world at almost any price; and in Asia, the grand scale of this overture to Peking will be anything but reassuring to those who have to live with the aggressive reality of Mainland China."

Senator John G. Tower (R.—Texas): "I am convinced that the U.S. should change her policy in regard to Red China, if at all, only when it is in the overwhelming best interests of the U.S. and in return for some genuine concessions from the Communist Chinese. So far, I have seen nothing concrete to indicate that we should change our policy vis-a-vis the current rulers in Peking."

In June, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover explained in an article entitled "Mao's Red Shadows in America" how violent revolutionary movements in our country, such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), are already heavily influenced and infiltrated by Maoists. But he also pointed out that as long as we do not recognize the Peking government nor admit it to the United Nations, Mao's agents operate under the "major handicap" of lack of "a legal base from which to operate spies." That handicap would be removed if we pay Peking's price for "friendship and peace."

If we forget today what communism really is, we will learn again tomorrow, first-hand, on our own soil—when it is too late.

Speak out now! It could be the most important action you have ever taken as an American citizen.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN G. SCHMITZ,
Member of Congress.

THE ALASKA COALITION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter received by me from the Alaska Coalition regarding the Alaska Native land claims bill, H.R. 10367, pointing out the concern of conservationists regarding that measure:

THE ALASKA COALITION,
October 5, 1971.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Alaska Native Land Claims Settlement bill, H.R. 10367, will reach the floor of the House in the next several weeks. The attached letter to President Nixon outlines the reasons why America's leading conservation and environmental groups believe this legislation needs to be purged of grievous defects before it is allowed to become law.

The great federal domain in Alaska—originally comprising all 375 million acres of the Alaskan land mass—is being disposed of rapidly. The settlement with the Natives under H.R. 10367 will grant them 40 million acres. Earlier, Congress granted rights to 103 million acres to the State of Alaska. Between them, under pressures from speculators and exploiters, they will compete in dividing up the best lands in Alaska—public lands.

The results of this competition will be

development of a chaotic land use pattern, in a "public-take-the-hindmost" land rush. H.R. 10367 seemingly serves the interests of the Natives, of the State of Alaska and of resources developers. But nowhere in this bill is the public interest accommodated—the interest of the 208 million people who own most of Alaska.

Conservation-minded Americans are deeply troubled by the threat this bill, in its present form, poses for the public interest. In this widely heralded new era of environmental concern, they are asking, how can we authorize the wholesale disposition of Alaska public lands without overall plans that include environmental protection and the careful advance protection of nationally significant areas—potential parks, wildlife refuges and the like?

You will be hearing further from us on this grave matter, which one leading conservationist predicts may be "the decade's sharpest conservation battle." We solicit your best efforts in finding a solution which will assure that the public interest is served.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1971.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have just returned from Alaska, and you undoubtedly have renewed awareness of what a national treasure it is. The undersigned share in this awareness, and because of it we feel compelled to ask you to intercede with those in the Executive Branch and the Congress who, however well intentioned, seem set on destroying much of that national treasure.

In recent months speculators and exploiters, never identified to the public but everywhere in evidence plying the halls of Congress, have been championing the cause of Alaskan Native Claims. Their theme has been: enormous grants of public land and some money for the Natives, but no restraints upon the commercial exploitation of the public lands of Alaska. To our deep concern, the legislation approved by the Interior Committee of the House of Representatives appears to respond to this point of view. The Senate Interior Committee seems ready to follow a somewhat similar course. Such legislation would not be a credit to your Administration, and on behalf of the environmental movement of this country we ask that you take steps to halt it until grievous defects can be corrected.

Looking at the House and Senate versions of Native Claims legislation we see that these bills seemingly accommodate the interests of 1) the Natives, who are to receive some 40 million acres of federal land; 2) the state of Alaska, which will be free to resume its selection of 103 million acres of federal land; and 3) resource developers, who will be able to proceed with their plans for unrestricted exploitation of America's last frontier. But nowhere in either of these bills is the public interest accommodated—the interest of the 200 million Americans who own most of Alaska.

While we hesitate to take issue with representatives of the Natives who contend this legislation is good for their clients, we have grave doubts about the long-term benefit to the Natives from a settlement which will make them prey to the designs of exploiters while guaranteeing no specific and enduring benefit to the individual Natives now or in the future.

Now to one of the most serious problems we see in this legislation. In recent years, Mr. President, the American people have become increasingly aware of the need for more park and recreation land, wilderness, wildlife refuges, scenic rivers and the like. To acquire land for these purposes the federal government often has had to buy back at present day prices lands which once were part of the public domain. As you have pointed out on several occasions, demands for recreation,

wildlife and other land acquisition far exceed the capacity of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and necessitate, in many cases, years of delay before acquisition can be made, if it can be made at all. We did not have the need nor the foresight to reserve adequate lands when many states were admitted to the Union.

