By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EILBERG, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 11260. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948, to provide for the addition of certain property in Philadelphia, Pa., to Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 11261. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for medical and hospital care through a system of voluntary health insurance including protection against the catastrophic expenses of illness, financed in whole for low-income groups through issuance of certificates, and in part for all other persons through allowance of tax credits; and to provide effective utilization of available financial resources, health manpower, and facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DU PONT:

H.R. 11262. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, to provide benefits to survivors of police officers, prison guards, and firemen killed in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH:

H.R. 11263. A bill to provide one additional permanent district judgeship for the northern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 11264. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to permit the maintenance of price, rents, wages, and salaries at levels contracted for prior to August 15, 1971; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 11265. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (for himself, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. KEMP, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. STEELE):

H.R. 11266. A bill to provide a system for the regulation of the distribution and use of toxic chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 11267. A bill for the relief of Soviet Jews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSEN (for himself, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. LANDGREBE, and Mr. SMITH of New York):

H.R. 11268. A bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant, and hallucinogenic drug laws in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 11269. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 11270. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the heads of the respective executive agencies to provide the Congress with advance notice of certain planned organizational and other changes or actions which would affect Federal civilian employment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 11271. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' group life and health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 11272. A bill to provide for orderly trade in iron and steel products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARE:

H.R. 11273. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1970 to increase the forgiveness advantage contained in sections 231 and 232 of such act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. DOW, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. BARRETT, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, and Mr. HANNA):

H. Con. Res. 424. Concurrent resolution calling for a free and united Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. LENT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. THONE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KOCH, Mr. RHODES, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. WYATT, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H. Con. Res. 425. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to placing before the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the dual right of all persons to emigrate from and also return to one's country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DERWINSKI, and Mr. BAKER):

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to placing before the United Nations General Assembly the issue of the dual right of all persons to emigrate from and also return to one's country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. THONE, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. STEELE, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. REES, Mr. HALPERN, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. BELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. ROBINSON of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of the years 1973 through 1978 as the World Environmental Quinquennium to involve all nations of the world in a global environmental research program of both national and international scope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. RANDALL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. ROE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MCKEVITT, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. VEYSEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MCDONALD of Michigan, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MANN, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. PRICE of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the designation of the years 1973 through 1978 as the World Environmental Quinquennium to involve all nations of the world in a global environmental research program of both national and international scope; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H. Res. 643. Resolution establishing the Select Committee on Privacy, Human Values, and Democratic Institutions; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

276. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in honor of the United Spanish War Veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. GRASSO:

H.R. 11274. A bill for the relief of Carson Laboratories, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 11275. A bill for the relief of Sylvia Pamela Allen White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS FOR THREADS AND COUPLINGS OF FIREHOSES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would authorize the establishment of national standards for threads and couplings of firehoses.

A civil defense need exists for standardization. In any large-scale nuclear attack on the Nation, the fire problem will be one of the major threats to life and property from weapon drops. Prompt handling of large fires and fire hazards will be essential to effective lifesaving civil defense measures.

The problem of standardization is not, however, confined to civil defense needs. An immediate peacetime dividend would result from standardization. In handling many large fires, local fire departments must call on other fire departments to assist them. Obviously if the equipment of the assisting fire department is not compatible with the equipment of the local fire department, assistance is hindered, if not prevented. There are a great many situations where this incompatibility exists, and it has contributed to fire losses. For example, in the loss in New York Harbor of the *Normandie* by fire, a contributing factor was lack of interchangeability of hoses. This also occurred in the fire aboard the aircraft carrier *Constellation*. Forty-nine workmen lost their lives in that fire. Lack of interchangeability has hindered firefighting in connection with forest fires.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The International Association of Fire Chiefs, from its very inception, has sought standardization of coupling threads. Standardization was a main topic at the first convention of the International Association of Fire Engineers in 1873, and it was still a topic for discussion in the 1971 convention of the International Association of Fire Chiefs. The association has, in resolutions adopted over the past 15 years, consistently found that lack of interchangeability has significantly contributed to fire losses, and resolved that stronger efforts be made toward standardization. I would particularly like to commend the chairman of the IAFC's Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Screw Threads, Robert Ely of San Diego. Assistant Chief Ely has worked tirelessly for many years to standardize threads and to stir public and official interest in this vital matter.

The task is well within the state of the art. Standards do exist and some States have adopted them by law. Machines have been developed for rethreading present equipment to meet such standards.

The slowness in standardizing can be attributed to a number of things. Not surprisingly, lack of money is perhaps the most important.

Currently there is negligible Federal support for firefighting. There has been some research by the National Bureau of Standards. Federal agencies, such as the military and GSA, do engage in firefighting in connection with protection of their own facilities.

About the only Federal agency that directly helps local fire departments in equipment needs is the Office of Civil Defense. Through it, surplus Federal equipment is donated to local governments; and, at one time, through the equipment matching funds program, authorized by section 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act, financial assistance was provided for equipment purchases. Such assistance, however, was limited by a restraint on OCD to assist only on a basis of need for attack preparation and by shortage of funds.

The Federal Civil Defense Act still authorizes such assistance for firefighting purposes. Civil defense is now a joint Federal-State and local responsibility. The Civil Defense Act should be modified to authorize civil defense to take into account needs other than those required to cope with the effects of enemy attack. Without downgrading these needs, civil defense can take into account the needs of States and localities to cope with other broad scale emergencies affecting the health, safety and welfare. This would remove any question of the propriety of assistance by OCD for firefighting purposes.

OCD assistance, however, would be predicated on a need to cope with more than a highly localized emergency, that is, OCD assistance would be for a need to cope with large scale disasters, and these involve interjurisdictional activities. It is precisely here where the need for standardization exists.

Thus, because a Federal objective can be shown under the Federal Civil Defense Act, and because OCD has, in existence in connection with ongoing programs, an administrative mechanism which can reach the recipients of the desired assistance, the bill amends the Federal Civil Defense Act to authorize the establishment of standards and to use the ongoing assistance programs under that act as the mechanism for providing any necessary Federal assistance.

OCD would, through rulemaking, consider and adopt standards based upon those already developed. These also would be applicable to any other Federal assistance and to equipment of the Federal Government, as standardization requires centralized decisionmaking.

The need for standardization has been pointed out for 98 years now, and while progress has been made, 98 years is, to say the least, an adequate time to demonstrate that this will not be accomplished by itself. The time to act is now.

HOSTILITY TO TECHNOLOGY IS IRRATIONAL

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following short article by Dr. Wernher von Braun deals with the self-destructive nature of the hostility which is developing among some segments of our society toward modern technology and science. It is well worth reading.

The article follows:

HOSTILITY TO TECHNOLOGY IS IRRATIONAL

(By Dr. Wernher von Braun)

A problem that disturbs me and which I think concerns us all involves the irrational hostility that seems to be growing in this country—especially among our college and university students—regarding science and technology.

It is irrational precisely because those most vocal in their hostility toward science and technology are the very ones professing the greatest concern about poverty, poor housing, hunger, and the quality of the environment. All of these problems of society depend in varying degree upon our technological capabilities, and certainly on increased productivity, for their solutions. Some, particularly environmental pollution, require advanced research into the nature of the environment and ecological interactions.

Now there is a chronic misunderstanding about science and technology on the public's part that I am afraid is growing, but which isn't altogether the public's fault. This concerns the role that science and technology play in the development of society and the economy. There is, unfortunately, no visible link between scientific discovery about natural phenomena on the moon, for example, and our everyday lives here on earth. Yet, there are concepts and knowledge coming out of the Apollo explorations, and experiments with the rocks and dust brought back from the moon, that offer the potential of improving agriculture and the treatment of disease, and as we learn more about interior of heavenly bodies may even help us in locating mineral resources here on earth or predict earthquakes.

Most concepts and scientific knowledge take years from the time a scientist formulates them and they enter the technology until some no-nonsense pragmatist comes along and turns the idea or knowledge into a product and a flock of new jobs. By that time, everyone has forgotten, if he knew at all, that it was the scientist who started it in the first place. The interesting thing about this process is that the scientist is labeled "impractical" because he deals in theories and squiggly mathematical symbols.

Glenn Seaborg gave a very refreshing and frank talk recently on the subject of "Misunderstanding the Atom." It's too bad it wasn't widely published for it might have done much to clear the air of a lot of fuzzy thinking about cleaning up the environment and restoring the ecological balance.

What struck me most was that here was a scientist pushing hard on a pragmatic approach to solve the environmental problem and, at the same time, provide the abundant energy sources that society requires. He explored in depth all the alternatives proposed by those conservationists and environmentalists who want a kind of back-to-natural-products movement to replace the "energy-intensive industries." As usual, Dr. Seaborg was lucid and highly rational.

No reasonable person could deny the validity of his position. But the trouble is, we are not dealing with a rational body of opinion. We face a militant, highly emotional, even fanatical segment of the population which has seized upon a valid and good cause, but which will accept no facts, no reasoning that run counter to its own fixed ideology. The anti-science/technology people are demanding that we pull the plug on modern civilization in the belief that somehow we shall all be better off in a more primitive state.

However, in primitive times, the major questions for mankind was physical survival. It is not hard to guess the predictable fate of hundreds of millions of people who depend upon modern technology for the necessities of life. We have only to consider for a moment what we would do without electricity, permanently. Even the famous naturalist, Konrad Lorenz, has been warning student audiences that if they destroy our store of knowledge to make a "fresh" start, they will fall back not a few centuries, but several hundred thousand years. "If you make a clean sweep of things," he observes, "you won't go back to the Stone Age, because you are already there, but to well before the Stone Age."

But it isn't the young people, the students, who are really to blame for this attitude of hostility to science and technology. They are simply misguided by certain social philosophers, cultural historians, and the like, whose teachings and published works provide only a very lopsided view of science and technology pictured as causing the downfall of man.

When you teach impressionable and idealistic youth that the rational, logical, puritanical work approach to life is bankrupt, and that technology serves only to erode the quality of life, you are bound to ring responsive bells in many minds of a generation that has never known the deprivation, the want, and the poverty of some older generations.

When a historian and philosopher of Lewis Mumford's stature inveighs angrily and brilliantly against the "megamachine" of science and technology, and declares there can be no reform until the present "megatechnical wasteland" is destroyed, a revolutionary spirit is fanned among the young. The natural fires of rebellion we have all felt against "the system" or the "establishment" are now stoked by an eminent and respected "authority."

And when Arnold Toynbee, equally famous as historian and philosopher, asks whether "spacemanship folly" isn't also a crime because its wastes that "slender surplus product that man has succeeded in wringing out of nature within the past 5000 years," he adds a moralistic fervor to the revolutionary spirit.

It does not matter that neither Toynbee

nor anyone else has explained just what "slender surplus product" we are allegedly wasting. It is enough that we are accused of wasting it, because the point Toynbee wants to make is that spacemanship not only is a folly, it is also a crime against mankind.

It seems strange that America is about the only nation in the world where technology and science are held in such low repute. All the so-called "have-not" countries in Africa and Asia are straining their limited resources to gain what some of our students seem bent on destroying. The older European countries would give their eyeteeth to have our technological capabilities. The Soviets are especially envious, and frequently announce they will surpass the United States in production or some other field of technology. So far they have failed to do so.

The Mumsfords, the Toynbees, the Charles Reiches, and others of similar persuasion, who are teaching the young suspicion and hatred of science and technology apparently do not realize the incalculable harm they may do to the very society they wish to preserve and spiritually enrich. If the ecology so many are deeply concerned about is in delicate balance, so also is society's economic health which can be upset or destroyed by a hostile ignorance, or a general loss of confidence and purpose.

The anti-science and anti-technology voices making blanket attacks on science and technology in the name of conservation, a clean environment, or improving the quality of human life, are doing the nation and all of us a great disservice. The problems they are rightly anxious and concerned about cannot be solved by a return-to-nature cult. That course leads only to disaster for multitudes of people.

Closely related to the general attacks on science and technology is the denigration of the space program among some persons. Mumford describes the space rocket as "the most futile in tangible and beneficial human results," and sees only that while man is indeed conquering space, the "megamachine" is carrying further its conquest of man. This is of a piece with Martin Van Buren's 1829 complaint to President Andrew Jackson bemoaning the evils of the railroad in which the carriages are pulled at "the enormous speed of 15 miles per hour by 'engines'," something the Almighty never intended for people.

Surprisingly—or perhaps, not so surprisingly—Mumford ignores the apparently limitless resources of knowledge that await man in space. Some of this knowledge, as we have just begun to learn, has great significance to man, to earth environment, and to the ecology. We are learning of the relationships between earth and sun and their effects on our lives which could be learned in no other way save by means of the rocket and spacecraft. Nor does Mumford make an allowance for man's need to extend his intellectual horizons by physically exploring new worlds, no matter how barren and unfit for organic life, such as the moon may be today.

This kind of knowledge and intellectual broadening apparently is of little or no value in the eyes of social philosophers and historians preoccupied with man in the microcosm. They have not yet learned to visualize mankind of extending into the macrocosm, or for the spiritual need to do so. The desire to know is more powerful than they may suppose. Pragmatism is a valuable, stabilizing human characteristic; but without imagination we would not be human, and as long as man exercises this precious faculty, he will not long be imprisoned in the successive shells the pragmatists try to enclose him in.

Those who look upon science and technology as a megamachine that dominates their lives and holds them in thrall to a strictly programmed existence have their own special hang-ups. There is another view, and it was expressed by Glenn Seaborg:

"The difference is . . . a positive outlook, some imagination, and desire to put science and technology to work more creatively."

SCHOOL BUSING NO BIG DEAL

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in this time of discussion of school busing and constitutional amendments, the following article seems to give an integrated view of the problem:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Sept. 27, 1971]

SCHOOL BUSING NO BIG DEAL

While this may be a drab thought to lots of people who think they are a little bit better than somebody else, black children don't particularly care to go to school with white ones. I don't mean to imply they can't handle it, which may save some parental ego. It's just that most blacks today are not very interested in crashing white society.

St. Louis has been having a little flap of its own over the question of school bussing, but it's a lot different from what's going on in Pontiac, Mich., and San Francisco and a few other places. There the question is racial balance in the schools, under court order, and, for all we know, it may never come up again, now that Chief Justice Burger and the Chief Executive have let it be known that they weren't all that serious.

For black people, the only bothersome thing is the hypocrisy of it all, but integration isn't very big any more. As a matter of fact, there was nothing more traumatic to black parents, a decade ago, than to send their children into hostile white schools in the South. They went ahead and did it anyway to force quality education across the board.

"'But there isn't any cause for integration any more," Mrs. Pearlie Evans said last week as we sat having an integrated drink. She's the city's commissioner of community services and a black activist and a pretty lady and she's on more committees than anybody I ever knew. And she went on to say that "you can't have integration between unequals."

Now Mrs. Evans is equal to anybody but what she was saying was that racial balance in the schools is a question that has been sent to the rear of the bus. She didn't use that terminology, of course. Her words, although we whites have heard them many times, have their own special meaning to black people—segregation, integration, separation—and for her it's more important that black children learn the agony that is hidden behind those words in the long history of the black in America. Far more important than meeting some white kids. So bussing and school integration aren't very big things to Pearlie Evans any more.

Instead, she sees separation as a necessary condition at this point in time, until blacks achieve equality on their own, as a right of citizenship and humanity and not as a gift from some good-hearted guy.

All that conversation made me want to go by and see Percy Green, shortly before he went to the Workhouse for 30 days for an encounter at one of those Veiled Prophet Balls we used to have in town. I went to see him partly because his name gives chills to the type of person who only knows what he reads in the papers. And partly because he has his own way of saying and doing things, and he keeps the city from going to sleep by forcing it to think.

We shared a six-pack in his cramped and crowded office on North Newstead and he said "we're interested in integration by black standards, not by enemy standards," but there were three whites and three blacks sitting there when he said it and I didn't feel like the enemy.

As chairman of ACTION, Percy Green has made a habit of doing things a little bit differently from anybody else around, and his position on school integration is this: "For each black student bussed to a predominantly white school, there must be a white student bussed to a predominantly black school." But it isn't because he wants everybody to become cronies. It's because busing "forces black students to be ashamed of themselves by learning to simulate white people."

So Pearlie Evans and Percy Green really were saying the same thing, and busing was no big deal.

But racism is. Last week a white lady named Mrs. Betty Roller had a comment to make about the South Side busing controversy and she said: "They (the protesters) mouth one thing, but their hearts are saying something else. The real issue is race." Percy Green had another way of putting it. "Who's making an issue of white kids being bused to another white school?" The question was lucid enough to me.

The North Side protest is a big deal, too, for them, but for quite different reasons, which have little to do with school and have deep meanings within the complexities of the black struggle for equality. To Pearlie Evans, it comes down to not wanting to go back to where you worked so hard to get away from. Not out of a black environment but out of the depressing surroundings of poverty. I'm sure there are white parents on the South Side who feel that way, too, and there has always been the white struggle to escape from poverty, as well, and I can understand it unless somebody thinks that the color of poverty is black.

Well, Percy Green will be picketing the Board of Education soon, but it won't have anything to do with busing. It will have to do with things like renaming schools in honor of leaders of the black struggle for equality, and having white students, even in all-white schools, learn something about the history of those struggles, and freeing black teachers to be vocal about their blackness.

That's where people like Percy Green and Pearlie Evans come together on the question of schools, the matter of freeing black students to stand proud. Busing isn't it. They don't want to "simulate white people," as Percy puts it. They just want to be free to be.

If that bothers any white egos, at least those folks can eliminate busing as a thing to keep them awake at night.

OUR NATION'S NEWSPAPERS—STILL NO. 1 FOR NEWS

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, this week, October 10–16, is National Newspaper Week. It is, therefore, appropriate to salute the newspapers of America and the hard-working men and women who produce them. I join President Nixon in saluting the newspaper industry for its contributions to civic growth and progress throughout our Nation.

The President, paying tribute to the great newspapers of our Nation, stated:

Communication is the life blood of a community.

Surely, no other medium performs its communicative functions so extensively, in so many forms, to such a diverse audience, and at such relatively low cost.

I was interested in results of a recent Bureau of Advertising survey showing newspapers remain the Nation's No. 1 medium for news—far ahead of radio, television, and periodicals. Today, even more than in the past, Americans turn to their newspaper for information and interpretation of what is happening around the corner and around the world.

President Nixon has termed the printed word "a powerful instrument of progress," and so it is, with impact on millions of readers daily. Business and civic life in our Nation's metropolitan centers, small cities, and towns, would slow to a crawl without the newspaper to publicize worthy causes, advertise goods and services, and bring entertainment and enlightenment to millions of homes.

In these days of political and socio-economic controversy, our American newspapers are coming under fire from those at both ends of the ideological spectrum. I am among those who sometimes find myself at odds with views expressed by some of our newspapers. At the same time, however, I can cite countless hundreds of editors and writers in my home State of Tennessee, and throughout America, who strive for objectivity and excellence in reporting, putting service to their readers above personal opinion. Regardless of our own political philosophy, we must all stanchly defend freedom of the press as requisite to a free, informed society, and attack encroachments upon journalistic liberty by any party.

It is encouraging to note the newspaper industry is continuing to prosper and expand despite the waves of controversy that continue to assault it. The October 1971, issue of the Tennessee Press, official publication of the Tennessee Press Association, has reprinted an article written by Daniel V. Cashman, investment officer of the First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co., Philadelphia. The article first appeared in the September 4 issue of a journalism trade publication, Editor and Publisher. Mr. Cashman cites statistics which seem to substantiate his view "newspapers have dawned as a new growth industry."

The article's contents are instructive, and it is my pleasure to incorporate them into my remarks:

NEWSPAPERS—A NEW GROWTH INDUSTRY

(By Daniel V. Cashman)

"As a long term consideration, there appear to be few areas for investment that can balance the inherent excellence of the newspaper industry."

He noted that it is "nearly impossible to ignore (as an investment) an industry that is guaranteed survival by the United States Constitution, enjoys legal monopolies in many of its markets, and is looked upon as a necessity by almost every American adult."

Cashman's last statement is supported in part by the results of a recent Bureau of Advertising survey which showed that newspapers remain the Number One medium for news. (Reported in September The Tennessee Press).

But Cashman said newspapers deserve serious attention because:

The industry has had an annual growth rate of 15 per cent a year.

The capital investment to start a newspaper is so formidable the field is not easy to enter.

The low cost newspaper is virtually indispensable to the daily routine of most Americans.

Local merchants need the medium of newspaper advertising to keep his flow of products moving.

—improved production technology helps greatly in offsetting the tremendous price and wage cost which the industry has experienced.

—the balance sheet condition of newspapers is basically unrivaled by any industry.

On this last point, Cashman said that figures on the 80 publically held newspaper companies show that they could cover quickly, if necessary, by cash and equivalents, 80 per cent of all their liabilities. The figure for industry as a whole is only 18 per cent.

In addition, he points out that newspapers after tax profit margins averaged 8.4 per cent over the last five years compared with 5.6 per cent for all corporations in the U.S. And he said return on stockholders' equities was a strong 15.4 per cent versus 11.1 per cent for all of industry.

Although Cashman was speaking of publically-held newspapers, reports from various segments of the industry indicated that despite the national economic slowdown and pockets of high unemployment newspapers are doing much better than expected.

For example, the Bureau of Advertising has predicted that the annual revenues of daily newspapers will exceed $6.1 billion in 1971.

A CONSTITUENT WRITES OF HER FAITH IN OUR GOVERNMENT

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I find as I am sure my colleagues in the House do, that my mail from constituents in my district frequently acts as an excellent barometer of the feeling of the people we have been elected to represent. The writers express their views, make excellent proposals, and declare their faith in their Government and their country.

In this age when so much of the dissent we hear seems not to recognize the strengths of our Nation, I would like to share with you a thoughtful letter I recently received from Mrs. Bonnie Bailey Sexton of Wynne, Ark. While she outlines some areas in which she disagrees with operations of our Government, she reaffirms her faith in that Government.

Mrs. Sexton's letter follows:

Mr. BILL ALEXANDER,
Member of Congress,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MR. ALEXANDER: I am a licensed practical nurse in the State of Arkansas. I do not get a large salary. I am not a big wheeler, in fact, I am one of the littlest of little wheelers. I don't mind that and never really wanted to be any more than that. However, I do have a complaint against our government.

I read in the paper where our government is sending an eight million dollar moon mobile to the moon. As an American, I was just as proud as anyone that our country was first to land on the moon. It shows that we are a strong, intelligent country.

I do think that our government is driving this thing in the ground. They are, in my opinion, spending taxpayers' money to act like a bunch of children with a new toy.

I am not against paying taxes, but I am against my tax money being spent frivolously. I do not think I am alone in this. I think other people are like I have been. They just say: "Who am I to say anything? Let someone else do it."

Another thing I do not agree with is the way our government is handling the Welfare Program. I am not against welfare. I think the poor person who is disabled to help himself should be helped by us all; however, there are many people in this state who are quite able to work. I think that if any woman who wants a child and can afford to care for it should have it, whether married or single. It is no one else's business. The thing is, there are numerous ladies on welfare having children ever so often and they get a bigger check. One has to be in pretty fair health in order to do this. If they can do this, then there is some type of work they can do.

I had government aid myself in order to go to LPN school. The program was called, "M.D.T.A." and it is good. Helping people to help themselves and helping those who cannot help themselves is our duty.

I am not altogether sure that I agree that building new homes for these people to own is good, either, when I have worked hard all my life and will probably never have one. However, rent houses are hard to find and I suppose that is the only way. They must have a roof over their heads.

I might add that I think we have a good government. We wouldn't be such a great country if we didn't have. I just think the government, like the individual, should try to improve because no one is perfect and that includes our government.

All I have written are strictly my opinions and I do think we are all entitled to that.

Sincerely,

BONNIE BAILEY SEXTON.

NEW REHABILITATION INSTITUTE IN CHICAGO

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 13, ground breaking ceremonies were held in my city of Chicago for the new rehabilitation institute to be built at Northwestern University—McGraw Medical Center. This institute, when completed, will be the finest rehabilitation center of its kind in the United States.

Since its founding in 1954, the rehabilitation institute has treated over 9,000 individuals. This new building will provide a 170-bed facility with top equipment and research capabilities for serving and rehabilitating the handicapped. A desperately needed center, the new institute marks the beginnings of a dream become reality for thousands of handicapped persons throughout the Nation.

In connection with the ground breaking of the rehabilitation institute's new

complex, I would like at this point to enclose for the RECORD a copy of an article from a recent Chicago Tribune magazine, written by Ridgely Hunt. I am sure that my colleagues will find this article to be a vivid and eye opening account of the unrehabilitated and rehabilitated lives of the handicapped and their struggle to return to a functioning and productive life.

The article follows:

WHO CARES FOR THE BROKEN MAN?

(By Ridgely Hunt)

When you injure your spinal cord, a number of curious things happen to compound your original disaster.

In the first place, because you are probably both paralyzed and insensitive to pain in the lower part of your body, you can neither shift position in bed nor feel the necessity for doing so. Many hospitals, ignorant of the dangers imposed by this condition, will permit you to lie immobile for weeks and months while your body weight squeezes the circulation out of your skin. Inevitably, you will develop appalling bed sores, sometimes as big as a watermelon and deep enough to encompass your entire fist. These may become infected and eventually kill you. At the least, they will delay by many weeks any attempt to liberate you from the prison of your shattered body.

But worse, both psychologically and physically, is the loss of bowel and bladder control. The spinal-cord patient typically can neither force himself to urinate nor prevent himself from passing stool. To cope with the former problem, a catheter—a rubber tube—must be threaded thru the urethra and left in place with one end inside the bladder and the other end draining into a bag strapped to the leg. For the latter infirmity, the patient is diapered like a baby. [Dr. Henry B. Betts, medical director of the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago, has seen such patients permanently installed in boxes of sawdust. When the patients' bowels moved, the attendants shoveled out the soiled sawdust and replaced it with new.]

The loss of control over these two most elementary functions presents enormous hazards for the patient. On the physical plane, the catheter causes a constant irritation. Altho the spinal-cord patient may not feel it, the catheter encourages the formation of calcium deposits that serve as the situs—the location and hiding place—for infections. These, in turn, may spread from the bladder to the kidneys with lethal consequences.

On the emotional plane, the results are frequently even more devastating. The patient is reduced to a humiliating dependency literally as helpless as a baby. He is compelled to submit to procedures that from earliest childhood he has been taught to regard as disgusting and demeaning. And this at the hands of the nursing staff, many of whom are young and pretty.

Because hospitals are staffed in large part by attractive women, the male patient in particular is forever reminded of his crowning misfortune: the loss of his sexual competence. Not all spinal-cord patients are similarly afflicted in this respect. Some men remain capable of an erection, tho they need help to achieve an ejaculation. Whether they will receive that help hinges on the love and skill of their wives, a fact that further emphasizes their dependency. In any event, because they have lost sensitivity in the lower part of the body, they will get little physical gratification from the act of love and must content themselves with the knowledge that they are fulfilling their roles as men, if only after a fashion. Furthermore, their muscular impairment will usually cause the sperm to be projected backward into the bladder, rendering them unable to beget children. [As in everything else pertaining to medicine, exceptions can be found to this generality. There is on record at least one Illinois couple both of whom are paralyzed from the waist down, who have produced a succession of offspring.] Because women can adopt an entirely passive role in lovemaking, a spinal-cord injury does not inflict so grevious a loss on their sexuality. They can conceive and bear children, and indeed, the inability to feel pain may come as a positive blessing in labor.

So the spinal-cord patient finds himself beset by a sea of difficulties. First is the catastrophic injury to his body, which may prevent him from walking or even moving his legs for the rest of his life. Worse, he may never move his arms. And second is the blow to his emotions, especially to his self-esteem. In several important ways, he has reverted to infancy: He wets his pants and soils his bed; he can neither feed nor dress himself; he must be lifted and carried like a baby. And third, he has lost his place as an adult—lost his job, lost his freedom, lost his manhood. He has become an anomaly in the eyes of the world. He knows that he will be stared at if he ventures out in public. He fears that his wife and friends will reject him, and in this he is sometimes right. Depending on the kind of person he was before his accident, he will feel resentful, angry, terrified and defeated. Or he will be determined, inventive, serene and courageous. Or typically he will be all of these things at one time or another.

It's surprisingly easy to injure your spinal cord. Cook County Sheriff Richard Elrod did it in a tussle with an S.D.S. rioter on Madison Street. Many victims do it while swimming, usually by diving into shallow water and hitting their heads on the bottom. The most common cause among patients at the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago is automobile accidents. But one way or another, the victim has suffered a traumatic injury that has broken his spine and damaged the spinal cord, the bundle of nerves that runs like a trunk telephone cable from the base of the brain downward for about 18 inches to the small of the back. Sometimes the cord is entirely severed, in which case, in the present state of medical knowledge, it can never be rejoined. Sometimes it is merely bruised and in time will regain some—possibly all—of its function. Because the cord does not visualize in X-rays, you cannot tell for sure how badly it is damaged; you can only wait and see. Patients often announce a firm expectation of walking again. Usually they are disappointed, and their failure plunges them into deeper gloom. But some achieve the miracle.

The extent of the disability depends on the location of the injury. If it is high up in the cervical vertebrae of the neck, it will disrupt the nerves that control breathing, and the victim will die. If the damage occurs somewhat lower, he will be paralyzed from the neck down, breathing shallowly but unable to move arms, legs or trunk. [This happened to Jim Braun, a 21-year-old patient at the Rehabilitation Institute, who dove into 3 feet of water one golden afternoon during a picnic in South Dakota. Still entirely conscious, he lay on the bottom of the pond, looking up at the fading sunlight on the surface but unable to reach it. Happily, his friends eventually realized that he wasn't fooling and pulled him out half-drowned.] Lower still, as the 31 pairs of nerves branch off from the spinal cord to the various organs of the body, the victim retains more function. He may be able to move a single muscle in his left shoulder. Perhaps he can shift his entire right arm although denied the use of the fingers. Or arms and hands may work while the legs dangle uselessly.

Though the extent of the loss varies, all spinal-cord patients can be divided into two camps: the more fortunate who can move their arms but not their legs and the less fortunate who can move neither. The first are called paraplegics; the second as quadriplegics. In the vernacular of the rehabilitation business, they are often referred to as "paras" and "quads." Most doctors and therapists who work with them deplore the tendency to categorize, to put labels on them, because, like all humanity, spinal-cord patients are infinitely varied. But certain classifications must be drawn for the sake of brevity, and so this man is a para and that girl is a quad. Through the accident of a moment, they have become lifetime members of a special minority, an aberrant class feared or despised or patronized by the ambulatory majority.

And thus they come to the Rehabilitation Institute, some of them despairing, some of them hoping for the miracle and none of them knowing what they will find inside those white-painted brick walls. The place looks like another of the warehouses and loft buildings that dot the semi-industrial area on Ohio Street out by Lake Shore Drive. Motorists, hell-bent to get home for their evening martini, could pass it for a dozen years and never guess at the maimed and crippled people who dwell inside.

Just as well. At first glance, they would make you cry out in shock and horror. Here on this wheelchair is a little boy whose legs have been amputated above the knees. There, silent and withdrawn, sits a girl injured in a college laboratory explosion; the left side of her head is crushed in. On that bed lies one of the nation's ablest newspaper editors, paralyzed from the neck down by an automobile crash. His voice breaks on the edge of tears when he speaks of his misfortune. His brain is undamaged. Only his body is broken. He has not yet learned to accept this, and acceptance is an important requisite to adjustment and rehabilitation. The middle-aged woman with the gravy running down her chin, she's a "hemi," a hemiplegic, paralyzed on one side of her body by a stroke. She used to be an office supervisor, but she won't go back to that. Her powers of speech have been entirely wiped out by the hemorrhage in her brain.

And over there, lying prone on a cart, that's a bilateral amputee with disarticulation. They took off both his legs as high as they could go, which in this case means removing the top joint of the leg from the hip socket. To look at him quickly, you would think he had been sawed in half at the navel, leaving only half a man.

In ages past, a man like that could make a living by displaying himself in public places, and parents sometimes maimed their own children to capitalize on the popular delight in freaks. But modern society, grown delicate and refined, prefers to shut its freaks away from view—in hospitals, in nursing homes, upstairs in the back bedroom. In the Pepsi generation, where everyone is beautiful and no one passes the age of 28, no place remains for the lame, the halt and the blind.

Even the medical profession has traditionally turned its back on them. After the "acute-care" phase, after the arm has been amputated and the stump has healed, after the broken spine has been fused, the doctors have had neither the time nor the inclination to help their patients master their newly circumscribed lives. Most of them still don't nor do they encourage their students to take up this work.

"When I was a medical student," says Dr. Betts, who is today an improbably handsome 43 years old, "there was a subtle disparagement of chronic disease. It was infused into our minds that geriatric and chronic problems were not the most interesting. Acute cases were the ones that the professors got excited about. There was a little groaning when you got an arthritic or an asthmatic. So you ended up with a subtle feeling against this sort of thing. I once had great hope for the younger generation of medical students. They just love

'dealing with the whole man,' which is what you have to do in rehabilitation. I was delighted with them. They came here to see what we were doing in the institute, and they loved it, and almost all of them went into something else."

When the institute first opened its doors in 1953, it was starved for patients because most doctors refused to refer patients there. The situation has vastly improved since then, but to this day, many doctors will not send a patient there, either because they are ignorant of or indifferent to the new science of rehabilitation or because they fear to lose a paying customer. Money, after all, influences all mortals, even physicians.

This fact helps to deter doctors from entering the field of rehabilitative medicine. There's more money as well as glamor in the practice of surgery. And the turnover is faster. Why tie yourself up in a long-term relationship with a physical ruin who soils his pants when you can knock off an appendectomy and collect your fee in a month? Besides, surgeons are community heroes, and lurking always in the background is the suggestion that rehabilitative medicine is somehow not quite respectable.

It is, in fact, a recent bloom in the garland of medical specialties, invented almost singlehanded by a physician named Howard Rusk toward the end of World War II. An Air Force medical officer at the time, Rusk observed and abhorred the crippled future that awaited many seriously wounded soldiers. For them medicine offered little help and less hope. Rusk supplied both in the new specialty of rehabilitation, which was largely pioneered in American military and Veterans Administration hospitals.

Even today, few medical schools offer training in rehabilitation. Of these few, Northwestern University is a leader. Physicians skilled in this field are called physiatrists [usually pronounced "fizzy-at-rists," but not always]. Working under them is a corps of paramedical specialists: physical and occupational therapists; prosthetists, who make and fit artificial limbs; and orthotists, who make braces. Training in these skills usually takes two or four years on the college level and is available, among other places, in branches of Chicago City College.

But the field still suffers from a lack of specialists and indeed from a lack of civilian institutions devoted exclusively to rehabilitation. Many hospitals maintain departments of rehabilitation, but many of these are understaffed, ill-equipped and poorly trained. Of large centers like Chicago's Rehabilitation Institute there are not half a dozen in the country. This is a pity for two major reasons. In the first place, it dooms 90 per cent of the physically disabled to a sort of living death, immobilized and hidden away. And in addition to the cost in human agony, this shortcoming presents society with a huge financial bill to support the nation's 250,000 disabled. It has been reckoned that, for every dollar spent on rehabilitation, $8 has been returned in welfare costs saved and income taxes paid by workers restored to usefulness. If humanitarianism will not spur this endeavor, then perhaps the motivation will come from a decent regard for the buck.

Rehabilitation itself is not cheap. Each day of inpatient care at the Rehabilitation Institute costs $100, and the average patient stays 53 days. Federal and state funds pay for some of these cases, and the institute itself carries five per cent of them free. But the majority are financed by so-called "third-party payers," mostly insurance companies, of which by far the largest share is borne by Blue Cross-Blue Shield. In general, the rich can afford the treatment; the poor will get it for nothing; and the middle-class may very well be wiped out. But for all, the money can be found one way or another. Finding a vacancy among the institute's 71 beds is another matter. At the moment, the waiting list is 8 to 12 weeks long.

A spinal-cord patient can suffer a shocking amount of deterioration in 8 to 12 weeks. Frequently he will spend these months held rigidly immobile within a Stryker frame, a two-layer cot built like a sandwich in which the patient becomes the filling. Bed sores will ravage his skin. His joints will harden from disuse, and from inactivity his muscles will wither and his tendons will stretch until arms threaten to disengage from shoulder sockets and legs from hips. And in this condition, if he is lucky, he will at length be brought to the Rehabilitation Institute.

An enormous amount of work lies ahead. Before anything else, his bed sores must be healed and new sores prevented from developing. In this the principal tactic is to turn him frequently and regularly, day and night, as often as once an hour. In some cases, it may take three people to "logroll" the patient. If he had received this kind of nursing during his earlier hospitalization, his skin would not be so ulcerated now.

His sores healed at last, the patient can work toward the considerable feat of sitting upright. He has no tolerance for this exertion, but he can be led toward it. At first he will be strapped onto a tilt table and tipped so that his feet rest lower than his head. In time, he can learn to endure an upright position for an hour or more.

From the beginning, he has submitted to the attentions of the institute's large and variegated staff. He has been interviewed by a social worker, a psychologist and a psychiatrist. He has been examined by at least one doctor and a physical therapist and an occupational therapist. And unknown to him, he has been the subject of a large conference at which Dr. Betts presided while the staff reported at length upon his case. Teamwork is important in rehabilitation. The occupational therapist must know what pitfalls the psychologist has discovered, and the nurse's knowledge of the patient's bladder program may vitally affect the social worker's recommendation for family relationships. If the doctor has detected a return in the right biceps, the physical therapist will want to know about it. If the patient is contemplating suicide, they will all want to know about it.

The bowel and bladder programs assume early importance, primarily because of the need to remove the catheter before it causes an infection. Although the patient may never recover the ability to urinate at will, it is possible to train the bladder to empty itself periodically into a leg bag. Similarly, through training and diet control, the bowels can be taught to move on a predictable schedule. These accomplishments are vital if the patient is ever to venture forth into the world again.

And he must learn to use a wheelchair. He may well have to spend the rest of his life in it. The wheelchair brings both freedom and restriction. In it he can move freely about his apartment—except into the bathroom. [Perversely, bathroom doors are almost always built too narrow to admit a wheelchair. If the door can't be widened, he will have to make do with a wash basin and a commode in his bedroom.] He can go outdoors, hoist himself into his car, fold up his wheelchair and stick it in the back seat, and drive away with the help of special hand controls. He can go to the movies, go shopping, go to work.

But he can't climb stairs. Unless he can find an elevator or a couple of husky friends to carry him, he is forever barred from the downstairs men's room, his favorite restaurant with the flight of steps out front, even the second floor of his own house. He will look for driveways whenever he wants to cross the street because Chicago has provided few ramps to help him up onto the curb. He can bounce his wheelchair over a curb by balancing it on its hind wheels and getting a running start, but that takes practice.

All of these tribulations must wait, however. At this point he can't even put on his own pants. The institute will teach him that too in a field of study called "activities of daily living." The problems here are formidable and the solutions often ingenious. The stroke victim, for instance, frequently suffers paralysis of both arm and leg on the same side and will probably have to get thru the rest of his life one-handed. He can make out quite nicely with a few exceptions. He can put on his clothes and button his shirt—all except the cuff button on his remaining useful wrist. This last cuff he can fasten by having a patch of Velcro sewed beneath the button and pressing it closed. Neckties can be tied one-handed more easily than he might suppose. So can shoelaces; there's a special trick that the therapists will show him. It would be easier to wear loafers, but stroke victims often need leg braces, and these work best with laced shoes. You can scrub all the parts of your body except the hand you're using, and you can scrub that, too, by gluing a scrub brush inside the basin and rubbing the hand against it.

Women stroke victims have difficulty fastening their bras. A front-opening model helps and can be equipped with Velcro instead of hooks. The application of a deodorant presents certain obstacles. So does lipstick. If she has lost all sensation on her paralyzed side, she cannot feel where she is applying her lipstick and sometimes winds up with a clown's mouth.

Often the stroke victim sustains a mental as well as a physical loss. He may no longer be able to speak or perform simple arithmetical chores such as counting his money. The institute's staff of speech therapists will help with these disabilities. But in addition, he may be subject to a general confusion so that he gets both feet into the same trouser leg or becomes lost while trying to work his arms and legs into his undershirt.

Aside from the neuroses that may stem from his injury, the spinal-cord patient usually suffers no such mental debility. Inside his wrecked body, his brain is scheming and plotting ways to help himself. And there are a thousand ways to survive in this predicament. Most of them he'd never think of for himself, but the therapists know all the tricks. They have forks that strap to the hand and typing sticks that can punch typewriter keys and paint brushes that can be held in the teeth. They have splints that convert wrist movement into gripping action.

And they make the patient work. They set him a task, like the construction of a bookshelf, and they keep him at it, endlessly sanding and sanding. It's good for the muscles. Jim Braun, the quad who lay so long on the bottom of the pond, has already completed a ceramic serving tray for his girl and gone on to a candleholder for his parents, both made almost entirely with his right arm since his left arm and both hands are pretty well useless. He gets around now in an electric-powered wheelchair which he controls by shoving his right palm against a couple of levers. He is about ready to go home to South Dakota.

For the goal is always to go home. The institute staff talks a good deal about "goals," which differ in detail from patient to patient. Many hope to walk again, and some do. Even tho both legs are paralyzed, you can stiffen them with braces and learn to walk on crutches. A few achieve the miracle and regain the ability to walk with no mechanical

assistance whatsoever. Nancy Hendricks did that. A pretty, 16-year-old blonde, she broke her spine in a motorcycle accident. Last Christmas, she was a paraplegic, flat on her back in bed. Five months later she was walking without even a cane. Now she works as a volunteer in the institute.

Most working men want to go back to their jobs. For many, the ability to support their families has been their only pride in an otherwise drab life. The man accustomed to working with his brain can usually expect to work again, but the manual laborer faces a more dubious prospect. He can no longer earn his bread by the strength of his arms. Neither can he be readily turned into an intellectual, tho there are exceptions. One institute alumnus, a 51-year-old truck driver, was found to possess remarkable computational abilities. Now he's enrolled in junior college, learning to be an accountant. The stroke victim may hold a job again, but his loss of mental acuity may prevent him from regaining his old position. One 15-year railroad veteran was forced to accept a job working for men he had once trained. His mind may have slipped, but he fully knows how his status has been degraded, and it breaks his heart. For some men, the most practical solution lies in "role reversal," in which the man stays home and keeps house while his wife goes out to work. But to the man who sets great store by his masculinity, this is often no answer at all.

Amputees face a brighter future, depending on their physical condition, their sex and the extent of their loss. It takes considerable strength to swing an artificial leg attached to a stump above the knee. Two such legs are much harder. And many amputees lose their legs as a result of the vascular diseases attendant upon old age. They are too old and feeble to support this burden, much less to master the skill of walking on prostheses, and so they resign themselves to life in a wheelchair. Men usually take more readily than women to artificial limbs. A man, after all, can hide his leg inside his trousers, but a woman's dress displays her aberration. In both sexes, vanity plays an important part in fitting prostheses. Great care is taken to match shape and skin color as well as to construct a socket that will intimately fit the stump. And more ingenious devices are under development such as an artificial arm and hand that respond to electric impulses generated by the arm muscles. Much of this research, as well as the training of prosthetists and the fitting of artificial limbs, goes on within the walls of the institute. The amputees must buy their arms and legs from a commercial limb shop, but they learn to use them at the institute.

And learning is perhaps the most important part in rehabilitation. The institute sees an endless procession of nurses, therapists, medical students who have come for training. It will see still more three years from now when it completes its new $25-million building, twice as big as the one-time book-printing plant it now occupies.

But the major portion of the learning falls to the patients themselves, who have so much to accomplish. Not only must they learn again to dress and feed themselves and perform useful work and walk or wheel themselves about as best they can, but also they must learn to live in a world that was never made for them. The institute helps them with this, too. As part of "recreation therapy," they make frequent sorties into the outside, sometimes to the theater or to a concert at Ravinia, sometimes to a ball game or a department store, occasionally even to Europe on a tourist's holiday.

The goal is not so much to divert them as it is to teach them how to exist in an ambulatory society. They learn that, if the theater restrooms are downstairs, they may be able to roll their chairs to the men's room in the soda shop, two doors away [or failing that, to empty their leg bags in a dark alley]. They learn that taxis sometimes refuse to stop for a man in a wheelchair [but the next cabbie will not only stop but haul him up three steps into a restaurant]. They learn to shift for themselves as much as they can, and when they must be picked up and heaved into an automobile seat, they learn to accept that, too, with grace and gratitude. They learn to live again—tho within their limitations.

For the limitations always remain, whether as a burden or a weapon. Some patients go forth from the institute as full-fledged wheelchair generals, determined to use their disabilities to bludgeon their families into servitude. Others, despite the best efforts of the staff, go out in defeat, convinced that they have lost their future and the love of their families.

But most set out with some improvement and with reasonable expectations. Tho they may never play golf again, perhaps, at least they can hobble around on braces and canes, which is better than they could do when they came in. If they must sit in a wheelchair, perhaps they can now feed themselves and type a letter. It may be a bitter bargain, but it's better than nothing. In the final extremity, most men cling to life, even tho it must be endured in agony.

And out of the pain may come some good. A remarkable number of patients embark upon their new lives with a deeper understanding of themselves, an enlarged wisdom about mankind. In their new weakness, many find new strength. And for some, that bargain is at least acceptable.

HOLIDAY INNS HELP FIGHT INFLATION

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, there is a well-known company in my district that believes in practicing what it preaches.

None of the distinguished ladies and gentlemen in this House can go back to to their districts without seeing one or more of the great signs, the famous yellow and green trademarks that have made Holiday Inns famous throughout the world.

Last week, when the President of our Nation asked the American public to join hands in the fight against inflation, the president of Holiday Inns of America, William B. Walton, was listening. When President Nixon ended his address, President Walton picked up his telephone.

The 1,346 Holiday Inns in domestic U.S.A. are interconnected by what is perhaps the largest privately owned communications network in the world, called the Holidex system. The Holidex has a "hotline" arrangement which is used on rare occasions, and which is labeled "Administrative Message Urgent." Only the top three officers of the company are allowed access to it. Mr. Walton plugged into the hotline, and dictated this.

To all innkeepers in the Holiday Inn system, from William B. Walton, president: Please help your country by putting the following message on the Holiday Inn Great Sign attraction panel as soon as possible: Help our President help our country fight inflation.

Mr. Speaker, by sometime the following morning, virtually every Holiday Inn in the country was helping to spread the message that their president, and our President, wanted the Nation to see. There is no way to estimate how many motorists saw that message that morning; there is no way to determine what, if any, effect this patriotic act may have had on their thinking.

But it is characteristic of this man, and the company he represents, that more than 1,300 Holiday Inns last week told the Nation that they were behind our President in his efforts to make things better for all of us.

HONORABLE ACE ALAGNA

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, celebration of Columbus Day this year carried a special meaning for every American. Legislation enacted by the 90th Congress, designating that Columbus Day be honored as a national holiday, was put into effect for the first time this year. Therefore, I was extremely proud to see that on October 11, 1971, 100,000 people participated in this year's Newark Columbus Day parade, making this the largest ceremony of this kind in New Jersey's history. Responsible for the sponsorship of this gala event was the Honorable Ace Alagna. Inscribed on his Christopher Columbus medallion, presented to him by the Americans of Italian descent and by the citizens of the city of Newark were the following words:

The making of a man is only measured by his self-sacrificing efforts on behalf of his fellow men. Ace Alagna, chairman, is a giant among men.

Ace Alagna, after 25 years in the photographic arts, retired from his position on the Star Ledger and became the publisher of the largest Italian-American weekly newspaper in this country. As a member of the National Press Photographers, he has been assigned the honorable task of portraying Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon and has covered Pope Paul's visit to America. Among his many significant awards, he holds the Boys' Club Bronze Award and the Boystown of Italy's Humanitarian Award as most special. A veteran of World War II, he is married to the former Josephine Zuccarello and is the father of four lovely daughters. He and his family reside in Newark, N.J. Again, I want to thank my dear friend for his dedicated efforts in successfully sponsoring the first national Columbus Day parade in the city of Newark.

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARINGS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, in early August an unprecedented number of Congressmen joined together on the floor of the House to voice their concern over the defense position of the United States as compared to that of the Soviet Union. Those who participated spanned the entire political and ideological spectrum and represented over one-fifth of the American people. Their sole purpose was to see that the public's right to know facts affecting their security was insured.

Unfortunately, the press did not cooperate. Deeming the entire episode to be "not newsworthy," the media ignored it almost totally and 88 Congressmen were right back where they started.

It was decided that another dramatic event must be planned and maybe this time the press would cover it. Out of this determination arose the "Special Committee on Defense Priorities," which held its first hearing on September 2, 1971. Several distinguished experts in the area of national defense and arms control agreed to appear and provide the committee with their appraisal of our current defense posture. Mr. Speaker, the information brought to light that day was not only highly informative but also quite startling.

I have here the transcript of that hearing, and it contains testimony which should be read and reread by every Member of this body. Each of us owes it to himself and his constituents to be thoroughly familiar with the contents of this document, and for that reason I include the transcript at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICA'S PRESENT STRATEGIC DEFENSE POSITION

(Thursday, September 2, 1971)

The Committee met at 10:15 a.m., pursuant to notice, in room 2222 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Floyd Spence (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Spence, Hunt, Crane, and Robinson.

Mr. SPENCE. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we might as well go ahead. Other members are on the way but we hate to detain you any longer than is necessary.

I would like to welcome you here this morning and to call to order the hearing of this Special Committee on Defense Priorities. Our committee is composed of Members who are deeply concerned over America's present strategic defense position in the world and over our research and development priorities looking to the future. Because of our recess schedule, the number of committee participants is somewhat limited.

This effort of ours grew out of the August 4th so-called "Special Order" on natural defense in which approximately 88 Members of the House of Representatives participated. This discussion may well have been unprecedented in its scope and significance, and the wide cross-section of opinion it represented.

To anyone familiar with the makeup of Congress, it should be clear that this outpouring of concern was broadly representative, not only of both political parties from all parts of the country, but a wide ideological spectrum ranging from conservative to liberal which cuts across party lines and regional boundaries. The ratings of the participants on any rating scale one might choose would range from near zero to one hundred. In virtually every case the thrust of the remarks was the same, a concern that America has fallen, is falling or will soon fall below the minimum level of the defense capability necessary to preserve our security and maintain the delicate balance of power which governs today's world. The emphases were different but the message was consistent and profoundly disconcerting.

As a result, we have called these hearings in the hope of focusing greater attention on deterioration of our defense posture and downgrading of our defense priorities. At the same time, we hope perhaps to shed some new light on our real defense needs and what exactly can be done to reverse the present trend and identify the most pressing priorities.

We are pleased to have a number of well-known and knowledgeable witnesses to appear before us. As you probably saw from our release, we were expecting Dr. William Van Cleave, prominent member of the arms control community, to be our first witness. Unfortunately, Dr. Van Cleave was taken ill last night. We have talked with him this morning on the telephone and he has promised us that he will appear before this committee at a later date. Dr. Kintner, our first witness, talked to him also, and will probably elaborate on some of the things Dr. Van Cleave would have said.

We will also have with us at these hearings Dr. William Kintner, who is at the witness table this morning, from the University of Pennsylvania, and Dr. Armbruster from the Hudson Institute, and at two o'clock we will hear from General Trudeau, former Chief of Research of the Army.

At this time I would like to welcome Dr. Kintner. If you will please, sir, tell us a little bit about your background and your work in this area.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM KINTNER, DIRECTOR, FOREIGN POLICY RESEARCH INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. KINTNER. It is my pleasure to be here, Mr. Chairman.

Currently I am Director of Foreign Policy Research Institute at Philadelphia, and also a member of the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania. I have been at these two capacities there for ten years.

Prior to that time I served 21 years in the Army. I received my Doctorate Degree from Georgetown University and have served in many government capacities, including Intelligence Agency of the National Security Council. I was a member of the White House Staff of Nelson Rockefeller when he was Special Assistant to President Eisenhower. I have been involved in foreign policy with strategic matters of almost my entire adult life. I have written on strategic interrelations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The latest publication is "Soviet Military Trends for United States Security," which was released in June.

I might point out that on this particular publication in which I stressed some of these trends, it had the support of many distinguished Americans such as General Lemnitzer, such as Mr. McNeil, who was former Comptroller of the Defense Department, and Mr. Gullion, head of the Fletcher School, and also Floyd Koehler, former United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

I regret very much that my colleague and friend Bill Van Cleave will not be here. I met with him last evening at seven o'clock and I could not have been more surprised than anyone when I heard that he was sick. Apparently he is very, very sick, with something having to do with elements of the inside of his stomach as far as I could determine. I have known him for some time, and this morning I talked with him again, and I would like to give some of his views on the situation.

For the past two years, up until very recently, he was a member for the Defense Department of our delegation in the SALT talks, and has been to Helsinki and Vienna many times. His point of view can be expressed very simply. When the SALT talks began, or during his participation in them, the Soviets had 1100 strategic offensive systems both land based and submarine launched. They now have 1900. In other words, there has been a 70 percent increase in the Soviet threat while these talks have been in progress

The major hope of some agreement comes about throughout our willingness to largely trade off the safeguard system. As you recall, the safeguard system was designed primarily to protect our land based offensive missile systems. There has been no appropriation, and there has been an interagreement that all defensive measures will be held down. The implication of that is rather interesting because the agreement as far as I can determine from the public press is that we will limit our defense systems to the national capitals of both Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union's national capital of Moscow contains the largest industrial complex of the Soviet Union, about 70 percent of scientific and technological institutes, and also contains a number of launching systems for its offensive missile systems. So there is no compatibility at all between an agreement in which we defend this paper mill known as Washington, D.C. and what the Soviets defend with their organization of defensive systems around Moscow which, incidentally, has been in existence since 1965.

Furthermore, during this same period we have put restraints on our R&D capabilities. Currently the Soviet R&D program is 40 percent larger than that of the United States and over half of it is focused on strategic offensive and defensive systems.

Bill Van Cleave also made the point there are quite a number of people in Congress who wish us to exercise even further restraints in the hope that we will get an agreement on the SALT talks, believing that this is the way to bring the Soviets into a good negotiating mood. This point of view is a widespread one. I don't think there is any foundation in fact.

I would now like to quote from a very recent publication by John Erickson entitled "Soviet Military Power." John Erickson is on faculty at the University of Edinburg and is noted as one of the foremost authorities on Soviet military development in the world. I quote from what he has in this report:

"It is certainly a very striking combination of circumstances that within four days of the United States committing itself to major defensive systems"—this is back in 1968—"the Soviet government seized upon the option which had lain dormant for almost a year of starting joint arms limitation talks. On June 24, 1968, the United States Senate voted 52 to 34 to defeat an amendment refusing funds for the Sentinel, predecessor system to the Safeguard. And on 27 June, 1968, Mr. Gromyko announced Soviet readiness for change of opinion on arms limitations including anti-missile systems. This was also the point at which Soviet Union had reached or could easily anticipate parity in ICBM with the United States, an achievement to which Soviet leadership appeared to attach considerable value."

In other words, he substantiates Bill Van Cleave's point by not doing anything in the

strategic or R&D field. We do not encourage the Soviets to reach an agreement on why should we because by our failure to act and by their continuation of their program they have already achieved a strategic advantage over the United States.

Bill's final point is that this is going to place. Unless we do something about it rather quickly and take measures to assure viability of our land based systems against the very large and powerful SS–9, the President of the United States in the very near future would be facing a crisis situation with the following quandary: should he give in, acquiesce, and perhaps lose whatever influence the United States has in any part of the world to maintain the very semblance of political stability or will we have to make the decision to launch at first strategic warning. This is a terrible quandary. It is a quandary recognized by the President of the United States, as I will indicate by quoting from the President of the United States in his two messages on the State of the World, 1970 and 1971.

In the first he asked this question: Should a President, in the event of nuclear attack, be left with a single option of ordering mass destruction of any civilians in the face of a certainty that would be followed by slaughter of Americans.

Then he continued the '71 message: Our deployments of defensive missile launchers were completed by '67. USSR continued to build a nuclear powered submarine force that will equal ours within three years at current rate. That is the only advantage we now have. We have 620 submarine-based missiles; they have approximately 400 now.

I continue from the President's statement: The USSR has constructed a large ICBM, SS–9, for which the United States has no counterpart, deployed in sufficient numbers, and armed with multiple independent warheads, MIRVs, which they have already tested, have sufficient accuracy, this missile could threaten our land-based ICBM forces. Our MIRV systems by contrast do not have combinations of numbers, accuracy and warhead yields to pose a threat to Soviet land-based ICBM forces.

That means in short that we have no counter force capability. We cannot dig out the Soviet missiles in their silos, whereas, they are capable or very soon will be capable of doing that to ours.

Now the facts that I am discussing I think are no longer a subject of controversy. And this article I pointed out within three months period of time the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Moorer, all laid these before the American people. The buildup has been predictable and it is still continuing. Ours, on the other hand, has stood still. Whereas the facts of this change have been understood, there is a great deal of uncertainty as to what the political meaning of it might be.

I will cite a rather well known individual on this matter, Mr. McGeorge Bundy, who was Special Assistant to the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, and likewise for Mr. Johnson for a while.

In December 1964 Mr. McGeorge Bundy wrote an article about the reaction of the President's focus on the Cuban missile crisis. Regarding that crisis, he pointed out that we had a tremendous strategic superiority and it made possible the successful conclusion of that interaction between ourselves and Moscow. He said it was fortunate that strategic superiority existed, and that it should be preserved.

In 1969 the same McGeorge Bundy, now President of the Ford Foundation, wrote an article for Foreign Affairs entitled "To Cap the Volcano." In that he made this statement: that for all purposes there is no longer any political utility in strategic advantage one way or the other. In short, that they have cancelled each other out. This to my mind is a fantasy. The Soviet Union for the past five years has been investing twice as much as we had in strategic offensive and defensive systems and the equivalent dollar term is roughly around $15 billion a year. This is the question you have to ask yourselves: Do they do this just to catch up? Do they want to be like Avis catching up with Hertz, or are they really concerned for a strategic advantage which can be translated into political utility?

I am convinced that the Soviets conceive political utility. We have had it before because up until very recently it was the strategic deterrent of the United States that gave whatever stability exists in Western Europe and in the far Western Pacific, and so forth.

Now that we can no longer in a credible sense threaten to employ our strategic forces, the Soviet Union can give us the option of either trying to move in with adequate forces, say, another crisis in the Middle East which is still very possible, or to cave in, in which case, the State of Israel goes down the drain; then the United States credibility not only in the Middle East but in Europe and in Japan will be shattered. And in this instance the Soviets have the major aces in their hands and they will continue to have them.

I believe that I have covered as much ground as necessary. There are copies of this particular publication available at the American Enterprise Institute and perhaps some one of your staff could get them, because all of the facts and figures are here.

I would just mention two things further from Mr. Erickson's commentary. We neglected to mention, in concentrating and focusing on the Soviet strategic buildup and naval buildup, what they have been doing in the way of maintaining their air force. I will point this out. He said the Soviet command has firm grasp of the realities of potentialities of air power and in precise terms there has been no retraction of the idea of going for air superiority, and so forth. In the last ten years no less than 13 new types of Soviet fighters have appeared. And there are at least three direct STOL fighters being tested, strike fighters, NATO code name Throgger, has been estimated to have speeds in excess of mach 2 and weighed about one-third of the American F–111, and you know what that aircraft is. Lift, strike and reconnaissance—all of these areas have received continuous Soviet attention. The air components permeates every section of the Soviet military activity. For example, the MIG–23, which have been recently deployed in Egypt, have a speed of mach 3. Our fastest aircraft is mach 2.5. This aircraft will give them complete reconnaissance ability over the entire Mediterranean.

There is just one other point which I think should be brought out for America's analysis. As you know, in this Congress there are many people who believe we can cut our defense budget very, very considerably. I have had the opportunity to testify, for example, before Senator Proxmire's Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and he has been continually making the point that the Soviets in the first place are incapable of spending as much as we are, and in fact they are not. He estimates their defense budget at $40 billion, to $80 billion on our part. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is completely wrong on this issue because all you have to do is count up the hardware that they have and regardless of the counting system, and so forth, it must take as much energy for them to produce a missile as it does for us.

Nevertheless, this argument is made that the Soviets want to slow down because of their economic strain. And it is this point that Mr. Erickson alluded to. From that point of view there are some reasons for the politburo to cry halt to further major expenditure. Kosygin pointedly referred to 25 percent resources consumed by military, which is to say that the real figure must be well over one-third. In other words, one-third of all of the resources of the Soviet Union. Take a look at our situation. Our defense budget now is approximately 7 percent of the GNP, 7 percent of, say, a GNP of around $1 trillion. Theirs is approximately one-third. The shift in this has been remarkable because 15 years ago our defense budget was about 15 percent of a much smaller GNP than it is now, and furthermore, represented far greater fraction of our federal budget than it does now.

This decrease is going to bring about, if it has not already brought about, a fundamental shift in the world balance of power which will be recognized by further deterioration of the United States ability to influence events and cause a more peaceful, orderly world.

Thank you very much.

Mr. SPENCE. That last point you made is a good one, I think. We have heard for a long time that we had nothing to fear from the Soviet Union, when they reached a parity with us from the standpoint of our military capability, that things would level off. I have seen them come from just about zero up to parity, and even going beyond that, and so the question I have now to ask these people is why they are continuing to build up their military forces when they have reached parity for all purposes, and we are still cutting back trying to so-called relieve world tensions and ease world tensions. So I would like to ask that question.

I was looking at the latest edition of "Jayne's Fighting Ships," as a good example, and they said in their foreword that in the strategic nuclear balance of power the USSR has gained superiority over us in numbers of ICBM and megatonnage that can be delivered. And they go on to say that in a surprise first attack they could just about wipe us out. I would like to have your views on that.

Mr. KINTNER. From the Soviet point of view parity is an unnatural word. They never use it and never think that way. Remember, they are trained in Marxist dialectics and there is no such thing as stability. Parity means stability. There is a transition point from inferiority to superiority and that is what I believe they have moved to. We, on the other hand, have played semantics. We went from superiority to sufficiency. I prefer the term right now "strategic deficiency" under which we are operating. The Soviets do not think in these terms. What they want is in any circumstances to have an aggregate of forces that they can preserve the national base, the Soviet heartland; at the same time inflict their will on their opponent, which might happen to be us in a particular set of circumstances. They have always operated that way when they have had the means to acquire such superiority in their defenses; in World War II, when they drove the Nazis back, they would assemble the greatest collection of artillery possible and literally blow their way across whatever the defensive line was, and then they would stop. What were they stopping for? They were stopping to bring up ammunition and guns to do it again. In a strategic sense they have done exactly the same thing. They don't have any particular plan of when they are going to use it but, in every field where they can achieve superiority, they first achieved it in air defense. Then they achieved it in strategic defense.

Now they achieved it in strategic offensive systems. There is a great indication they are trying to achieve lunar space command, which is the space right around the world. They are not going up to the moon because if they can gain control of satellite communication and reconnaissance systems, they will again be in an advantageous position.

I pointed out what they are doing in the air power field. In all of these areas they are moving as fast as they can and, by taking a proportionate share of the growth of their economy, moving forward. And this of course

indicates that they have perhaps a better capacity to stomach the long haul confrontation between us than we have.

Mr. SPENCE. Doctor, before we go any further, I would like to introduce at this time the other committee members present. Congressman Phil Crane from Illinois, and Congressman Ken Robinson from Virginia. I would like for them to ask any questions they might have.

Mr. CRANE. First of all I would like to express my appreciation, Dr. Kintner, for your appearance here. I have been one who has made use of materials from the Foreign Policy Research Institute going back to my days as a college professor and have been a great admirer of the work you have been doing.

I remember some years ago a book published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute entitled "Protected Conflict." One of the points I recall in that book is the explanation of the multi-dimensional conflict in which we find ourselves, and considering the fact that negotiations are a form in the Soviet's eyes at least of carrying on an overall struggle just as you can maintain economic warfare and diplomatic warfare and military warfare.

In your judgment is it conceivable that, considering your comments earlier in your earlier testimony about how the Soviet strength has been growing during their participation in the SALT talks, that they are using the SALT talks and engaging in deliberate procrastination as a means of buying time to gain their strategic superiority that appears to be developing; and that they recognize the inherent defects of a free society such as our own participating in talks to put arms limitations on the major powers of the world and simultaneously at home developing arms?

In short, it is virtually impossible, I think, in this kind of a climate of hope and expectation in the United States to talk in terms of a massive arms buildup because the public at large says we are sitting there to put a limitation on this, and they being a totalitarian state by contrast could deliberately exploit such a thing as strategic arms limitation talk to buy the necessary time to gain another objective.

Mr. KINTNER. I think you have stated the case very well. The Soviets again are dialecticians and dialectically it is quite possible to arm with one hand while negotiating with the other. They have done that many times in the past. As a matter of fact, going back to 1924, Stalin made a rather notable statement that peace under certain circumstances is a better way of fighting the bourgeoisie than war. And this combination of holding forth the carrot of a possibility of reaching an agreement which means you don't have to waste these vast expenditures in arms is a very attractive and very seductive appeal to make to the Western people.

On the other hand, the Soviet people have no influence whatsoever on the decisions made by the Politburo and Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. And from their point of view, any negotiating tactic that leads to a conclusion which favors them is perfectly in order. The only experience I have ever had in this area was the Korean Armistice Commission and you know what happened there, that for four months the negotiators at Panmunjom agreed only on four items of the agenda. During the four months' period of time the entire line across Korea, and I later on was commander at Pork Chop Hill, was fortified during that period.

Now if we had called off the negotiations at any time they would have been less well prepared to stand against our very strong Eighth Army at that time. But we continued doing it. We placed no pressure upon them, violating the historical experience of the first World War when we put the pressure on continuously and brought about the armistice of November 11, 1918.

This is a standard tactic that you use negotiations as well as you use any other instrument of influence to advance your position and the Soviets are quite adept at it.

Mr. CRANE. In this connection, Dr. Kintner, I am reminded of what happened at the time of the August 7 cease fire in the Middle East when within an hour there were reports of violations of the conditions of that cease fire, and the upshot of it was, as I recall, that after two weeks of consistent violations by the Soviet Union and Egypt, by moving surface to air missiles into that security zone, that buffer zone, 50 kilometers west of the Suez Canal, that the United States acknowledged that there were indeed violations by the Soviet Union and Egypt, but there were no sanctions imposed for the violations.

During that period of time then both Egypt and the Soviet Union were able to accomplish by negotiations what they were totally unable to accomplish before the cease fire went into effect. And I could not agree with you more on a historic pattern of that kind of duplicity and that kind of behavior. In this connection I would like to ask another question dealing with our efforts to achieve some agreement with the Soviets in these strategic arm limitation talks. A recent New York Times dispatch which William Beacher, that I am sure you are familiar with, discussed elements of United States proposals at the Strategic Arms Limitation talks which would freeze ABM missile systems below numerical level, and place a ceiling on the number of land based ICBMs. In view of the differences in payload capacity between United States and Soviet ICBMs, is there in your judgment any danger that such an agreement could lock the United States into position of permanent inferiority with regard to the number of individual warheads mounted on ICBM?

Mr. KINTNER. I think there is a good possibility, because one force of the Soviet missile force is SS-9, which has 25 megaton warheads. Its payload is such that if you MIRV it, in other words, have the independent entry vehicles, you get about five megatons for each one of these, whereas, if we MIRV any one of our systems which is not precluded by this agreement, we get something down in the KT area, maybe a hundred maximum. That is speculation. Please don't hold me to the exact figure. But the key thing is that the counterforce capability of a missile is influenced both by its accuracy and by the payload of the explosion and therefore ours, with much smaller payloads, have to go almost down the rain barrel if we are going to have counterforce capability, whereas theirs, because of the immensity of their explosive capacity, have to be less accurate and do not need to be as accurate even though we believe they are as accurate as ours.

So that this type of an arrangement would not solve the strategic problem which I alluded to in and came out in my conversation with Bill Van Cleave this morning.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, Dr. Kintner.

Mr. Chairman, I will at this time yield to my colleague from Virginia.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Robinson.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to apologize to you and to the participants for being late in arriving from Virginia this morning.

Dr. Kintner, in a recent study entitled "Soviet Military Power" by Mr. John Erickson, published by British Royal-U.S. Service Institution, an ominous question was raised concerning implications of the rapid growth of the Soviet military power. What is your view of the applicability of this study to the current United States national security situation?

Mr. KINTNER. I have already referred to the study which I have in my hands. I think it is one that people in the United States can very well take a look at. The British are not necessarily disinterested bystanders. This was sent to me, incidentally, by Vice Air Marshal Paddy Monroe, who is talking about the situation that goes on in Great Britain at the present time. They are very concerned about it. Erickson, as I mentioned earlier, is a former student of the Soviet military affairs and I think the British do still maintain a credibility for objective scholarshp. It is perhaps better that a Britisher take a look at this bilateral relationship than American as far as hopefully convincing some people and particularly those who are members of Congress as to the significance of this very determined Soviet drive to acquire an overall dominant military position vis-a-vis the United States.

Mr. SPENCE. I was wondering too, you mentioned a while ago about the capability of the Soviet Union from a standpoint of being able to put more and more of their gross national product into defense matters without the public in Russia having a whole lot to say about it, whereas, in this country we have the opposite situation as you indicated, and the present trend from the standpoint of cutting back on our construction program funds in the area of submarines, I understand the Russians have three times our nuclear submarine construction capacity, and that they have this capacity and they are able to go ahead and devote more and more of their defense budget in construction of Polaris type submarines; whereas on the other hand, our construction program in the next five years has really already been fixed by budgetary considerations here in Congress. We have already put a limit on what we can build in the next five years and they are free to go ahead and do whatever they want to do.

Mr. KINTNER. We have a consumer oriented society which has very good aspects on it. On the other hand, their allocation of resources is made by command, so to speak, at the very top. And this gives them a tremendous advantage because they can assign priorities to programs which enhance their power position. If that is their goal, they are capable of doing it.

Another factor, also related to our consumer orientation, is that the pay of their military personnel is far less than ours, relatively speaking. Out of our defense budget I believe somewhere around $37 billion goes to pay and allowances of civilian and military personnel. The Soviets only have to spend one-fourth of that, which means there is a great deal of resources left over for submarines, missiles, aircraft and what have you.

Mr. SPENCE. They put more in the hardware than we do.

Mr. KINTNER. They have as many men under arms but the benefits that the men receive from serving the Soviet motherland are less than what our men receive. I am not disparaging what our men are getting, as I hope you understand, but it does make a difference how their society can maximize its power position with less overall resources than we have.

Mr. SPENCE. You are saying, in other words, even figures can be misleading sometimes. We compare the amount of money we put into the military vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. They are probably getting more in the way of military hardware and research and development than we are because a lot of ours goes into livability and pay allowance.

Mr. CRANE. Dr. Kintner. I would like to ask a specific question dealing with the differences between our United States Minuteman class ICBM and Soviet SS-9 ICBM. What are the fundamental differences between the two?

Mr. KINTNER. The fundamental difference is that our Minuteman has a one megaton payload and theirs has a 25-megaton warhead.

Mr. CRANE. Could you elaborate as to translating it into the destructive power of the bomb we dropped at Hiroshima?

Mr. KINTNER. The bomb we had at Hiroshima was 20 KT, if memory serves me correctly. It is a far less destructive bomb than one megaton but again it depends on the target you are going after. Our Minuteman is primarily designed as a counter-city weapon. In fact, our whole strategy is still counter-city, whereas, in their point of view, with 25 megatons in the SS-9, if that were dropped in the center of one of our Minuteman complexes, there is a command silo and then there is roughly ten of these missiles spread around them in a circular arrangement, we don't know what the effects might be. It could create such a minor earthquake that could disturb our silos so that our own missiles could not take off properly. It might shake up the covers on them. It might have an electronic effect that could burn the circuitry. We don't know this because again with another agreement we reached with the Soviet, which is Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 1963. That has a very interesting story which I think is almost pertinent to the SALT discussions. If you recall, there was a 3-year moratorium on nuclear tests from 1958 to 1961. During that period of time Mr. Khrushchev was premier of the Soviet Union. Many times he said publicly, "If anyone dares to break this test ban treaty, he will have the fate of all humanity upon him."

In September 6, 1961, Mr. Khrushchev ordered the biggest nuclear testing program that has ever been conducted by any country. He ordered it while there was a meeting of non-aligned nations headed by Tito in Belgrade in Yugoslavia. In this test they exploded nuclear offensive systems, nuclear defensive systems which we have never done, and they learned a lot of things about so-called electromagnetic pulse effect which we are trying to find out by underground testing.

In the spring of '62 Mr. Kennedy ordered a resumption of our testing for political purposes only. We had not planned a test. We learned nothing new by these tests. One thing that we might have learned was the effectiveness of the beginning of our ABM missile system because we had a test site out of Kwajalein. At the last minute we did not even fire toward Kwajalein with this test. We sent offensive missiles without nuclear warhead out there and transferred it to the British Christmas Islands, because our then Ambassador to the United Nations did not believe that we should test on trust held territories. Then after that the Soviets tested again in the spring of 1962. It takes about six months to really learn through telemetering what the results of a nuclear test were. By December '62 again, after the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviets had learned what they wanted to learn from this and for the first time they said "Wouldn't it be a good idea to have a nuclear test ban treaty in the three atmospheres." So the progress went on and by June of that year Mr. Harriman went over to Moscow to sign the treaty which was ratified in August of that year. I happened to have a personal report by Mr. Harriman. He said Mr. Khrushchev was at the bottom of the ramp with pen in hand at the airplane and said, "Where is your pen? Let's sign it now."

To me this is indicative that they received an advantage from that test. You may also recall the propaganda regarding a nuclear fallout, and so forth. I remember reading one headline when build-up was going on in this country—"Fallout increases 2000 percent in Toronto." Two thousand percent of what? We finally looked in the small print of the story. The fallout is less than what you get from normal cosmic rays of Denver, Colorado. Since that time there have been a lot of tests conducted, including hydrogen tests by the Chinese and French.

Do you see those big square headlines in the United States any more, may I ask you? The same thing on the SALT talks, there is this pressure. I am not against getting an effective agreement on SALT which would reverse the arms race. I would like to see that. On the other hand, agreement for agreement's sake which does not take into account our own security requirements would be potentially disastrous.

Mr. SPENCE. Thank you.

I would like also to welcome to the committee hearings this morning Congressman John Hunt from New Jersey.

John, since you have arrived do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. HUNT. I have been interested in several things and I don't know whether you have covered them or not, Mr. Spence. One is on the ballistic missile defenses. Have you covered any portion of that?

Mr. KINTNER. We have touched on it briefly but perhaps you have another point.

Mr. HUNT. I want to know if you believe it is desirable to build the ballistic missile defenses to protect urban industrial areas. There has been perhaps some discussion on that and at the present time I don't think there has been anything created or proposed that would do this?

Mr. KINTNER. As you know, the Sentinel system which was advocated by President Johnson in 1967 was largely oriented toward the defense of urban complexes. The Safeguard system, which was a modification of this, was designed to do two things, primarily to protect our strategic offensive systems and also to prevent, protect the national capital so in the event of nuclear war there would be a possibility of exchange taking place between opposing leadership groups. I think in order of priority, I would concentrate on the Safeguard system and if your defensive techniques indicate that it is possible to have a credible defense, and I don't mean by that a hundred percent air type, because I think that is always impossible, but if you can raise the Soviet price of admission to use a strategic term for even considering attack on one of our urban complexes, then I think there is an advantage in doing so.

Also it may prevent the Chinese from threatening to blow up San Francisco if we don't pull out of some place in the Western Pacific a few years from now. I think it is desirable but in terms of priority, I would go after defense of our strategic forces first as preservation of our deterrent capability which is threatened by these Soviet offensive advances.

Mr. HUNT. I am happy that you raise that question about the Chinese because when we were talking about ABM trying to get the hardening of the sites in effect, and to increaase some of the situation out there more so it would not be so vulnerable, we heard so much then about the Chinese threat.

How do you read this picture now that the Chinese threat has apparently disappeared? I hear no more about this Chinese threat.

Mr. KINTNER. Well, I think, if I may speak frankly, there is diplomacy involved in that. When we first attempted to deploy the ABM, that was in 1967, we were pursuing a dual strategy, we were trying to get the bear over in Moscow on one hand, and at the same time recognizing he might bite and trying to build up defensive systems so we did not want to admit we were putting up that system vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. I think that has been part of our strategy. We have tried to be reasonable, persuasive with them, and to indicate that we don't think they are very aggressive, potentially expansionist or anything of that kind.

Now the Chinese threat, however, has not disappeared. The Chinese threat today is a lot greater than it was before. As a matter of fact, their acceleration in the development of their nuclear systems is faster than any other nuclear power including the United States. It only took them two and a half years to go from atomic explosion to hydrogen bomb, and there always was far less resources in the Soviet Union. They are putting in a remarkable amount of it in the strategic field and I think it is very likely that in a reasonably short period of time, meaning about three or four years, that they will have ICBM capability and probably be testing it down near Zanzibar in the Indian Ocean, and it is interesting how they operate. They are building a railroad down there and they are doing a lot of other things and they are also putting up their telemeter facilities for the testing of the first Chinese ICBM. So do not ignore the Chinese. It is getting to be a 3-cornered operation more than a 2-cornered operation.

Mr. HUNT. I was curious as to why this threat had almost disappeared overnight and I in my own mind could not visualize it because it is there, and it is real and the Chungking Province facilities have not diminished. If they had diminished, the Russians would not be maintaining the tremendous force they are on that.

Mr. KINTNER. Remember the missile gaps we had in the '60 election campaign. January 21, 1961, the new Secretary of Defense, Mr. Robert McNamara, said there was no missile gap.

Mr. SPENCE. In that connection, if I can quote from a so-called Blue Ribbon Defense Panel that was proposed to the President or appointed by the President a while ago, they said, and had not been given a whole lot of publicity, "It is not too much to say in the 1970's neither vital interest of the United States nor lives and freedom of its citizens will be secure."

This was put out, but a report on pornography has gotten ten times as much publicity as this has and this concerns the vital interest and security of all of our people, and you don't read about it.

Mr. KINTNER. Pornography is much more sexy, as you know.

Mr. SPENCE. This is not sexy but it can hit you in a different place.