We believe it would be the height of irresponsibility for the United States to repeat that kind of mistake in Alaska. To allow public lands to pass into private hands—either directly or through the channel of Alaska state selection—before they have been reviewed for possible retention to meet national needs is unthinkable. Needed extensions of the Arctic National Wildlife Range and Mount McKinley National Park are but two examples of land endangered by these bills. The Gates of the Arctic National Park, under consideration for years, is another. The Yukon Flats, and Selwik and Teshekpuk Lakes, and the Koyukuk River are other outstanding examples of areas needing careful review before they are made available for selection by the Natives, the state of Alaska or for appropriation by commercial interests.

Further, no provision is made at all for the coordinated development of a master plan for all Alaska to assure that transportation, communications, settlement, development and other facets are accomplished in an orderly manner that is consistent with the best interests of all concerned.

The present approach to Native Claims legislation has these additional defects which we wish to call to your attention:

1. In transferring 40 million or more acres from Public to Native ownership, it would set up a sequence of land selection and disposition that would relegate the national interest to the lowest priority. State, Native, and private interests would receive preference over the public's interest in areas of the highest aesthetic, cultural, scientific, wildlife and wilderness values. The present land management confusion in Alaska would only be intensified by this legislation.

2. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to classify unreserved public lands for mineral leasing and outright disposal to private parties in accordance with existing inadequate public land laws. And the House Committee's version fails to require the Secretary to identify and propose for Congressional consideration areas suitable for inclusion in national park and recreation areas, national wildlife refuges and national wild and scenic rivers. The Senate Committee's version, while directing the Secretary to advise Congress, fails to provide adequate safeguards during this critical review procedure.

3. Under the House Committee's version, thousands of acres could be eliminated from the national wildlife refuge system in Alaska, including some of this Nation's most critical areas of wildlife habitat. Preliminary indications of the final draft of the Senate version suggest the impact of the refugees could be even worse.

Mr. President, along with all other Americans, we share in the ownership of the Federal lands of Alaska. We are shocked at what the pending proposal of the two Committees would appear to permit to be done to them. We believe a raid upon the public domain of Alaska must be prevented. And we call upon you to use the power and prestige of your office to help stop it until these defects can be corrected.

If Congress cannot be persuaded to recognize the larger public interests involved in this issue, we strongly urge that you make use of existing withdrawal authority to assure that the values of these unique and critical areas of public land in Alaska are not lost for lack of leadership.

As you stated at our last meeting with you on Washington's birthday in 1970, we should meet more frequently and keep up our com-

munication about serious conservation issues. It appears to us that an early meeting on this critical subject would be most beneficial.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY BRUMM,
Alaska Action Committee.

SPENCER M. SMITH, Jr.,
Secretary, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

MARY HAZELL HARRIS,
Executive Director, Defenders of Wildlife.

AVERY TAYLOR,
Environmental Action.

DAVID R. BROWER,
President, Friends of the Earth.

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director, National Wildlife Federation.

J. MICHAEL MCCLOSKEY,
Executive Director, Sierra Club.

STEPHEN G. SALTZMAN,
Washington Representative, Trout Unlimited.

STEWART M. BRANDBOG,
Executive Director, the Wilderness Society.

DANIEL A. POOLE,
President, Wildlife Management Institute.

CARL POPE,
Washington Representative, Zero Population Growth, Inc.

FRANK C. DANIEL,
Secretary, National Rifle Association.

NO-FAULT INSURANCE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to provide the District of Columbia with a progressive system of first party no-fault auto insurance.

The movement toward no-fault insurance has been growing around the country, largely as a result of the failure of existing insurance plans to provide adequate protection to motorists at reasonable rates.

No-fault insurance represents a whole new way of dealing with the problem of protecting drivers against the tragic costs of auto accidents. Instead of wasting vast sums of money trying to determine whose insurance company should compensate the injured parties, a no-fault system would have the injured motorists and passengers collect from their own insurance company, just like in other fields of insurance such as health and fire insurance.

On the legislative front, the most sensible approach is a national no-fault bill such as the one proposed by Senator HART. This would provide for a single uniform insurance system, though it would be left to the states to control the rates charged. Opponents of no-fault prefer a state-by-state approach, which gives lawyers and insurance salesmen the maximum influence over the legislation. As was pointed out during the hearings held earlier this year by the House Commerce Committee, a large percentage of the men and women who sit in the State

legislatures are practicing lawyers or insurance salesmen, with a substantial vested interest in how auto accident victims get compensated.

While the debate over a national approach to no-fault insurance continues, several states have enacted such laws. Some of these plans, such as the one passed in my own State of Illinois, bear little resemblance to the fundamental concept of no-fault insurance except for their titles. But in one form or another, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, South Dakota, and Puerto Rico have all passed no-fault insurance legislation.