Mr. KINTNER. I agree. It is very difficult. Let's go back to philosophical position. De Tocqueville, when writing about the United States over a hundred years ago, said democracies are very effective in dealing with domestic issues, their production, their standard of living, and so forth, but they find it with great difficulty to deal with foreign policy problems over the long haul. And you realize that we have been engaged up to our neck around the world ever since the beginning of the second World War in 1940. That is 30 years. It has been for democracy a very remarkable achievement but the world has not yet emerged in which we can neglect these matters. The tendency of this other directed people, with its vast wealth and its great leisure, the number of speedboats have increased by a hundred percent in the last four years, and so forth, is to ignore these things and of course that is where responsible leadership both in the executive and gentlemen like yourselves in Congress have to be somewhat more concerned than the average citizen because you are here to think about his future and ways that he himself will not think about. I personally believe that the American people would be willing to pay the prices required to assure their survival if they knew what the story is but the confusion that surrounds these problems, the esoteric nature of nuclear strategy, people read about it, but it is not for real.

This very simple fact that political influence can issue from a strategic advantage or disadvantage is one which has so many links to it that the average person does not understand it, but the people who run governments do, and the governments are what

make for war and for peace and I would hope that our country and its leaders pay enough attention to these matters that we can continue to make a very responsible contribution to making a stable world until humanity finally gets enough sense in its head to order its affairs in a more harmonious and responsible fashion than it has in the past, but the record of humanity is not a very optimistic one.

Mr. SPENCE. That is exactly what some of us tried to do, focus attention on this problem, and it is a problem because most people are more concerned about reordering our priorities, domestic programs, that most people are concerned about, and they don't want to look at the bad side of life, and that is what it is, the bad side. We have to talk about it and let people know what the situation is.

Mr. CRANE. Dr. Kintner, I have a hypothetical question that rests on some rather high level briefings quite a number of Members of Congress have had recently on our deteriorating defense position, and since you are not associated with government but certainly one who is a recognized expert in the field, I would like your opinion on this assessment that many of us recently received.

It was suggested that as we fall behind in terms of strategic weapons, we may not fall so far behind that the Soviet Union would be tempted into launching a preemptive first strike against it. Nevertheless, we are inferior today in most of the areas of strategic weapons with the exception of Polaris subs.

In addition to this, we have a deteriorating position with respect to our Navy. The Soviet Navy has grown, as has been indicated here, and the recent revelations from "Jayne's Fighting Ships." That being the case, what appears increasingly possible is World War III fought in conventional terms save for the sophistication of on M–16 vis-a-vis M–1 or ship to ship missiles.

Is that a practical possibility if this situation continues?

Mr. KINTNER. Not necessarily. I am not even certain that World War III is ever going to take place except in the way it is taking place now. It is a combination of diplomacy, deployments, R&D, economic matters, and so forth. I think that the Soviet game, if there is one, is to become the dominant power. You can not possibly conceive of a conventional war in a nuclear theater such as Western Europe of large scale because the very existence of nuclear weapons would preclude the point because whether they are used or not you have to avoid massing and matters of that kind. So I think that is rather unlikely. I believe that the Soviet game is far more subtle than that, that they see that as situations arise that the United States will be placed in a questionable position of whether to do something or not to do something.

I will cite the possibility of an upheaval in Greece. I cite the possibility of blow-up in the Middle East. I cite the possibility of what is going to happen when Tito dies in Yugoslavia. These are all going to produce quandaries. The Soviets are likely to make a move and they are going to come to us and say, "You don't want to interfere here, because if you do there are certain consequences that you must recognize." And then in time the capacity of the United States to give any credible assurance to its European allies or in the Far East will deteriorate to such a point that there will be new alignment in the world.

The alignment in Europe, for example, changed fundamentally after Hitler went into the Rhineland in 1936. The little alignments which the French had been building up in Europe collapsed and the people went to Wilhelmstrasse to discuss how they were going to arrange affairs in that region. There can be a slow erosion of power and the influence is merely the shadow of power. When the shadow is gone, the influence goes also. This is going to be a phase, which, if we permit ourselves to continue into, we will very quickly have achieved the pinnacle of our status as a nation and once you lose that if you look back at history, it is rarely if ever regained. That is what the quandary is all about. Do we want, with the system that we represent, a democracy, a society that believes man, perhaps, has some purpose beyond his material existence, which is the Soviet philosophy? Do we want to lose our capacity to help design this world of tomorrow which is going to be quite different in many respects from the world we know now? But we with our tremendous power and our energy and devotion to the principles that we all share in common I believe have the right to make certain that its voice will be heard, and its voice will not be heard if it permits itself to unilaterally place itself in a disadvantageous position vis-a-vis our main competitor.

Mr. CRANE. In following up on this same point, the observation that I have heard made by several reputable authorities is that we could anticipate perhaps as early as the middle of this decade the Soviet Union starting to gobble up real estate throughout the world and that in fact is what I understand you to have just said, that we run that risk.

If you project that down the line, at some point if you are dealing with a predatory power then unless you are prepared to totally capitulate, you would run that risk, would you not, of that major final confrontation?

Mr. KINTNER. I am not certain, again, that they are interested in gobbling up real estate except in the territories immediately around them. The influence is a far more subtle thing to have. For example, in the past ten years we have lost all influence whatsoever in the entire North African littoral. The Soviets are in and out. The Soviets are in Algeria and Egypt, and so forth. It is much better that Algerians and Libyans run the show for them but in the crunch the Soviets have access there. From their point of view I don't see having a lot of Soviet Unions around the world. They would like to have a situation where the people recognize that the Soviet Union is the dominant power as we have been for some time and still are essentially throughout the world, or people go to Moscow when they have a serious problem rather than to Washington, whereas their economy develops, people go there to learn how to do that and do that rather than come here.

It is that role which I think that they are seeking to attain and they are buttressing it with the modes of power which they believe will give them the greatest political influence. They have had unusual successes with the Chilean affairs, and the Soviets are not directly responsible for it but they have taken a rather paternal interest in developments there. This kind of thing might go elsewhere. Of course the Soviets, I should point out, have their own set of problems and particularly that large country to the east of them, and they don't have everything going for them, but they want to hedge their bets insofar as possible to have the capacity both to deal with the Chinese situation and also to deal with those areas in the world where their position and desires run into conflict with our own.

Mr. SPENCE. You think they not necessarily want to gobble up lands from the standpoint of assuming control but promoting their ideology throughout the world and we, getting ourselves in a position where we can't help these small nations defend themselves, and so they end up being democratic republics, or something, and in that way Vietnam, Laos, Thailand, Korea like all of the rest of these countries, still help these countries to spread their type ideology throughout the world and we can't do anything about it and they blackmail us to stay out of it.

Mr. HUNT. Doctor, along those lines, I am interested in the NATO situation, the fear that you have just expressed, and the fact that you have expressed that the Soviet spheres of influence have been extended into those nations enumerated. It appears now we have also lost the Island of Malta for all practicable purposes. NATO headquarters has moved out of there.

I would like to ask you one more question in a nuclear sense. What do you believe the impact will be on NATO and any of our other alliances if we in the United States should lose the strategic nuclear advantage we are now alleged to enjoy? I am somewhat skeptical at times that we do enjoy a nuclear advantage. Suppose we should lose that without any equivocation. What would your thinking be as to the impact on NATO insofar as we are concerned? Would there be a deterioration of some nations? Are nations liable to be blackjacked into leaving us and joining the Soviet sphere? This is the possibility we have been discussing for quite some time.

Mr. KINTNER. I personally feel that the advantage is no longer the correct word. I say that the strategic situation as of the moment is uncertain. And the Soviets are ahead in various categories which I have indicated. We are still ahead in the submarine launch missile force, and so forth. It may well be that there is enough uncertainty on both sides to not have a common recognition that we are slipping into second place but if their present trend carries forward and if they still invest at the same rate in several years time it will be quite noticeable. I think it is already noticeable to the more perceptive Europeans.

Willy Brandt figures he has a better bargaining position now than he will three or four years from now, and why not make the best deal he can. Unless these trends are reversed or unless the European members of NATO work together more effectively there is a possibility, particularly in a tactical nuclear field, the possibility of NATO continuing to serve its mission, which is to prevent the outbreak of war in Western Europe, will probably diminish because not only with defection of Malta but potential defection of islands which to me could be a strategic disaster. I lived in that country during the war for a while and I have some affection for it. But there, it would open up the gates to the entire Soviet submarine force either coming out of the Black Sea or coming out of Murmansk in the region without any real capability of detection as to their deployments into the North Atlantic, and that has not taken place yet but potentially it can. There is a lot of work that could be done I think to restore some of the adverse political trends that now exist in the islands.

Mr. HUNT. I take it that you think that islands, as many members of the Armed Services Committee think and believe, the island is most strategic.

Mr. KINTNER. It is. It commands the seaways of the North Atlantic and as long as we don't have assurances, if we lack assured sea communication with Western Europe, the NATO alliance would be out of business.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you.

Mr. ROBINSON. Dr. Kintner, I think it goes without saying that those of us who are here essentially agree that there is a problem and appreciate very much your enunciation of the problem and the problems that we face today in this regard. I know also that those of us that are here are continually telling our people at home that we think that this problem exists, that it has some significant national concern and that we are not going to be able to reduce our

defense spending as a result of winding down the Vietnam conflict, as a consequence of the situation that we face. But I do wonder what you think our priorities should properly be as to how we approach this increasing lack of ability to stand up to those that we must acknowledge have other philosophies than ours.

Mr. KINTNER. Well, democracy presumably functions on the basis of enlightened public opinion and there we run into a very touchy area, are both sides of the issue getting the proper treatment in the media which I know is a very controversial question, and I know members of the media are here. Sometimes I feel that these matters which are less sensational than some others do not receive the attention that they should have, and there is no blanket indictment. There are some excellent men in the press who do spend a good deal of time on these issues and do bring them forth, but I think under our system the press serves as a communication link between you gentlemen of Congress, between people like myself, and the think tanks, and so forth, in the treatment of what is put on that front page or in the editorial page, and so forth, that some concern should be given to these issues and they are very complex and they are controversial, but they are not the kind of thing that affects Tom, Dick and Harry on the street unless he sees it right in front of his nose, and I think this part of the educational process is the area where more attention can be paid.

As I have indicated in this particular report, also in the Erickson study, these facts are now I think pretty well established. There has been a fundamental shift in our relative power of position and we are now talking about two things, what can be done to rectify this without again accelerating an arms race. I don't want that. We haven't been racing. The other side has been racing but I would not want us to get into a situation where we build for building's sake. That I think that is insane. But we need to discuss the implications and what are the practical measures that can be taken.

This country has the resources to protect itself as well as having the capacity to maintain the highest standard of living of any country on earth, and it is just a question of slight shaking down of our priorities and perhaps cutting down our personal consumption rate by maybe one percent or something of that sort. It is not a matter of Churchill coming before the American people and offering us blood, sweat and tears. We might get the blood and sweat and tears unless we are willing to pay a little bit more now.

Mr. ROBINSON. Assuming, Doctor, that we had an informed and sympathetic populace wtih regard to this as a national problem, then what would be first priority in your mind as to the direction we should proceed to catch up?

Mr. KINTNER. I think the main thing is in our R&D area, where if you take a look at the recent figures the Soviet expenditures are currently about 40 percent higher than ours. I have a chart in the back of this report that lays that out. Their curve passed ours about two or three years ago. As you can see, if you can see that far, it is growing in a fantastic rate. There may be new ways of doing things that we know nothing of.

For example, there may be capabilities of defense with the laser, which would make some of the weapon systems we now have completely obsolete. Another thing I believe that, and I know my colleague Dr. Armbruster is going to talk on this, that I think the fact that we still rely on a strategy which is called MAD, that is the Soviet acronym for mutual assured destruction. Our whole strategy is based on our willingness to commit suicide. The Soviet strategy is not based on this. We would move away from that strategy which means we should give more concern to defensive capability than we have given and that is quite possible. I am concerned if we get locked into the type of SALT agreement that Mr. Beecher reported in the New York Times, whether that represents what is going on inside I have no way of knowing, but that type of agreement I think would be retrogressive from our point of view because the Soviets would under those circumstances have a deployed ABM system, and I think it would be very unlikely if we reached that agreement that we would even go on with tiny steps that we are already discussing as far as defense goes. That is an area I would spend some time on. I think our Naval situation is one I would put a little bit more effort into because if you do maintain psychological parity, then it is your local conventional forces at the scene of a possible conflict that became more important.

I am particularly concerned about the Middle East with the Sixth Fleet, which I assume is in pretty good shape and still has predominant position, but it is a very tricky area to operate in and with the type of craft that we have, we may not be as effective of maintaining our end of a confrontation that might develop there as we were in the past.

Those are just some of the areas that I would play into but R&D is the seed corn of tomorrow and the unfortunate fact is that you are in a period now where you can't really do anything for three or four years because of decisions made three or four years ago. But to not keep your R&D in full development I think is a very unfortunate factor.

Another area is in the tactical atomic weapons. There are a lot of developments in the very low yield clean tactical nuclear weapons which would permit you to maintain a local defense without having excessive damage to the rest of the area, and to maintain it on the line of contact. Obviously, in a NATO situation that is a highly desirable factor if you can achieve it. There are possibilities in that area.

There are possibilities in command control, communications, and in many areas whereby you can make certain that the Soviets will never be tempted, which is the first thing you have to make certain to ever launch against the United States and, secondly, that we can hold our own in a political confrontation because it is politics that dominates strategy and strategy should never try to dominate politics. If you have strategy posture that is adequate necessarily it is going to influence your politics.

Mr. SPENCE. Doctor, we appreciate your effort here, and taking time from what I know is a busy schedule to come in and help us out, and I want to thank you on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the American public, for that matter. I know of your knowledge in this area and of your work for many years, as a matter of fact, and I wish you the very best and thank you very much again.

Mr. KINTNER. It was my pleasure. Thank you.

(Material submitted by Mr. Kintner follows:)

SOVIET MILITARY TRENDS: IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. SECURITY

(Remarks by William R. Kintner)

The rapidly growing military power of the Soviet Union has created a new balance of power which poses a serious threat to the United States. The Soviet Union is developing forces capable of projecting its influence on a global scale. The protection provided by U.S. strategic forces to our friends and allies is being reduced by the vastly increased Soviet capabilities.

The Soviet buildup in strategic missile forces, the expansion of the Soviet Navy and increased expenditures on military research and development are the three most crucial elements of the Soviet challenge. The Soviets possess a substantial lead in both number and size of ICBM's and are rapidly catching up in submarine-launched missiles. At present the Soviet Union have almost 1400 ICBM's including the giant SS–9 capable of delivering a 25-megaton warhead, compared with U.S. forces of about 1000 smaller missiles.

In naval capability the Soviets have undertaken a major building program in the last decade and now challenges Western naval superiority in several key areas. The Soviet Navy has built up a sizable Mediterranean fleet in the past five years and is moving into the Indian Ocean. Naval visits to Cuba have occurred several times recently and the Soviets are constructing port facilities there.

Soviet research and development expenditures are larger and growing at a faster rate than the American R&D effort. The Soviets are spending the equivalent of approximately $11 billion a year on military R&D, about 40 to 50 per cent greater than the U.S. and this figure is growing at about 15 per cent annually.

At the present time, there is approximate equality between U.S. and Soviet strategic forces, a condition called nuclear parity. Under conditions of nuclear parity, the large communist superiority in conventional forces becomes more important. In particular, our friends and allies may feel that alliance with the United States no longer provides an adequate safeguard for their security. Growing American incapacity and irresolution before Soviet advances is already making the United States a questionable partner for those who must risk our friendship as an alternative to accommodation with the Soviet Union.

In Europe, under conditions of nuclear parity and domestic pressure for U.S. troop reductions, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) which has provided the bulwark of Western security for over twenty years, may not be able to continue this vital function. In the Middle East, the Soviet Union has been able to capitalize on the Arab-Israeli confrontation by establishing a regular military presence in much of the Arab world. The Middle East could become the scene of a major confrontation for which the U.S. would be ill prepared. Latin America has recently witnessed increased Soviet diplomatic and economic activities, the election of a Marxist President in Chile, and Soviet naval visits in the Caribbean.

In recent years we have sought to achieve security at "bargain rates." The proof of this can be seen in the declining portion of our Gross National Product devoted to national defense—in sharp contrast to the steady increase in Soviet expenditures. The United States may have forgotten the maxim that there is only room for one at the top. "Leonid Brezhney's declaration to the 24th Party Congress—'the total triumph of socialism the world over is inevitable'—reminds us that the Soviet Union wants to be that one."

RESUMPTION OF HEARING

Mr. SPENCE. I would like to call Dr. Armbruster.

Doctor, could you tell us who you are and a little bit of your background? I would appreciate it.

STATEMENT OF FRANK ARMBRUSTER, DEFENSE ANALYST, HUDSON INSTITUTE, AND CONSULTANT ON DEFENSE TO IDA, RAND CORP. AND THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I am senior member of the staff of Hudson Institute and a member of the Research Council there. I have been dealing while at the Institute in foreign policy and domestic policy and military policy research.

Prior to coming there I was with the International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation as manager of operation analysis for all defense work. Prior to that I was with Boeing Corporation in operation analysis and prior to that I was with the Government for eight years in the military analysis field.

At the moment I have been working recently on the strategic weapons balance and have published in the area of military capability of China, Vietnam, and so forth.

Mr. SPENCE. Thank you very much.

For a starter, since you mentioned that you have been working in that particular area, I would like your view on our comparative position with the Soviet Union from the standpoint of our offensive military capability at this time relative to missiles.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. As Dr. Kinter has indicated, the balance of the intercontinental forces has gone to the Soviets with about 1300 weapons, compared to roughly 1050 for the United States. And also, of course, with the heavier deploy weight on so many of those missiles, the SS–9 is about one-quarter of the force, the balance of warhead impact and the yield megatonnage yield from these of course is even larger than that would indicate.

The submarine force, as was mentioned earlier, is increasing in size and at the moment they have a large-scale building program for a Yankee class submarine which launches 16 missiles similar to our ballistic missile submarines that we have at sea.

There is a large range of intermediate range missiles they have which do not threaten the United States particularly but have a large threat against Europe and for that matter against the Japanese since they have something like 600 of these aimed at Europe and another hundred or more aimed in the area of the Far East. This balance is changing slightly. They have intermediate range missiles going in other areas which one could call tactical, depending on the range, but has ability to strike strategic targets in Europe and Japan.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Crane.

Mr. CRANE. I would like first of all to welcome you before the committee, Dr. Armbruster, and thank you for giving of your busy time, too.

I have recently—yesterday, as a matter of fact—returned from the Far East, and I was in Japan for awhile during that trip as well as Taiwan and Hong Kong, Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. Of course there are many issues immediately on the minds of many of our friends in the Far East. And perhaps the papers reflect an overwhelming concern right now with the economic situations. Nevertheless, you do find in the journals over there a concern over the recent shift in our policy vis-a-vis Red China. And there seems to be something of an effort in Japan at least to reorder their position vis-a-vis Red China and talk about Mr. Sato making a trip to Peking even before the President, talk about establishing diplomatic relations with Red China as soon as possible, and there are internal pressures that have been created for the Japanese government because of our changed policy.

I am interested to find out if in your judgment you feel that the recent overtures to Communist China by this Administration reduced the need for strategic weapons by the United States.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I personally don't think that conclusion can be drawn at least for the moment. If we are suggesting by having representation in a nation we reduce the possibility of war, I can only point out that there was representation between all of the great nations in World War II, whereas, as a matter of fact, at the time of the beginning of World War II when the Sino-German pact was signed which divided Eastern Europe and started the war, we were in the midst of diplomatic negotiations, like the British had a team already on the way to Moscow at that time, and we have historic examples of actually diplomatic maneuvering being used to start the war.

So if we are suggesting that by having diplomatic recognition we reduce the possibility of war, I think it is difficult to make that statement strong, and if we are suggesting that by having recognition we have greater ability to deal with the Chinese on such things as arms control, I would again be skeptical because apparently we have had pretty close negotiations with the Chinese in Warsaw without having representation in Peking, where on the other hand, the British who had diplomatic recognition and have had diplomats in Peking, have been not that successful in dealing with them on almost any of these issues.

Also the French diplomats in Peking do not have easy access to their foreign office.

So I would suggest, if we are hoping to have changes which would not have necessarily come anyhow because of Peking's own policy, which could have come about through Warsaw or anywhere else that they wanted to make contact, we have not closed the door to any contact with them on the basis of ideas of arms control or what have you. I would suggest we may not gain as much as some people would hope. Of course, we are all hopeful that something will come about that will reduce tension between United States and China. I happen to be not that optimistic.

Mr. CRANE. In this same vein, what are the implications in your judgment with the President's overtures to Chinese Communists in relation to our defense position with Japan?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I think there is a difficulty here because there are those who speak in this country of the utilizing the Sino-Soviet split, if you will, by having United States play one against the other to widen the split, or do something to force the Soviets into a better mood in Europe, in other words, driving a wedge between those two countries or at least exploiting the wedge that is already there.

I would suggest there is a possibility that a wedge will be driven between us and Asiatic friends and allies, including Japan. I think that the Chinese are quite interested in the movements that recently occurred in Japan, certain indications that Japan might be interested in Taiwan. This is very bad because the big issue of the Chinese Communists has always been to incorporate Taiwan, which they don't have conventional military capability to do, but attempting to do this politically or reduce influence of Taiwan or get it into a position perhaps like West Berlin where it has a questionable status.

I think that if the Japanese were to become interested in Taiwan and linking with Taiwan economically and perhaps politically, it might be more difficult to deal with them over Taiwan than it would be for us. Perhaps this is in the back of the minds of the Chinese in making these overtures now to us, to somehow or other possibly get some type of unilateral declaration from us that they could not get from the Japanese. I would suggest this is correct. The Japanese would be more sensitive to Taiwan because it is closer to them.

I would suggest that that kind of relationship with Japan could possibly result particularly if we are going to Peking in a weak position, by that I mean we can to the extent where perhaps we are trying to get some kind of an agreement with China to go along with what Hanoi apparently has been doing recently, that is, winding down the war so that we try to buy the security in Southeast Asia, perhaps at the cost of alienating the Japanese by trying to use leverage on them to keep their interests out of these areas. The power vacuum caused by the United States might be filled by Japan. So if the Chinese Communists want to make any deal with that area, it might be better to make the deal with the United States rather than with tough-minded Japan.

Mr. HUNT. Doctor, along those lines, did you have the opportunity to recently see the commentary on television "The Rising Might of Japan"?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I am not sure. Which one was this? I have seen so many on Japan recently.

Mr. HUNT. I was switching channels in a hurry and I came on it, but it depicted quite vividly what you say, the fact that the Japanese are well armed and well trained and that they are now in a position once more to effectively produce a very strong fighting aircraft force, that their factories are now geared to this. Do you attach any significance to that?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I would of course suggest that Japan, being the great industrial power that she is, could at the drop of a hat go to military techniques. She has the strength, know-how, workers, and the organization. It is merely a question of intent with Japan not capability. She has the capability. If the Chinese are concerned, they seem to be concerned about the rising power of Japan, there is no question that this capability is there. What is politically possible in Japan and what the intent of the Japanese government is, of course, I am not privy to these internal discussions.

On the other hand, if I were in Peking and were a pragmatic person, as they definitely are, they are not by any means wild, looking around them I think they would have to be concerned with the shift in that power balance if we should leave and the difficulties in making agreements with a country like Japan if she should in any way begin to become sponsor of those proxies around the border of China.

Mr. HUNT. So that any power vacuum that would be created by this country in our defense posture could, of course, be filled.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. It could. I think that we have to be careful because the Japanese have not indicated that they are willing to dive in whole hog and go after this area if we go out of it, and we have been very reluctant to see them. As you know, we have been very strong about their not developing nuclear weapons and they have themselves not wanted to do this but I think that the Chinese Communists, looking at the Western World in a different light than we do and not having the trust that we do in Japan and other countries, may very well. I am not saying they are paranoid but they have had experience, and they may be concerned about Japan. In other words, our leaving the area from their point of view may not be the best thing for them, either, unless they can get these arrangements set up before we are gone to somehow insure the area and to guarantee on their borders they have friendly powers, or some way to get "friendly powers."

I would indicate that perhaps something like the Soviet Union and Europe. They might want Finlandization of the area around them where they prevent them from coming closer to any outside great power and in this case it might be Japan.

Mr. HUNT. Coming back once more and recognizing that you have been recognized as an authority on the nuclear situation insofar as the Navy is concerned, you made mention of the Yankee class submarine with 16 tubes. I have heard and I have read in some different articles and publications of the increased range of the tube of the missile in the Yankee class to where it has increased to a range of 2200 or 2300 miles, which would give them the encompassing range of Chicago and our defense centers

Do you place any significance on the fact that this was played down almost immediately? We never heard any more about it in the press. What is your professional judgment insofar as that is concerned in regard to our natural defense posture?

We knew there was a submarine somewhere in the Gulf of Mexico and from that point they could reach us, but it died as suddenly as it appeared in the press, and I was

wondering if you had any judgment in that respect.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I can't speak for the press, of course, but I think that if we take the whole posture of the Soviet Union, when you introduce these submarines, you bring in this interesting business of ability of your detection screens to handle that kind of an attack. Low shots, if you will. Incoming shots from submarines close in are not going to be picked up by radar screens in Canada, obviously. You will have another dimension, a whole new dimension to the defense problems of the United States. And I think that these, and you correctly indicated the longer range missiles which they are now supposedly installing and have a capability to put aboard these vessels, changed the direction which the threat may come. They have the effect of negating to some extent our warning systems and, of course, when you do this it has to do with the whole posture of the defense forces and the defense of your cities.

Mr. HUNT. The reason I brought it up was that I don't think the American people, the average American citizen realizes this threat that we have now facing us, and I was wondering why it was played down because in my estimation if they want the people to know and if we are to have a strong deterrent defense, as indicated by the gentleman who preceded you, then the political pressure from the populace would be necessary. We simply want the people to know of the deteriorating defense posture we are in and I am wondering why this has not brought out more vividly by the press, because it is very important.

If you can slide a Yankee class submarine into the Gulf of Mexico to reach our major defense centers, I think the American public is entitled to know all of the particulars that go with it so we can say to them and they can say to us we want the defense of this Nation to be strong.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. You are touching on a point which I covered in my statement. I refer to the matter of the whole attitude about the American defense position in the nuclear area worries me considerably. I happen to feel that the policy as it now stands, if I read it correctly, is not only imprudent but one could say immoral—at least morally questionable. What we are doing appears to me to first of all play down our ABM systems, our antiballistic missile systems, which would in effect take care of part of the problem you are talking about. In other words, if we had a system which would cover our cities, I am talking about point defense, long-range defense and very long-range defense where our cities who have some kind of cover where perhaps one submarine would not be enough to really put us in this very strange position where our big industrial centers and population centers would be uncovered. I think this is bad from several points of view. It is bad from military point of view but it is also bad because of the position it puts the President in. I think the President should have some kind of choice here other than threatening to annihilate millions of people in order to deter a war. We certainly want to deter attacks. We don't want nuclear war starting, but I think we have to think of some other means particularly if it is possible for us to get to that means to give the President some kind of choice in a crisis. If he has no capability to defend the cities, if all he can do is go to the horrendous business of threatening to kill many millions of people in the other country, then he is deterred by the threat he makes as much as anything else.

Apparently, according to Deputy Secretary Packard's statement a while ago, we are not concentrating on the best guidance for our warheads on our missiles that we could launch if we had to. I happen to think this is very bad because I believe perhaps one of the most, or perhaps the only morally justifiable target that you could have for a strike by nuclear weapon would be the other fellow's nuclear weapon. Yet here we take away the best capability these missiles have to disarm him by shooting at those weapons. This leaves us with a soft target force which is a very bad thing to have when you force the President into a crisis when all you can do is hit cities. It is even bad if you don't get guidance and we hit the weapons system anyhow because instead of having a few well guided warheads that can do a surgical strike, we throw in larger warheads that would throw out a fallout.

So our whole posture is one which if the war should come it is more horrible. And as a matter of fact, it is worse than that. You can think of situations. Bill Kintner mentioned the problem with China. What does the President do if he gets into a low level crisis, we are threatened by some kind of a crude system? And incidentally, the Chinese system right now is a crude system which could throw a half megaton warhead at San Francisco. This missile they used to boost their satellite could pitch about a half megaton state of the art today at San Francisco or Los Angeles. It is not a system that has a lot of penetrating aids, but they could threaten you.

The way it stands today, if the President is faced with a crisis where he is in a strong confrontation with the Chinese over some area of the world, you close it, he would be in a grave situation as far as decision was concerned, because since we have no coverage for those cities, a single warhead could take them out and he would then be in a positoin where he would have to threaten this terrible thing against the Chinese instead of saying "We are going to stand firm."

By the way, I would want to quickly point out this does not mean there would be a nuclear strike. It means in the area of negotiations he is in a bad position as a moral man in a free nation. He has to deal with what he threatens to do compared to what the threat to him is.

I think when you rob him of this flexibility and force him in the position where he has to escalate this horrible war, sure, you prevent him from doing things perhaps, but you also reduce the amount of possibility he has to settle these problems. Furthermore, if the war should ever come, and God knows none of us wants it, I worked on arms control studies over 10 years ago, but we are living in a nuclear age, they are here. If that war should come, even an accidental launch by one of these crude weapons systems that somebody may build, we have no defense for our cities. They could tell us the thing is coming and there is nothing we could do.

I think that is morally questionable to do that kind of thing to the decision makers in this country, to put them in that position. We have to think about these things and we can't brush them by saying that the war won't happen.

You don't have to have them in a position where the whole world blows up so they won't fire a weapon. As a matter of fact, I don't think any rational man would fire a weapon. I can conceive of an issue where any rational leader would fire a weapon no matter how good your defenses were or how good the other fellow's were not. You don't want to break that threshold because it is uncertainty that you may get hit by one or two weapons. I think the man who would fire a weapon would be completely irrational. If you are going to take care of an irrational man you are not going to do this. You have to worry more about capability and less about intent.

This is the situation we are in today. If your deterrence works with the rational or you are worried about the accidental launch, then you have to go to the capability problem. That means heavy defense and capability on your part to disarm this irrational man without covering this planet with fallout and killing innocent people. So we have heavy ABM coverage for our cities and for good, very accurate weapons with low yield to do this job surgically.

I think that is the moral situation one should be in and what I consider to be a prudent and moral defense position.

Mr. SPENCE. You think it is better to have all of these weapons and not need them, than to need them and not have them.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. It is better to have weapons and capability. Let me go on to a real crisis of the highest order. Suppose somebody struck us, maybe the Soviet Union, and suppose they warned us in the beginning and said let's not hit cities, what do you do? All your system can do is hit cities. You have the capability of fighting in the rules of war. Every war has had some kind of constraints on it including World Wars I or II, bad as they were, had some kind of constraints. We must be able to accept those constraints as you come along. You can't have a man locked in. You have to give him some choice.

Mr. SPENCE. If I might stop right here and inform the press we have a limited number of copies of Dr. Armbruster's statement here which he had not been able to give you. We also have a limited number of these publications here by Dr. Kintner of the American Enterprise Institute if any of the press would like to have them.

Doctor, we could of course just put your statement into the record or let you ad lib from your statement, whichever you would like.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I think I have covered the basic points now and I would be delighted to answer questions on any of these points.

Mr. SPENCE. Without objection your statement will be put in the record and then we will have questions by the members.

(Mr. Armbruster's statement follows:)

FRANK ARMBRUSTER'S STATEMENT ON U.S. DEFENSE POLICY

I shall address myself to just two of the many issues which this committee must consider. In the vital areas of ballistic missile defense and intercontinental ballistic missile guidance, we apparently are following a policy which, I submit, is not only imprudent but morally questionable. I make this statement because, in my judgment, a defense posture which is tailored to threaten many millions of innocent Soviet, Chinese and American citizens with a horrible death in order to deter a war is not desirable, particularly when another posture might be possible.

Obviously, the most desirable solution would be to completely abolish all nuclear weapons; and our government has for many years been engaged in a highly commendable effort to find a way to accomplish this. I was a member of the research team that produced one of the early large-scale studies on this issue for the State Department in 1960–61, before we had an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The SALT talks and the continuing study efforts to find a way to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear war should continue to have a high priority in our government. Until this effort is successful, however, we must live in a world of nuclear arms; and a posture designed to make a nuclear war more horrible if it should come seems highly questionable.

Yet, I submit that is what our current policy does. The relatively low-priority and deployment schemes of our antiballistic missile program plus our current position at the SALT talks put what I consider to be an essential element of a prudent, moral, defense posture—the heavy defense of our cities against incoming warheads by short-, long- and very long-range antiballistic mis-

siles—beyond our reach even in the not so near future. At the same time, according to the testimony of Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard before the Subcommittee on Arms Control and International Law and Organization of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we have adopted a policy not to develop superior guidance for our intercontinental and submarine-launched ballistic missile systems, which may rob them of their highest capability to dig out hardened enemy missiles aimed at us. As long as we have such systems it makes no sense for them not to have the best counterforce capability possible. Enemy nuclear delivery systems not only are the most logical targets from a purely military point of view (particularly considering the vast megatonnage delivery capability of each Soviet missile), but, under certain specific, dire circumstances are, in my judgment, one of the few—if not the only—morally acceptable target systems for an intercontinental nuclear delivery force.

Yet, under current policy, as enemy nuclear delivery systems are placed in less and less vulnerable concrete silos, we may have a primarily soft-target, or "city-busting" intercontinental nuclear force; and at the same time, because of our antiballistic missile policy, our own cities will be largely uncovered. There are those today who applaud this posture on the grounds that this makes nuclear war unthinkable and therefore deters those who would start one. I consider this argument weak on many grounds. To mention two: even with the heaviest antiballistic missile defense systems and best "counterforce" weapons, one is absolutely at a loss to conceive of an issue (except perhaps the very survival of the nation itself) over which a rational decision maker would launch a nuclear first strike. The possibility of a nuclear launch over lesser or non-issues arises with the irrational decision maker and the accidental launch of an enemy missile or missiles. One can make the not completely unpersuasive argument that a somewhat irrational decision maker could be made to feel entirely "safe" (when he really wasn't) by such defensive and counterforce systems, and thus be tempted to initiate a nuclear strike. But when one enters this area of irrationality and accident, one must weigh the possibility of judging the degree of possible irrationality of future potential enemy leaders, the probability of accidental launch from some potential nuclear delivery system, etc. Logically, under such circumstances, the planning must of necessity swing even more to concern for the potential enemy's *capability* rather than his *intent*. The prudent decision maker in this environment must wish for something other than the ability to threaten the utter destruction of perhaps hundreds of millions of people (which, in addition, is no defense against an accidental launch). This is no small issue for a moral leader of a free nation of moral men, and it can arise early in a crisis. Which leads us to the second weakness in the *schrecklichkeit*-approach and one we are much more likely to encounter: the effect on the President's flexibility of action in a crisis situation.

Let us consider the following illustrative and not completely improbable scenario: a confrontation occurs in which the United States is attempting to prevent the fall of some small nation to the aggression of a second-rate nuclear power or its proxy. This nuclear power has no counterforce capability against our nuclear forces and cannot match us in conventional force at the point of contact. For the sake of being specific, let us assume this nation is China. (Diplomatic recognition and commercial trade do not rule this out; the British were dealing with fully accredited ambassadors from both the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany in 1939 and had a diplomatic mission en route to Moscow when Russia and Germany announced their partition of Eastern Europe which started World War II. In 1870, Bismarck actually used the diplomatic exchanges with Louis Napoleon to precipitate the Franco-Prussian War in the famous Emms telegram incident). In this scenario, San Francisco and Los Angeles are implicitly, if not somewhat explicitly, threatened by a few relatively crude warheads, and the President is faced with a difficult situation, which would very likely have some effect on his "negotiating" position. Without specific point- or large area-defense antiballistic missile systems, he cannot defend these cities; and if the Chinese weapons are buried in thick concrete silos (no great technological feat), he may not be able to dig them all out with anything but a large, first-strike salvo of our less than superaccurate intercontinental ballistic missiles, even if he wanted to launch such a strike. Because there is no way to convince the Chinese that the President feels that there is some chance that we can "ride out" even their crude attack on Los Angeles and San Francisco, perhaps the only way he can look serious in his demand that China or her proxy cease and desist may be to quickly place himself in the morally undesirable position of threatening to incinerate millions of innocent Chinese men, women and children by destroying two or more of *their* large cities. Even if he chose the questionable alternative of a large U.S. nuclear strike by many less than fully accurate missiles on enemy hardened missiles, the moral question still comes up because of the chance of fallout from these many ground bursts killing large numbers of Chinese civilians, as well as the chance that two prelaunched and/or surviving Chinese missiles will hit unprotected Los Angeles and San Francisco anyhow. His third alternative is to back down.

A prudent President must go through such thought processes long before the crisis reaches this stage, and he may well be almost as deterred by the horrendous consequences of his own threatening actions as by the possible loss of life among the population of the United States. He deserves more time and flexibility of action within the framework of our moral value system, and our defense posture should not be designed to deny him this time and flexibility. An ABM system that protected our cities would lend more credibility to a firm posture by the President in low-level nuclear crises without his having to go to explicit, extreme threats; and it could defend our cities from the stray, accidentally launched, crude ICBM, with its bad or nonexistent fail-safe system. If the unwanted war should come, despite all efforts, there would be some defense, at least against small, and eventually presumably even against large, salvos. Furthermore, in the event of war, superaccurate ICBM's and SLBM's could enable us, as a last resort, to apply a smaller number of lower-yield warheads in a "surgical" strike against enemy ICBM's, thus reducing residual radiation and alleviating, to the greatest degree possible, the effects of a nuclear strike. Surely this is the more prudent and moral defense posture in the nuclear environment in which we are forced to live.

RESUMPTION OF HEARING

Mr. CRANE. I have a question in connection with an observation you made about necessity of defending cities. Is ABM defense system tactically feasible in your judgment?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I think that it is technically feasible. This is a highly debatable point. I don't believe that today we are dealing with this issue on the basis of purely technical capability. I think we are dealing with it on the basis of how Soviets react to our building and how we react to their building. It is sort of a negotiation problem and a problem which has to deal wtih reaction and counter-reaction, and so forth.

I would suggest that it is possible to build a system, several systems which could intercept missile. We have done this. We have a system at Kwajalein that has done this. I think it is now our duty to go into heavy R&D to try to iron out the bugs that are there, to develop the kind of system and devote the kind of energy which we have to other systems to getting defense for this country. They have a right to it. More than that, it puts the president in a position where he does not have to get into these horrendous positions so quickly. It gives him time and flexibility. If the war should ever come it is worth so terribly much to suggest that we are cutting funds in that vital area because somebody becomes annoyed, which I can't understand that myself, frankly, or because it should go elsewhere. I think they would have to make a very strong argument to me to show those funds were not that important that we could not double the R&D work in that area. I think it is necessary that we develop such systems and I think the state of the art can be driven by that point by the kind of work I would like to see done on it.

Mr. CRANE. Dr. Kintner indicated earlier that he would place R&D as top priority for defense spending today. Would you share Dr. Kintner's position as to where those dollars should be?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. In the nuclear field I would agree. I think R&D area is one. I suggest ABM work should have high priority and study of techniques for protecting and defending our cities is vital. If I had to make a choice among other systems in the nuclear area, this is the area I would put the money.

Mr. CRANE. How about laser development?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. Insofar as laser development could be used for defense, which I presume you are suggesting, obviously. Maybe we have breakthroughs. I would not want to suggest that the state of the art today of the laser solves all of the problems but I think as use for minute detection laser radar, our systems that are based on laser and possibly eventually laser beams that could knock out these missiles. I think that is in the distant future. Certainly this is an area that should be looked into with the kind of effort that the United States has put into other systems.

Mr. SPENCE. Doctor, I asked Dr. Kintner a question a little earlier about the arguments some people have in this country relative to the military capability of the Soviet Union and the fact that they were afraid of us, and as soon as they obtained this parity with us, they would slack off in their effort and of course we have seen now that they have gotten to that place and gone beyond and show no signs of slackening the pace.

Do you think this trend on their part will continue or will they tend to slack up in their development since they have gotten to this place of parity with us?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. It is very hard to say. First of all, the Soviets never promised to stop when they got to parity. That was our idea. They never told us they were going to do that. All they were doing was developing systems. I think you have to be careful because you are talking about a situation where they have capability to do it and their intent could change very easily.

If they develop technological know-how and the production capability they could make the systems. I would like to point out in the area of antiballistic missiles they may not, even if they made promises, may not be able to live up to the promises because the threat from China, even if we solemnly swear not to fire our IBM at them, they have to worry about China. Unless we can get other countries to guarantee this too, she

would have a legitimate reason for building ABM, even if we convinced her that we were not going to try to attack. I think as far as her other systems are concerned, as Bill pointed out, she usually goes forward with a large development program and she usually does an awful lot of R&D, and is fairly sure of the model when she goes and when she goes big, as happened with the SS–9. The pauses she has had in the past, which supposedly people say she has stopped, she has not stopped. She came up with mach 2, a better system, and then she went forward.

I would suggest it is very hard for us to tell what she is doing even when she pauses, and she has not paused that much. She is now ahead of us in IBM and throw weight makes a tremendous difference in the number of SS–9 capability of throwing in 3, 5 megaton warheads compared to three 200 KT warheads for our Minuteman.

I don't like those big warheads but they can take things out and make a lot of fallout and they may have this capability for counterforce strike we mentioned before if we keep to these silos.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have one question that I would like to ask. It again has to do with the question of priorities. In your prepared statement you give almost equal concern, it seems to me, to the necessity of an ABM missile system and to a low yield vehicle with pinpoint accuracy to attack their hardened sites, wherever they might exist.

In your informal remarks you mentioned ABM as having first priority and I wanted to make certain that this is the case in your mind.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. Yes. As I said, I was only to address two issues because of the time element, but choosing between those two issues I come down heavily on ABM for defense of these cities.

Mr. ROBINSON. Thank you.

Mr. CRANE. I have a question, Dr. Armbruster, and this has to do with our low profile defense posture vis-a-vis the Soviets. Does this make us more or less sure in your judgment as a nation?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I am sorry. Does this what?

Mr. CRANE. Does our low defense profile posture today make us more or less secure vis-a-vis the Soviet Union? In other words, where we have de-emphasized considerably, as you know, both in terms of rhetoric as well as performance our defense capability—this goes back quite a number of years starting most specifically I think with Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's decisions as to what our strategic position should be—that we could remove the suspicions of the Soviets and therefore they would follow our lead. As has already been touched upon here, we have some evidence that they have not followed our lead but a continuation of this general policy. Will this make us more or less sure as a nation?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I would suggest it can't make us more sure and will probably make us less sure, because I believe that the Soviets do not have intent for all-out nuclear strike on the United States. They don't have intention of nuclear strike against anyone. Of course, we don't either. It turns out they are very difficult to use. On the other hand, in the background at all times are these nuclear weapons and they have to do with the resolve of the people who face Soviet Union at low-level crises or proxies of the Soviet Union in low-level crises.

I remember vividly after 1962 incursion into India by the Chinese I was talking to a high-level Indian civil servant and I said, "Why didn't you use your aircraft against the Chinese columns coming through those mountain passes?" And he said, "Well, they would have bombed Delhi."

It turns out they only had two little bomber strips and they could not have carried enough bomb strikes to take anybody out. But they worried about those cities.

Now with those nuclear crises in the background, it is real and any time you inject nuclear weapons and even though China has made statements of no first use, that doesn't do it. The weapons are still there. When you get an imbalance where somebody has dominance, you always have this problem of how do you handle a crisis and how do you keep your allies in line or how do you keep the person in line who asked you to help to start with if they have this thing looking over them.

I would suggest that I am not saying the United States has to defend the whole world. I happen to feel a lot of these countries, particularly in Europe, can do a lot of defense for themselves, but even though the threat, India is a good example, and Southeast Asia, the Chinese can't get there with a large army. But with the dominance of the large power up there, they look to the north, it is difficult to tell that nation, "Don't worry about it because they can't come over the mountains." But the point is that that large power there with nuclear arms has a dominating effect on any negotiations in the area and this applies also to the Soviet Union. As she gets this tremendous strength and has this power which could be greater than ours, there is no question about the influence there and what happens to the countries around here, and I don't for my own point of view think that is a good way for the world to go. I think it is bad for the United States.

Mr. CRANE. I would like to have you elaborate more fully on a statement you made earlier with respect to implications of our China policy. You suggested that if you were sitting in Peking and working paranoically perhaps about a powerful Japan filling a vacuum created by withdrawal on the part of the United States, that you would be vitally concerned with cementing relationships with those countries on your borders. Thinking back historically to the Thais having maintained independence through the years by making their arrangements with a dominant power, would this not suggest that before Japan makes such a decision, if she ever does, that Chinese policy might be to put increasing pressures on those countries which are flanking her immediately to guarantee friendly governments there, and I mean political, economical, diplomatic, any kind of pressure that might be brought to bear, and is it not possible that we could find ourselves in a situation where those countries that we have been trying to cultivate to be able to maintain their independence free from Chinese Communist domination in the past might see the United States withdrawing into the background, Japan not yet in a position to fill any vacuum and kind of stumbling over one another to make their arrangements as best they can in a hurry for fear that if they don't they might find themselves with the refuse and power struggles that could go on in Asia?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I think this is right. There is always a danger that if the countries, the smaller countries near the large powers begin to see the support leaving them, even though it may not be indicated in imminent danger from China militarily, that they would like to go in and make deals while they still can make them, while there is still bargaining possibility there.

The difficulties that Southeast Asia has had of course is that friendships of China or Soviet Union has usually meant usually very strict neutrality to the point where neutrality means you don't have anything at all, a la Burma or something, or it means "friendly governments", which are people's Communist governments, if you will.

Now I think as long as that danger is there, these countries are not going to want to put themselves in a position where they accept the Communist coup, if you will, or even demeanalization of them where foreign policy is dominated by China.

I would suggest that what China is concerned about is support they have from the United States, our forces, our backup, our Seventh Fleet, and I think that what the Chinese may be after is making agreements, neutralizing these areas, making sure no foreign policy gets in and getting agreements which the Japanese might not be willing to give them and maybe we have a breakthrough here with China which can be related to the idea that perhaps they get more out of us then they will out of the next power coming into the area.

I am not privy to what goes on inside Japan but the potential is there and Peking may not look on Japan as quiescent as we do.

Mr. CRANE. Looking at the long-range stability of the area, would it not be over the long run better to have strong coalition of smaller powers that could be relatively resistant to either domination of Red China or Japan than to put them in this kind of a situation where they either have to make a quiet accommodation with Red China or else worry about the prospects of coming into subjection of dominant Japan at some future date?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I am very cool on regionalism of small powers. Normally these arrangements, these regional defense arrangements, NATO, the Warsaw Pact, usually exist because there is one strong power that holds them together. I have heard six powers could fall out of NATO and it would still be there. Not if one of them was the United States, it would not still be there. You can have small groups, but sometimes alliances don't work together, as Napoleon found out.

So you have to have some power which takes the head and normally historically it has been some strong power in the area which has done this and attached to its other powers sometimes reluctantly like in the case of the Warsaw Pact group. The Soviet Union dominates that. We are the big power in NATO and we have been the big power in the Pacific. We have regional agreements with these countries.

I am not too happy about thoughts of what might happen if we were to leave without some other large powers backing them up. I think those agreements would be rather shaky.

Mr. CRANE. This is my point: Aren't you suggesting that that is the kind of a situation that the United States is participating in creating and dominant power under present circumstances would most certainly be Red China?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. I would suggest that if we pull out and if there is a confrontation with Red China and if these small powers don't have a big power just for moral support, the probability of them holding together well is less. It is obviously going to be less. They don't like to become Communist. They like to be independent. They like to have "indifferent" United States coverage. I don't know how indifferent Japan would be but they don't like this heavy concentration if they join the camp of Hanoi, for example, as Hanoi is trying to get Laos to do. It changes the domestic setup perhaps too much and the Communists may demand that much of a change before they recognize them as friendly. They won't like this. They may be forced into it.

I would suggest if we pull out and some big power doesn't support them, that there is this possibility.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you.

Mr. SPENCE. Doctor, I know you have had to analyze a lot of these questions from all angles, and I have been concerned about the military uses of outer space. It seems we devote most of our time and effort in going to the moon and Soviets seem to be more con-

cerned about lower atmosphere and building space platforms. Do you see any significance in this trend on their part?

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. Well, you know about the treaty of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction. Let's assume for the sake of argument that they don't put into those particular vehicles in space anything that is military. The knowledge you gain from that kind of program gets pumped into a military program. We have been concerned about orbiting weapons they have had and capability of bypassing our own warning system, and so forth.

I would suggest that any of the effort in that area could be transferred at least to some extent to the military field. Whether they would break a treaty and some day inform us that that spaceship up there really had lasers on board that could wipe out New York City is hard to determine unless you were on board and looked at the thing. But even if they lived up to all of the agreements we might make with them, the technology which is again an important thing could be applied to military stuff and I presume it would be.

Mr. SPENCE. Especially from a standpoint of the so-called space platforms, and we haven't dealt a whole lot in that area.

Mr. ARMBRUSTER. If you are talking about a manned platform for military purposes, they are supposedly a little further than we are. I don't know how good that would be. Frankly, it is an area that is very iffy. We are even discussing whether it be better to have machines or men on the moon, so I think it is hard to make a firm statement, but I will repeat technology could be applied to military stuff and it does not hurt their military program.

Mr. SPENCE. Gentlemen, any questions?

We will without objection put your entire statement in the record and I would like to inform those present that we will reconvene at 2 o'clock. At that time we will have General Trudeau and we will go into the area especially of R&D, research and development, because it is a very big problem that has been mentioned by both witnesses this morning at length.

I thank you for coming in. We will see you again about two o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m. the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2:00 p.m. the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. SPENCE. I would like to reconvene the hearings, please.

This afternoon we have with us a witness, Lt. General Arthur D. Trudeau, retired, and General, we are happy to have you with us. If you would please tell us a little bit about your background and your work, and then we will go into questions.

STATEMENT OF LT. GENERAL ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU, USA (RET.)

General TRUDEAU. All right, Mr. Chairman. My background is professional Army officer, graduate of the United States Military Academy, West Point, 1924, postgraduate Degree in Civil Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, 1928.

Most of my early professional service was in the Corps of Engineers, shifting to combat type commands. After the war commanding the First Cavalry Division in Japan, and to a degree in Korea and 7th Division in Korea last year of combat. First Corps Commander over there from 1956 to 1958. Major staff positions in the Pentagon, you might say, Deputy Director and Director of Training of Service Forces during World War II, or part of it. Chief of Manpower Control for the Army, 1946 to 1948. Chief of Army Intelligence 1953 to 1955. And Chief of Research and Development for the Army 1958 to 1962, four and a half years.

Following that, I immediately went as President of the Gulf Research and Development Company for the Gulf Corporation for six years, from '62 to '68, and for the last three years I have functioned as the Assistant to Chairman of the Board of North American Rockwell, not as an employe but as a consultant, that is, my primary effort, and that function was not business in the Pentagon but trying to transfer some of the advanced technology that had been developed on the aerospace side of our business, in the hard-nose side of our business, which gets into automotive, textile, machinery, printing machinery, and miscellaneous other things. I still serve in that capacity.

Mr. SPENCE. From the standpoint of your background with research and development and intelligence, I think you are very well qualified to give us some information which we in turn hope to relate to the American people. I don't know whether you want to put your statement in the record or you want to go through it, or ad lib from it or what, but whichever way you would like.

General TRUDEAU. I am entirely at your service, whichever way you would prefer it. I did have several comments in here but, as you say, they will be in the record.

(General Trudeau's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU

Distinguished Members of the Committee: I have been asked to comment on our national position with respect to research and development and the adequacy of funding.

I would like to consider first why R & D is important as ony in this way can priorities of effort, and hence funding, be appropriately established.

Beyond the doubt of any reasonable and informed American, the Number One issue today is the survival of the United States. Never before, even in the darkest days after Pearl Harbor, has our very existence been threatened from without and within by the vile threat of World Communism to the degree that exists today. Every pronouncement for two generations has asserted their determination to eliminate us and those enjoying the free enterprise system as national entities in a distraught world. Consequently, while our advancement in science and technology is vital to our physical defense against aggression from without, it is also essential to ease the burning pressures from within that are scorching the thin veneer of Western civilization.

Second, the welfare and progress of the nation as a whole demand the full sweep of scientific and technological progress to meet the social, economic and political challenges of our time.

Thirdly, we know that we can no longer live in this most favored segment of God's earth without sharing with others less fortunate around the world our vast knowledge, our talents and, within reason, some of our resources.

Thus, the exploding field of science and technology has risen like a balloon in these last decades due to stimulation by and recognition of the three objectives I have mentioned. Now we seem to falter and lose faith in ourselves.

Before going further, I would hope that the usual reference to just science when R & D is discussed would include science and the related technology that gives practical meaning to the fruits of basic research. Too often, I have heard new developments classed as scientific successes or engineering failures based on results. Nothing could be less true. While I cannot speak directly for that great scientist, Dr. Edward Teller, if you were to question him today, I think he would tell you that our problems are as acute in the field of applied engineering as they are in basic research. This in no way degrades the vital importance of adequate basic research as the foundation for further advancement in all fields of endeavor.

Our national program spanning research, development, test and evaluation is presently expending about $25 billion per year. One third is provided by private funds and two-thirds by federal funds. One half of the federal effort is executed by government facilities and the other half by industry under contracts or education under grants or contracts. These tremendous funds have increased rapidly in the past years, but now retrenchment doesn't even cover built-in inflation of at least 5 percent per year, to say nothing of actual reductions in moneys available. I would not expect R & D to stabilize as a fixed percentage of our growing GNP although an upward trend is essential. The Canadian policy of writing off 150% or R & D costs before taxes could be stimulating to industry, R & D, like a rising balloon, however, can climb to higher reaches by casting overboard some ballast that is certain to exit. Unprofitable duplication, long-term efforts of doubtful value, tasks of highly questionable or nebulous application and others in the think tank field need closer scrutiny and probably elimination. When funds are relatively stable and personnel levels are likewise, new high priority efforts can only be undertaken when those at the bottom are cut off. Ten years ago when I headed Army R & D, we eliminated perhaps 200 tasks or projects to take on more urgent work. The management, the employees and sometimes the politicians will resist—and sometimes they'll win—but not always. With today's dollar headaches, a sharper look must be taken. We might learn a lot by considering the policies and practices of the Soviet Union now that they are reaching a position of superiority in technology.

A great deal has been said in recent months concerning the growing technological superiority of the Soviet Union in the field of new weapons systems and military science problems.

One aspect of the discussion thus far which has been largely overlooked is the structure within which the systems of military science and weapons research and development operate in the Soviet Union as opposed to the United States.

Indeed, I would say that it is impossible to properly understand why the U.S. is lagging behind unless a careful examination of the Soviet structure is made.

Americans, conditioned to the creative disorganization of the free enterprise system, give far too little thought to the implications involved in a highly technical and rigidly controlled system of organization which, in the case of the Soviet Union, has led to an even more sophisticated system for research, development and demonstration of new and improved weapons system.

Some of the other witnesses are from institutions which conduct much of the work for this country which, in the Soviet system, is accomplished through a highly complex governmental system with the Central Committee of CPSU and General Secretary Brezhnev in constant control. With due respect to the great work done at these American institutions, and especially for the outstanding contributions of those who speak today, it must be said that, considering our current deemphasis of military matters it is not possible for these American institutions to fully compete with the Soviet structure, given the top priority which the Soviet institutions have been assigned.

Let us, therefore, in our examination of this whole question, briefly examine just what kind of structure we are talking about with the hope that such a discussion will shed some light on the discussions of the other witnesses who will detail America's tragic and strategic decline.

It is indeed disquieting to see the Soviet military establishment expanding its mili-

tary science program at an alarming tempo while we think in terms of "changing priorities" and critical reductions in military expenditures.

Soviet military science today has reached an unprecedented degree of development owing to the ceaseless work of numerous permanent agencies and groups of experts who not only hold high military ranks and considerable command experience, but who have high academic degrees in military and other sciences and are well known in Soviet academic and military circles.

At its highest level, the Soviet military science programs are supervised by the Supreme Military Council of the Central Committee of the CPSU, chaired by General Secretary L. I. Brezhnev himself.

The working staff of this Council comprises high-ranking military personalities under the command of the current Deputy Chief of the General Staff for Operations, Col. Gen. M. I. Povaly. The Council provides guidelines on matters of military science to the Ministry of Defense and the USSR Academy of Sciences. In the Ministry of Defense the General Staff is responsible for all military science programs and as such is the highest authority in the field, making the Chief of the General Staff, Marshal M. V. Zakharov, the main military theoretician in the Soviet Union.

The Military Science Administration of the General Staff supervises and implements the programs with the assistance of a number of subordinate secret military science institutes. In addition, military science projects are carried out at the Academy of the General Staff, the highest ranking military Academy in the Soviet Union. Admission to this Academy, by invitation only, is limited to graduates of 18 other military service academies with combat or command experience and proven abilities in leadership or the military science field. The military science departments of the Academy of the General Staff set the pace for trends in military science, especially with respect to general problems of strategy and with military theory. The staff of the Academy, comprising over 300 persons, is heavy with leading military science experts in the fields of strategy, military operations, tactics, military economics, and other military disciplines.

Aside from military science activities directly controlled by the General Staff, military science in the Soviet Union is also developed within the 18 military academies attached to the five services with different profiles of study. The all-services prestigious Frunze Academy specializes in tactical and operational studies; the Dzerzhinskiy Military Academy, serving the Strategic Missile Forces, concentrates on strategic concepts conditioned by the use of missile systems; and the Ushakov Naval Academy is involved in the study of modern naval combat operations.

Military science is also the object of intense study within the civilian USSR Academy of Sciences, the highest academic establishment in the USSR, subordinate to the Supreme Military Council and the Council of Ministers. The dual, civilian/military profile of the Academy is manifested in the personality of the President, Academician V. M. Keldysh, who is known to have been the Director of the Soviet space (missile) program for a long time. Military studies are done within different sections of the Academy.

The Institute of the USA is headed by G. A. Arbatov, a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, a frequent visitor to the United States and well known in American academic and even government circles. He maintains a permanent military strategy group supervised by former professors of the General Staff Academy.

The Institute of World Economics and International Relations (IMEMO) with a staff of 500 persons, has an International Policies Division headed by a leading expert in military strategy who recently visited the United States and who is assisted by a group of Soviet experts in military theory.

Aside from the various Institutes related in varying degree to the study of military science, the Academy of Sciences also directs a system of interdisciplinary studies on political and military topics.

The various military academies and the Academy of Sciences coordinate their studies through seminars and interdisciplinary conferences which are translated into official guidelines on military science developments and transmitted to all levels and areas of the military scientific activities in the USSA.

The exact number of Experts engaged in this coordinated military science program is estimated to be about 3,000 in the USSR, as compared with about 880 for the United States.

The Soviet Union has been engaged for many years in an extensive weapons research and development program which was accelerated recently when introduction of nuclear weapons and missiles revolutionized military affairs. This drive for new and better weapons has not been left to the haphazard initiative of isolated plants or institutes, but has been centralized and developed under the control and guidance of an intricate network of Party, government, military and scientific authorities. The result of this combined, centralized effort has been the introduction of a series of new and perfected weapons systems of every type and caliber, ranging from the extremely simple and practical Kalashnikov machine gun (famous AK–47) to ballistic missiles fired by the latest types of nuclear submarines and satellites cruising in outer space.

At its highest level, the USSR weapons systems' research and development program is controlled again by the all-powerful Supreme Military Council.

The Council is assisted in its work by the various departments of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the CPSU, more particularly by the Department of Administrative Organs, and the Department of the Defense Industry which controls and guides the various ministries working more or less directly for defense. The Department acts also as a link with the Department of Military Affairs of the GOSPLAN, State Planning Commission, which prepares the long-range and annual economic plans for the entire industry of the USSR.

In the General Staff of the Ministry of Defense there is an office for new weapon analysis, which was headed until recently by Col. Gen. of Engineering Services N. N. Alekseyev, now Deputy Minister of Defense and highest Soviet military delegate to SALT.

The General Staff is assisted also by its Military Science Administration, comprising leading specialists in the various fields of military science and technology. Aside from the General Staff, basic Soviet weapons research and development is performed in the USSR Ministry of Defense by the six administrations specializing in weapons, missiles, engineering, ships and naval weapons, and aircraft.

The Soviet military effort is also served by the various industrial ministries of which at least 10 are related directly or indirectly to military production. These are the ministries of Defense Industry, Aviation Industry, Automotive Industry, and others.

Basic research for new weapon systems starts at the level of the Academy of Sciences or in the institutes of the General Staff. Then the new weapon is planned, drafted, and created in the agencies of the Ministry of Defense or the research institutes of one of the above ministries. The approved design is used for the production of several samples or prototypes at one of the assigned plants of the appropriate ministry (Ministry of Defense Industry, or Automotive Industry, etc.). This prototype is then tested and compared with similar weapons for its performance and effectiveness by commissions consisting of experts from the Ministry of Defense and industry. The finally approved new weapon is then admitted for serial production in the plants of one or several ministries depending upon the complexity and characteristics of the system. The total development cycle for the complex missile is estimated to take from 6 to 8 years, determining, thus, the lead time for weapon system development.

I shall not belabor further the descriptions of the complex and intricate structure of the Soviet military research and development system further, except to point out that this system spends some $9 billion annually, while our somewhat disjointed and unproductive system spends between 6 and 7 billion dollars per year. Since Soviet salaries consume far less of the research and development dollar than is consumed in the United States, it is safe to say that the Soviets more than double our effort in this area.

Federal organization of R & D needs further study in fact, our whole procurement system does. I am viewing it not as a scientist but as a high-level manager with 41 years as Chief of Army R & D, 6 years as head of research and engineering for the Gulf Oil Corporation, and now three years seeking to transfer some of the advanced accomplishments in aerospace programs to the hard-nosed side of business for the North American Rockwell Corporation. I've seen both sides now. The responsibilities of the numerous offices and agencies engaged in R & D seem nebulous, overlapping and conflicting. I think a better solution could be evolved to energize and streamline the whole effort. I do not believe, based on limited consideration, however, that a Department of Science is the answer. It would cut across all functional lines and departments in the Executive and serious operational conflicts would be inevitable. NASA, however, could be energized as a logical vehicle to integrate all national programs.

While latitude must be given to scientists engaged in basic research, at least a fair degree of objectivity must be required. An industry that depended on serendipity for adequate progress and return on research expenditures would fail and not even the U.S. Government can afford any such luxury. Some discretionary funds should be available for unscheduled research but the proper distribution and use of such funds is a function of good management.

The man-year cost of research has been increasing annually. To give you rough figures today, I would say university-supported research might average $35,000 per professional man-year, $40–50,000 in industry and $60,000 in federally-supported research centers.

I doubt if regional-funding would improve our overall capabilities. Certain areas lend themselves more to a particular field of interest and effort than others. The location of higher education facilities and industry seem to be a determining factor in the location of laboratories where freedom of choice prevails. I doubt if we can raise our talent level by spreading existing talent to small colleges or industries. The highest level of proficiency will still be attained at major universities and industrial laboratories where the concentration of both professional and potential talent will continue to concentrate.

The active collaboration of universities and industries is essential to maximize scientific and technological advancement. The campus needs the collaboration and even the instructional competence of many industrial researchers. By the same token, the tenure-protected halls of academe need exposure to the more practical problems of industry.

where objectivity and pay-out on cost bears closer relation to results.

Previous government funding of research may, in at least a small way, have abetted student unrest. It appears that one factor in the slowness of certain universities in clamping down on student disorders may have been the fear of faculty criticism. This fear of faculty criticism, related to existing antipathies between faculties and administrators, is diminishing, I hope. Some professors have been encouraged, in their disdain of university authorities, by the ease with which they have established their own private umbilical cords to federal funding agencies. Let's get university presidents in control of their universities.

I have frequently observed what I consider to be an unfortunate circumstance. This is that when scientific advisory committees are formed they are largely composed of professors. Repeatedly I have observed said professors attempting to resolve difficulties by asking for more money. A more practical approach is usually needed. I recommend that all influence possible be exerted to get such committees filled at least to about one-half with competent industrial scientists and engineers or competent industrial research administrators. This is the most effective way I know to ensure that a balanced view is achieved between the projected value of research and the funding that is required.

Just because we have reached a high level of sophistication in weapons systems, it is folly for this nation to believe we have achieved the ultimate and can relax. Hardly anything has been produced or is on the drawing board that wasn't in some stage of R & D when I retired nine years ago. We must go forward.

Considering the long lead time necessary for weapons system development, considering the problem of inflation and cost overruns, considering the current status of the Soviet programs, considering that Americans are generally weary of unsought rivalries, I believe it is high time we develop and accelerate a coordinated and integrated program of weapons systems development and that the Administration and the Congress fund it adequately.

We need not socialize our basic industries to do this. We must, however, reduce unnecessary competition among private firms who work on parallel projects. We need the combined expertise available from all such enterprises to support an agreed-upon program for new weapons systems.

It is too bad that welfare and warfare now compete for funds, but until the world changes we won't long enjoy the former unless we can prevent or win the latter. Actually, it is the cutback from the fine programs and high employment of the 1960s that has caused the breadlines and unemployment of the 1970s. We are spending more with much less to show for it. Relief is the bottomless pit of a socialist state.

I was detailed as Special Assistant Administrator of the Works Progress Administration for New York City 35 years ago. We did a lot of good temporarily spending 70¢ of each dollar for wages and the other 30¢ for material and equipment. Only as we built back toward a solid economy and accented more substantial efforts under the Public Works Administration, however, reversing the costs and putting only 30¢ into direct labor and 70¢ of each dollar into construction and equipment, did we reverse the trend and rebuild our economy.

What is my point? This. With 60¢ of the defense dollar going for pay, etc., you can't provide an adequate and effective military force on the 40¢ left, particularly if the defense of this country is only worth 7% of our Gross National Product. A study of GNP, inflation and military expenditures over the past 25 years clearly seems to indicate that annual expenditures of about 10% of GNP are required. Don't make the Army or its sister services a welfare project, or the nation will live to regret it. Don't make a WPA of the military.

Research must be better sustained. The whole system needs to be reviewed. There is no end to the road, apparently, as we stretch our sights from the Mohole to the Quasars. However, our challenge in near space is so critical that the moon may be far enough to go for the moment until we solve the many problems we face between here and there.

Unless we awaken now to the sinister threats pressing in from all sides, we may indeed be exposed soon to the prophetic remarks made over fifty years ago by that great inventor and patriot, Hudson Maxim, when he said:

"Fate has decreed that our pride shall be humbled, and that we shall be bowed to the dust. We must first put on sackcloth, ashed in the embers of our burning homes. Perhaps, when we build anew on the fire-blackened desolation, our mood may be receptive of the knowledge that we must shield our homes with blood and brawn and iron."

Only if we maintain our military power and national will to meet all challenges can we avoid the cataclysm he envisioned.

You can expect to see the will of the West tested again in Berlin, the Balkans, or the Middle East. You will recall the surge of the visigoths through Western Europe in the fifth century, the Moors in the eighth, the hordes of Genghis Khan in the thirteenth, and the Ottoman Turks in the sixteenth, when they were turned back at the great naval battle of Lepanto in the Adriatic in 1513. Shall we see its counterpart off the Albanian coast or Malta in the twentieth? It could be.

Or will the hills of Megiddo, the Armageddon of the Bible, ring again to the clash of combat in the Middle East, as they did in earlier days? Whenever I think of the strategic importance of the Middle East, my mind turns back to a statement made by one of our diplomats over a hundred years ago that still may be prophetic.

In May of 1861, as our unfortunate War between the States was breaking out, Ambassador Cassius Clay at the Court of St. Petersburg, Russia, wrote to Secretary of State Seward in Washington, and I would like to quote one paragraph from his letter. He said, "Russia and the United States will each circumnavigate half the globe in opposite directions until they meet and greet each other in the regions where civilization first began."

He apparently recognized these two great focal points of coming world power. What he envisioned in the way of how we would greet each other remains for all of us to contemplate. But, certainly, the area he spoke of was the hills of Megiddo, the Armageddon of the Bible.

Don't let us be caught with our guard down.

RESUMPTION OF HEARING

General TRUDEAU. I put in quite an analysis of the Russian system which has some advantages over ours, I believe, not that we should adopt it but we should learn by studying their system and see if we can't improve ours both in the R&D and in the procurement fields.

We are just not coming up with much that is new and I don't believe the way we are funded and operating that we are going to come up with much that is new, and many of us are very much concerned that we are being outdone by the Russians. We are not being out-funded by them, but because they can do many things where the dollar goes much farther. We think that the military effort in Russia today in research and development and prototypes, in other words, in the military systems, is probably about double what we are doing. We see ourselves getting woefully behind in a number of areas and it becomes a matter of very serious concern.

The same thing is happening to a degree in industry and yet people that are really knowledgeable know and if they think about it will accept the fact that when these difficulties occur and things get together, is the very time when there should be more accent on research and development, to develop new techniques, new products, systems and approaches, and this is true whether we are talking about the hard sciences, as we are principally, or the life sciences, the humanities and social sciences to a degree.

Mr. SPENCE. General, right there, with your knowledge of it, where do you think the Russians are putting most of their effort from a standpoint of research and development? Into what systems or area of the military?

General TRUDEAU. Well, certainly their effort in space is one of the great ones and many of us are concerned that with what they have in the way of satellites that may be circling the earth now, or that will be in addition to their offensive weapons, that they are gaining quite some degree of superiority over a position in which we have been relatively dominant until the last years, and at least have held a position of reasonable equality with them, but we are seriously concerned that this is slipping away.

I think it is very unfortunate that we have degraded our NASA effort to the degree that we have. When NASA was organized, was formed in 1958–59, I was then the Chief of Army Research and Development, and I pleaded that there were military aspects to be considered in space. We rather took the ostrich position as a nation, however, and said, "If we don't tell the Russians that, they won't know it." And of course this is a completely stupid approach. They know it very well, and we knew it very well then but we didn't do enough about it.

Now I am concerned about outer space between here and the moon and the moon has taught us a lot, and there is a lot we need to know about the space shuttle and things that we do in near space, if you want to put it that way.

I think when it comes down to priority of funds for exploration in space, that there needs to be more accent on what we do between here and the moon, for the moment, and considering funding problems, then to put the major accent on going to Mars and doing too little to protect ourselves against the terrible threat.

Mr. SPENCE. The question I asked this morning of one of the witnesses was the effort seems to be on the part of the Russians to devote their time and money and research into near space, the space platform and this kind of thing, and I was wondering if that was significant, whereas we are spending most of ours on the long-range way out.

General TRUDEAU. I think it is most significant, and I think this is one of the greatest threats that we face, is in near space.

Mr. SPENCE. From the standpoint of space platforms, so called?

General TRUDEAU. That is right. The ability to have satellites cruising in space that can be guided in through various methods of control here on the ground. You can even envision electronic radar or radio stations placed at critical points on the earth that could be turned on at certain times that could bring the satellite in directly.

Mr. SPENCE. Then they could have the space platforms stationed more or less over all of our major cities, industrial, military installations, and all the rest, and at some given time, "All right, you in the United States, this is it."

General TRUDEAU. That is exactly the kind of blackmail that I am afraid a President of this country will face some day, and they will

either be over there in overwhelming numbers and capacity to obliterate us, so second strike does not exist, and at the same time we are being deterred from defending ourselves with an ABM system.

Mr. SPENCE. Do you have anything further on that? I wanted to cover that especially before I left that subject.

Mr. CRANE. I have a question going back to your experience in R&D when you were still in the military. To your knowledge, in the last decade, roughly, has there been any new weapon system, dramatic new weapon system that has been introduced by the United States?

General TRUDEAU. No, there has not. There hasn't, and I have included that statement on page 10 when I have said that just because we have reached a high level of sophistication in weapons systems, it is folly for this nation to believe we have achieved the ultimate and can relax. Hardly anything has been produced or is on the drawing board, at least to my knowledge, that was not in some stage of research and development when I retired nine years ago, and we have certainly got to move forward from this position.

During my time, and in everyone that has succeeded me, and in a number of places we constantly or recurrently almost annually have a new study in reducing what we call lead time, the reduction in time between when an idea is conceived and when the first piece of that hardware is available for use, and we accept the fact that due to a number of factors this generally averages out around eight years.

I have been retired nine years, and I can think of nothing that has yet come out that represents a new concept or a new weapons system of any magnitude at all since that nine years ago when I retired.

Mr. CRANE. General, in the category of aircraft—and maybe this is getting beyond your expertise going back to days in the Army—but are you aware that we have anything in our present generation of aircraft that compares favorably with the current generation of aircraft the Soviets have developed? I mean specifically the Mig-23, Foxbat, which I understand dwarfs in its capabilities our Phantom jets.

General TRUDEAU. That agrees with my understanding, although I have not gone into the technical aspects or characteristics of our fighter aircraft compared with theirs. But I believe this is correct. Of course we are struggling to build about one bomber to give us something modern in that particular field as our other bombers are getting pretty old.

Mr. CRANE. Dr. Kintner and Dr. Armbruster testified this morning that in terms of allocation of defense dollars, they would place at the No. 1 priority, research and development expenditures. Would you make a similar assessment?

General TRUDEAU. Yes, I certainly would. I certainly would. I don't think we can afford to see our effort falling so much behind the Soviet. Their objective is to introduce, if they can, one and a half to two new weapons systems per year, according to our understanding. We seem to have no objective of that kind that is being fulfilled at least. Now it might be in the back of somebody's mind but it is not being fulfilled.

There is no doubt about it, our opinion is that about $15 billion in United States equipment, whatever the ruble is worth, is being devoted to Soviet military research and development, whereas, ours runs very much less than that. I should say that is their total. In military research for the Soviet the figure is probably about $9 billion equivalent, wh re ours is around $6 billion, but considering the reduced unit costs of doing something, whether it is an hour of labor or what not in the Soviet Union, we believe their 9 as against our 6 represents a double of what our effort is, and in the long run you can't help coming up second best, and as you know, that is no good at a poker table or on the battlefield.

Mr. CRANE. I have another question, and this has to do with technical sophistication of the Soviet missiles.

Do you know of any reason why the Soviet Union is not capable of possessing the same level of technical sophistication in warhead design as we have achieved in Minuteman III and our Poseidon programs?

General TRUDEAU. No, I know of no reason at all. As a matter of fact, the warhead that they have on SS-9 is much more threatening and much more powerful in the opinion of most of us than what we will have on Minuteman III.

Mr. CRANE. Do you know of any weapon that we have in at least development stage that is the equivalent of the sea-to-sea missiles the Soviets have on vessels in the Mediterranean?

General TRUDEAU. As far as I know, we have nothing that can compete with that system or defend against it homing in on us at the present time. Certain suggestion is in the wind. As a matter of fact, I was speaking with some people recently on a possible system but it is not funded, to my knowledge. I have to admit that while I have a top secret clearance and serve as a consultant on the Army scientific advisory panel, I have ever since I retired, there is much that goes on where it is in a need to know basis where I am not cognizant, and even if I were, and I am not, I would not be able to discuss this in open session. But I don't know, and it is a matter of great concern. It is a matter of great concern to my Navy associates as to what they are going to do to stave off this threat that exists.

Mr. CRANE. I saw in the paper recently that the Navy elected to concentrate on F-14A models instead of the B model because the former is already in production, and I am not that conversant with the sophistication of weaponry. Is F-14B roughly comparable to your knowledge to the MIG-23 Foxbat?

General TRUDEAU. I would not really be qualified to answer that question so anything I would say would be a guess, so I don't know. If I were to guess I would say no.

Mr. CRANE. Do you have any understanding as to why the Navy made the decision not to go ahead with the F-14?

General TRUDEAU. No, I do not. I am not knowledgeable in that field. While we are speaking here, and I appreciate the latitude you have given me in making remarks, I do want to refer to a few paragraphs in my paper, if I may, because I think it has direct application to what we are doing in trying to turn the military into a part of a welfare state, and this concerns me greatly because I don't think that the Army—and let me just confine my remarks to the Army since I am best informed there, but it applies to the others, too—I don't think that when the chips are down you will have the kind of fighting force that is necessary to defend this country if we continue along the lines we are going.

I have no better way to present to you here what will eventually be than what you read in the paper.

Going back to personal experience, and I will leave it to you to consider whether the analogy is reasonable or not, so if I may, quoting from my paper, I said it is too bad that welfare and warfare now compete for funds. But until the world changes, we won't long enjoy the former until we can prevent or win the latter. Actually, it is the cutback from the fine programs and high employment of the 1960s that has caused the breadlines and unemployment of the 1970s.

You might say this isn't a hundred percent true but it has more merit in it than you know. We are spending much more with much less to show for it because relief is the bottomless pit of a socialist state. I was Special Assistant Administrator of the Works Progress Administration 35 years ago. We did a lot of good temporarily spending 70 cents of each dollar for wages and the other 30 cents for materials and equipment, but only as we built back toward a solid economy and accepted more substantial effort under Public Works Administration, reversing costs and putting 30 cents into direct labor and 70 cents of each dollar into construction and equipment did we reverse the trend and rebuild our economy. What is my point? It is this: With 60 cents of the defense dollar going for pay and related items today, you can't provide an adequate and effective military force with 40 cents left, particularly if the defense of this country is only worth 7 percent of our GNP. A study of GNP, inflation and military expenditures over the past 25 years clearly seems to indicate, and without a Vietnam, that annual expenditures of about 10 percent of GNP are required and justified in protecting this country and its vast resources and its people.

I say don't make the Army or its sister services a welfare project, or the nation will live to regret it. Don't make a WPA out of the military.

Research must be better sustained. The whole system needs to be reviewed. There is no end to the road, apparently, as we stretch our sites from the mohole to the quasars. Our challenge in near space is so critical that the moon may be far enough to go for the moment until we solve the many problems we face between here and there.

Mr. SPENCE. In that connection too Congressman Crane was mentioning aircraft a while ago. I have been informed that the Russians have developed about 18 new types of fighter aircraft in the last 20 years or so, and up until the advent of the F-14 and 15, which aren't yet in production, we had not produced one.

General TRUDEAU. That is right.