Until such time as Congress enacts a uniform national system, the people of the District of Columbia deserve to enjoy the benefits which a comprehensive no-fault auto insurance system can provide.

The bill which I have introduced today is modeled after a similar bill introduced recently in the Senate by my friend and colleague from Illinois, Senator STEVENSON. It would require every company selling insurance in the District of Columbia to offer first-party no-fault insurance coverage. Under such policies, every person injured in an auto accident—drivers, passengers, and even pedestrians—would be entitled to compensation regardless of how the accident happened. There would be no need for elaborate investigations and lawyers and trials and juries. Injured persons would be reimbursed for all their out-of-pocket medical and hospital expenses. They could receive as much as \$1,500 per month for 3 years to compensate for wages lost because of the accident. Funeral and burial expenses would also be paid, up to \$1,000. If the injured person dies, his dependents would be entitled to compensation for loss of support.

Lawsuits against other drivers in an accident would be permitted where losses exceed the maximum amount payable under the no-fault coverage. A tort action would also lie for intangible losses—"pain and suffering"—in cases of death or severely disabling injury.

With respect to vehicular damage, the insured must be given a choice of a no-fault option, a fault option, or a full deductible option. The first would provide for payment regardless of who was at fault. The second would enable the driver to collect for property damage only if the other driver were at fault. The third would in effect make the policyholder self-insured for vehicular damage.

Every person who drives in the District of Columbia would be required to purchase such an insurance policy. No one could be refused a policy, nor could his policy be cancelled, so long as he paid the premiums and had a valid license to drive.

Finally, the bill requires an 18-percent reduction in premiums covering personal injury, reflecting the lower cost of administering compensation under a no-fault system. This insures that savings will be passed on to the consumer.

LOWER RATES

One of the greatest sources of dissatisfaction with present insurance systems

has been the astronomical increase in premiums, without any increase in service. Cancellations and refusals to insure are on the increase. Insurance companies are trying to become investment companies—they are looking for "hazardous hazards and riskless risks," in the words of one critic. In the last 10 years, auto insurance premiums have increased by an average of 65 percent.

By eliminating the money spent on judicial determinations of fault, no-fault insurance can provide more benefits for lower premiums. In the first 6 months of operation, Massachusetts' no-fault system has saved residents a total of \$76 million in premium costs.

The bill I am introducing does not leave this to chance. It prohibits cancellations and refusals so long as premiums are paid on time, and it mandates an initial rate reduction of 18 percent.

MORE COVERAGE FOR YOUR MONEY

At present, 55 cents out of every premium dollar goes for overhead. Only 44 cents is returned to the consumers in benefits, as compared with 90 cents or better under other insurance systems, including Puerto Rico's no-fault auto insurance plan.

Furthermore, no-fault would result in a more equitable distribution of those benefits which are paid. At present, accident victims with minor injuries are generally overpaid in out-of-court settlements. A study of 500,000 auto accident victims by the Department of Transportation revealed that victims who suffered damages of about \$500 recovered an average of \$2,250—more than four times the amount of their loss. On the other hand, victims with serious injuries are generally shortchanged. These are the claims which the insurance companies resist, for there is more at stake. The same Department of Transportation study showed that victims with severe losses—over \$75,000—recovered an average of only 16 percent. Forty-five percent of those seriously injured did not recover a single penny.

The no-fault system my bill would establish would guarantee that every accident victim was compensated fully and fairly for all his out-of-pocket losses. People with no serious injuries and no economic losses could no longer pick up a quick \$500 settlement by crying "whiplash." On the other hand, a severely injured driver with thousands of dollars in medical expenses would not be left out in the cold merely because a high paid defense lawyer convinced a jury that he was not free from blame, or because the driver who hit him was uninsured and had no resources.

END SETTLEMENT DELAY

The Stevenson-Mikva no-fault bill requires that compensation be paid monthly as the loss accrues. This would represent a vast improvement over the present payment system, which involves long delays during which time the victim is hard pressed to meet expenses incurred as a result of the accident. The average accident victim today must wait 18 months before receiving any compensation. Delays of 4 or 5 years are not uncommon, where a jury trial is necessary.

RELIEVE CONGESTED COURT DOCKETS

Cleaning up the mess from auto accidents presently occupies a great deal of court time unnecessarily. A study by the Federal Judiciary Center found that auto accident litigation accounts for 11.4 percent of all judge hours in Federal district courts, and 17 percent of all judge time in State courts. Legal experts across the country have urged that the most important step in improving the efficiency of our judicial system is to weed out those areas which do not require judicial determination. Attorney General Mitchell and Chief Justice Burger are among the many who have urged that auto accident compensation be removed from the courtroom to free up the dockets for criminal and civil trials. No-fault insurance means that lawyers and court cases would be the exception, not the rule.

THE PROBLEM OF UNINSURED MOTORISTS

Auto insurance premiums are so high today that many people who cannot afford them simply drive without insurance. They represent a threat to every pedestrian and driver on the streets, and to the welfare of their own families as well. It has been estimated that nearly 30 percent of all drivers in the District of Columbia are uninsured. The Stevenson-Mikva bill would remedy this problem in two ways.

First, by making coverage compulsory and reducing premium costs, more people will be insured. Second, drivers will look to their own insurance company for compensation, and will not have to be concerned about whether the person who hits them is rich or poor, insured or uninsured. The driver who chooses to break the law and drive without insurance would be endangering no one but himself. Each driver would be able to protect himself and his family adequately, without regard to what other drivers do.

THE PROBLEM OF OUT OF STATE MOTORISTS

Nearly 40 percent of all auto accidents in the District of Columbia involve at least one out-of-State car. This raises certain problems if those out of State drivers do not have no-fault, first party coverage. Additional problems are posed by accidents involving District of Columbia drivers who go into other States. If District of Columbia drivers do not have residual liability coverage, they are unprotected against lawsuits by out of State drivers who may sue them.

Of course, this problem would be eliminated if all States had uniform no-fault insurance, and this is one of the strongest reasons why a national no-fault bill is desirable. In the absence of such national uniformity, District of Columbia drivers will not be able to enjoy the full savings of no-fault, for they will have to pay for additional protection against out-of-State drivers.

In order to reduce the cost that District of Columbia drivers have to pay because of other States' failure to enact progressive no-fault insurance plans, my bill includes a provision requiring every person who drives in the District of Columbia to maintain first-party coverage. Thus, a New Hampshire or an Illinois driver who comes to the District of Columbia will have to have a no-fault rider

in his insurance policy to cover him while in the District. This will take care of the large number of accidents involving out-of-State drivers which occur in the District of Columbia. It leaves only the problem of District of Columbia drivers who get in accidents while in another State. Fortunately, the number of such accidents is not high, and the extra cost of residual liability coverage should not be too great.

IMPACT ON SUBURBAN MARYLAND AND VIRGINIA

Adoption of a no-fault insurance plan in the District of Columbia will result in rate reductions for suburban drivers as well as for District of Columbia drivers. At present, suburban drivers must pay to insure against the risk of being hit by one of the many uninsured motorists who drive in the District. That cost will be eliminated, for under a no-fault system it makes no difference whether the other driver is insured or not. Furthermore, there will be fewer uninsured District drivers under the Stevenson-Mikva plan than at present.

Mr. Speaker, I have attempted to explain in considerable detail why a comprehensive no-fault insurance bill for the District of Columbia is a necessary and desirable reform. I believe the bill I am introducing would provide the residents of the District of Columbia with one of the most forward looking auto insurance systems in the country. It would give greater protection, more efficiently and for less money, than the present no-pay system. The people of the District need and deserve the benefits which no-fault will bring.

CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the American citizen possesses the distinctive ability to inherit and pass on the beauty of his ethnic traditions while actively seeking to maintain, develop, and interpret the democratic principles and beliefs valued by each of us today. Often, feelings of ancestral pride and of American identity work together to reinforce and to unify the foundations on which our country stands. Common to all the men and women and to the countless immigrants who colonized our shores were the dreams of opportunity, progress, and peace. Many of these people strongly supported and aided our American Revolution. Many lost their lives defending our liberties.

In honoring the contributions and sacrifices of individuals who fought to preserve the independence of this Nation, a man from the small Polish town of Warka deserves much recognition. Casimir Pulaski left his homeland and voluntarily serve in Washington's army. He scouted for supplies for the famished troops at Valley Forge, he participated in the Battle of Brandywine with distinction, and he organized, with the permission of Congress, the first independent corps of Cavalry and light infantry. He

refused to allow himself to languish in a state of inactivity and constantly expressed the hope he might continue to prove his devotion to the American cause. October 11th marks the 192d anniversary of the death of this great hero of the American Revolution.

I am pleased to join with my many friends of Polish descent who rightly point with pride to Pulaski's selfless devotion to the cause of freedom, liberty, and independence.

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO— GUIDELINES FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, these are, to borrow Thomas Paine's phrase, the "times that try men's souls." In this, the era of President Nixon's "New American Revolution," the American people are wondering what will come next—what is the blueprint for the future.

Mr. Nixon's travelog gives some indication of what is serving as the guidelines for our future. He intends to visit Red Russia after he pays a courtesy call on Communist China and Chairman Mao.

Another indication of the power behind the throne—the driving force of "democracy"—is the recent announcement by a leading left-wing liberal that we should "resume diplomatic relations with" Castro's Cuba.