Mr. SPENCE. A lot of research and development has to go into lead time in developing any type of new fighter aircraft.

General TRUDEAU. It certainly does if you want more than just a small product improvement, and we do more than that.

Mr. SPENCE. Just so we will have it in the record, because a lot of people don't understand it, on the Armed Services Committee we are being continually faced with Services coming in and report a reprogramming effort when they started research and development on a weapons system, and they need three years in which to do it, and they find out they have to go in a different direction, and they come to us for approval on that. During that lead time we have many changes and variations. If you don't start some place, you don't have a chance to keep up with the changing times.

General TRUDEAU. I couldn't agree with you more, Mr. Spence.

Mr. HUNT. General, let me talk to you about research and development. The R&D community has deteriorated considerably by reduction of funds for NASA, is that correct?

General TRUDEAU. That is definitely correct.

Mr. HUNT. What are we doing to retain the identity of the research and development teams that this is a fine job there?

General TRUDEAU. Well, you aren't. The morale in almost every laboratory in this country is shot to a degree. Some of the industries have held up pretty well, particularly those that are producing consumer or production type products, but the rest of it, including those who produce capital goods and heavy equipment, most of them have suffered severe cutbacks with the result that the morale is shattered to quite an extent because the people remaining are not sure

when they are going to be next and we have some of the most capable men in this country who literally have nothing to do. Nothing.

Mr. HUNT. Considering that erosion which to me is almost fatal in some respects, what is your opinion of some of the colleges that have been hostile, although accepting federal moneys for research and development, have been hostile to the development of a weapons system but would rather spend their time looking at leaves and bugs and trees rather than doing something constructive for the defense.

General TRUDEAU. Of course I think it is rather pitiful and, as I have watched at least one major one, where people who think we can get along or a person who thinks we can get along with practically nothing in the way of military since the offensive is always in control and nothing you can do to defend yourselves is adequate, since that was one of the largest recipients of Government funds either in direct grants, research grants to individuals or laboratories under extensive contract with one or more of our services, since they have permitted radical students and professors on such campuses to destroy that, I don't know what is going to be left to build on, as a matter of fact. This is one of the big concerns. I think that through a lot of weak-kneed college professors, and I must say our government and our crime enforcement, law enforcement and all of us have to take a certain part of that responsibility, if the will of the people means anything, I think we have all got plenty to answer for.

Mr. HUNT. There are certain colleges not too far removed from where we are now in the Ivy League—in fact, I have correspondence in my file from one professor who had two grants totaling $62,000 over an 18-month period, who specifically told me that he would not at any time consider turning over any information that might be used in defense.

Now this same professor, I note by the news media that is sometimes accurate in that respect, was one of the first persons to apply for a visa to Red China. Now you know who I am talking about.

General TRUDEAU. Yes, I do.

Mr. HUNT. Considering the fact that we are so woefully behind again now in research and development, and considering the fact that we have in our educational community some excellent research people in the professor ranks——

General TRUDEAU. Tremendous.

Mr. HUNT. What would be your recommendation that we follow, that we project, that we advocate, would you be one of those persons who would simply say remove the R&D from those colleges who consistently advocate no research for new weaponry and transfer to those colleges who have so many people who would like to do it for us?

General TRUDEAU. Yes, I would. Yes, I would, just as I believe that should be the position of the military when our colleges, including our land-grant colleges, will no longer recognize a ROTC unit. Take them away. Put them in others. If you can get the right people, they will go and you can build. I don't believe in just a general dissemination of talent by trying to build up, by trying to put a new laboratory in the hills and valleys of some out-of-the-way place because people are going to go to centers of excellence, but if these centers of excellence, so-called, today are no longer real centers of excellence, then let's shift the sites and put it where we can.

Mr. HUNT. We have, as I understand, buildings and equipment and the physical appurtenances already available where we have deleted the R&D teams from NASA. Would it be too far-fetched to consider using some scientists in R&D from some of our colleges who would like to come in and work on weaponry, would it be too far-fetched to sponsor and spawn an idea of that nature?

General TRUDEAU. No, it would not, indeed. I don't know where it is in my paper, we probably could find it, but I believe I made a definite point there that we ought to give more consideration to NASA and perhaps use it as a focal point on which to rebuild a solid base for R&D in all fields. Now I recommended a year ago, because I happened to have been on a group at the University of Miami considering the field of oceanography, that even without changing the name, or the initials, if you don't want to, you could rename NASA the National Aeronautics and Systems Administration, or you could rename it the National Aeronautics and Science Administration if you consider that broad enough. But where NASA not only had tremendous talent in it but NASA also had a little of the WPA aspect in it because it was a going concern and plenty of money put it in. We have NASA buildings on many of the campuses of this country. You can take NASA and use it as a focal point and build it up into the center of this whole thing instead of letting it continue to be fractionated into many different departments as far as your basic research and to a degree your applied research and the adoption of systems.

I think you would eliminate some needless duplication in research projects. It is entirely possible for a researcher to have two major projects being paid for by different institutions where his work is the same, but due to nomenclature and definition and description, the work is almost identical. But you see the continuation of an effort to fractionate it.

Or let me say you see an effort to consolidate it. They talk about a department of science. I don't believe that is the answer because it cuts across all of the lines of the other departments, although much of it could be brought together under a working administration or agency like NASA today. I think there is a lot of merit in this. But one of the last things that has been done down here, and as I started to remark, sitting on this panel considering oceanography at the University of Miami in connection with their Institution of Marine Sciences, I asked for a show of hands on something and we had 30 percent vote that oceanography be made an aspect of NASA. The talent is there. The scientists, many of them are broad-gaged men. They are not all specialists and know only one little aspect about the moon, although their knowledge is usually narrow but in depth, but it has an aspect to oceanography the same as space.

No, this isn't good enough. The oceanographers want to report to the President, or they want a separate institution, whereas there is a fraction of the work to be done there as important as it is in comparison with space. And remember this old earth of ours has a hell of a lot to be done on it too. NASA could be a great institution if it is reorganized and used as a focal point.

Mr. HUNT. You have verified my thoughts in this matter that had begun to deteriorate as far as funding was concerned, which was my suggestion that we incorporate and consolidate the oceanography, the defense weapons systems, and everything, together, and get the best brains that we had and keep these people and from the colleges that had the R&D brains who were not so inclined toward defense, those people who never fought for the country and never will, bring them into our orbit and use them in this function.

General TRUDEAU. That is right. We don't need to start over again. NASA is in almost every substantial college or university in this country, or was until they had to pull out because of reduction in funds.

Mr. HUNT. General, I have asked this question repeatedly and I am not getting the right answers. Do we have a weapons system, deterrent system that will handle the Stix missile?

General TRUDEAU. No. To my knowledge we do not. We do not.

Mr. HUNT. It is a short range missile but the lapsed time is in there.

General TRUDEAU. This is the ship-to-ship that I think Mr. Crane brought up here. No, I do not know of anything that could handle that at all. And of course this becomes a threat from these Comart class vessels, which I don't know how many hundred they may have in Cuba off our shores. The threat is very great and the Navy is very concerned.

Mr. HUNT. Thank you, General. If I leave it is not because I don't want to stay longer, but it is because I have an appointment with Secretary of Agriculture about beaches.

Mr. CRANE. I would like to ask another question, General. I gather from your remarks and statements that you believe our present expenditures for R&D are inadequate to guarantee our continual survival until there is a rather dramatic change made soon.

General TRUDEAU. I certainly do.

Mr. CRANE. You have indicated one recommendation in the form of changes in our policy working through the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as an agency coordinating various areas of R&D.

What other specific changes would you recommend that we might take at this moment? What specific recommendations might you have in areas of R&D?

General TRUDEAU. Well——

Mr. CRANE. In other words, on the one hand harking back to the figures you gave earlier approximately 9 billion being spent to our six billion, but considering their lower wage costs amounting to an expenditure twice ours, simply allocating moneys not guaranteed to produce the results.

General TRUDEAU. No, it isn't. I think, and this is hard to do due to the competitve nature that we have in the free enterprise system, and I am not trying to change that system. I have given my best to defend it and to improve it, and we all admit its weaknesses, but I do think that we need to be more selective and perhaps limiting the competition between certain firms or in a group of firms with a known competency to do certain kinds of work. This sounds restrictive for the people that aren't so selected to bid and I don't say just give it to one. Let five bid, but not ten or fifteen, because here is what happens. I know of contracts in my time where more than ten firms bid on a moderately sized contract and each of those firms had to spend a million dollars. Only one can win. Somewhere when these other nine do win, they have to pick up that extra million dollars. This is a heavy price that we pay in the system and if only five of those best known firms, firms that had produced the best, firms that had stayed within the budget and not had overruns, although overruns to a degree are unavoidable in R&D, let me say that first in defense of some overruns but there are certain firms that have performed better than others. They should be recognized and given some priorities.

If you had five firms bidding on any contract, particularly after a feasibility design has been accepted, I think that would be enough and I think you would save a lot of money and I think you could still arrange for a pretty fair distribution of effort so that nobody was being pushed out of business.

There are a lot of lost dollars in this scheme that I think need to be avoided. We have improved a lot of things by going to the cost with incentive, cost plus incentive plans. I think we have made a considerable improvement in that field.

But another thing, there is no question in my mind, and with all of the experience we have in government now, we ought to also be able to pretty accurately estimate the cost of

a system or the cost of producing this, or what it has taken, or at least our auditing system should be sufficiently good so we know what it costs the manufacturer to do it, and this is an area that I think we ought to get into to a greater degree. I think there is too much overhead in the people that have to constantly review projects that come up. There should be more of a focal point and maybe NASA is the place to do it, or perhaps DDR&E is adequate with some reshaping, but all of these various councils, probably ten of them, at various places in the Executive Department that seem to be too high, too numerous, not consolidated to the degree that that could be done. Those are about three of the points I would make.

Mr. CRANE. Turning to those areas where we are concentrating in research and development and separating, say, conventional weapons systems from strategic or tactical weapons in the nuclear category, which would you say requires our paramount attention today? In other words, where do you see the greatest deficiency? I am aware of the position of inferiority we have today in ICBM, for example.

I am aware of the fact that the Soviets have a capability of going beyond us in Polaris subs within the next two years, that we have deficiency in ABM. By the same token, I have heard briefings on our deteriorating naval position.

General TRUDEAU. Right.

Mr. CRANE. And we commented here earlier on sea to sea missiles.

General TRUDEAU. Yes, the Stix.

Mr. CRANE. Which you said we have nothing comparable to.

General TRUDEAU. Not that I know of.

Mr. CRANE. I don't know what breakthroughs the Soviets may have made in rocket systems that can be carried by troops in the field. I do understand that they have developed a rocket that a soldier in the field can carry that would have been very devastating against our helicopters in Vietnam had they ever given them to the North Vietnamese to use.

Looking at this broad spectrum and considering our deteriorating defense position, where do you think those R&D dollars would be best spent today?

General TRUDEAU. Of course, I fully believe in the ABM system and I may be biased on that since it was adopted as a program the day I took over R&D. But I am convinced of the capability of the NIKE system and you can stick any name you want on it. They keep changing the name, whether it is Safeguard, and it used to be Zeus, and all of the rest, but those are only modifications to the system due to constantly improving certain components in it, and the radar and rest. In principle, I think that ABM system is absolutely essential. I don't think it has any business being considered in the SALT talks at all. I don't think what a nation does to protect itself against what they think is the threat of an opponent that needs to be put in balance to deny yourself that if the other one wants to build more offensive weapons. I think we are making a mistake there and I think we ought to go ahead with an ABM missile system. I think we ought to look and consider another possible system that could have great merit and might cost less, not necessarily to replace it but also as an adjunct to it. At least that should be the earlier consideration. There is no question about the Navy needing some tremendous support and buildup, and I must say this includes the merchant marine also. Those of us that live in this field see great deficiencies in our merchant marine. Even if they are not sailing under the American-Flag, they should be American owned and American controlled. We are now shipping out from this country fantastic quantities of coal, wheat, and of course in wheat you did provide a certain protection to the American-flagships, but in all of this, and now we are going to bigger and bigger ships such as those that we built in bulk, 325,000 ton tankers, and you are going to find many of those that also have the capability not only of carrying oil but of carrying wheat, of carrying iron ore, of carrying probably other products, coal certainly, so there is going to be a back-haul.

This gets into another ramification that I should not develop but I would like to mention it, and that is there is not a deep port in these United States that is taking these big ships They are getting into other areas of the world. Canada is going to have one on the East Coast and West Coast. This whole question of the Administration of our ships and ports is important not only as commercial but for military adjuncts. To the Navy certainly. The Air Force in connection with their bombers and certainly in connection and developing an adequate fighter that is certainly equal to what anybody else in this world has got.

Then you come back of course, as far as the Army is concerned, into the conventional field and there you get into transport, which is pretty good. I was a great believer in the helicopter. I am entirely convinced that it is worth what it cost us. I have suggested study by the Army War College to show what it would have taken to do what we did in Vietnam if we hadn't had that kind of mobility. Also it resulted in a great decrease probably in casualties and to a certain degree in psychoneurotic cases because men were only subjected to certain pressures for a time and then pulled back.

This doesn't take care of the dope problem, which is a different thing, and pornography and other things which have been pressed upon our present generation, but in the weapons systems, certainly we can improve those. We want to improve our air to ground systems and firing from helicopters. We want to be able to get point targets and destroy tanks on the ground. I am sure we can do that. And I repeat it I am sure we can do that. We need to extend the range of our ammunition. I am sure that we can do that, too. But it is not being done at the moment to the degree that I think its importance justifies.

Mr. CRANE. You mentioned that a highly developed ABM system as probably the No. 1 area where we should be spending dollars in research to guarantee protection to our population. In your judgment, and I asked this question this morning, is it technically feasible today to talk in terms of a sophisticated ABM defense of our major urban areas?

General TRUDEAU. Yes, it is. I am not talking about research dollars there. I am talking about production dollars. Building the damn stuff. It has been on the boards 13 years and we have constantly learned by doing despite people saying you can't do this, and you can't do that. If we had not built the first NIKE back in 1952 when old K T. Keller, a man that certainly knew the engineering game, finally said, "Boys, there is a time when research and development has to stop and you have to build something." And we built that and we could knock down aircraft up to 50,000 feet in the air, which is about as high as they could fly.

Based on that as we went higher we built the next system and we could knock down anything to a hundred thousand feet in the air, and from that came the Zeus system. So I really regret to see it disparaged by a lot of people with scientific knowledge that in my opinion in many cases know better.

Mr. CRANE. Have you any idea of the cost of such a system to give us reasonable security?

General TRUDEAU. I don't think I could pinpoint it now. I have heard great extremes of cost used on it. Of course, I am very much concerned about this thing because I happen to be the Chairman of an Army Board appointed at Senator Stennis' direction to study what appeared to be excessive costs of construction in certain military construction. We find that that has been increasing at the ridiculous rate of 12 percent per year. It is high time that some cap is put on this inflation or this terrific salary in construction costs. A part of it is due to very great advances in wage rates, but a large part of it is due to a very serious decrease in productivity on the job in loafing, incapability and what-not, and we are at the position now where in preparing our next ten-year program we are going to have to estimate that anything in the ten-year program that isn't going to be built until 1980, we are going to put in double the estimated cost of what it would be if we were going to build it in 1972.

Mr. CRANE. General, one final question on this point. You indicated earlier the desirability of a back-up to ABM as I understood your remarks. Are you thinking in terms of something like lasers?

General TRUDEAU. Well, I am thinking of other systems that would be, let me limit it to this, that would be non-nuclear. Not that I am concerned about the explosion about taking care of this in the upper atmosphere in upper space, which ABM does, and can do well, but the systems we are thinking about would have a non-nuclear aspect.

Mr. CRANE. I see.

Mr. SPENCE. A lot of this that we are talking about I am sure is more or less dry to some people, it is nuts and bolts and all of the rest, but don't you think sometimes that what the critics of R&D expenditures overlook is the fact that the consumer in this country benefits in many ways from our military research and development, and from the standpoint of the NASA from all of the shots to the moon we have had advances to communication and medicine and all of the fallouts that people don't even realize, and we have other advantages too that we get. I think most of the consumer products now to some extent were developed during wartime or as a result of military R&D?

General TRUDEAU. There is no question about it. You can go back to World War I, which is pretty far for you younger men to go back to, and I was younger like you are today, then, but you can go back there and you can see that what was done directly accelerated the development and commercial utilization of the airplane, the automobile, and the radio and surgery and this has gone on since. There never is as rapid an acceleration of development in any similar period as there is in a year or two or three years of war. This is not advocating war as a solution to the problem. I want to be sure we understand that. But the fact does remain that everything we have done has had a tremendous impact upon our society and upon commercial products and consumer products.

Mr. SPENCE. In peacetime the money we devote to research and development still benefits consumers in all of these ways. Another good fallout as far as I am concerned, when we cut back on R&D we discourage young people who are going to school to train themselves to be scientists, we discourage those people who want to go into research and development as a lifelong job.

General TRUDEAU. Yes, we do.

Mr. SPENCE. And we cut back on our ability there in the long run to push ourselves further as a nation, whereas in a place like Russia they put all of these people to use. They don't have them driving taxicabs like we do, like the NASA scientists who are out of work suddenly. They turn out more scientists than we do and we cut ours off.

General TRUDEAU. Confining the terminology between engineers between applied research and applied engineering, and as Dr. Keller said on numerous occasions, the thing we have got to get on is applied engineering. He said, "I am more worried about the lack of people in that field than I am with scientists themselves." Without getting into the pro and con of that, I did notice the other

day that the current production of engineers in this country I believe is about 40,000 and in Russia 160,000. This is very significant and this continuation of this in the field of technology is bound to put us in second place.

With respect to the scientific effort, estimates have been prepared and given to me, and I won't vouch for the validity but I have confidence in their source, is that in equivalent field of where we are using about 800 scientists, that the Russians have about 3000 doing equivalent work or within the same parameters, let's say, as far as effort is concerned, and we just can't live with that forever without being No. 2, and we are getting damn close to No. 2 now.

Mr. SPENCE. You are talking about lead time and all of a sudden you can't train scientists and applied engineers overnight. You have to have them in the system and working on it. We are talking about twice as much of our defense budget, twice as much of the Russian defense budget going into R&D as ours. I have also been lead to understand that twice as much of their defense budget goes into offensive systems as we put into our offensive system capability.

General TRUDEAU. Well, it certainly can. When you consider the difference in maintaining a Russian unit, the number of guns per division as against what we have, in other words, when you consider—how should I put it—probably effective weapons systems, they must be 50 percent better off than we are. We do so many things, we spend so much money on many things that do not directly contribute to our military strength but help to solve some of our social problems or get everybody to live in the way that they would like to be accustomed to living, whether we can afford it or not, and we have certainly gone overboard in that. An army particularly should be Spartan. The best soldiers I know are Spartan by nature and to make this part of the welfare state, a home for everybody who can't find a job anywhere else and pay him twice as much as he is worth has no appeal to me as a soldier at all.

Mr. CRANE. I gathered from what you say, General, that considering the increased expenditures made by the Soviets, considering the greater number of people in applied engineering than we have, that we might anticipate within a reasonably short period of time some technological surprises, a low Sputnik to come out of the Soviet Union, as a matter of fact.

General TRUDEAU. I definitely expect that. I definitely expect that. As a matter of fact, one of the things that has always amazed me and still does is the known Soviet ability to bring back their space craft to a comfortable landing on land where we still have to dump ours into the middle of the ocean, and I am wondering, that is a problem we apparently still have to solve when we bring back the re-usable space shuttles and these other things we are talking about, so there are areas where they are definitely ahead of us, and I think we can expect those surprises, and I think the worst surprise we will ever get, and one I still fear, is when the message comes to the President sometime, "Either this or else," and I see that day ahead.

Mr. CRANE. I was going to say in this connection, could you provide any guidelines as to where some of those technological surprises may come? I am thinking of the space platform, for example. Their concentration on near space rather than outer space.

General TRUDEAU. I fully expect that if we don't do better than we are doing, the Russians will be dominant in upper space. I mean near space and I mean upper space. I mean between here and the moon, to do what they want. I expect this. That is the way it looks now, and already there is a tendency on this space shuttle to cut this back in favor of putting more money in going to Mars.

Now I for one am all for the scientific effort in space. I am not trying to belittle that at all. But let's be sure we do the things in that area not too far above us that we need to insure our survival. And this means deterrence, it doesn't mean only the ability to wage war. Our people don't go for that philosophy at all. That is why we accept the second strike position. But there is no evidence that the other side, with their continual buildup of SS–9 and SS–11, which are weapons beyond the concept of anybody here, and have little or nothing to be compared with as far as Minuteman, certainly Minuteman I or II are concerned in their capacity for devastation, as we see this tremendous accent on that, it seems to me it behooves us that we have really got to do more and we can't continuously sit down at the table with these people, as much as we would like to, and come off second best going for what they want to do.

Mr. CRANE. It seems to me in this connection that examining some of the ramifications of strategic arms limitation talks that with a position of inferiority with ICBM today, let's assume we reach an agreement there tomorrow, that margin of difference is not necessarily that great, still we are in an inferior position. Let's assume that we reach agreement on ABM. Again on the basis of testimony we have heard, we are in a position of inferiority if we reach that agreement as it has been suggested, but this would seem to me to put even greater significance on R&D expenditures, where even if we reached some agreement, if the Soviets come through with some great technical breakthroughs over the span of the next two or three years, that whatever agreements are reached in these SALT talks will have no relevance perhaps to some enormous breakthrough in a variety of other areas.

General TRUDEAU. This is correct.

Mr. CRANE. And so it puts a great deal more premium on R&D dollars.

Turning to another aspect of this question, considering the political climate in this country when one talks in terms of developing our defense capabilities or when one even gets into a discussion of our growing position of strategic inferiority, that one way in which we could most effectively spend our dollars today, given the political imperatives of today in the United States, is in this area of R&D. Would you agree with that assessment?

General TRUDEAU. Yes, I certainly would agree with it. I certainly would. It wasn't until we started getting into this advanced technology, the advanced scientific studies of really the 1950's, although there was a pretty good spark put during World War II by Dr. Vannevar Bush and his group, but it was not until the 50's, really, when we got into the question of the studies in all of the hard sciences in depth that we begun to understand the interrelation between them, that we found out that chemicals, metals and materials we were talking about things that were interlocked.

We found that electricity, light, and sound all had very positive and definite relationships with them. I am sure that if we continue those studies in depth there would be other break-outs on this. You may remember it was only about 1959 that Dr. Bill Shockley came up with the maser and that was the maser, a word that may not even be familiar to you in these days, because you talk about the laser. But the laser came about after the maser and the maser was the microwave amplification and similation of radiancy and the "1" is for light amplification. Each of these steps come in turn. When the laser came up, people did not know what to do with it. We find it not only has military potential but it is used for operations on your eyes and will be used for many things and will be used far more.

We don't need to say that we have found out all about the laser, let's quit. No, this is just the starting point. Who knows what the laser will lead on to? And the same thing is true in many other fields of science, and we ought to be getting with it instead of having this talent here looking for jobs, men of great brains.

Mr. CRANE. Thank you, General.

General TRUDEAU. I would add here before we go, that it is quite obvious, with the disregard that is being put on this or the lack of understanding as far as the population as a whole is concerned where only a few of us seem to be concerned that the job of the media to get out and get the people to better understand this and for people who do understand it to be given an opportunity by the media, and I mean all parts of it, to get our people better informed is an essential part of this unless we are just going to be completely defeated.

The efforts of the group down here which represented twenty percent of the House of Representatives, and representing apparently 40 million people, to bring before the public the situation, and what happened? Not a major paper in the United States picked it up. Nothing happened.

Another little outfit, some of which I am associated with, or helped to support, tried to do this, but we have got to get it to the people.

Mr. SPENCE. General, we appreciate your time and effort, and, of course, that is what we are trying to do.

General TRUDEAU. I know you are.

Mr. SPENCE. I want to express our appreciation to members of the press who are present, and who have been here this morning, because we have had a good reception on this particular endeavor, and I agree with you that if we are going to be able to let people know what is happening, we have to depend on the media to do it.

General TRUDEAU. Yes, we do. They have a big responsibility and a great opportunity if you are going to save this country.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank you and I thank the members of the press for being present.

That is all for this hearing.

General TRUDEAU. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 3:10 the hearing was recessed subject to call.)

PROBLEMS OF DRUG ABUSE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our country suffers from the problems of drug abuse, I believe that we must focus our attention on the suppliers of illegal drugs. Postmaster General Blount recently pointed the accusing finger at France:

> I call on the American people to institute a boycott of all French goods now until the French clean up this cesspool with which our young are being contaminated.

I believe that the Postmaster General must not be left to take this courageous stand alone. France now provides more than four times as much illegal heroin to this country as all other foreign countries combined. The drug abuse which feeds from this supply of heroin continues to destroy the lives of countless American young people, from the highly populated

cities of the east coast to the rural areas of New Mexico and beyond.

A thorough boycott of French goods could result in extensive pressure on the French Government to crack down on the illegal drug traffic to the United States. Regular commercial imports from France last year totaled $942 million, Commerce Department figures show. The cutting off of French exports to the United States would provide enormous incentive to the French Government to crack down on the processing and exporting of heroin to this country.

The major source of illegal heroin in the United States is clear. The means of pressuring that source out of existence is clear. Let us join together in an effective boycott of French imports until we have eradicated the major source of processed heroin in this country.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MILITARY RETIREES TO ESTABLISH FINANCIAL SECURITY FOR DEPENDENT SURVIVORS

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, we have demonstrated to all American service personnel, both active duty and retired, that this body wants them to have freedom from anxiety over their families' welfare in their retirement years. By building on the foundation of social security, we have provided in H.R. 10670 an opportunity for all military retirees to establish financial security for their dependent survivors. In so doing, we have closed one of the major gaps in the otherwise outstanding program of fringe benefits for career military personnel.

I am proud to have had the opportunity to participate in the development of this legislation, and I wish to commend our distinguished chairman, Mr. PIKE, for his capable leadership throughout the lengthy hearings.

I also wish to associate myself with the comments concerning our distinguished ranking minority Member, Mr. GUBSER, whose leadership was indispensable in getting sound legislation in this complex area.

I applaud the gentleman from California for the statesmanlike manner in which he has defended the bill even though he opposes one section of it, the section providing for the first time for attachment of military retired pay.

Mr. GUBSER has stated most eloquently his opposition to this section, but with the good grace that marks his nature, he has elected to avoid a fight over this provision that might endanger the bill. He has put the welfare of military families first, and I commend him for his stand. I think it is especially appropriate because it was the gentleman from California who introduced the first legislation on survivor benefits for career military personnel in retirement.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO GOD

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the great satisfactions of public service is the opportunity we have of meeting and knowing outstanding people in all walks of life. One such person whom it is my good fortune to know and admire is the Reverend Monsignor John J. Podkul, who is the pastor of St. Mary's Nativity Church in Plymouth, Pa., which is in my congressional district. On Sunday, August 29, 1971, the monsignor observed the golden jubilee of his ordination to the priesthood. A prior commitment prevented me from attending the reception in his honor, but one of my constituents was kind enough to send me a copy of the program for that auspicious occasion. I, therefore, would like to make the program a part of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to again extend to the monsignor my warmest congratulations and best wishes:

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE TO GOD

I have so many things to be thankful for—

To God:

For the call of the sublime privilege to be His servant;

Dispenser of His Graces;

Minister of His Sacraments;

The Treasury of the Poor;

The Instrument of Charities in His name;

The sublime dignity of the Alter Christus.

To my parents:

For the countless sacrifices in my behalf;

For the prayers of my Mother;

For the self-effacement, toil, and sympathetic direction of my Father;

The living inspiration and example of their devout lives.

To my brother and sisters:

For their extreme generosities during my student days;

For the lavish financial support of my causes during my Priesthood.

To my alma mater:

For affording me the many opportunities for spiritual, moral and mental growth;

For the assistance of dedicated professors, who enkindled, nurtured and fostered the Love of God, of my beloved country, of the country of my forefathers with all their traditions;

For the pardonable pride of being her Alumnus;

For the realization of the debt I incurred, which cannot be repaid till my dying day;

For the basic understanding and Divine Wisdom that the Heart of Education is the education of the Heart, the soul of training is the training of the soul—My Alma Mater—I salute Thee now and always.

To my priest friends:

For their lifelong friendships;

Their understanding and considerations;

Their patience with my short-comings and pressures;

For their spirit of cooperation and collaboration in my many activities;

For their sympathies and solace in my bereavements;

For their joys in my successes;

For our mutual admirations.

To my lay-friends:

For the challenges and opportunities for service they helped to solve;

For their response to call above the call of their duties, sometimes beyond their means;

For the occasions to engender in them the spirit on the high level of Charity in the name of Christ;

For their kindness and dedication;

For their Heart and Hand and Substance in the pursuit of helping others.

To my parishioners:

For their devotion and dedication to things of God, Church and Parish;

For lightening of my burdens in the administration of the Parish;

For the ready response to my pleas for their spiritual and moral welfare;

For the unabated showering me with their love, respect and generosities;

For the joyful participation in all my honors, promotions and dignities;

For the permanent reminder—that I am their spiritual Father, their shepherd, their Priest—their Friend;

On his side of Eternity you will never know how grateful I am. On this day when I am counting my blessings, I utter with deepest humility "Lord You have given me so much, completely beyond my deserts, give me just one more thing, give me a grateful heart."

What shall I render to the Lord for all the things He has given me?

I will take the Chalice of Salvation, and I will call upon the name of the Lord (Psalm 115).

Gratefully Yours,

Msgr. JOHN J. PODKUL.

RECEPTION HONORING REV. MSGR. JOHN J. PODKUL

Pastor of Nativity of B.V.M. Church, Plymouth, Pa., on the occasion of the golden jubilee of his ordination to the Holy Priesthood, held at Convention Hall, Oak Street, Pittston Twp., Pa., Sunday, August 29, 1971.

To Monsignor John J. Podkul, on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of his priestly ordination, with gratitude to Almighty God for faithful service rendered in proclaiming the Holy Gospel of his Son, and with prayer for continued guidance by the Holy Spirit, we impart our special Apostolic Blessing.

From the Vatican, June 29, 1971.

PAULUS P P. VI.

DIOCESE OF SCRANTON,
Scranton, Pa., June 25, 1971.

Monsignor JOHN J. PODKUL,
Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Rectory, Plymouth, Pa.

DEAR MONSIGNOR: Having learned that in the near future you will be celebrating the Golden Jubilee of your Ordination to the Priesthood, I wish to send you my greetings and best wishes, along with the expression of my hope that God will spare you for many more years.

As you look back over the fifty years you have served God as a priest, you must feel a sense of deep gratitude to Him for the many graces He has showered on you, and through you on countless others who have come under your spiritual care.

It is given to relatively few priests to celebrate the Golden Jubilee of their Ordination. This privilege is now yours and the whole Diocese joins me in rejoicing with you on this happy occasion.

I gladly take this opportunity to thank you for your consistently devoted service to the Diocese and loyalty to its Bishops, past and present.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Most Reverend J. CARROLL MCCORMICK, D.D.,

Bishop of Scranton.

RESIDENCE OF THE AUXILIARY BISHOP,
Scranton, Pa., August 2, 1971.

Monsignor JOHN J. PODKUL,
Pastor, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Rectory,
Plymouth, Penn.

REVEREND AND DEAR MONSIGNOR: It is with pleasure indeed that I write to congratulate you upon the Fiftieth Anniversary of your Ordination to the Holy Priesthood.

This notable event recalls to mind the happy privilege that was mine of preaching the sermon at your First Solemn Mass, which you celebrated in your native parish, the Maternity of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Wilkes-Barre.

Your faithful service to Holy Mother Church over the past five decades will surely be rewarded by our Heavenly Father. May the Eternal High Priest continue to favor you with an abundance of divine graces, and may the Blessed Virgin Mary always keep you in her tender care.

Together with my friendly felicitations, I send prayerful best wishes, Monsignor, to you and yours.

Sincerely yours in Christ,
HENRY T. KLONOWSKI, S.T.D., V.G.,
Auxiliary Bishop, Scranton.

AUGUST 6, 1971.

Rev. Msgr. JOHN J. PODKUL,
St. Mary's Nativity Church,
Plymouth, Pa.

DEAR MONSIGNOR PODKUL: May I join you in spirit of joyful thanksgiving to Almighty God for the many blessings showered upon and through you during the fifty years of your priestly ministry. You have been an example of a zealous, faithful and prudent servant. You have shared the burdens of your parishioners and the faithful of the diocese and you have been a singular instrument of help to the Church in Poland. Your indefatigable efforts have been a source of edification and inspiration to others.

May I assure you of my own profound personal and cordial esteem. I pray that God may spare you for many years and when your physical resources decline your spiritual and prayerful activity for the welfare of the Church and for your own sanctification may increase.

I invoke upon you the blessings of God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Devotedly in Christ,
JOHN CARDINAL KROL,
Archbishop of Philadelphia.

ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON,
Washington, D.C., July 23, 1971.

THE GOLDEN JUBILEE COMMITTEE,
St. Mary's Nativity Church,
Plymouth, Pa.

DEAR FRIENDS: Thank you for the cordial invitation to attend the fiftieth anniversary Mass of Monsignor Podkul on Sunday, August 29, and the Jubilee dinner, which is to follow the Mass.

I recall distinctly the excellent work done by Monsignor Podkul for the people of Poland when I was the director of War Relief Services. He was of immense help to me, and I always admired his priestliness, his charity and his compassion for those who were in need.

I am very sorry I cannot attend the Jubilee celebration on the 29th because of my schedule here in Washington, but be assured I am with you in spirit.

God bless you all.

Faithfully yours in Christ,
PATRICK CARDINAL O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Harrisburg, Pa., July 27, 1971.

Rev. Msgr. JOHN J. PODKUL,
St. Mary's Nativity Rectory,
Plymouth, Pa.

DEAR MONSIGNOR JOHN: My heartiest thanks to you for your goodness in inviting me to the Mass of Thanksgiving with which you are to commemorate your fiftieth anniversary in the priesthood of Christ Jesus on Sunday, August 29.

For all these years we have been friends and brother-priests and I value the friendship you have shown me, I assure you.

Most gladly I would be with you on your jubilee day if it were possible, but the fact is that I am already committed to a ceremony here in the diocese on that very day, and so I must ask you to accept the will for the deed and kindly hold me excused. I shall be with you and yours in spirit.

With renewed congratulations and friendliest wishes for your health of soul and body, I beg to remain, dear Monsignor John,

Sincerely yours in Christ,

———— ————,
Bishop of Harrisburg.

DALVATICANO, *June 21, 1971.*

OUR DEARLY BELOVED JUBILARIAN: With profound emotion, I learned of the advent of your Jubilee of the Holy Priesthood from the Rev. Father Viareta. On this occasion I am sending my most sincere wishes for the 26th of June. I shall offer Holy Mass at the Chapel of Nations in the Vatican Basilica and so we shall supplicate many Divine Graces for you, and yet more, long years of priestly services.

Besides, I asked for the Holy Father's autographed picture. If I am lucky to receive it . . . unfortunately, it may arrive too late for the day of celebration on account of the numerous formalities that take quite a time. Moreover, I sought to send a telegram with His Blessing that, together with the wishes, you would also receive my "picture". I will send it as soon as possible.

Simultaneously, I am emitting a gift from myself, a bronzed plaque, a token which I received from the Holy Father.

Once more, I leave you with my most sincere wishes and kiss the hands of our beloved Jubilarian.

Msgr. ANDREW MARIA DESKUR.

A PEEK INTO THE PAST

In witnessing this uniquely granted day, let us join together in thanks to Almighty God our Father, for the great solemnity of the Golden Jubilee to the Holy Priesthood of our dedicated and dearly beloved Pastor, Reverend Monsignor John Joseph Podkul. One would miss half the splendor of the moment, were we to fail to unveil, here and now, the giant curtain of the past, in retrospection of the historical background of this humble priest of God.

Let us then retrace our steps to the city of birth, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, where God in His great mercy deemed to place the infant John Joseph into the loving gentle care of two saintly parents, Francis and Angela Matusz Podkul. Their simplicity and spirituality penetrated as fresh seeds of Divine Love into the heart of the newly born. Yes, this happy couple, received this, their "Gift" from God with great anticipation, hope and joy. Their lofty thoughts nourished his early boyhood with a pious education and a virtuous love of God and neighbor. Very carefully, together, they planned the narrow pathway of his elementary education with the Bernardine Sisters at St. Mary's Parochial School in Wilkes-Barre. The frequent climb to Saint Joseph's Monastery nearby, lent something of a transcending sweetness to the boy, and slowly, but surely, the splendor of the Altar's Ministry began to shine in the early youth. Its enchantment never failed. As years went by, little by little tender aspirations to God shot upwards from the secret desires burning from the innermost soul but temporarily quenched by exterior determination to keep the secret and be sure . . . It became relevant, however, as time flew by, later, in St. John Kanty's High School in Philadelphia, Pa. Thus, the Christian Education of the home was favorably continued and developed in the wholesome atmosphere of Catholic Culture. The boy's normal involvement in frolic and fun did little to quell the steady urge in his vocational ideal. Of all the joys that the parents experienced with John this was the greatest—to see him opening up as a fragrant flower to the sunshine of Divine complacency. It thrilled them, his sisters and relatives, to watch his jovial innocence burst into virtuous blossoms as he took an ascension to the path that would one day lead young John Joseph to the Altar of God. Above all they wondered, as he blossomed beneath the warm rays of the Eucharistic Devotion. The altar boy grew into a little cleric. Yes, no wonder God touched him sweetly with the finest challenge that parents could ever hope for, the Holy Priesthood.

Oh, how loath all else seemed to be when so great an honor was opening the doorway to welcome their boy, their Johnny, to the Vineyard of Christ. Happily enough, John received the required consent and entered the precincts of St. Mary's College in Orchard Lake, Michigan. There he was fervently steered into a threefold pattern of formation; social, scientific, aesthetically spiritual. The depth of this last keynote was so far reaching in the young seminarian that beyond doubt, already then, his instructors and guidance directors sensed that here was a true product for the vast mission of Christ's work in His Church.

Time elapsed quickly. So, that the preparatory years of John J. Podkul brought him in direct contact with the St. Cyril and Methodius Seminary at Orchard Lake where he delved wholeheartedly in the study of Theology. Inspired by the rich teachings of his masters and enlightened by the frequent, profound readings and discussions, the young candidate became ready to assume his grave commitment to Christ as a promising laborer in the Lord's Vineyard. Notwithstanding the structurized accumulation of knowledge, John was endowed with spiritual qualities that would so develop in his time of apostolate as to make of him another St. Paul, in quest of souls. He was approved and ordained by the late Bishop Michael J. Hoban, D.D. at St. Peter's Cathedral in Scranton, Pennsylvania.

Then the Ecclesiastical authority foresaw the potential of the young priest, and eventually after his ordination, requested him to accept the appointment as assistant Pastor, to the priest of the church of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary in Scranton, Pennsylvania. There, the Reverend John Joseph Podkul remained in activities as a true disciple of Jesus for two years, reaching souls by his kindness, understanding and metallic dynamism. Both young and old sought him and cherished his help, guidance and condescending understanding. The Lord wished to try out his good servant on a harder and more propitious mission. Thus he was transferred as early as December 19, 1923, when he was summoned as "Pastor of his own flock" to the parish of St. John the Baptist in Exeter, Pennsylvania. For not long was he the "new unknown priest." His tremendous dynamism and active potential readily won for him the welcome title of the "Hard Worker" and "Accomplished Administrator." Verily he came to the limelight of fame, for he weaned his way marvelously through every hardship achieving results that for somebody else may have been a strenuous ordeal and an apparent failure.