But perhaps the leading clue to the great mystery concerning the plans for the future lies in the legislative program of this, the 92d Congress. This House has considered and passed legislation that would guarantee an annual income to all Americans; it has passed a bill that on becoming law would virtually take the American children away from their parents and make them wards of the State. Furthermore, this House has considered and passed legislation that gives almost total control over the lives, fortunes, and sacred honor of the American citizens to the State—to big brother. The Federal Government now has the power, or soon will obtain it, to control the food we eat, the wages we make, and the prices of the goods we buy. It even controls that which we are like and dislike through the subsidy of the arts. It has even gone so far as to subsidize a study of "the wild boar in Pakistan" and to build an imposing structure in this capital to allow the public to view the "classic arts," all efforts designed for "thought control."

In other words, the legislative program, the announced intentions of America's leaders, and the very planned activities of the American President indicate that the plans for the future of America are the collectivization of American society and the destruction of individual personality differences in the American people. To do this, the U.S. Constitution must be destroyed. These are the aims of communism.

This House has gone so far as to go on record that there is no longer any Communist threat to America. When the House repealed the bill allowing detention camps in America, it also repealed the findings of Congress that there was indeed a Communist threat to the free world—one that was a clear and present danger.

No, there is no longer a Communist threat to America—America has stepped over the line. It is not there yet, but our leaders are following plans very similar to those outlined by Karl Marx in "The Communist Manifesto" plans that can only take us further and further down toward the pure collectivist State.

A government is judged by what it does.

So that my colleagues might realize the path that they are following and so that the American people might know what their leaders are doing, I insert a portion of "The Communist Manifesto," written by Karl Marx in 1847, in the RECORD at this point:

THE COMMUNIST MANIFESTO

(By Karl Marx)

II

Proletarians and Communists

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working-class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand practically the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties; formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented or discovered by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change consequent upon the change in historical conditions.

The French Revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favor of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism

is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonism, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We Communists have been reproached with the desire of abolishing the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man's own labor, which property is alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence.

Hard won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of the petty artisan and of the small peasant, a form of property that preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that; the development of industry has to a great extent already destroyed it, and is still destroying it daily.

Or do you mean modern bourgeois private property?

But does wage labor create any property for the laborer? Not a bit. It creates capital, i.e., that kind of property which exploits wage labor, and which cannot increase except upon condition of getting a new supply of wage labor for fresh exploitation. Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labor. Let us examine both sides of this antagonism.

To be a capitalist is to have not only a purely personal, but a social status in production. Capital is a collective product, and only by the united action of many members, nay, in the last resort, only by the united action of all members of society, can it be set in motion.

Capital is therefore not a personal, it is a social power.

When, therefore, capital is converted into common property, into the property of all members of society, personal property is not thereby transformed into social property. It is only the social character of the property that is changed. It loses its class character.

Let us now take wage labor.

The average price of wage labor is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence which is absolutely requisite to keep the laborer in bare existence as a laborer. What, therefore, the wage laborer appropriates by means of his labor, merely suffices to prolong and reproduce a bare existence. We by no means intend to abolish this personal appropriation of the products of labor, an appropriation that is made for the maintenance and reproduction of human life, and that leaves no surplus wherewith to command the labor of others. All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the laborer lives merely to increase capital and is allowed to live only in so far as the interests of the ruling class require it.

In bourgeois society, living labor is but a means to increase accumulated labor. In Communist society accumulated labor is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the laborer.

In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society the present dominates the past. In bourgeois society, capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.

And the abolition of this state of things is called by the bourgeois abolition of individuality and freedom! And rightly so. The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at.

By freedom is meant, under the present bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.

But if selling and buying disappears, free selling and buying disappears also. This talk about free selling and buying, and all the other "brave words" of our bourgeoisie about freedom in general have a meaning, if any, only in contrast with restricted selling and buying, with the fettered traders of the Middle Ages, but have no meaning when opposed to the Communist abolition of buying and selling, of the bourgeois conditions of production, and of the bourgeoisie itself.

You are horrified at our intending to do away with private property. But in your existing society private property is already done away with for nine-tenths of the population; its existence for the few is solely due to its non-existence in the hands of those nine-tenths. You reproach us, therefore, with intending to do away with a form of property, the necessary condition for whose existence is the non-existence of any property for the immense majority of society.

In one word, you reproach us with intending to do away with your property. Precisely so: that is just what we intend.

From the moment when labor can no longer be converted into capital, money, or rent, into a social power capable of being monopolized, i.e., from the moment when individual property can no longer be transformed into bourgeois property, into capital, from that moment, you say, individuality vanishes.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way and made impossible.

Communism deprives no man of the power to appropriate the products of society: all that it does is to deprive him of the power to subjugate the labor of others by means of such appropriation.