Restless in his vital demeanor, he drove with broad strides fomenting true spirituality in the parish and organizing simultaneously responsible societies with good moral standards. His careful planning and watchful guidance rendered possible the numerous improvement that could be witnessed since his arrival. At the very outset everyone sensed his high values for Religious Education. To this purpose he established Catechetical Instruction. But it was not until 1928 on June 15, that St. John's parish would be shadowed

by the eclipse of their beloved Pastor. Their tireless shepherd was transplanted into another field of Christ's Vineyard. This time he found himself engaged in the vast experiences at the St. Stanislaus Kostka Parish in the northern area of Wilkes-Barre, Pa. In conformance with his high ideals, here too, our hero was readying himself for every sacrifice regardless of cost, for God and for the Church—for Souls. Nothing could deter him. His sublime urge became a noble passion for his Leader. He sensed at once that lack of funds hailed the doom of the parish thriving. But nothing could hinder his superb, dynamic willpower, engendering new vim, new possibilities and portraying the glory of a good exit!

Thus, he franchised an easy outlet midst barriers of strenuous difficulties. Nothing could deter his plans. He was resolved to win over the tempest of adversity . . . so he did! Super human effort on the part of this priest scored up a series of achievements. He managed to carry out his plans, purchased needed property, as his views seemed to roll out of his mathematically skilled mind as of a genius engineer. What more, despite the heavy storms of depression that drenched the nationwide dropping budget with inflation, he ripped the barring obstacles like a giant superman, and though he failed to build a new church, he readily renovated the first structure. Highly aware of the importance of spiritual foundation of his flock, he did not yield until the parish could once more smile with satisfaction as it came into possession of its own parochial school. For this reason, he urged the immediate purchase of a public school building and the annexation of a convent which he staffed with the Bernardine Sisters of St. Francis from Mt. Alvernia, Reading, Pennsylvania. Now that the elementary grades, one to eight, were in session, Father began to wrestle with new difficulties in the parish. Somehow he managed to overcome all of these and procured to make possible a new era of prosperity and welfare in this nucleus. Just as the sunshine streamed through the dew in lasting Blessing, the Lord saw it fit to wrench Father John out of his deserved relief into greater trials giving him plenty of opportunity for self-sanctification in the narrow pathway of self-abnegation and the Cross.

Already destined for another portion of the great pact that Christ be made known and served, he was sent to the town of Glen Lyon, Pennsylvania on September 15, 1938. From the start he wedged himself and hopefully sought the Mother of Sorrows whose day brought him there to help bring the Master's work to success in a parish steeped in debt. Soon his hand was set to work at St. Adalbert's Parish, he became both employer and employee. At the same time, lacking funds, meant scraping up from an insignificant scratch. He worked to the sweat of his brow till he managed to produce an unaccountable amount of improvements and so established an adequate school for the children's education. Of course, his relentless spirit, guided by Divine grace and wisdom, answered for his admirable accomplishments. With all this sagacious planning, he labored in every direction. Extensive changes followed with improvements. In a short time the pious priest had the interior of the church renovated and sufficiently modified. Once more he was forced to set church property in order. He established the badly needed catechetical school and again turned over its administration to the Bernardine Sisters of St. Francis to whom he fondly owed his elementary education. Let none think that administrative work and pastorate of his particular parish was a sole concern of the Priest. Far from it! One must remember Father John Podkul as an Apostle! Thus his immediate area of work would little satisfy the generous soul embellished with virtues of human pity and charity. His priestly heart was anxious to spread far and wide the kingdom of God—especially too, to his little ones. His heart, attuned to the Heart of Christ sought out the souls, burning to comfort them, heal their wound and bring them to the fold of the Good Shepherd, his Master Jesus.

In this wise, he contributed to the development of an Institute for forlorn children and homeless tots. Because of his great fatherly love, he extended his protective eye to the welfare of St. Stanislaus Institute in Nanticoke, Pennsylvania. This exists today, in the motherly hands of the Bernardine Sisters of St. Francis.

This Institute is a glowing memorial that reflects in a very special way the tedious work and sacrifice of Father John Podkul who, as its challenging director, held the post for twenty eight years since his election in 1928. By 1938 he was still its prominent figure, winning the election as the President of the Institute's Board of Directors. This post he held for a period of five years. It was during this time that the new chapel, auditorium and laundry were constructed under his auspicious care . . . just another proof of the superhuman involvement outside his many tasks as a Pastor, Confessor and Administrator. There too, he managed to purchase a school building for the educational benefit of the children. In order to promulgate the perpetuity of aid necessary to St. Stan's, Father organized the "Social Service Department," endowed the institute with the medical and legal staffs as well as various active Auxiliary Groups in the neighboring parishes that then flourished in the Diocese. All of this fabulous zeal and potential that intertwined administrative organizations and spirited support in an upheaval of helping a humane cause spread far and wide, won for Father John Podkul a long chain of compliments and recognition.

Hence, it also caught the perspicatious eye of the Most Reverend Stephen S. Woznicki, then Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Detroit. This noted Prelate selected Father John Podkul, with an approval of the late Edward Cardinal Mooney, and appointed the young priest to the status of the First Secretary General of the newly established Catholic league for Religious Assistance to Poland. To this work he dedicated himself with untold sacrifices, unprecedented difficulties, even grave humiliations, alleging a fulltime devotion and heroic perseverence. Without questioning, he obtained a leave of absence from his Ordinary, the Most Reverend Bishop William Hafey, to begin a laborious quest. Father John resorted to many tiresome trips all around the country. His great sojourn through the Dioceses, where semantic groups of Polish extraction populated the area, brought about the creation of a worthy organization for foreign aid, expressly to the oppressed people of Poland. After many exhausting travels, he organized a number of favorable movements that corresponded wholeheartedly to the primary task of soliciting funds towards this great goal. Besides the monetary aid, he stimulated great drives of religious materials furnishing complete outfits for the churches and chapels in vestments and religious utensils, especially as pertaining to the Liturgy of the Mass and the Administration of the Sacraments. All this aid was rendered in behalf of the multineeds of the people chiefly during the doleful period of reconstruction that followed as the sad effects of World War II.

Nothwithstanding the cumbersome task and frequently repudiating situations, his great faith and trust in the Divine Providence, as well as his hope in the gratifying generosity of the Polish extraction, insured Father Podkul's anticipated success with a remarkable sum of 335 parochial units, working with the intensity of Union in the Catholic League established under his supervision. The far reaching efforts of this strenuous work can be realized only hereafter, when God in His Divine Mercy deems well to reveal his recompense in fulfillment of His promises: "A Hundredfold."

Once the Polish Welfare Program came to a successful close, an exhausted but happy Father John Podkul returned to his post and pastoral duties at St. Abalbert's in Glen Lyon where destiny left him 'till the day of October 3, 1955. Then it was that a new summons destined Father to wend his way to St. Mary's Nativity Parish in Plymouth, Pennsylvania. It was during this lapse of time between the pastorate of Glen Lyon and afterwards at St. Mary's Father Podkul also served as Chaplain of the Polish Union of the United States of North America for a period of four years, from 1952 to 1956. Then it held Wilkes-Barre as its headquarters.

Once Father John took over his new mission at St. Mary's Nativity Parish in Plymouth, he immediately got to work. His philosophy that God would be served better in a more pleasant atmosphere, urged him to modify conditions and better circumstances for his flock. It was then that he really delved into the excessive work without selfish interests, requesting God's help above all else. In return the good Lord rewarded this childlike confidence with unique graces of successful accomplishment. Besides, our Lord advanced Father John in his prayerlife and sacrificial self-giving. Playing on this zealous instrument, God blessed his parishioners in prosperity and grace in as much as they too corresponded with His Blessings.

It is noteworthy that Father John Podkul's love of the Blessed Mother and the Sacramental Lord helped him to wrestle against unpleasant circumstances and reach the exit he searched. Through his outstanding efforts, church property was augmented according to further advancements and needs, for school and convent. The parish grove too, suffered considerable change and embellezment with proper adjustments in regard to posterior recreational demands. The church then underwent transformation because of the unwavering zeal of Father John Podkul. Thus the expansion of the Sanctuary, the new pulpit and the Baptismal Font, as well as the annexation of rest rooms and parking lots, contributed to the welfare of many, eliminating the barriers hindering order and space adaption. This application to administrative areas might wrongly impress people and provoke relative criticism as to Father's spirituality. Far from it. Never! His mind and heart strummed to a singular harmonic cord—that of total endowment and commitment to Christ. His priestly desires, transcended his soul from the ephemoral matter of earthly mire and distilled in the atmosphere of spiritual treasures swayed it in balance to his aspirations. He wanted his church, school and buildings equipped and free from debit—and did it . . . so they would conduce souls to work for greater sharing for the glory of God. Most of all he yearned to possess a Salvific Talisman for each of his loving sheep; the spirit of Christ in constant growth in the Holy Faith, to grow and become robust in grace and flourish evermore in the magnificent garden of the Mystical Body, the Church. He sought to bring lost souls to the confessional, to make them whole, to create a heavenly Utopia of "Peace on Earth and Good Will to Men" by drawing throngs to the God of Love in the Eucharist; in this solace, he wished to yield lilies that blossom constantly in the sweet Vineyard of Christ. By their perfume of innocence they would clear the air of pollution of bad morals. Yes, he tried by dire tasks, to spread the Gospel News witnessing to Christ with his secret, silent acts of true charity in a fatherly magnitude of heart. He tried to become all to all who sought him and cooperated with his willing readiness. He did this,—never once counting the cost.

In the endeavor to surround the Lord with special attention, he created the Altar and Rosary Societies and the Christian Mothers

Organization. He gathered the youth and children setting them a spiritual advancement in the Society of the Infant Jesus of Prague and the Children of Mary. Bewildered as to the future of the parish youth, the fatherly pastor feared the ease of waywardness in some, even the best, unless provisions relative to a healthy social life would accompany an intrinsic religious stage. Thus, as soon as he prospered, the purchase of a public school for a "Youth Center" together with the "pateos" marked the beginning of a happy investment in 1966. Father stipulated amounts needed to purchase materials and enact programs, and established trained instructors as well as trainees for the continuance of the groups established in sectors; Boy Scouts, Boys' Club, Girl Scouts, Sewing Circles, Arts and Crafts Sector and a variety of inter-activities that slowly but surely expanded and gave rise to a fond gathering place for the teens of our parish. The laurel of this Center belongs to the great foreseer of a true Father and Educator behind the screens: Father John J. Podkul."

He nourished the men in their spiritual tastes by establishing for them the Holy Name Society. Blessings surely flowed from Heaven upon this servant of God and his endeavors. How else could he do what he achieved? They affected the growth of the number at Mass, at the Communion rail, and those that frequented the Devotions.

Finally a silver lining dawned on the horizon of his beautiful priestly life. For his devotedness to the service of the church, on May 22, 1959 His Holiness Pope John XXIII elevated John J. Podkul to the high rank of a Domestic Prelate (this means one honored as an honorary member of the Pope's household which entitles him to the official list of the "ANNUARIO PONTIFICIO" at the Vatican, with special privileges granted yet by Pope Pius X on February 21, 1905). Conferring on him the title of a Right Reverend Monsignor, the special ceremony was enacted by His Excellency the Most Reverend Jerome D. Hannon, D.D. on September 13, 1959. The investiture of the new Prelate took place at the Cathedral of St. Peter in Scranton, Pennsylvania. As a dignitary of Monsignoral rank, the Very Reverend John Podkul pledged himself to spend his life to its fullness in his commitment to his Church, Christ's Mystical Body. The joy and blessings of the elevation promoted the spirit of welfare and solidarity among his people. It rendered special consolation to the humbly disposed servant, Monsignor John Joseph Podkul.

From thence, his tireless nature set a new standard of still greater endeavors pro spiritual as well as material matters in his immediate environment. Ever trusting in God, never accepting credit for self, he simply shrank from ostentation and ovations. This is why our good Lord deemed to draw His faithful son closer to His Sacred Heart. He crowned his works with a very successful outcome, with a fruitful harvest of fifty years, splendid merits of a wonderful accumulation of laborious achievements. Yet the tests of the Lord continued successively reiterating his very yielding and submission with further spurts of trials, discomforts and even physical ailments. Though the flesh was weak, his spirit turned like a giant rock of Gibraltar in the busy programs he endured each day. Strain and stress never broke him down. No wonder, when the great giant seemed to tower and sway as he fumbled, he rose once more, stronger than ever sharing his own courage to strengthen weaker characters than his own. This spiritual energy had its own source only in the constant intrinsic endeavor of fifty years of prayer and sacrifices, ourified by the crystalline fire of the cross and molded by the magnetic hand of an Almighty God in whose providence he placed his Faith, his Hope, his Joy. Now then, as the fifty years wreathed out the dazzling aureola of 50 crowns of a glorious life in Christ, with Christ, the angel of God still challenges Monsignor John as he did of yore, to the faltering Jacob: "Take and eat, you still have a long journey to go."

Ad Multos Annos in the Vineyard of the Lord. Do not stop . . . there is still work to be done, Monsignor. Do not hesitate. Yet a dose more of sacrifice and work, more heavenly riches to store . . . your undying vim must not cease till Christ's vital spirit draws you with every fiber in you to the perpetual joys of an everlasting crown in Heaven.

Go on! Brave the tempests of the earthly sea, continue saving immortal souls, live to love in your Christ—serve your High Priest, Oh Jubilant Solenizarian!

Ad Multos Annos! Right Reverend Monsignor! May each heart rejoice with you and sing the MAGNIFICAT as they contemplate the marvels He prepared for those who love Him, for His followers—HIS ALTER CHRISTUS!

Ad Multos Annos!

—E. B. M.

MASS OF THANKSGIVING

Sunday, August 29, 1971—4:00 P.M.

St. Mary's Nativity Church—Plymouth.

The Most Reverend J. Carroll McCormick, D.D., Bishop of Scranton, presiding.

Principal Celebrant: Reverend Monsignor John J. Podkul.

Concelebrants: Rev. Stanislaus Slominski, Rev. John Kowalkiewicz, Rev. Stanislaus Kalinowski, Rev. Anthony Kosiowski, Rev. Joseph Sadowski, M.M., and Rev. Henry Zapotocki.

Master of Ceremonies: Rev. Monsignor James C. Timlin.

Lector: Mr. Bernard Janoski.

Presentation of offertory gifts: Sister M. Amelia, C.S.B., Mr. John Ratajczak, Mr. Leonard Stavish, Miss Ann D. Pleban, Sister M. Esther, C.S.B., Mr. Robert Stavish, Mr. Stanleyl Pleban, and Mrs. Martha Donaldson.

Sacred Chant: St. Cecelia's Choir—Mr. A. Magda, Director.

Recessional: "Serdeczna Matko".

JUBILEE DINNER MENU

Cocktails.
Hors D'oeuvres.
Fruit cocktail supreme.
Chef's tossed salad.
Relishes.
Oven roast of beef with mushroom gravy.
Baked potato.
Belgian carrots.
Dinner rolls and butter.
Coffee.
Tea.
Milk.
Ice cream cake roll.

GOLDEN JUBILEE BANQUET PROGRAM

Processional: Orchestra.

Presentation of guests: Rev. Joseph E. Papka, Honorary Chairman.

Star Spangled Banner: Assembly.

Invocation: Rev. Msgr. Joseph B. Pilny, Pastor, Ss. Peter and Paul Church, Plains, Pa.

Toast: Mr. Malcolm Rule, Co-Chairman.

DINNER

Remarks and introduction of toastmaster: Mr. Edward Wilkes, Chairman.

Toastmaster: Rev. Hilary L. Malinowski, S.T.L., Adm. Sacred Heart of Jesus Church, Dupont, Pa.

Remarks: Most Rev. J. Carroll McCormick, D.D., Bishop of Scranton.

Greetings from school children: Theresa Zuba.

Remarks: Mayor Edward Burns, Plymouth, Pa.

Choral tribute: "Feast Day Song"—"Let There Be Peace," St. Cecelia's Choir—A. Magda, Director.

Address: Hon. Peter Paul Olszewski, Judge, Common Pleas Court, Luzerne County, Pa.

Polish dances: Polish National Alliance Dancing Group.

Humorist: Joseph Gallagher.

Principal Address: Rev. Msgr. Vincent V. Borkowicz, Pastor Emeritus—St. Stanislaus Church, Detroit, Michigan.

Presentation: Mrs. Delbert H. Cragle, Co-Chairman.

Concluding remarks: Jubilarian, Rev. Msgr. John J. Podkul.

Benediction: Rev. Msgr. Michael C. Polcha, Pastor, Holy Trinity Church, Swoyerville, Pa.

"Holy God We Praise Thy Name": Assembly.

Recessional: Orchestra.

Dancing and refreshments.

GOLDEN JUBILEE COMMITTEE

Honorary chairman: Rev. Joseph E. Papka, Rev. Joseph S. Sitko.

Chairman: Mr. Edward Wilkes.

Co-chairman: Mrs. Delbert H. Cragle, Mr. Malcolm Rule.

Secretary: Miss Helen Cebula.

Treasurer: Mrs. Anthony Piotrowski.

TICKET COMMITTEE

Mr. Leonard Wojcik, Chairman; Mrs. Felicia Bierzynski, Co-Chairman; Miss Blanche Bylinski, Mrs. Helene Ciecierski, Mr. Delbert H. Cragle, Mrs. Elizabeth Dudek, Mr. Anthony Gabriel, Mrs. Helen Janoski, and Mrs. Caroline Kosloski.

Mrs. Helen Lipinski, Mrs. Bertha Kuzminski, Mrs. Mary Martinski, Mrs. Theodore Loke, Mrs. Joanne Yanek, Mrs. Claudia Nowak, Mrs. Clara Posiusny, and Mrs. Frances Przybyiski.

RECEPTION

Mrs. Dorothy Smith, Chairman; Miss Geri Lukasavage, Co-Chairman; Mrs. Bernice Mugjo, Mr. Bernard Janoski, Mrs. Marion Makos, Miss Caroline O'Rourke, Mrs. Gertrude Phillips, and Mrs. Clara Zawatski.

DECORATIONS

Mrs. Helen Hinkley and Mrs. Lillian Loke.

PROGRAM

Mr. Frank Phillips, Mrs. Gertrude Lukavitch, and Mrs. Eleanor Stush.

INVITATIONS AND BOOKLET

Mrs. Marlyn Zlotek, Chairman; Mrs. Lorraine Piotrowski, Co-Chairman; Mrs. Dorothy Cebrick, Mrs. Josephine Strongowski, Mrs. Joanne Yanek, and Mrs. Stephania Dziekan.

As we celebrate the Golden Jubilee of Ordination to the Sacred Priesthood of our beloved Pastor, Monsignor John J. Podkul, we wish to express our sincere gratitude to all those who have contributed so generously to the success of this joyous occasion.

It was through the combined leadership of our respected priests, Rev. Joseph E. Papka and Rev. Joseph S. Sitko, and the devoted efforts of members of the parish societies, parishioners and friends of St. Mary's that this Jubilee celebration grew to reality.

To you, our Pastor, we extend sincere congratulations, and we ask God to shower His abundant blessings upon you.

—St. Mary's Parish Jubilee Committee.

MY JUBILEE

Finally we celebrated the greatest of days of my priestly life, my Golden Jubilee in the Holy Priesthood of Christ.

I owe it to you, my dear people from St. Mary's, and from all the other neighboring parishes where I worked, that this great solemnity did take place. Through the unselfish sacrifice of so many wonderful parishioners and friends, it was possible for me to see through these years of God's work.

I am very happy for this Golden Day, and wish to thank you with the most cordial gratitude. Humbly I offer Thanksgiving to

the Eternal Father for His unwavering paternal care for me.

From the depths of my heart I thank you all and bless you; I pray God to shower His choicest graces upon each and everyone of you.

In a special sense, I extend my thanks to the Committee and friends that made such great efforts for this memorable occasion. You certainly went big in helping out with your kind contributions. Words are inadequate to express all I'd love to say. So thank you again, most sincerely.

As soon as possible, you will receive a warm note of thanks through the mail for your gifts and donations.

God bless you and love you.

MONSIGNOR PODKUL.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI, FATHER OF THE AMERICAN CAVALRY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, October 11 marked the 192d anniversary of the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish soldier and patriot who gave his life in the struggle for American independence. Without his superb leadership of the first American cavalry forces, the poorly organized and ill-equipped colonial troops would have been seriously weakened and possibly defeated. I believe we should recall some of the details of the remarkable career of this man who did so much and finally made the supreme sacrifice to help us win our independence.

Pulaski was born in Podolia, Poland, on March 4, 1748. He became interested in military affairs before he reached his majority and served in the guard of Duke Charles of Courland before he reached the age of 20. In 1768, he joined his father, Joseph Pulaski, as one of the eight original associates of the Confederation of Barr, a national Polish movement against Russian oppression. He and his father pledged themselves to freeing Poland. Casimir carried on a partisan warfare against the Russians after his father's death, and in 1769 raised a revolt in Lithuania. He finally forced the Russians to withdraw from the fortified monastery of Czestochova to which he had been driven and took an active part in forcing them across the Vistula.

Subsequent military reverses caused Pulaski to leave Poland. He went to Turkey to seek, unsuccessfully, the aid of the Sultan against the Russians. He then went to Paris in 1775. It was in the French capital that he made the acquaintance of Benjamin Franklin. After his talks with Franklin he became interested in the American struggle for independence and came to this country in March of 1777. He immediately joined General Washington's staff in Philadelphia. In the battle of Brandywine, in company with Greene, Wayne, Sullivan, and Lafayette, he struck his first blow in behalf of the American cause. His great service in this engagement was to defeat the attempt of the enemy to cut off the line of retreat. He executed his task so successfully and promptly that, upon the recommendation of Washington, he was commissioned a brigadier general by Congress and assigned to command the newly organized American cavalry. General Washington, in his letter to Congress recommending Pulaski for this position, said:

> This gentleman has been, like us, engaged in defending the liberty and independence of his country and has sacrificed his fortune to his zeal for these objects. He derives from hence a title to our respect that ought to operate in his favor as far as the good of the service will permit.

Pulaski later saved the Army from a surprise at Warren Tavern, near Philadelphia, and took part in the battle of Germantown. In the winter of 1777–78, he participated in the operations of Gen. Anthony Wayne and helped defeat a division of British troops at Haddonfield, N. J. Subsequently, he was assigned to special duty at Valley Forge.

Congress, upon General Pulaski's suggestion and upon the recommendation of General Washington, authorized the formation of a corps of lancers and light infantry to be commanded by Pulaski. This corps, which was recruited mostly in Baltimore, later became famous as "Pulaski's Legion."

Performing garrison duty at Minisink, N.J., during the following winter, he expressed a wish to return to more active military service in Europe, but Washington persuaded him to remain. On May 8, 1779, he entered Charleston, S.C., and 3 days later, May 11, the city was attacked by 900 British troops. Pulaski's forces were heavily outnumbered, but he held the city until the arrival of reinforcements on May 13.

In the siege of Savannah, where he met his death, he rendered distinguished service. In the assault of October 8, he commanded the entire cavalry, both French and American. During the battle he received a wound which eventually proved fatal.

For the account of General Pulaski dying in the arms of Col. Richard Clough Anderson, we have the word of Colonel Anderson's grandson, Edward Lowell Anderson. The biography of Colonel Anderson, published by his grandson in 1879, contains the following:

> The attack [on Savannah], though at several points successful, was, in the end, repulsed. Upon his way back to camp, my grandfather met Pulaski. The unhappy Pole was mounted upon a rough-moving pony, at whose every step the blood from a mortal wound churned up in the long boots of the rider. Until death released Pulaski from his sufferings, at some hour during that night, Major Anderson remained with him. He received from the dying man a sword, in memory of the sad service.

There is no further mention of Pulaski's sword in Mr. Anderson's book.

The details given in other historical accounts differ, but there is general agreement that Pulaski was carried from the battlefield after the conflict to the American brig *Wasp* for transfer to Charleston. Two days later, in the company of his close friend and subordinate, Captain Bentalou, he died of the gangrene which had set into his wound. He was buried at sea, but, when the French fleet reached Charleston, a memorial procession and service were held. Pulaski's empty coffin was followed by his horse, which bore his uniform and cavalry accouterments.

Casimir Pulaski was not the only brave Pole who left his native land to help America win her independence. Those who served under the general in the Pulaski Legion included Joseph Baldeski, Maurice August Beniowski, Baron de Botzen, August Christian Elholm, Jerzmanowski—first name unknown—Michael Kowacz, Kraszewski—first name unknown—Charles Litomski, Matthias Rogowski, Kotowski—first name unknown—and John Zielinski, a cousin of General Pulaski and one of the first three officers of the legion.

Americans have not forgotten the contributions of General Pulaski. There are eight towns named after him, located in the States of Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, Mississippi, New York, Tennessee, Virginia, and Wisconsin; and seven counties, located in the States of Arkansas, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, and Virginia. The Pulaski Highway in Maryland runs from Baltimore through Aberdeen and Elkton to the Delaware line, and the Pulaski Skyway in New Jersey is a wonder of highway engineering.

Gen. Casimir Pulaski spent more than $50,000 of his private fortune to maintain his cavalry. In a letter to Col. R. H. Lee in 1778, he wrote:

> Honor and a true desire of distinguishing myself in defense of Liberty was the only motive which fired my breast for the cause of the United States.

His example of sacrifice and devotion to our Nation's cause is a model of patriotism for all times. Truly, Casimir Pulaski stands as one of history's greatest protagonists of human freedom.

A VETERAN'S GRATITUDE FOR THE GI BILL

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from a young veteran in my district, Mr. Danny Ray Falkner, expressing an attitude toward the U.S. Congress which is seldom verbalized. Mr. Falkner, asked me to express his feelings to this body, and for this reason I insert his letter be printed in the Record.

The letter follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1971.

Hon. ED JONES,
House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JONES: My tour of duty now is completed with the US Army Security Agency, and I was discharged on the third of August 1971. It is my request that you, if you wouldn't mind, to please relay the following note of appreciation to the appropriate office.

As I graduated from Ripley High School in Ripley, Tennessee, I saw many of my

friends prepare for further schooling at an in-state or out-of-state college or university. I did not, nor did my family, have the necessary financial backing to pursue further schooling. Having no alternative plan of action, I decided to enlist in the U.S. Army. This proved to be beneficial in many ways. My thinking matured, but, above all, my appreciation and thankfulness to live in a free country as we do increased as I saw several countries without my privileges.

At this time gentlemen, I would like to take this opportunity to say how much I appreciate the chance to attend school under the G.I. Bill. Without the necessary financial backing that the G.I. Bill provides, I would be unable to attend school. My lack of knowledgeable words to put down in appropriate writing leaves me unable to express my thankfulness to the Congress of the United States.

May God's blessing be upon the entire membership of the congress of my country.

Very truly yours,

DANNY RAY FALKNER.

THE HONORABLE CHARLOTTE T. REID

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for those of us who have felt such a deep bond of respectful affection for our former colleague, Charlotte Reid of Illinois, I am sure there has been more difficulty than on most occasions in finding just the right words to express our thoughts. But the words of a remembered poem came to me the other day which, I think, fits the subject. Lord Byron paid an ultimate compliment to a lady when he said:

She walks in beauty like the night
Of cloudless climes and starry skies.
And all that's best of dark and bright
Meet in her aspect and in her eyes
Thus mellowed to that tender light
Which heaven to gaudy day denies.

As a colleague, Mrs. Reid deserved to be considered a peer as a matter of right. But some demand and some earn. And Charlotte always earned.

As a politician in her own district, the overwhelming majorities by which she was six times elected to this body provide full testimony of her ability to win and hold respect of her constituency.

As a Congresswoman, her work in her various assignments here—including her work on the coveted Appropriations Committee—have earned her the respect of all with whom she dealt: colleagues, staff, witnesses, and press. No allowances had to be made for her in the rigorous role of legislator which we all find so demanding.

But the most impressive of all was that unique ability to carry the responsibilities of politician and legislator without diminishing the graceful quality of her femininity. Her womanliness was never used as a crutch or club, but it was ever a quotient in her service. Whenever Charlotte took part in the discussion—whether it involved matters of state or frivolity—the level of consideration was always raised noticeably. She always had the capacity by her very presence to make us a little more noble, a little more considerate, a little more gentlemanly in our attitudes.

It is not just because she is a fine woman, a helpful associate or a worthy adversary, but because she is a great person that she has contributed so much to these halls and will be so greatly missed. As a member of the Communications and Power Subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I shall be fortunate enough to be able to continue a professional association with the lady from Aurora as she goes to her new assignment in public service.

I know my colleagues join me in the satisfaction that her service to America and the process of government will continue in her new post on the Federal Communications Commission. The FCC plays a critical role in the lives of all Americans, and as the new and expanding technology of the electronic media increase the influence of that segment of communications over our lives even more in the future it is vital that the FCC consist of persons of the highest character, intellect, foresight, and responsiveness to new and significant challenges, and who have sensitivity to the noblest public interest.

Charlotte Reid is endowed with those qualities and a sense of purpose in life that will see her meet the new challenges of the position she is to assume.

We wish her well in her new career.

TAX AND DEBT LIMITS AND CALIFORNIA'S EXTRAORDINARY MAJORITY VOTING REQUIREMENTS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a former mayor and State legislator, I am especially aware of the tremendous difficulties involved in financing State and local government. In a State like California, with its tremendous size and large population, the problem becomes particularly acute. Alan K. Browne, retired senior vice president, Bank of America N.T. & S.A., recently spoke to the Kenna Club at the University of Santa Clara in California on "Tax and Debt Limits and California's Extraordinary Majority Voting Requirement."

I would like to share his view with my colleagues, which were given on October 1, 1971, as follows:

TAX AND DEBT LIMITS AND CALIFORNIA'S EXTRAORDINARY MAJORITY VOTING REQUIREMENT

OPENING REMARKS

States and their local units of government are in financial trouble. Budgets have been rising while tax and revenue sources have tended to shrink. Voters have been reluctant to approve bond issues and tax increases where applicable. Property owners have become more vocal in their opposition to any increase in their tax load.

Yet the demand for public services and the expectation of public services is unappeased. To add to the problem are the new standards for environmental quality indicating vast expenditures, both public and private, are necessary to meet these standards.

Our school system has been faced with added expenditures to insure the safety of its structures from earthquake damage and to provide quality and equality of education for all pupuls. Additional costs of busing must be borne by the affected districts. The California Supreme Court decision on the question of inequality of school district resources to provide equal educational opportunities is a potential tax and debt problem for California taxpayers. Striking teachers seeking improvement in their benefits, and the unfunded condition of some public retirement systems, presage additional costs to be underwritten by the taxpayers of our State. The financial problems of our parochial schools and the private colleges are additional manifestations of our economic woes and could lead to further burdens. In fact, education at all levels, and welfare, continue to be the major budget problems facing State and local government today.

There is no doubt that a decline in business activity results in an economic blow to government finances, varying in degree according to locality. Unemployment and declining sales mean lower tax receipts. Unfortunately it is difficult for government to anticipate with any degree of accuracy changes in the business cycle—nor does it have the flexibility to reduce expenditures or increase revenue resources mid-stream.

President Nixon's 90 day wage and price freeze, and related actions pertaining to the dollar, represent still another financial problem for State and local government. Uncertainty as to Phase II will continue to worry legislators until they can determine what impact it will have on revenues. States that have tied their income tax to a percentage of the Federal tax will have some adjusting to do. Meanwhile the fate of revenue sharing is still anyones guess as to when it might be enacted, how much relief it will provide and what form it will take.

I have tried to establish in your minds the seriousness of the dilemma facing State and local government. As voters and taxpayers you must be acutely aware of what is happening—and yet it is difficult to come to grips with the problem. It is even more difficult to find solutions.

Today I will not attempt to discuss all aspects of State and local government financial needs. Rather I will confine my remarks, as the title of my paper implies, to "Tax and Debt Limits and California's Extraordinary Voting Requirements". I will also comment on some additional related limitations, which together, play a significant role in State and local finance and determine the flexibility by which government responds to changing public needs and the jiggles in the economy.

WHAT ARE THE LIMITATIONS?

Underlying the financial problems of State and local government are the changing roles and relationships with the Federal government.

James Madison wrote in the "Federalist", and I quote:

"The powers delegated by the proposed constitution to the Federal Government are few and defined—(they)—will be exercised principally on external objects, as war, peace, negotiation, and foreign commerce, with which last the power of taxation will for the most part be connected. The powers reserved to the several states will extend to all the objects, which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties and properties of the people; and the internal order, improvement, and properties of the State". (Unquote)

Far reaching developments in the social and economic life in our country have altered this concept.

The functions of government in general are substantially greater than they were in the past. Both Federal, State and local. To-

day scarcely any government function belongs to a single level. The Federal government depends on State and local government for effective performance in shared functional fields and in certain national functions as well.

In effect there is a great mixture of shared and interdependent functions rather than a neat pile of whole functions among three distinct levels of government.

To further complicate the picture, State boundaries, fixed by history, are not based on current social and economic needs so that solutions for some major problems are beyond the reach of any one State.

Services provided by the States and their local units vary in range, quality and quantity.

Of the 48 older States, relatively few have adopted new constitutions since 1945. The California legislature in 1933 submitted the question of calling a constitutional convention to the voters. The proposal received a majority approving vote, but because of time limitations and defects in the proposal, the legislature finally took no action. So California still functions under its second constitution adopted July 4, 1879, with periodic piecemeal amendments. However, an advisory commission and staff have functioned in recent years to eliminate obsolete provisions, consolidate some and to rewrite others. Unfortunately their efforts have met with indifferent voter response at the polls.

Most States, including California, impose statutory or constitutional limitations on their power, and on the power of their local governments, to borrow and to tax. Many set interest rate limits on their respective borrowing and some prescribe the majority voting requirement on bond issues and tax rate increases.

A—State constitutional and statutory restrictions on amount of government debt

Many of the limitations on State and local borrowing are historical and had their roots established in past periods of economic crises such as the 1830's, the reconstruction period following the Civil War, and the 1930's. Periods which saw sharp debt expansion and followed by depression and defaults.

Essentially the limitations have been enacted to prevent reoccurrence of past misdirected over-borrowing in order to protect taxpayers, preserve the credit (solvency) of their government and to protect bondholders.

In a study made some years ago (1958) of State debt limitations, three groups were used for comparison.

Group I—Prohibits State borrowing except as authorized by constitutional amendment.

Group II—Borrowing proposal must be enacted by the legislature and then approved by popular referendum.

Group III—Legislatures make the borrowing decisions.

On this basis Groups I and II were found to include 21 States each, with 8 States falling under Group III.

Constitutional and statutory limitations on the borrowing of local governmental units vary considerably. The most common limitation, used by 34 States in 1961, sets a ceiling on debt as a percentage of the property tax base of the local government.

Another common limitation is that the issuance of bonds be approved by referendum. This requirement, with individual variations, was imposed constitutionally in 23 States and statutorily in 27 States.

1. California's Limitations

a. *State general obligation debt*—There is no limit to State general obligation debt. Statutory provisions also set limits as well as prescribe methods of sale, maximum maturity, and maximum interest rate. Occasionally the Act creating the debt may contain specific limitations without regard to the statutes. However, this is an exception and usually results from lack of knowledge.

b. *County General Obligation Debt*—Direct general obligation debt of a county may not exceed 5% of assessed valuation. Due to the nature of county government, the purposes for which county debt may be issued are limited with many counties having no debt outstanding. Statutory provisions govern sales procedures, purposes for which bonds may be issued, maximum maturity and maximum interest rate.

c. *City general obligation debt*—Direct general obligation debt of a city is limited to 15% of assessed valuation. Charter cities, including the City and County of San Francisco, may set their own debt limits, either as a percentage of the city's assessed valuation, or by excluding certain debt from the computation of outstanding bond issues such as self-liquidating debt. Statutory provisions also govern sales procedures, purposes for which bonds may be issued, maximum maturity, and maximum interest rate.

d. *School district general obligation debt*—School, high school and junior college district direct general obligation debt may not exceed 5% of assessed valuation, respectively, but may be increased by 5% increments where any or all of these functions are additionally combined in one district. A high school and junior college district, for example, would have a 10% debt limitation, while the limitation of a unified school and junior college district would be 15%. There are also provisions for excess debt when existing districts form new districts through unification. In such instances outstanding debt continues as an obligation of the originating district, but new bonds issued by the unified district are liens against the enlarged area and the 5%–15% debt limitations does not include the underlying bonds of the original component districts. Statutory provisions also govern sales procedure, purposes for which bonds may be issued, maximum maturity and maximum interest rate.

e. *Special district and authority debt* have so many diverse limitations according to the multitude of California special laws, that overall generalization would be misleading. It may be said, however, that laws governing special districts and authorities are typically more liberal and the restrictions less onerous than for other units. Some have no debt limits.

Not all special districts can incur debt. Of the 3800 odd special districts in California, relatively few have debt outstanding except for purposes related to community services, flood control, recreation and park, sanitation, public utility and water, etc. However, they all have the power to tax and usually do.

f. *Loopholes*—Keep in mind I have only mentioned general obligation debt. Because of the complexity of other forms of debt, I will not attempt to detail their respective provisions.

To quote a Brookings Institution study—"Limitation have held down aggregate borrowing, but they have stimulated a mushroomlike development of ingenious devices to escape the limitations. The most important device has been the non-guaranteed bond (as distinct from a bond secured for its interest and principal by the full faith and credit of local government)". (Unquote)

Creation of public authorities and new governmental units is motivated chiefly by a desire to gain new borrowing as well as additional borrowing power; to exceed, in effect, statutory and constitutional limitation.

In California, loopholes have been found through use of such devices as non-profit corporations, lease purchase contracts and joint powers agreements.

Special assessment financing has also contributed to our problems, as it tends to be promotional in certain situations and a form of public aid for private enterprise.

Because of the nature and form of these special types of borrowing, interest rates tend to be higher than for traditional vehicles to attract investors. Such financing tends also to negotiated sales and to an increase in overlapping debt, adding to the burden of the taxpayer.

B. State constitutional and statutory restrictions on taxing powers

1. *State of California*—We are so used to thinking of California State taxes in the form of a sales tax, income tax, liquor and cigarette taxes, and the gas tax that we forget there is authority for a property tax. The California Supreme Court's recent decision concerning school finances brought the possibility of a statewide property tax into focus again.

In a report of an Assembly Interim Committee on Revenue and Taxation, it summarized California's tax history into three periods:

1850–1910—An era of minimum government supported largely by ad valorem taxes on property.

1911–1932—The era of separation of tax sources and growing State government supported largely by gross receipts taxes on public utility corporations, but also characterized by the levying of various taxes on special objects (e.g., motor vehicles and related activities) the proceeds of which were earmarked for particular purposes.

1933 to date—An era of expanding government in which the State thrust itself into many areas formerly considered functions of local government (e.g., support to schools, support to the categorical aids, etc.) and derived a large share of its revenues from sales, income and excise taxes.