It has been objected that upon the abolition of private property all work will cease and universal laziness will overtake us.

According to this, bourgeois society ought long ago to have gone to the dogs through sheer idleness; for those of its members who work acquire nothing, and those who acquire anything do not work. The whole of this objection is but another expression of the tautology: that there can no longer be any wage labor when there is no longer any capital.

All objections urged against the Communist mode of producing and appropriating material products have, in the same way, been urged against the Communist modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.

But don't wrangle with us so long as you apply, to our intended abolition of bourgeois property, the standard of your bourgeois notions of freedom, culture, law, etc. Your very ideas are but the outgrowth of the conditions of your bourgeois production and bourgeois property, just as your jurisprudence is but the will of your class made into a law for all, a will whose essential character and direction are determined by the economical conditions of existence of your class.

The selfish misconception that induces you to transform into eternal laws of nature and of reason the social forms springing from your present mode of production and form of property—historical relations that rise and disappear in the progress of production—this misconception you share with every ruling class that has preceded you. What you see clearly in the case of ancient property, what you admit in the case of feudal property, you are of course forbidden to admit in the case of your own bourgeois form of property.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical

flame up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.

The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital.

Do you charge us with wanting to stop the exploitation of children by their parents? To this crime we plead guilty.

But, you will say, we destroy the most hallowed of relations when we replace home education by social.

And your education! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate; by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society by means of schools, etc.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in education; they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class.

The bourgeois clap-net about the family and education, about the hallowed correlation of parent and child, become all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labor.

But your Communists would introduce community of women screams the whole bourgeois chorus.

The bourgeois sees in his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion, than that the lot of being common to all will likewise fall to the women.

He has not even a suspicion that the real point aimed at is to do away with the status of women as mere instruments of production.

For the rest, nothing is more ridiculous than the virtuous indignation of our bourgeois at the community of women which, they pretend, is to be openly and officially established by the Communists. The Communists have no need to introduce community of women; it has existed almost from time immemorial.

Our bourgeois, not content with having the wives and daughters of their proletarians at their disposal, not to speak of common prostitutes, take the greatest pleasure in seducing each others' wives.

Bourgeois marriage is in reality a system of wives in common, and thus, at the most, what the Communists might possibly be reproached with, is that they desire to introduce, in substitution for a hypocritically concealed, an openly legalized community of women. For the rest, it is self-evident that the abolition of the present system of production must bring with it the abolition of the community of women springing from that system, i.e., of prostitution both public and private.

The Communists are further reproached with desiring to abolish countries and nationalities.

The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they don't possess. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word.

National differences and antagonisms between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world-

market, to uniformity in the mode of production and in the conditions of life corresponding thereto.

The supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster. United action, of the leading civilized countries at least, is one of the first conditions for the emancipation of the proletariat.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.

The charges against Communism made from a religious, a philosophical, and generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious examination.

Does it require deep intuition to comprehend that man's ideas, views and conceptions, in one word, man's consciousness, changes with every change in the conditions of his material existence, in his social relations and in his social life?

What else does the history of ideas prove than that intellectual production changes in character in proportion as material production is changed? The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class.

When people speak of ideas that revolutionize society they do but express the fact that within the old society the elements of a new one have been created, and that the dissolution of the old ideas keeps even pace with the dissolution of the old conditions of existence.

When the ancient world was in its last throes the ancient religions were overcome by Christianity. When Christian ideas succumbed in the 18th century to rationalist ideas, feudal society fought its death-battle with the then revolutionary bourgeoisie. The ideas of religious liberty and freedom of conscience merely gave expression to the sway of free competition within the domain of knowledge.

"Undoubtedly," it will be said, "religious, moral, philosophical and judicial ideas have been modified in the course of historical development. But religion, morality, philosophy, political science, and law, constantly survived this change.

"There are, besides, eternal truths, such as Freedom, Justice, etc., that are common to all states of society. But Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion and all morality, instead of constituting them on a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."

What does this accusation reduce itself to? The history of all past society has consisted in the development of class antagonisms, antagonisms that assumed different forms at different epochs.

But whatever form they may have taken, one fact is common to all past ages, viz., the exploitation of one part of society by the other. No wonder, then, that the social consciousness of past ages, despite all the multiplicity and variety it displays, moves within certain common forms, or general ideas, which cannot completely vanish except with the total disappearance of class antagonisms.

The Communist revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism.

We have seen above that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments

of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organized as a ruling class; and to increase the total productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning, this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property, and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which in the course of the movement outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order, and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.

These measures will of course be different in different countries.

Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonism, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, it is a happy privilege for me to join my colleagues in

paying tribute today to that intrepid traveler and explorer, Christopher Columbus.

It is altogether fitting that we have designated a national holiday in his honor.