As a result of home owner criticism of the State's tax structure in 1905, the Legislature appointed a commission to make a systematic analysis of the State's fiscal problems. The impetus for the study was not additional revenue, but a readjustment of the tax burden. At this time the general property tax provided about 70% of the State's revenue.

As a practical solution to the problem of property taxation, the commission recommended a separation of tax sources. This meant local governments, cities and counties, would have one tax base—local property, and the State government a separate tax base, e.g., a gross receipts tax on all public utilities. Under this plan the State would forgo the property tax and the two levels of government would depend upon different tax bases. The objective of the division was to allow each level of government independence in matters concerning its taxation.

The commission reasoned that local property, such as homes, stores and farms, have a distinct local situs, and receive benefits directly from local government. Corporate property, on the other hand, did not have the same local situs; it extended over many communities, served all, and all contributed to its income.

The report of the 1906 tax commission was approved by the Legislature, but a constitutional amendment was defeated in 1908. After some modification it was resubmitted to the voters in 1910 and was passed. Since then the State of California has not levied a general property tax (defined in Article XIII of the State constitution and limited to 25% of its required funds), except a special levy was made to finance the Panama Exposition and was discontinued after 1915.

The next period of major State tax reform took place in the 1930's. The 1910 constitutional amendment had outlined its usefulness as its precepts were no longer valid.

A clear distinction no longer existed between property with only a local interest and property with a general statewide interest. The expansion of State services blurred any former distinction which may have existed between the function of State and local government.

The gross receipts tax, as the major tax

of the State, was too inflexible to remain a suitable means for financing the operation of the State government.

The financial solvency of the State government was almost destroyed by the depression during the thirties. New services, especially relief, were demanded by the citizens, but the structure proved incapable of meeting the fiscal requirements. Revenues declined, expenditures increased, services were cut, and deficits mounted.

Sounds familiar—doesn't it? The tax crisis of 1933 was resolved by a plan proposed by two members of the State Board of Equalization, Ray L. Riley (State Controller) and Fred E. Stewart.

In essence—the fiscal problem of 1933, as viewed by Riley and Stewart, was to balance the State budget, relieve real estate of some of its burden, avoid a State property tax levy, and at the same time maintain essential governmental services.

Not all of the proposals of Riley and Stewart were enacted by the Legislature. However, a revised amendment to the constitution was approved by the voters in 1933. A retail sales tax was adopted but a personal income tax was vetoed by the Governor. However, in 1935 a new personal income tax bill was signed into law to meet the critical revenue short fall.

One significant part of the Riley-Stewart plan was local property relief through the State assuming the fixed charges of $30 for each elementary school pupil and $60 for each high school pupil in average daily attendance. It was up to the legislature to determine what additional revenue sources were to be tapped to fund the extra school costs.

While State tax legislation in the intervening years has been important, particularly the passage of the Collier-Burns Act of 1947 relating to motor vehicle taxes, it has been a matter of degree. Actually California's tax structure has changed very little since 1935.

In view of the State's pressing financial problems of today—a little history is worth noting.

To quote from a recent speech I gave before the Commonwealth Club of California.

"The lessons of the past seem to be too readily forgotten and each generation shows a tendency to make the same mistakes which were made in prior years". (Unquote)

It is interesting to note that the "Deans" of California's State Senate and Assembly are Senator Randolph Collier, elected in 1938, and Assemblyman Vincent Thomas, elected in 1940. Very few members of the legislature have served since the 1940's with most taking office in the 1960's. I do not mean to imply that these gentlemen are not capable of resolving California's dilemma, but I wonder if many will turn back the pages of history?

From this brief background history of California's State taxation, you can see how the emphasis has shifted to meet the changing needs of a growing State—sometimes too late—sometimes too little—but still innovative on occasion. Limitations on taxation have essentially been legislative and on occasion through constitutional amendments. As stated earlier, there is a certain element of inflexibility in the State's tax structure. Rather than setting rates for specified tax resources, which will respond to the changing economy and produce needed revenues with surpluses to tide over the deficits, the routine is to change rates and exemptions, and to scrounge around, hopefully, for new sources—such as a windfall from withholding personal income taxes and now a statewide property tax.

2. *Local units of government*—The major source of local tax revenue has been, and remains, the property tax. However, sales taxes and business license taxes, plus grants and shared revenues, constitute a growing portion of local tax revenues.

The power of local governments to levy property taxes is subject to constitutional or statutory restrictions in most States.

The restrictions take the form of maximum limitations on the allowable tax rate related to assessed value of taxable property.

Although restrictions on property taxes have existed throughout the history of the tax, limitations as we know them, originated in the several States at different times after about 1876 and before 1940. Their introduction was generally associated with efforts to reduce or contain local government expenditures under the stress of depressed economic conditions. A few property tax limitations came into being as companion measures to restrictions on the borrowing powers of local governments.

The initial effect of the impositions of tax limitations was to arrest the growth of local property taxes and in some cases to reduce them, particularly where their introduction came at the beginning of a period of declining property values. The economic collapse of the 1930's produced the most recent flurry of activity aimed at limiting local property tax powers when several States enacted particularly stringent measures, generally amending their constitutions.

a. *California counties:* The Board of Supervisors is empowered to fix the rate at which such property shall be taxed. The figure is determined by the amount of approved budget requirements after deducting the unencumbered cash balances, centrally collected revenues, State shared costs, and locally collected levies, fines and fees. In effect there is no property tax limitation. Some expenditures are fixed by State law and are beyond the discretion of the Board of Supervisors. Article XIII of the California constitution specifies the basis of property valuations on which a tax is based.

b. *California cities* derive their power to tax property from the general laws of the State or from their own charters. Maximum tax rates, which may be exceeded only by vote of the people, for general purposes are $1.00 per $100 of assesed valuation, except on specific programs such as retirement, debt service and certain expenditures for park, recreation and library activities. Charter cities in many instances have tax rate limits in their charters.

c. *California school districts*—Schools are financed by an annual property tax, a large amount of State grants-in-aid, small sums through Federal grants, and, in a few cases, by city appropriation. The school district tax is actually levied by the county board of supervisors, which is required by law to set a tax rate adequate to finance the budget submitted to it by the district governing body. There are tax limits for each type of district, and levies exceeding these limits require a favorable vote of district residents—such as a pay-as-you-go capital improvement program, a State school building loan, or an over-ride tax to conform to the Field Act.

d. *California special districts*—Districts are financed by bonds, taxes, special assessments, service charges and grants from local government units and from the State, and even the Federal government in some instances.

Most districts may levy an annual tax upon property in the district. The tax base may include personal property and improvements, as well as real property, depending upon the particular enabling act. Many entities have been given a tax limit. In substance, special districts have many variations with little uniformity in their financial provisions.

C. Constitutional and statutory rate limitations on State and local bonds

Another significant limitation on the ability of State and local government to obtain needed financing during periods of high interest rates are interest rate ceilings on their bonds. These limitations may apply to general obligation bonds, bonds issued by specific units of local government or may apply to all classes and types of bonds. The limitations are not always uniform, reflecting the urgency of needed legislation to raise the ceiling on one or more particular classes of local government rather than across the board.

Currently among the 50 States, 27 have no rate ceiling on State general obligation bonds, while 23 have ceilings ranging from 5½% for Montana to 10% for Texas and Tennessee. Certain States raised their ceilings for a temporary period.

It is interesting to note that the States that have no rate ceiling on their general obligation bonds, almost universally set no limit on other State issues as well as local issues. Those that do have rate ceilings have various limits on their other State borrowing as well as local borrowing.

1. *California*—You will recall that during the tight money period of 1968–1969, the State of California, and many school districts, could not sell their bonds previously authorized because of a 5% rate ceiling. Cities and counties had some latitude as the ceiling was 6%, unless bonds were voted with a lower limit. Other local units of government had some difficulty in marketing their bonds because of varying ceilings.

As a result, legislation was introduced in the State Legislature to raise the ceilings. There was no serious opposition, however, once the legislation became law, it did not apply to previously authorized debt approved while the lower ceilings were in effect. This meant that bond issues would have to be re-submitted to the voters if the higher ceiling was to be used. Many governing bodies were reluctant to do this on the theory voters would turn them down. However, those that decided to re-submit the bond issues invariably found the voters approving their prior mandate. For those who did not go back to the voters all sorts of schemes were concocted to find a buyer at the old statutory rates. These ranged from shortening the maturities, inducing those who would benefit from the sale of property and construction, to purchase all or a sizable portion of the bond issue, and by increasing deposits of public monies in financial institutions to encourage their investment in the bonds. Some financial institutions continued their policy of financing local government through purchase of their bonds at the old statutory limit until legislation raising the ceilings was enacted.

The State of California presented a different problem. With about $1.3 billion voted but unsold bonds, inability to sell its Water Resources bonds and School Building Aid bonds, meant potential losses to contractors and possible greater increased start-up costs to the State as well as local school districts if construction was stopped.

To remedy the situation the statutory ceiling was raised to 7% and a constitutional amendment was submitted to the voters, which was approved, raising the ceiling to 7% on the authorized but unsold bonds. It also provided that the rate could be raised beyond this ceiling by a two-thirds approving majority of both houses of the Legislature and by the Governor.

D. Statutory limitations on redemption of State and local debt

While often minimized, limitations on redemption of debt are an important factor in determining the ultimate cost of public improvements.

A simple rule of thumb calculation will indicate that the longer the average life of a bond issue, the greater the interest cost. In other words, the longer a bond issue runs, the more interest accrues on the unpaid balance and the interest rate is higher. This is why opponents to bond financing in general or favor a pay-as-you-go plan, point out that it is not just the principal of a bond issue that must be paid back, but the interest as well

Another factor is the annual tax required to maintain the property or improvement once acquired or completed.

I will not attempt to discuss maturity limitations imposed on public debt in other States as they vary widely. However, they all attempt to do about the same thing—that is to ease the repayment of a debt over a reasonable period without excessive annual increments which would tend to impact the tax rate to the distress of property owners and to relate the redemption period to the potential useful life of the property acquired or the capital improvement constructed.

California's constitution of 1849 set the maximum maturity for State debt at 20 years. In the passage of time this was raised to 75 years and subsequently reduced to 50 years.

The Constitution of 1879 set the maximum maturity for county, city and school district debt at 20 years, similar to the State limitation. This was raised to 40 years in 1892 and has remained there ever since.

It is interesting to note that in an amendment to the State constitution in 1906, the City and County of San Francisco, the City of San Jose and the Town of Santa Clara, were granted a maximum maturity of 75 years on debt as an aftermath of the 1906 earthquake.

Special district and authority debt have varying limitations on maturities specified in their respective statutes too numerous to mention but patterned after the constitutional provisions for state, county, city and school district debt.

E. Constitutional and statutory limitations on voting requirements of bond issues

No type of limitation on local indebtedness is more basic than the requirement of popular approval. As in other debt limitations, there are a great many variations between States and within States for different levels of government.

Some States require only the action of a governing body and currently some 32 States require only a simple majority vote. Restrictions involving property ownership as a basis of approval have gradually been modified or eliminated by court action.

California's extraordinary majority voting requirement (two-thirds approving majority) as defined in Article XI, Section 18 of the State Constitution has been the subject of much debate. It applies to all "county, city, town, township, board of education or school district" indebtedness.

This provision was declared unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court on June 30, 1970. The case was appealed to the United States Supreme Court which reversed the decision of the California court June 7, 1971. Chief Justice Warren Burger stated in the majority opinion, and I quote in part:

"It must be remembered that in voting to issue bonds, voters are commiting in part the credit of infants and of generations yet unborn, and some restriction of such commitment is not an unreasonable demand. That the bond issued may have the desirable objective of providing better education for future generations goes to the wisdom of an indebtedness limitation—it does not alter the basic fact that the balancing of interests is one for the State to resolve." (Unquote)

In a recent (August 1971) California poll conducted by the Field Research Corporation and reported in the September 21, 1971 San Francisco Chronicle, there is indicated a definite trend by California voters to lower the voting requirement. Some 56% favor lowering to 60% with 32% favoring the two-thirds retention. However, while 37% favor lowering to a simple majority, 49% oppose.

The incongruity of the constitutional voting requirement is that only a simple majority is required to pass general obligation bonds of the State of California, while special districts and authorities not covered by Article XI, Section 18 have various voting requirements. To further complicate the problem, California local government has resorted to borrowing, using various devices not considered debt in the constitutional sense, thus evading all of the limitations we have been discussing.

There is an element of emotion involved in the pros and cons of changing California's extraordinary majority voting requirement. Concern over higher taxes resulting from an anticipated increase in approved bond issues must be weighed against the need for the proposed improvements and the devices which local government substitutes for the general obligation bond issue—which inevitably means higher taxes without voter approval. The potential impact of the 18 year old vote has many tax conscious organizations and individuals rushing to the barricades to repel any change in Article XI, Section 18.

However, the State Legislature is considering legislation which will reduce the majority voting requirement to 60% and may also require certain forms of "Phantom debt", currently not subject to a vote, to be voted on in the same manner as general obligation debt.

At this point I should emphasize that general obligation bonds supported by the unlimited taxing power of the issuing unit of government on property subject to taxation by the governmental unit represents the optimum form of borrowing in terms of lower interest costs to the issuer.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We have explored the various restrictions on debt and taxation which exist in various State constitutions and their respective statutes, with particular emphasis on the State of California.

Each of the restrictions, whether it is the amount of debt, authority to tax, maximum interest rate, length of maturity or voting requirement, have been considered safeguards. Not only for the voter and taxpayer, but for the bondholder as well.

They have stood the test of time and have not been subject to frequent or drastic changes as a matter of degree. Case law has been established within these limitations and State and local government have carried out their responsibilities accordingly.

California has benefited from these basic limitations as they have been sound—insuring favorable response from voters and investors.

Having said this—is there any reason for change and what changes should receive priority? In my opinion there are ample reasons for change which I will enumerate. However, change should only be accomplished after a thorough study of alternatives and potential pitfalls. This calls for expert advice and adequate resources to accomplish.

What then are the reasons for change? Certainly not because it is convenient, expedient or self-serving. Rather it is to recognize the need for greater flexibility in State and local finance—to recognize that government is "big business" and that public officials today are largely professional and dedicated individuals. To understand that demands on State and local government to provide all services and all public facilities, and to maintain environmental quality as needed and desired by their respective constituents is placing a major burden on their financial resources. To understand the interdependence between all levels of government for their tax and revenue resources, to be prepared for emergencies, and lastly, to appreciate the inter-play of all levels of government when raising funds in the bond market. I am confident there are other reasons which may occur to you, but I think these points are the most obvious.

How should one go about making the changes? Due to the complexities of the several subjects—they do not lend themselves to a simple solution. However, here are some suggestions that might serve as guidelines which could lead to desired goals.

A. Commission

Following a time-honored custom it would seem to be appropriate to appoint a commission either by the Legislature or the Governor to study and recommend legislation to provide financial flexibility for State and local government in California. It might comprise representatives from the following categories:

1. Constitutional officers, applicable committees, and staff of the Legislatures and departmental staff could ably assist the commission.

2. Associations representing public officials and units of government could have a tremendous input.

3. Our universities and colleges could be tapped for their applicable resources.

4. Professionals in taxation, law, economics, public finance, banking, institutional investors and investment bankers, could make a significant contribution.

5. Voters and taxpayers, either individually or through organizations, or legislative advocates could balance the judgment of others.

To activate a commission would probably require legislative action and an appropriation. The commission should have established goals and a target date to report back with interim reports to be filed.

B. Goals

1. *Constitution*—This has been undergoing a piecemeal process of amendment with divergent views as to the nature and composition of changes. It is essential that constitutional provisions concerning the debt and borrowing power of State and local government should be limited to matters that involve basic principles. The details should be left to statutory enlargement.

2. *Statutes*—Several years ago the general laws of the State of California were codified with the result that the Acts of the Legislature are spread among various codes and the constitution. There is no compendium that would bring together in one code all acts relating to State and local debt matters. An Assembly Interim Committee on Municipal and County Government made a good start on this and I am sure there are additional excellent references. This is a desirable goal to provide ready reference, eliminate unnecessary legislation and to provide uniformity in debt incurrence.

3. *Debt limitations*—As the State of California has been the most prolific borrower and has no debt limit—the need for a debt limit and how it should be computed, should be explored. While there are many theories on local debt limitations, the most important question is—What constitutes debt? This would seem to be a very important subject for study in view of current abuses which evade debt limits.

4. *Taxation*—This covers a wide spectrum and has been studied by many commissions and committees. Rather than rehash the studies of the past—what is needed is a balancing of tax and revenue resources to insure adequate funding of governmental operations and as a back-up for borrowing. With so much concern over property taxation—debt which has unlimited access to the property tax could be limited to non-self liquidating priority projects—while other debt that is self-liquidating or with lower priority be supported by dedicated revenues or users fees or simply the general fund. This should be a fruitful area to develop. Certainly the periodic surfacing of initiative measures to limit or reduce property taxes in California such as the Jarvis Property Tax Ceiling Ini-

tiative, the Watson Proposal and Dorn Proposal, indicate a need for a tax overhaul.

5. *Interest rate limitations*—It is very easy to say that interest rate limitations should be fixed at the highest conceivable rate or no limitations, but difficult to achieve. Looking back a few years 5% seemed pretty high and 6% was way out and 7%—something must be wrong with the bond. Yet we saw these rates exceeded time and again in recent years. It would be important to study the effect of rate limitations on the borrower, taxpayer, and those benefiting from the bond issue. In addition, it would be desirable to measure the impact of competitive bidding on new municipal bond issues as a stabilizing effect in maintaining responsive borrowing costs.

6. *Maturity limitations*—Some guidelines are needed to assist local government in determining the useful life of capital improvements and acquired property within their capacity to borrow. Maximum maturities are desirable but if used in paying for a fire truck or street sweeper as in the case of a sewer system or waterworks, could lead to financial complications.

7. *Voting requirements*—California will probably change its majority voting requirements, but it should not be a simple case study. What has happened in other States, with either a simple majority or less than two-third majority vote, could produce some interesting criteria. Granting authority to certain levels of government to authorize debt without a vote for specified purposes and within certain limits should be considered. In keeping with a need for a definition of debt, the desirability of including any debt which impacts the tax rate within the several debt limitations should be determined.

8. *Funding and refunding debt*—While statutes provide for refunding debt prior to maturity—procedures to accomplish refunding are not explicit. In other words, permissive power does not activate and so when the need arises to refund—about the only procedure available is to vote a refunding bond issue—costly and time consuming. A study of refunding techniques, the pros and cons—and relative costs of selling callable bonds as compared to non-callable bonds—would be in order.

Recognizing the need for occasional restructuring of debt through funding could be added to the study of refunding.

9. *Intergovernmental relations*—A commission to be effective—comes into being—does its work—and makes its recommendations. It seldom can do more than this—except to appear before legislative committees in support of its legislative recommendations. This is not enough as each session of the Legislature produces an abundance of new legislation relating to State and local financial matters. There should be some State agency to "advise and consent" to insure that basic principles are adhered to and that needed changes are uniformally sound. There are many other desirable functions that such a State agency could perform, not only in the interests of good government, but for the electorate as a whole. I have called this State agency the California Bureau of Intergovernmental Relations, for want of a better title. Its creation should not wait for the appointment of the proposed commission on financing State and local government, but should be "in being" as soon as possible to insure continuity in its effectiveness.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In concluding my remarks, I hope I have awakened your interest. Taxation, debt, representation and public improvements, both necessary and desired, are at best somewhat dull subjects—but they are everyones business.

Individuals such as yourselves, representing the academic and business community, should be concerned. The subjects I have covered today affect your family, your home, your business, your professions and the institutions that serve our spiritual, educational, recreational and artistic needs. They need your attention, understanding and involvement. Let us cross the threshhold together to insure California's continued growth and prosperity.

ANALYSIS OF THE WORLD COURT OPINION ON NAMIBIA

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, in his address to the 26th session of the General Assembly of the United Nations on October 4, the Secretary of State declared that:

In Africa, where the right to a freer existence is still denied to many, we are constant in our support of practical and peaceful means to achieve self-determination and end racial discrimination. That is the policy which President Nixon and I were pleased to confirm to the President of Mauritania and the distinguished delegation from the Organization of African Unity in Washington last week. Consistent with that objective we have decided to accept the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legal consequences for states of South Africa's continuing occupation of Namibia.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the RECORD both, first, the answer to the question put by the Security Council to the court on the legal consequences for states of the continued presence in Namibia of South Africa, notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276, and, second, the analysis of the opinion of the court prepared by the Registry of the International Court of Justice for the use of the press:

ANSWER TO THE QUESTION

In answer to the question put by the Security Council of the United Nations, "What are the legal consequences for States of the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970)?", the Court is of opinion, by 13 votes to 2,

(1) that, the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia being illegal, South Africa is under obligation to withdraw its administration from Namibia immediately and thus put an end to its occupation of the Territory;

by 11 votes to 4,

(2) that States Members of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia and the invalidity of its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia, and to refrain from any acts and in particular any dealings with the Government of South Africa implying recognition of the legality of, or lending support or assistance to, such presence and administration;

(3) that it is incumbent upon States which are not Members of the United Nations to give assistance, within the scope of subparagraph (2) above, in the action which has been taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia.

ANALYSIS OF THE ADVISORY OPINION

Course of the Proceedings (paragraphs 1–18 of the Advisory Opinion)

The Court first recalls that the request for the advisory opinion emanated from the United Nations Security Council, which decided to submit it by resolution 284 (1970) adopted on 29 July 1970. The Court goes on to recapitulate the different steps in the subsequent proceedings.

It refers in particular to the three Orders of 26 January 1971 whereby the Court decided not to accede to the objections raised by the Government of South Africa against the participation in the proceedings of three Members of the Court. These objections were based on statements which the Judges in question had made in a former capacity as representatives of their Governments in United Nations organs dealing with matters concerning Namibia, or on their participation in the same capacity in the work of those organs. The Court came to the conclusion that none of the three cases called for the application of Article 17, paragraph 2, of its Statute.

Objections Against the Court's Dealing With the Question (paras. 19–41 of the Advisory Opinion)

The Government of South Africa contended that the Court was not competent to deliver the opinion, because Security Council resolution 284 (1970) was invalid for the following reasons: (*a*) two permanent members of the Council abstained during the voting (Charter of the United Nations, Art. 27, para. 3); (*b*) as the question related to a dispute between South Africa and other Members of the United Nations, South Africa should have been invited to participate in the discussion (Charter, Art. 32) and the proviso requiring members of the Security Council which are parties to a dispute to abstain from voting should have been observed (Charter, Art. 27, para. 3). The Court points out that (*a*) for a long period the voluntary abstention of a permanent member has consistently been interpreted as not constituting a bar to the adoption of resolutions by the Security Council; (*b*) the question of Namibia was placed on the agenda of the Council as a *situation* and the South African Government failed to draw the Council's attention to the necessity in its eyes of treating it as a *dispute*.

In the alternative the Government of South Africa maintained that even if the Court had competence it should nevertheless, as a matter of judicial propriety, refuse to give the opinion requested, on account of political pressure to which, it was contended, the Court had been or might be subjected. On 8 February 1971, at the opening of the public sittings, the President of the Court declared that it would not be proper for the Court to entertain those observations, bearing as they did on the very nature of the Court as the principal judicial organ of the United Nations, an organ which, in that capacity, acts only on the basis of law, independently of all outside influences or interventions whatsoever.

The Government of South Africa also advanced another reason for not giving the advisory opinion requested; that the question was in reality contentious, because it related to an existing dispute between South Africa and other States. The Court considers that it was asked to deal with a request put forward by a United Nations organ with a view to seeking legal advice on the consequences of its own decisions. The fact that, in order to give its answer, the Court might have to pronounce on legal questions upon which divergent views exist between South Africa and the United Nations does not convert the case into a dispute between States. (There was therefore no necessity to apply Article 83 of the Rules of Court, according to which, if an advisory opinion is requested upon a legal question "actually pending between two or more States," Article 31 of the Statute, dealing with judges ad hoc, is applicable; the Government of South Africa having requested leave to choose a judge ad hoc, the Court heard its observations on that point on

27 January 1971 but, in the light of the above considerations, decided by the Order of 29 January 1971 not to accede to that request.)

In sum, the Court saw no reason to decline to answer the request for an advisory opinion.

History of the Mandate (paras. 42–86 of the Advisory Opinion)

Refuting the contentions of the South African Government and citing its own pronouncements in previous proceedings concerning South West Africa (Advisory Opinions of 1950, 1955 and 1956; Judgment of 1962), the Court recapitulates the history of the Mandate.

The mandates system established by Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations was based upon two principles of paramount importance: the principle of nonannexation and the principle that the well-being and development of the peoples concerned formed a sacred trust of civilization. Taking the developments of the past half-century into account, there can be little doubt that the ultimate objective of the sacred trust was self-determination and independence. The mandatory was to observe a number of obligations, and the Council of the League was to see that they were fulfilled. The rights of the mandatory as such had their foundation in those obligations.

When the League of Nations was dissolved, the raison d'être and original object of these obligations remained. Since their fulfillment did not depend on the existence of the League, they could not be brought to an end merely because the supervisory organ had ceased to exist. The Members of the League had not declared, or accepted even by implication, that the mandates would be cancelled or lapse with the dissolution of the League.

The last resolution of the League Assembly and Article 80, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter maintained the obligations of mandatories. The International Court of Justice has consistently recognized that the Mandate survived the demise of the League, and South Africa also admitted as much for a number of years. Thus the supervisory element, which is an essential part of the Mandate, was bound to survive. The United Nations suggested a system of supervision which would not exceed that which applied under the mandates system, but this proposal was rejected by South Africa.

Resolutions by the General Assembly and the Security Council (paras. 87–116 of the Advisory Opinion)

Eventually, in 1966, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolution 2145 (XXI), whereby it decided that the Mandate was terminated and that South Africa had no other right to administer the Territory. Subsequently the Security Council adopted various resolutions including resolution 276 (1970) declaring the continued presence of South Africa in Namibia illegal. Objections challenging the validity of these resolutions have been raised, the Court points out that it does not possess powers of judicial review or appeal in relation to the United Nations organs in question. Nor does the validity of their resolutions form the subject of the request for advisory opinion. The Court nevertheless, in the exercise of its judicial function, and since these objections have been advanced, considers them in the course of its reasoning before determining the legal consequences arising from those resolutions.

It first recalls that the entry into force of the United Nations Charter established a relationship between all Members of the United Nations on the one side, and each mandatory Power on the other, and that one of the fundamental principles governing that relationship is that the party which disowns or does not fulfill its obligations cannot be recognized as retaining the rights which it claims to derive from the relationship. Resolution 2145 (XXI) determined that there had been a material breach of the Mandate, which South Africa had in fact disavowed.

It has been contended (*a*) that the Covenant of the League of Nations did not confer on the Council of the League power to terminate a mandate for misconduct of the mandatory and that the United Nations could not derive from the League greater powers than the latter itself had; (*b*) that, even if the Council of the League had possessed the power of revocation of the Mandate, it could not have been exercised unilaterally but only in co-operation with the Mandatory; (*c*) that resolution 2145 (XXI) made pronouncements which the General Assembly, not being a judicial organ, was not competent to make; (*d*) that a detailed factual investigation was called for; (*e*) that one part of resolution 2145 (XXI) decided in effect a transfer of territory.

The Court observes (*a*) that, according to a general principle of international law (incorporated in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties), the right to terminate a treaty on account of breach must be presumed to exist in respect of all treaties even if unexpressed; (*b*) that the consent of the wrongdoer to such a form of termination cannot be required; (*c*) that the United Nations, as a successor to the League, acting through its competent organ, must be seen above all as the supervisory institution competent to pronounce on the conduct of the Mandatory; (*d*) that the failure of South Africa to comply with the obligation to submit to supervision cannot be disputed; (*e*) that the General Assembly was not making a finding on facts, but formulating a legal situation; it would not be correct to assume that, because it is in principle vested with recommendatory powers, it is debarred from adopting, in special cases within the framework of its competence, resolutions which make determinations or have operative design.

The General Assembly, however, lacked the necessary powers to ensure the withdrawal of South Africa from the Territory and therefore, acting in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Charter, enlisted the cooperation of the Security Council. The Council for its part, when it adopted the resolutions concerned, was acting in the exercise of what it deemed to be its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security. Article 24 of the Charter vests in the Security Council the necessary authority. Its decisions were taken in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter, under Article 25 of which it is for member States to comply with those decisions, even those members of the Security Council which voted against them and those Members of the United Nations who are not members of the Council.

Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (paras. 117–127 and 133 of the Advisory Opinion)

The Court stresses that a binding determination made by a competent organ of the United Nations to the effect that a situation is illegal cannot remain without consequence.

South Africa, being responsible for having created and maintained that situation, has the obligation to put an end to it and withdraw its administration from the Territory. By occupying the Territory without title, South Africa incurs international responsibilities arising from a continuing violation of an international obligation. It also remains accountable for any violations of the rights of the people of Namibia, or of its obligations under international law towards other States in respect of the exercise of its powers in relation to the Territory.

The Member States of the United Nations are under obligation to recognize the illegality and invalidity of South Africa's continued presence in Namibia and to refrain from lending any support or any form of assistance to South Africa with reference to its occupation of Namibia. The precise determination of the acts permitted—what measures should be selected, what scope they should be given and by whom they should be applied—is a matter which lies within the competence of the appropriate political organs of the United Nations acting within their authority under the Charter. Thus it is for the Security Council to determine any further measures consequent upon the decisions already taken by it. The Court in consequence confines itself to giving advice on those dealings with the Government of South Africa which, under the Charter of the United Nations and general international law, should be considered as inconsistent with resolution 276 (1970) because they might imply recognizing South Africa's presence in Namibia as legal:

(*a*) Member States are under obligation (subject to (*d*)) below to abstain from entering into treaty relations with South Africa in all cases in which the Government of South Africa purports to act on behalf of or concerning Namibia. With respect to existing bilateral treaties, member States must abstain from invoking or applying those treaties or provisions of treaties concluded by South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which involve active intergovernmental co-operation. With respect to multilateral treaties, the same rule cannot be applied to certain general conventions such as those with humanitarian character, the nonperformance of which may adversely affect the people of Namibia: it will be for the competent international organs to take specific measures in this respect.

(*b*) Member States are under obligation to abstain from sending diplomatic or special missions to South Africa including in their jurisdiction the territory of Namibia, to abstain from sending consular agents to Namibia, and to withdraw any such agents already there; and to make it clear to South Africa that the maintenance of diplomatic or consular relations does not imply any recognition of its authority with regard to Namibia.

(*c*) Member States are under obligation to abstain from entering into economic and other forms of relations with South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia which may entrench its authority over the territory.

(*d*) However, non-recognition should not result in depriving the people of Namibia of any advantages derived from international co-operation. In particular, the illegality or invalidity of acts performed by the Government of South Africa on behalf of or concerning Namibia after the termination of the Mandate cannot be extended to such acts as the registration of births, deaths and marriages.

As to States not Members of the United Nations, although they are not bound by Articles 24 and 25 of the Charter, they have been called upon by resolution 276 (1970) to give assistance in the action which has taken by the United Nations with regard to Namibia. In the view of the Court, the termination of the Mandate and the declaration of the illegality of South Africa's presence in Namibia are opposable to all States in the sense of barring *erga omnes* the legality of the situation which is maintained in violation of international law. In particular, no State which enters into relations with South Africa concerning Namibia may expect the United Nations or its Members to recognize the validity or effects of any such relationship. The Mandate having been terminated by a decision of the international organization in which the supervisory authority was vested, it is for non-member States to act accordingly. All States should

bear in mind that the entity injured by the illegal presence of South Africa in Namibia is a people which must look to the international community for assistance in its progress towards the goals for which the sacred trust was instituted.

Accordingly, the Court has given the replies reproduced above on page 1.

Propositions by South Africa concerning the supply of further factual information and the possible holding of a plebiscite (Paras. 128–132 of the Advisory Opinion).

The Government of South Africa had expressed the desire to supply the Court with further factual information concerning the purposes and objectives of its policy of separate development, contending that to establish a breach of its substantive international obligations under the Mandate it would be necessary to prove that South Africa had failed to exercise its powers with a view to promoting the well-being and progress of the inhabitants. The Court found that no factual evidence was needed for the purpose of determining whether the policy of *apartheid* in Namibia was in conformity with the international obligations assumed by South Africa. It is undisputed that the official governmental policy pursued by South Africa in Namibia is to achieve a complete physical separation of races and ethnic groups. This means the enforcement of distinctions, exclusions, restrictions and limitations exclusively based on grounds of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin which constitute a denial of fundamental human rights. This the Court views as a flagrant violation of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Government of South Africa had also submitted a request that a plebiscite should be held in the Territory of Namibia under the joint supervision of the Court and the Government of South Africa. The Court having concluded that no further evidence was required, that the Mandate had been validly terminated and that in consequence South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal and its acts on behalf of or concerning Namibia illegal and invalid, it was not able to entertain this proposal.

THE FHA GHOST TOWNS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, if the current trend continues, the Department of Housing and Urban Development will own one out of every 20 Detroit houses 1 year from now. These houses are acquired through foreclosure of FHA-insured mortgages. According to a Detroit News article of October 11, by staff writer Don Ball, mismanagement of the FHA mortgage insurance program has resulted in HUD's present inventory of 3,000 homes in the city of Detroit, acquired at a cost of $30 million to the insurance fund. Razing these structures will constitute an additional $7 million loss to the fund, compared to the $12 million cost of refurbishing the houses for resale. Either course is far too expensive a proposition for both the FHA insurance fund and Detroit's housing stock. Unless new solutions are found to correct this housing and urban deterioration, many more families will flee the city without really wishing to do so, and those who cannot will be trapped in a ghost town.

To understand the enormity of this problem and the necessity of immediate action for not only Detroit but other major cities across the Nation, I urge my colleagues to read this article. The article follows:

HUD—RELUCTANT OWNER OF 4,200 VACANT HOUSES

(By Don Ball)

Abuses and mismanagement of FHA mortgage insurance programs have turned some Detroit neighborhoods into "ghost towns" where a handful of families exists amid vandalized and fire-gutted houses.

The reluctant owner of the vacant homes is the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), the Federal agency charged with upgrading problem neighborhoods.

HUD owns one out of every 68 homes in Detroit—a total of 4,200 of the city's 287,000 single-family and duplex houses.

The agency acquired these residences through repossession after foreclosures on FHA-insured mortgages, and, because of their unfavorable location and other problems, cannot resell them.

The HUD inventory of vacant houses is only a hint of a larger problem beneath the surface, however.

If the current trend of HUD repossessions continues—and an analysis of FHA files by The Detroit News indicates this is a distinct possibility—the agency will own about one out of every 20 Detroit houses a year from now, including entire blocks in some city areas.

HUD is stuck with these "white elephants" and it is costing taxpayers millions of dollars.

The News' analysis included files on the 303 Detroit homes repossessed by HUD in August, a 10 percent sample of repossessions in the city during the March-to-August period, and other FHA records made available by William C. Whitbeck, director of the Detroit-area HUD office.

Additional statistics were provided by the Washington office of HUD.

HUD officials have confirmed that the same problem exists in such other major cities as Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, and New York.

It is aggravated in Detroit because the city has such a large number of single and duplex homes.

Interviews with local HUD officials and analysis of FHA records revealed:

HUD repossessed some 2,300 Detroit homes during the first eight months of this year, almost doubling the number of vacant homes to which it held title as of last Jan. 1.

So far this year, HUD has rehabilitated and resold 529 Detroit homes. About 600 were rehabilitated and resold last year.

Despite these sales, the total number of empty Detroit homes owned by HUD has more than quadrupled since Jan. 1, 1970.

(By comparison, the previous peak of homes repossessed because of foreclosures of FHA-insured mortgages in the Detroit area was reached in March 1964, when the federal agency held title to 2,911 properties, of which 90 percent were outside the city.

HUD records indicate the number of repossessions will increase in the coming months. Sheriff's sales have been held on another 3,400 Detroit homes with FHA-insured mortgages and nine out of 10 of these will be repossessed by HUD in the next six months. FHA-insured mortgages on an additional 18,000 Detroit homes are three months or more in default, and HUD eventually will repossess about half of these.

About 80 percent of the homes repossessed so far this year were sold originally under FHA programs for low income families.

Large numbers of HUD-repossessed homes are concentrated in two areas, one on the eastside and the other in the middle of the city. HUD owns nearly 8 percent of the homes in the east side area bounded by Mack, Gratiot, Woodward, the Detroit River and Alter. It holds title to more than 2½ percent of the homes in the area bounded by Fenkell, Wyoming, Plymouth, West Grand Boulevard and Highland Park.

A map prepared by The News showing the location of HUD-repossessed homes in Detroit emphasizes the gravity of the problem.

It appears from FHA files that the problem also exists to a lesser degree in other southeast Michigan cities such as Flint, Pontiac, Hazel Park, Highland Park, Inster, Madison Heights and Warren.

The statistics relating to Detroit are chilling.

But the real problem for the city and to its homeowners is starkly outlined by a tour of the neighborhoods involved.

On some east side streets only a few families remain in the homes on an entire block.

The renters among them are preparing to move.

Families buying their homes with FHA-insured mortgages have the choice of staying on in a "ghost town" of vacant dwellings or defaulting on their mortgages and moving.

One such area includes the first two blocks of an east side street south of Jefferson.

The problems on the street started early in 1968 after Congress enacted special programs to permit low income families to buy homes with minimum down payments and at the same time extended FHA mortgage insurance to homes in "older, declining neighborhoods" of the nation's cities.

About the same time, mothers receiving assistance from the aid to families with dependent children (ADC) programs became qualified to buy homes under FHA-insured mortgage programs.

There are 84 homes on the first two blocks of the street south of Jefferson. Wayne County Tract Index records show that since early 1968, 52 of these houses have been sold under FHA programs for low income families. ADC mothers made up a substantial segment of the buyers.

In all but one case, the sellers of homes were real estate speculators who had bought cheaply and sold at much higher prices in line with FHA appraisals.

Mortgages in 24 of the sales have since been foreclosed and a dozen of the other homes face foreclosures. All the homes are vacant.

Although every effort is made to secure empty homes owned by HUD in Detroit, all too often they become dope dens, hangouts for hoodlums or fire-gutted wrecks which are potential death traps for children.

The same story is true on dozens of other Detroit streets suffering the same problem.

Like a cancerous growth, the vacant homes are spreading along these streets and to adjoining streets.

HUD cannot rehabilitate and sell the empty houses it owns on these streets because no one wants to buy a home surrounded by vacant dwellings, some of which are burned out and most of them vandalized.

Real estate investment firms say they are not rehabilitating and selling homes in these areas because of tough restrictions imposed by HUD last January.

Actually, investment firms are not active in those areas because they have been no more successful than HUD in finding buyers for homes there.

Investment firms reaped their profits from the area and have moved since to the middle city and outlying areas north of McNichols.

At present, then, HUD is stuck with a large number of repossessed homes and that is another facet of the problem—the cost to the FHA insurance fund.

Each person buying a home with an FHA-insured mortgage pays one-tenth of 1 per-

cent of the principal of his mortgage into the FHA insurance fund each month.

The fund totals about $1.7 billion and protects lending institutions against defaults on FHA-insured mortgages.