There are many who dispute the claim that Columbus was the discoverer of America. In fact, it is pretty well established that he was not, that there were others before him who were, in fact, on continental North America.

But that detracts nothing from the remarkable voyage Christopher Columbus made with his three ships to the West Indies.

While he may not have been the first, he was the foremost. His voyages fired the imaginations of the people of his time, and soon voyages to the Western Hemisphere were commonplace.

And so, we people in America are rightly indebted to Columbus for the giant step he took toward establishing the permanent settlements on this continent. Those early settlements fathered the stream of migration which was the mark of America, which stamped the heritage of diverse peoples on all of our society.

Probably not until our recent explorations of the moon has there been such a far-reaching geographical discovery.

We owe a tremendous debt to Christopher Columbus. This holiday, which we have established in his memory, is a partial payment on that debt.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, many persons were unable to attend the hearings I held in Minneapolis. However, I have received a number of letters from Minnesotans concerning specific topics of interest to them.

The following two letters from Mrs. G. B. Martinson sets out in great detail the cost incurred by her family since September 1970, when her husband started receiving treatment on an artificial kidney machine. Between September of 1970 and July of 1971, the family spent a total of \$19,331.47. As Mrs. Martinson points out in her letter, these figures do not include other increased costs which they have had to bear. As Mrs. Martinson mentions in her letter, the care her husband received was superior. However, the cost has become overwhelming. Congress must act quickly on this aspect of health care and eliminate the possibility of economic disaster for a sick individual.

Mrs. Enid Griffin appeared at the hearings and discussed Federal programs for sickness. She pointed out that when caring for her mother, Medicare paid \$1,600 for inappropriate care without receiving permission from anyone in

the family. She also pointed out that Federal insurance programs do not cover diagnostic care, care which in the long run could significantly reduce health costs. Another major limit in insurance coverage was that incurred in treating their retarded child. The doctor treated the child on an outpatient basis, as is common according to Mrs. Griffin, and none of this treatment was covered by insurance. As these two women so persuasively point out, the delivery of services at a reasonable cost to the individual has been unsuccessful. The letters follow:

HOPKINS, MINN.,

June 28, 1971.

DEAR SIR: In a recent letter, you said you would be testifying before the House Ways and Means Committee in July about a National Health Plan.

I thought you might be interested in the following expenses which we have incurred since September 1970, when my husband was diagnosed as having chronic renal failure and started treatment on an artificial kidney machine. February 23rd we started giving the treatments at home. These are the expenses we have had so far:

| | |
|------------------------|------------|
| Doctors | \$1,245.00 |
| Hospital | 9,973.53 |
| Kidney machine | 3,670.00 |
| Kill (filter) | 1,700.00 |
| Lab supplies | 1,209.09 |
| Osmonics pump | 1,165.00 |
| Medical supplies | 368.85 |
| Total | 19,331.47 |

These figures do not include all the volunteer labor and materials donated to prepare a suitable treatment room in our basement, nor the plumbing and electric bills which come to \$500.00 each and are not yet paid. It also does not include an increase by about three times in our monthly electric bill, doubling our water bill, nor the fact that our hospital bills keep on because of regular blood checks and the doctor bills go on and may include periodically an operation to replace the plastic tube in my husband's arm. The medical and laboratory supplies also have to be replaced regularly.

I have heard of a "catastrophic illness" plan which is meant to help chronic patients and their huge medical bills. I hope something can be done to help us and others with similar medical bills.

Mrs. G. B. MARTINSON.

HOPKINS, MINN.,

July 5, 1971.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your prompt response to my letter about the medical bill and our personal interest in it. Yes, you may use, for public record, the figures I sent you pertaining to our medical costs so far. You thought the figures "startling", but they were rather conservative, because I did not include the following:

- 1) prescription drugs, because our whole family charges its drugs at the same pharmacy,
 - 2) tools necessary for cleansing and preparation of the artificial kidney machine
 - 3) \$385.00 charge per year for service on the kidney machine, which must be paid in advance
 - 4) hospital bed, pressure cuff, stethoscope, clamps, stop watch, thermometer, scale, etc.
- In no way am I criticizing the medical care my husband received. We found the doctor in charge of the kidney unit, the technician,

and the specially trained nurses dedicated, able, and always available. The hospital staff has been patient and understanding about the finances. We have been more fortunate than many patients because our relatives, friends, our church and community rallied to our support—but we are still in debt and still incurring medical bills of about \$200.00 per month, as far as we can estimate.

We surely hope there will be a Health Security Bill passed soon that will help out families like ours which undergo chronic illnesses which cripple the family finances.

Yours truly,

Mrs. G. B. MARTINSON.

ANDERSON, S.C.

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Anderson, S.C., is the largest city in my congressional district and known in our area for its friendly and progressive citizens. We were especially delighted, therefore, that Anderson received such splendid national recognition through the column of nationally syndicated columnist Bud Kirvan of Ann Arbor, Mich. The following is Mr. Kirvan's column of July 28, 1971:

ONCE OVER LIGHTLY

Anderson, South Carolina, is not the easiest place to get to, or from, at least as far as the airlines are concerned. It's a couple of hours drive from Atlanta, and about the same distance from Charlotte, North Carolina, but if you're depending on air travel, it's somewhat difficult to get there and back in a 24-hour period.

You shouldn't want to leave Anderson that fast, for it's an attractive and friendly city of about 45,000 people. The setting around Anderson is rolling country and hundreds of miles of fascinating lake shoreline and, at first look, it appears that all is not as frantic and loud and despoiled as is the case in many other areas.

Last week marked my first visit to Anderson and my trip was unheralded. Imagine my surprise, therefore, when I noted from the descending plane that there was a large crowd gathered to greet me—with floodlights, banners and cameras—the whole works.

I was thinking, "Aw, they shouldn't have gone to all this trouble," when I realized that they had misspelled my name on the huge banner. It said, "Welcome Evelyn," of all things.

Something was amiss, for sure. None of my three traveling companions bore the name of Evelyn, so it had to be another passenger on the plane. It wasn't difficult to pick out Evelyn, regardless of the fact that she sat directly across the aisle. Upon seeing the crowds and the excitement this young lady began to tingle with excitement and, had it not been for the stewardess, might have disembarked before the plane landed.

Thank heavens this wasn't the return of another fugitive from the Miss Universe contest. No, Evelyn's was a far greater mission (you'll recognize this pun a little later.)

Evelyn was greeted with delighted shrieks (the women of course), hugs and kisses (the men of course), some back-slapping, hand-pumping and a barrage of two-score unanswerable questions. No one paid much atten-

tion to our quartet of weary travelers and not one photographer took our picture.

We quizzed a couple of attractive women (they all were) and we're told that Evelyn was a local girl, who had made good by five years of doing good as a missionary in far-away Taiwan. The welcoming committee was made up of relatives and friends from the Central Presbyterian Church, the local support for Evelyn's activity.

Evelyn's friends enveloped us too, and spread their cheer among us and a couple of them even offered rides to the city. My friends insisted that it was my inordinate curiosity and delight for being in the center of this type of demonstration that prompted the Andersonites to keep a close eye on us. They even said that I might be susceptible to a traveling "flim-flam" man.

I guess that's about all the story. There really wasn't much to write a column about. It was just a pleasant experience in Anderson, South Carolina.

All hail the Evelyns of this world!

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of support for comprehensive reform of our health care system. Much of this support grew out of the hearings recently completed in Minneapolis. Mr. Richard Moe and Mrs. Minnie Holt, both representing the Retired Municipal Employees Association of Minneapolis, have made known their support for a health plan that would include public employees. As Mr. Moe pointed out, at retirement, members of their organization must pay for their own hospitalization. This cost has gone from \$35 per month to \$55 per month for coverage for a man and his wife. At that rate, according to Mr. Moe, hospitalization will eventually be priced out of the reach of retired municipal employees. Because the Health Security Act of 1971 does not require prior employment or restrictive employment provisions, the retired employees would qualify for the plan. We must eliminate health insurance plans which are based on considerations extraneous to health.

The following letter from Mr. Richard Nolan, a State representative from Minnesota, discusses his support for the comprehensive health care plan, the Health Security Act, H.R. 22:

FEBRUARY 23, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
U.S. Representative, 332 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: Thank you for having introduced the Health Security Act. A comprehensive system of health care for everyone, as well as, the development of an adequate system of income maintenance are the two most important contributions that liberals can make to our society in the years ahead.

Sincerely,

RICHARD M. NOLAN,
State Representative.

COLUMBUS DAY 1971

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my recent visit to the birthplace of Christopher Columbus as a member of a congressional delegation to honor him was an inspiration to me. Again I was reminded of the achieve-

ments of this man who tenaciously fought a lonely battle and won. This year marks the first time the United States celebrated Columbus Day as a national public holiday and in doing so we give grateful recognition to the personification of discovery and exploration and to the strong friendship we have with Italy, the ancestral homeland of many Americans, myself included.

The memory of Christopher Columbus symbolizes to all Americans the spirit of discovery, the bravery of exploration of new worlds and new life, the perse-

verence in the face of insurmountable odds and the skill to accomplish in the face of the unknown. These are qualities upon which America has thrived and grown.

I am proud that I had a part in establishing Columbus Day as a national public holiday. We have honored Columbus in many ways in the 479 years since he discovered our shores, with expositions and commemorative coins and monuments, but in this yearly national celebration we show our true appreciation for this great man.