When a mortgage is foreclosed and HUD takes possession, the insurance fund pays off the lending institution holding the mortgage.

A basic premise of the FHA mortgage insurance program is that a home repossessed because of default can be refurbished and resold with the net loss to the insurance fund amounting only to the expense of refurbishing and the sales costs.

This rests on the assumption that the home was a sound structure when it was sold and the mortgage first insured by the FHA.

The FHA appraisal of the home prior to its sale was supposed to guarantee the home as a sound insurance risk for the FHA.

Based on the findings of investigations of The News over the last eight months, however, hundreds of substandard homes have been given high FHA appraised valuations and sold to unsuspecting families by unscrupulous real estate and investment companies.

The FHA system still is working with homes repossessed by HUD in the northwest and far east areas of the city.

The houses are sound and in desirable neighborhoods. They are sold quickly by HUD with a minimum of rehabilitation needed. The FHA recaptures a major portion of the funds spent on paying off the original mortgages, refurbishing the homes and reselling them.

The opposite is the case with homes repossessed in east side, inner and middle city areas.

HUD had owned hundreds of homes in these areas for as long as 18 months and most of them were substandard when they were sold originally with FHA-insured mortgages.

Although the homes are basically sound, it would cost around $4,000 each to rehabilitate them for resale—if there were any buyers.

The News analysis of the files on the 303 Detroit homes repossessed by HUD in August revealed that two-thirds of the houses are located in middle and inner city areas and east side neighborhoods.

A sampling of files on homes repossessed from March through July indicated the percentage held true for all 2,300 Detroit homes on which HUD has taken title so far this year.

The FHA insurance fund spent more than $23 million to pay off mortgages on homes repossessed in Detroit during the first eight months of this year. More than two-thirds of the money went to pay off mortgages of homes located in the inner and middle city areas and on the east side.

To get a full picture, the homes repossessed in the three areas this year must be added to those on which HUD took title in 1969 and 1970.

That brings HUD's inventory in the areas up to some 3,000 homes, acquired at a cost of about $30 million to the insurance fund.

An estimated $12 million would have to be spent on rehabilitating the homes for resale—if they could be sold.

As it is, HUD has started tearing down hundreds of the homes.

The demolition program started 16 months ago and 289 houses have been razed. Another 463 are scheduled for demolition.

The razing program will result in a net loss of some $7 million to the insurance fund after sale of the raw land from which the homes are removed.

HUD and Detroit cannot afford to have all 3,000 repossessed homes torn down in the middle and inner city and east side areas, however.

Neither can they permit the repossessed homes to remain vacant to imperil the neighbors and cause other families to leave.

Either course would be far too expensive in costs to the insurance fund and the city's housing stock.

While the losses to date and the potential for future losses are great for the city and HUD, the real losers are the families who bought and then lost their homes under the programs and the families who own homes in the hardest hit areas and are trapped there.

Unless some solutions are found, new areas will be blighted by the spread of vacant homes—and more Detroit families will be trapped.

MISS LILY PETER, THE ARKANSAS TRAVELER

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, during our efforts in the Congress and across the Nation to revitalize our small towns and communities and improve the lot of agriculture, our focus sometimes becomes narrow. We begin seeing this segment of our population only in terms of their needs. We too infrequently remember the contributions these people have made and are making to our national life.

To bring back to mind some of these contributions, I would like to share with my colleagues a story about one of the most remarkable farmers I know. She is an extremely talented woman whose interests and accomplishments are impressive. A newspaper article written by Henry Mitchell of the Washington Post recently recounted some of the many activities of Miss Lily Peter, of Marvell, Ark. It was published during Miss Peter's recent visit to Washington to attend a performance at the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The occasion was the first chamber music concert at the new center. She was a sponsor of the concert of Moravian music. Miss Peter is a descendant of Johann Friedrich Peter, who in the 18th century was one of the Moravians who produced the first body of chamber music in America.

The news story follows:

ARKANSAS TRAVELER

(By Henry Mitchell)

Lily Peter, of Marvell, Ark., who knows she is a good farmer and hopes she is a poet, stood up for rural America at the Kennedy Center yesterday, merely by being present. For she is an enthusiastic Friend of the Center, and a link with the music of both yesterday and tomorrow.

A sponsor of the concert of Moravian music—the first chamber music concert in the new Center—she also is a descendant of Johann Friedrich Peter, who in the 18th century was one of those learned Moravians who produced the first body of chamber music in America. His second quintetto, composed the year the American Constitution was adopted, was featured yesterday.

The music, like the descendant, was neat, polished; and if the composers were farmers, you are pretty sure they had fine barns and careful records.

Miss Peter sat in a box at the curve of the horseshoe, said she thought the Center was charming and its music glorious. She wore a high-necked, long-sleeved brown silk dress, with a cross of white and blue enamel that belonged to the last Russian czarina.

But most of the year she's out in her fields. She is one of the few women in the world who operates a complicated cotton and soybean plantation. She lives in a plain house, got up at 5 a.m. for years to open the farm store, can run a cotton gin herself, and the Lord only knows the last time she ever lounged on the gallery with a julep.

She is the first woman ever to build two sky-blue cotton gins. The usual old-gray-wood-and-tin gins look dilapidated and she decided a gin might as well look nice. (She is also quite proud of the plantation's safety record).

Her home plantation, out from Marvell, is the one on which International Harvester tested its prototype cotton-picking machines back in the '30s—an invention that as much as anything changed the Delta Country. On her farm (she did not own it then) in those days there were 95 tenant families. Now there are 11.

In the old days, nobody on a cotton farm would have upped and come to Washington the second week of September.

In the Delta Country it doesn't rain in September and October, but it pours in November. The trick is to get the cotton picked before the late rains. But with cotton machinery, you don't start picking until a great deal of the crop is ready—fewer and later pickings, but vastly cheaper than hand labor. So now you don't have to be home in early September.

Though she has seen a few changes in her day, Miss Peter is not altogether old-fashioned. She spends much of her year racing her farm truck over Big Cypress Bayou to the Elaine Equipment Co., 40 miles away, for machine parts. And from time to time she's spotted in small Delta towns looking snappy in her polished black vinyl knee-height boots.

An authority on Hernando de Soto's route through her country in 1541 (though as she points out she was not actually present at the time) she once sent a picture of a locally famous cypress tree to a magazine, as an example of a tree de Soto passed by and must have seen.

A photographer among other things, Miss Peter shot the top of the tree at a distance, then moved in and shot the great base of the tree. The center of the ancient giant she could not shoot at all, since a forest of lesser trees obscured it. When the editor complained the tree didn't have a middle, she said why not just run the top of the tree at the top of the page and the bottom of the trunk at the bottom and just sort of fill in with type. Which was done, and the effect was fine.

A very serious farmer, she knows cocklebuns are botanically Xanthium and she's a walking encyclopedia on the uses of alpha, alpha, alpha-trifluoro-2, 6-denitro-N, N-dipropyl-p-toluidine, one of the well-known weedkillers.

She has also published books of poetry, is an enthusiastic amateur historian and, perhaps above all, a music lover.

Two years ago she sat down and wrote Eugene Ormandy on her plain farm note paper and asked if he'd consider bringing the Philadelphia Orchestra to Arkansas for some concerts.

Ormandy later told reporters he was afraid, at first, that Miss Peter didn't understand the Philadelphia Orchestra didn't just pick up and plop down in Arkansas for the hell of it, but the upshot was the orchestra went to Arkansas, presented some sell-out concerts, and Mr. Ormandy kissed Miss Peter right in front of half of Little Rock on the auditorium stage—a thing Miss Peter remembers with pleasure.

She mortgaged her land for the concerts and dictated that no ticket could cost more than $5—otherwise how could anybody but the rich afford to attend?

Yesterday's program hugely supported by North Carolinians and Pennsylvanians, nevertheless found in the farmer of Marvell a sponsor. Roger Stevens, Kennedy Center chairman, was saying at a luncheon before the concert (attended by box ticket holders at the Watergate Terrace) that the Center really belongs to the nation, not just Washington, "in spite of what some Washingtonians think."

But the problem, as one guest said in a whisper, is whether Lily Peter may not get the whole thing shipped down to Arkansas.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 12, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues here in Congress in pausing to remember the great achievements of Christopher Columbus on this, the first national holiday dedicated to his memory.

Columbus was a prophecy of Americans to come—the immigrant who uprooted himself from his homeland in search of opportunities. This is the legacy of Columbus—our land dedicated to the principle that all men have the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

The dauntless spirit of this great Genoese navigator has profoundly shaped the destiny of the American Nation. As Emerson said:

Every ship that comes to America got its chart from Columbus.

This is true not only in the navigational sense but also in the realm of fortitude and courage. How many millions—Italians, Irish, Swedes, Germans, Mexicans, Chinese—have pulled up roots, and with tenuous financial means, taken the journey to the new land in search of a freer and more prosperous life? Columbus fought against the old ideas and found a fundamental truth. This is true of the men who later fought our revolutionary war, and separated us politically from that from which we were already separated in spirit and thought.

Columbus is a great example—a great light that permits us to understand in a better way our world of today, our people wrought by doubts, by a weary seeking of the truth, but also supported and consoled by faith in themselves.

When Americans pay tribute to Christopher Columbus they express their deep appreciation and gratitude to the people of Italy for their immense contribution to the history and ideals of our country. All Americans feel this gratitude, whether their grandfather came from Italy or some other foreign land, but Italian Americans must be especially proud on this day. For although every group of immigrants has added something to our great country, from this great Italian, Columbus, comes the birth of our land; the beginning of the hopes for a land of the free and the brave.

RALPH NADER

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, I have addressed the House on several occasions on the subject of Ralph Nader, and read with particular interest an editorial in the Detroit Sunday News regarding Nader's recent attack on the American Automobile Association. Ralph Nader has indeed become "Big" Nader and the American people have the right to know more of his motives and expertise in such a diversity of fields. I am pleased to share with my House colleagues the following editorial from the Detroit Sunday News:

AAA ROW NOW DEMANDS A PROBE OF NADER

Challenged by an arrogant and high-handed Ralph Nader, the American Automobile Association recently countered with the novel suggestion that if AAA was to be grilled by Nader, the AAA should in turn get a chance to inquire thoroughly into Nader's objectives, motives and goals.

Nader, however, refused to be interviewed by a trained staff of AAA newsmen, thus violating the logic by which he justifies his own investigations into big business and big government. After all, he has become Big Nader.

Nader has spread himself around like an oil slick, covering such areas of interest as auto safety, air safety, railway efficiency, land use policies, nursing home practices, monopolies, bank management, water pollution and the manufacture of hot dogs. He has accused the Air Force of flying too low near nuclear plants, the fish canners of putting foreign objects in canned fish, the citrus folk of watering down their orange juice.

As the self-appointed defender of consumer interests, Nader has become a national, semi-public institution wielding enormous influence over the minds of millions of Americans. The public therefore deserves a look into Nader's own organization and methods.

How can one man be an authority in so many fields? What kind of control does he exert over the young men and women who form the task forces known as "Nader's Raiders"? What are their qualifications? How do they operate? How carefully do they check their facts?

Since he unmercifully exposes others in behalf of the public's right to know, Nader should be the first to agree to an inquiry into Ralph Nader Crusades. When we say inquiry, we mean something more than a superficial, Nader-oriented TV panel show or an audience-participation interview which covers many subjects but permits no continuous line of questioning on any.

Nader had a right to object when General Motors conducted an undercover investigation of him but there was nothing secret or offensive about the AAA proposal. If he simply objects to being investigated by a business firm, we have an alternative suggestion: an investigation—upon his approval, of course—by an appropriate committee of Congress, by a reputable and objective foundation or by a team of trained reporters given time to follow up their points of inquiry in depth.

The American public does need protection against unscrupulous business firms and negligent government. In some cases Nader has served as a useful gadfly. But honest firms and reliable government officials deserve protection, too, against the reckless shotgun blasts of publicity-seeking crusaders.

The public deserves an assessment of the quality of the information Ralph Nader furnishes and the methods by which he obtains it. Therefore, it is disturbing when the investigator, himself, refuses to be interviewed.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 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:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

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. This 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.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the testimony received in conjunction with the hearings I recently chaired in Minneapolis centered, in part, on the shortage of medical manpower. A letter I received from Ruby Olson discusses the difficulty in getting an appointment since there are too few doctors. Mr. Allen Sollie, representing the Minnesota Concerned Seniors and the Minneapolis Old Timers forcefully urged increasing the number of doctors and dentists in order to improve the quality of health care. Mr. Sollie contends that spending $67 billion on health would be sufficient if there were a better organized and larger staff of professionals serving the public. He also argued persuasively for increasing the consumer role in pushing for health reform. Along these lines, he announced his support for the Health Security Act of 1971.

Mr. Werner Egli testified about the shortage of trained medical personnel. He persuasively argued for improvement in the training and number of health professionals. His remarks follow:

STATEMENT BY WERNER EGLI

Mr. Fraser, I'm not a physician, I don't run a medical school, I don't run a free clinic, I'm just a layman but I want to add some thoughts to what you have heard already. I want you to devote more effort towards reform of the medical system instead of this tremendous concentration on medical insurance schemes alone. If you don't have decent medical systems, if you have the kind of outhouse system we've got now, no amount of medical insurance is going to fix it. If you take the analogy of the roads it's fine to have socialized roads, I'm all for it, but if you still have to pay someone a million dollars a foot to build those roads every time you want a road, you're in bad shape. The two main flaws in American medical care are scarcity and high cost. . . .

Well, as I was going to say, broadening insurance doesn't cure scarcity of medical service and it tends to, in fact, disguise the impact of high costs—of course they're still paid indirectly but they don't seem so high. Not only does this disguise the impact—sometimes medical insurance schemes drive up medical costs, medical charges. My experience with Blue Cross and Blue Shield—they set a usual and customary scale of fees for medical services and then right away this usual and customary becomes a floor or absolute minimum charge. Physicians and hospitals use this as a floor—They'll only accept in some cases custom—what the Blue Cross-Blue Shield calls customary and usual. They'll only accept that as payment, as full payment, from the very hard up people, and even then they only accept it with the air of doing a great favor. I speak from experience. More along the lines of insurance schemes driving up costs—everyone's heard about the Medicare scandals, I presume, where fortunes have been made for allegedly providing service to elderly patients under these insurance schemes. A member of fortunes have been made very rapidly I read. And I suppose that for every glaring abuse that has been uncovered there are probably five more which can't be proved with full legal rigor. You have to give them the benefit of the doubt.

At any rate it's clear to me that the medical insurance schemes as they exist now have helped unscrupulous and greedy medical people to exploit the medical shortage to amass unearned fortunes. These fortunes, of course, they come out of pockets, they are a drain on the public. There are several reasons for the shortage—there is often a privileged position which the medical profession has built for itself—they built a nice cozy little nest—they've done this under the guise of protecting the health of the American people. There are two main ways they do it that I see that are obvious. Number one, they restrict the supply of physicians and surgeons, etc., and another interesting thing they do, they make more and more medical services marked physicians only that no laymen are allowed to touch. Restriction, well it is done for example like stretching out the training process; it takes an unnecessary long time to to become a physician. In my humble opinion, about three or four years of the training process is padding unless they've changed it since last I was informed about it. Three or four years wasted in general university courses before they get down to the muttons—before they get started in medical school proper. So this of course helped to restrict the supply to make it take a long time to get through school. And the second, another restrictive technique, well I think we've heard about quota systems—religious and ethnic quotas in medical schools like "I'm sorry, we already have our quota of Jewish students this year; we can't have any more." Okay, that's a restriction and a large bit of territory they also refer to has been going on steadily, I think. For example, there used to be a time when a lot of deliveries were done by midwives. By golly, it just seems they're all done by an O.B. now. At least he charges a scale for it—sometimes I understand he's not always necessarily present at the actual act of delivery. Another example of this increase of territory, is simple things like administration of vaccinations, inoculations, which you think would require no great expertise. Now you have to go see the doctor in his little old office and pay him his little old fee to get shots for the kids and it's quite a bit. This is private practice I'm talking about.

It's all done in the name of protecting the public. Any doubts quelled by saying that any amount of extra expense, *any* amount of added inconvenience to the public, is justified if it saves even one life. I question their sincerity on this one at least—some of the whims of the profession.

Interesting here—veterinary surgeons have joined the gravy train too. I found myself unable to buy serum to give to my cats for distemper shots. No sir—couldn't do it. Well, I am free to have my cats murdered by the vet and he won't ask any questions. I presume that isn't to protect the welfare of the cats, but more to protect the health of the veterinarian. . . .

We must increase the supply of MD's now, enlarging medical schools and training, building new ones, etc., and also streamlining the medical curriculum, cutting out unnecessary hunks of it. Maybe a streamlined curriculum could be improved in some ways. What we want is that the many dull and incompetent men and women who get through medical school and get out into practice, we want to find a way of excluding those. We want a system—educational system that will attract talented people with encouragement to complete their training but as I say gently but firmly filter out the incompetent ones who can now, do muddle through school and do go into practice, Mr. Fraser. So, we increase the supply of meds.

Another thing we can do is para-medical personnel for important but routine and simple medical services, like as I mentioned, innoculation, immunizations, vaccinations, minor treatment of bruises, cuts, abrasions, minor stitching jobs, routine examinations of supposedly healthy people, like life insurance exams or exams to become a bus conductor or something. Examinations for signs of specific diseases during epidemics, having to check people for blue rash or purple dots or whatever—that you might have in some plague, to screen a large number of people rapidly, and examinations of infants for abuse. They can also examine diagnostic records such as electrocardiograms. They can at least be trained to recognize one that is normal. They would not have to do any diagnostic work with one that is out of kilter.

These things that can be done by paramedics—a lot of them are actually, it is true, now done by nurses as well as M.D.'s. The point is you have to go to an M.D. office, pay him his rates to have his nurse do them. This is not necessary. Paramedics need intelligence, training, and the ability to see when a patient needs more expert help. There is a role, however, for medical insurance if you have a referral medical system. Socialized medicine has two advantages. One, it encourages people to go to a physician early when they feel the first twinges. It would save a lot of people from perishing of cancer or having a lot of agony, and the second thing is just the existence of a socialized medicine improves people's health, mental and physical, because they're not worried about being wiped out by an illness, and losing their house and homes, because that happens.

Please think about this and I hope you will consider the relative importance of medical reform. Your brief description looked like some of it was tokenistic, lots of heavy bread for big insurance schemes and maybe we'd better fiddle around with reform of the medical scheme, going to set up some impotent medical panels which look good but do nothing. We need more than that. Americans like me are fed up with paying more for medical service and having about the worse public health statistics of any civilized nation.

Representative DONALD M. FRASER,
Federal Courts Building,
Minneapolis, Minn.

Most people that I know think the welfare fund should be reduced and give the taxpayers a break. Many times we cannot afford to go to the doctor because of the high cost.

Some program should be set up to attract more people to the medical profession. It is too difficult to get an appointment as there are too few doctors.

Yours very truly,

RUBY V. OLSON.

TAX INCENTIVES FOR CLEAN INDUSTRIES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the most effective Federal tool for halting industrial pollution goes on. Are tax incentives more effective than strong sanctions—or should the order be reversed? Several of the States have given us a glimpse of the effectiveness of tax incentives, but the question remains unsettled because most

manufacturers are interested in the big money to be saved by possible Federal tax relief. Some sanctions are beginning to have an effect because the Environmental Protection Agency is now sufficiently organized to investigate abuses, and the Nixon administration dredged out of the books a Federal statute of the last century, which law certainly must have been intended as an "apple pie" bill during the halcyon days when the Nation's rivers were still being mapped.

A good discussion of where the tax incentive question now stands appeared in a recent issue of Environmental Science and Technology, in an article titled, "Tax Incentives for Clean Industries." I bring this article to the attention of my colleagues because it offers a good outline of the possible tax incentives which could be made available to industry, and also because of its description of the presently existing, accelerated amortization writeoff which has given industry a taste of some of the problems involved with fiscal incentives to halt pollution.

[From the Environmental Science and Technology, August, 1971]

TAX INCENTIVES FOR CLEAN INDUSTRIES

To the economy-minded industrial executive, the next best thing to not having to make any pollution control expenditures is to be able to write them off quickly on his corporate income tax. Or so a whole host of governmental agencies—from the federal Internal Revenue Service to the treasury divisions of many state governments—seem to believe, judging from the range of tax incentives now becoming available.

The most redundant thing one can say about spending for pollution control is, of course, that it is generally not revenue producing. So when expenditures are made, any money-saving concessions that government can make are useful to those doing the spending. There are several ways that government can help industry with pollution control expenditures:

Grants-in-aid. These are sometimes available, usually for processes that have not been adequately demonstrated elsewhere in the same industry (see ES&T, June 1971, page 498).

Exemption from property taxes. This approach is favored in many states, but may be restricted to that portion of the facility which can be demonstrated to be utilized for pollution control; any portions producing a marketable by-product may not be eligible for the exemption.

Exemption from sales and use taxes. The exemption applies to the cost of the individual pieces of equipment which together make up the abatement facility.

Income tax credits. In some states, a fixed percentage of the cost of installation (generally 5%) may be directly deducted from taxes due. A federal 7% investment tax credit which was in force for expenditures of any kind, until suspended in 1966, was retained for pollution control spending, until repealed in 1969 (see below and ES&T, February 1970, page 103).

Accelerated amortization. Whereas pollution control equipment might in practice be expected to be operated for more than 10 years, many states—and the federal government, see below—have initiated rules by which the entire cost of a pollution control facility can be written off over a much shorter period, usually five years. The proportionate cost is deducted from other taxable income in each tax year.

While each state seems to favor rather different incentives from its neighbor (see box), it is true to say that for many firms the greatest interest of business with tax credits and other incentives lies with the federal government, and more specifically with the Internal Revenue Service. The reason for this, of course, is that the federal tax bite can be much larger than that taken by the state in which the facility is located.

FEDERAL INCENTIVES

The first indication from Congress that pollution control expenditures would be given more liberal consideration than other types of spending came in 1966. Then, the 7% general investment credit that had been in force since the investment-stimulating days of the Kennedy administration was suspended, but an exception was made for pollution control facilities. Those who made expenditures for facilities that were demonstrably for pollution control could deduct 7% of the cost from federal income taxes.

The 7% investment tax credit was repealed in entirety by the 1969 Tax Reform Act. In its place were instituted provisions for accelerated amortization of pollution control capital expenses. Conditions under which a facility could qualify for the faster write-off were tightly drawn in the act and, in fact, the detailed regulations were not published in complete form until May of this year. The main reason for the delay, which industry has bitterly criticized, was that qualifying facilities must be federally certified (they must, in addition, be certified by the state in which they are located). Since almost the whole of 1970 was taken up with the wheel-spinning that resulted in the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in December, it was not until 1971 that the federal government was in a position to take on the certification job.

The May 26, 1971, Federal Register spells out the EPA's certification requirements. Treasury Department regulations governing the accelerated amortization procedure are given in detail in the May 18, 1971, Federal Register. Basically, guidelines and regulations specify that, for expenditures to be eligible for accelerated depreciation:

The plant to which the facility is attached must have been in operation before Jan. 1, 1969. Treatment facilities attached to plants commencing operation after that date are ineligible, no matter when they were installed. Owners of eligible facilities can write off their cost in 60 months provided several other criteria are met:

Treatment facilities must be installed after Dec. 31, 1968 and before Jan. 1, 1975.

Building cost will not be included unless the sole purpose of the building is to house a treatment facility.

A treatment facility used in connection with plants built before 1969 (which are eligible, see above) and with plants built after 1969 (which are not) may nevertheless be eligible for the fast write-off; EPA will determine how much of the facility's cost is allowable to the earlier, eligible plant.

If only part of the facility is for pollution control, EPA will make a determination of how much of the total cost can be subject to accelerated amortization. If the facility has a useful life of more than 15 years, only that portion of its cost "attributable to" the first 15 years of its life is eligible for accelerated depreciation; the rest of its cost must be amortized over its actual useful life. If it appears to EPA that the costs of a facility will be recovered by profits (for instance, from sale of a by-product), the facility will not qualify.

Forms for the federal certification procedure will be made available in EPA regional offices around the country. State certification, which is also required, must be applied for separately. The necessary certification forms, or letters indicating that they have been applied for, must be submitted with the corporate income tax form. There is no separate schedule for pollution control cost write-offs; the taxpayer must add a sheet to the regular depreciation schedule. Details are given in the May 18 *Federal Register*.

REACTION FROM TAXPAYERS

Despite this evidence from state and federal governments alike that industry's efforts in the field of pollution control can earn them a tax break, industrialists have not exactly been falling all over each other in profuse thanks to a munificent taxing authority. In fact, they have been quite critical.

The National Association of Manufacturers, in an official position statement, has criticized several features of the federal accelerated amortization program which, it says, have rendered it "ineffective and its benefits illusory." The particular bones of contention are the requirement for dual—federal and state—certification, the tightly drawn eligibility dates for the facility and plant it serves, and the exclusion of profit-making facilities.

NAM plumps instead for an approach in which investment credits and accelerated depreciation would be combined. Such an approach could lead to much greater savings to companies making the pollution control investments. By the same token, of course, it would also lead to much greater revenue losses to the Internal Revenue Service.

It is probably too much to expect the U.S. Treasury Department—or, for that matter, any state treasury division—to be enthusiastic over plans that rob them of revenue, no matter how noble the goals. Former Treasury Secretary David Kennedy has given his opinion that the effectiveness of the accelerated depreciation provision is "doubtful" and that "overwhelming incentive for industrial pollution control will continue to be governmental antipollution enforcement action, or the threat thereof." He is probably correct, but any help with the spending for control will nevertheless not be refused, despite the critical words from industry.

PROF'S VIEW OF ECONOMY GLOOMY

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the best written and, at the same time, most disturbing articles I have ever read was printed in the Indianapolis Star on October 11. The writer, Anthony Lejeune, is one of the most respected columnists to write in England for an American audience. His column, "Transatlantic," enjoys wide readership.

Based in Great Britain as he is, Mr. Lejeune is in a unique position to see the economically and socially disastrous consequences of socialism and collectivism. The once-proud United Kingdom since World War II has declined from a lofty position of world power to one of near insignificance, thanks to its moves toward the welfare state.

The trend toward collectivism, as exemplified by the grossly ineffective National Health Service and a confiscatory tax system, has brought about that nation's well-publicized "brain drain," an alarming decline in the British share of world markets, and, most alarming of all, galloping inflation of even greater magnitude than that which we have experienced in America.

Of course, the collectivists did not inflict this system on Britain with the deliberate purpose of destroying a nation. It was done because such programs are popular with great blocs of voters. As

liberalization progresses, a nation also turns more and more toward pure democracy and government by plebiscite.

If all men were men of goodwill, able to see the best course toward the common good and willing to make some personal sacrifices to attain that good, then democracy would be excellent. But, given the realities of human nature and its mentality of "What's in it for me?" it is imperative that we constantly bear in mind that ours is a republic, not a democracy. In a republic, the elected representatives of the people utilize their own informed judgment and altruistic goodwill to choose the best course for the nation.

Of course, this is an ideal, not often realized. Politicians, too, are often afflicted with the "What's in it for me?" syndrone. But we can come much closer to realizing this ideal among a smaller, more select, group of elected officials than we can with the "one man, one vote" system of democracy and populist collectivism.

Collectivism has failed as an economic system. It has failed in the totalitarian countries of Eastern Europe and in the free socialist nations of the West. Free enterprise, to be sure, has its faults, but its economic successes are well documented. While the socialist countries have stagnated in the world market, nations where freedom is the heart of the economy have flourished.

The article by Lejeune follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Oct. 11, 1971]

PROF'S VIEW OF ECONOMY GLOOMY

(By Anthony Lejeune)

LONDON.—Prof. F. A. Hayek, the doyen—and surely the greatest—of those modern economic philosophers who still believe in free enterprise and a free society, has been visiting London, and his view of the Western world and its prospects is extremely disturbing.

When I last met him, three or four years ago, he had just retired from the University of Chicago, and I asked him then whether he thought America was doomed to follow Britain down the road to collectivism. No, he said, because, although there were ominous signs pointing in that direction, he had great faith in America's ability to pull up short of the brink, and to turn around, and to recover.

I asked him the other day whether he still felt the same, whether he was still—at least in the long term—optimistic.

He shook his head doubtfully. For the first time, he said, he was beginning to be really depressed about America. President Nixon's government, he believed, had started out on the side of the angels but was being increasingly forced to do the wrong things. And he felt that because, particularly in Britain, we had been through so many economic crises in recent years, people didn't realize the true gravity of the crisis with which, on both sides of the Atlantic, we were now confronted.

He meant chiefly the desperate problem of inflation. The problem continues to be far worse in Britain than in America—the latest report of the International Monetary Fund shows that consumer prices in Britain rose by 10.3 per cent during the last year and in America by 4.5 per cent: But clearly the same disastrous influences are at work in both countries.

What, I asked, did he think the American government ought to have done? It might have been better, he said, if the government had done less. This may be difficult in a democracy, where rival politicians try to win votes with competing promises of action, of instantly effective remedies. But it cannot be impossible. The United States has always been a democracy, but Americans used to believe in the limited capacity of government.

A principal cause of the change, and one which deeply depressed Prof. Hayek, was the near-unanimity with which intellectuals, teachers, writers, accepted the collectivist idea and kept telling people that solutions through government action were available.

He himself had no short-term solution to offer. He doubted, he said, whether the problem of inflation could be solved at all within the present framework of collective bargaining. He had been trying to devise some way in which the workers could be given a significant measure of economic participation in return for part of their basic wage.

The difficulties so far had defeated him. How could such a scheme be applied to workers in declining industries or in non-profit-making public services? How could it be imposed on powerful unions which believed they would do better by continuing to hold the employers to ransom with inflationary wage demands?

There is not, nor should there be, in either Britain or America, any central authority able to demand compliance with a particular economic formula. If there is to be a solution, if we are to pull back from the brink, it will have to be through a conversion of hearts and minds.

The most worrying aspect of the present situation is that we seem to be further than ever from any such conversion.

REMARKS OF D. BRUCE SHINE TO THE THIRD STATE CONFERENCE ON THE ARTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

HON. RAY BLANTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on September 30 of this year, the third State Conference on the Arts was held at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville.

D. Bruce Shine, chairman of the Tennessee Arts Commission, gave a challenging address to the conference.

I am extremely proud of the active, intelligent leadership Bruce Shine is providing for the TAC, and I am equally proud of the energetic people throughout my home State who are actively participating in promoting the arts, and I insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY D. BRUCE SHINE

Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the advisory panels to the Tennessee Arts Commission:

I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the services you have performed on behalf of your State and to discuss some of the problems and opportunities for future growth in the arts in this State.

PROBLEMS

The subject of my remarks to you probably should be "Mission Impossible". It is true that we have been faced with many problems that seemed almost insurmountable, yet we have made progress and based on over four years of experience, it is now possible to make some predictions as to the future that you and I would like for the Arts in Tennessee.

First, some observations on problems now facing this commission:

The Tennessee Commission on the Performing Arts, the temporary study group, presented in 1967 a report and set of recommendations to the then Governor, Buford Ellington, and General Assembly. Conclusions drawn by the Commission identified the problems for this present commission. The most significant problem then was the fact that "There are (were) no artistic or cultural organizations in Tennessee with statewide influence or impact."—That conclusion is no longer valid, because of the impact of the Tennessee Arts Commission since June of 1967 on all areas of our State. The number of programs and general increase in artistic activity and support in this State during the past four years is astounding. At the same time, the conclusions of the temporary commission are valid, today, because there are no fully professional performing arts groups in this State.

Another conclusion was that artistic and cultural programs of high quality were, for the most part, restricted to the larger cities thereby denying many citizens of rural and semi-rural Tennessee, access to programs and performances of artistic quality and merit. The Tennessee Arts Commission has made giant strides in correcting this situation but it still exists, in a lesser but still significant degree.

This Commission has noted another change since the original report was compiled—the improvement of coordination of artistic and cultural activities. In 1966 and the early part of 1967, there were only four community arts councils or commissions in the entire State acting as coordinators for more than one area of arts activity. At the present time, there are 20 such groups in the State. Also, five arts centers housing several arts activities have been created in Tullahoma, Kingsport, Winchester, Cookeville, and North Nashville. Unfortunately, financial support of these arts programs and organizations continues to be sporadic, uncertain, and inadequate. The Commission has been able to help somewhat in this respect. But local communities must continue to realize that they must bear the major cost for that degree of cultural enrichment which they envisage for their own communities.

With limited funds, the Commission's problem was and is the task of simultaneously:

Studying the Arts, gathering and disseminating information;

Planning, directing and evaluating its activities;

Generating its own support and support for the arts;

Advancing the arts;

Making the Arts available, and more recently

Administering the State Museum.

In all of these endeavors, the Commission has attempted to create an environment favorable to the growth of the arts and an appreciative public large enough and well enough informed to support our artists' efforts.

On several occasions, the question has been raised as to the validity and efficacy of our State Arts Commission. The most recent move to consolidate or abolish the Arts Commission was recommended in the "Jarman Report". In this report, TAC is to be absorbed in the Department of Education under the administrative control of the Librarian and Archivist without the involvement of our advisory panels, specifically those of you here assembled, nor active participation of Commission members.

The Public Acts of 1967 create the TAC as a permanent entity for the arts and as an official State agency by which Tennessee could develop its cultural legacy and resources. Further, in establishing the Commission's duties and objectives the enabling legislation clearly states the TAC's dual responsibility of service to the public and to State Government.

True, Arts are a part of education. Also, they are a part of Tourism, history, libraries, recreation, and more importantly in this State as a vehicle by which we might attract industrial development. However, the Arts do not gain substance from these other en-

terprises, they exist as a complete human endeavor in their own right.

Because of the strong commitment and the active participation by citizens and community organizations, both in time and money, the Commission has been able to greatly reach beyond the ability and capability provided by State and Federal support. This support, being outside of normal governmental structure and activity, is never clearly in focus within the State and Federal government.

There are in addition to the Commission members and staff, over 170 of you who advise and actively participate in the Commission's activities. You are authorities, and experts in various arts disciplines. Many of you have organized and directed State-wide activities, for example, the Tennessee Theatre Association, Tennessee Film Festival, the first State-wide Conference on the Dance. All were planned, managed and operated by volunteers. This points out the service which you Tennesseans are willing to donate because you believe the arts are essential to the life of this State. You, our panel members, are imaginative, energetic, competent and dedicated. I believe no other agency in State government can match the accomplishments of this Commission and that fact is because you have contributed time and talent and money for the advancement of this cause and the role that your State government is taking in this endeavor. We are grateful to you and proud of our achievements that you have made possible.

PROGRESS

Because of the innovative nature of the Commission's activities, not all our programs have been successful, nor were all our projects successful. I think you will agree that the Commission's activiites are innovative because none of these existed a little more than four years ago. We have made progress. In the course of these years, there emerged major programs from pilot project activities. Our successful major programs are Purchase Collections in the Visual Arts; the Touring and Ticket Endowment Programs in the Performing, Literary, and Visual arts; Community Grants-in-Aid in the Coordinated Arts; conferences, seminars, workshops; and the informational program that gathers and disseminates information about the arts.

The professional management of our Commission, and I might add at this point that we have, in my opinion, the most qualified and dedicated staff of any commission in the nation, has improved with the years of experience resulting in special grants from the National Endowment for the Arts in addition to our State Grant-in-Aid from the Endowment. The General Assembly recognized the expertise and qualifications of our Commission and Staff when they transferred the State Museum to our jurisdiction.

The bringing to Tennessee and/or supporting of regional, national, and even international artistic events to our State benefits our own cultural life and adds to our economy as well. What I am trying to demonstrate is that other activities of this Commission which are perhaps not as well known to you and to the people of this state, are as equally important to the progress of the Arts in Tennessee, if not sometimes more important.

For almost five years, and for the first time in the history of our State, the Arts have become involved in State government, and as a result, State government in turn has become involved in the Arts.

Governor Winfield Dunn has proven himself to be sympathetic to our needs and conscious of our potential. The executive agencies, and the Legislature have reviewed our progress, approved and increased our budget. Also there are special committees such as the Legislative Fiscal Review Committee; the Legislative Study Committee on Boards and Commissions; the Budget and Finance Committees of the Executive and Legislative Branches; and the "Jarman Commission", the Governor's committee to study cost control, all of whom have commended our progress, while they may have in some instances felt our procedures might be modified. But such modifications are in form and have not criticized our substantive progress or goals. (Forget the Jarman Report . . . I want to think positively about our progress with State government for the moment.) So here you have some constructive ways that we are working to cooperate with other State Departments and to coordinate arts programs with them:

Executive Branch—Arranging arts events at the Capitol and at the Governor's residence. Serving as the Governor's staff agency for the arts.

General Assembly—Keeping the members of the Legislature informed on the arts in Tennessee. Arranging special arts events.

Department of Conservation—Co-publishing arts and events booklet, folk singing at camp sites at the State Parks, arranging public performances at State Parks, encouraging the sale of Tennessee Crafts in Tennessee State Park Gift Shops, and a major program that will be announced later in this conference.

Division of Industrial Development—Featuring Arts in national advertising.

Department of Corrections—Encouraging the department to hire a designer to improve the furniture and other products manufactured by prison industries.

Department of Agriculture—Encouraging more and better arts events at Fairs in the State.

Higher Education Commission—Designing survey of colleges and universities' facilities to include data on arts facilities.

And many others including the Tennessee Historical Commission, the Building Commission, the Department of Education, the appointment of your chairman to the Tennessee Bi-Centennial Commission, State Architect, to name a few.

Other activities at the State level, other than State government, are the cooperative efforts of your commission with statewide organizations such as the Tennessee Society of Architects, the Tennessee Federation of Womens Clubs, the Partnership for the Arts, Tennessee Theatre Association, Tennessee Artists—Craftsmen Association, trade and professional organizations.

The most recent cooperative program of significance is the help of the Nashville Advertising Federation and the Nashville Art Directors Club to develop a Statewide public service campaign to help us and to help you promote the arts in your communities.

Again, involve the arts in other activities, and, in turn, these activities involve themselves in the arts.

PROGNOSIS

This fifth year is the beginning of dynamic growth for the cultural life of our State, for the commission it means a year for redefining goals, developing programs and evaluating where we have been and where we are going. This can be accomplished with good judgment and an over-view of the needs of the arts and of our State.

The enriching of school activities, the seeding of individual grants are no longer enough. I believe major subvention of the arts is essential to the future of the arts in Tennessee.

It is a time for understanding and better communications among the arts and between those involved in the arts and other areas of citizen influence and support. There is great validity in our pluralistic approach to support of the arts. However, we have reached the point where our goals and our activities have exceeded the hand-to-mouth financing and year-to-year planning of the arts. This is the time for long-range planning, for building-up data about the cultural needs of our State, for future goal-setting, and for major future financial support of the arts with long-range funding. Remember, there are in Tennessee no fully professional artistic enterprises, no school of the arts, no official arts policy in State government, no dynamic leadership for the arts in the business community, no major arts programs in public education.

One thing the TAC could do is serve as an advisory group to businesses wanting to invest in the arts by our objectively advising the business community on how to invest in projects which have the greatest long-range benefits and assuring them of good management in the arts.

Another idea could be an Endowment Matching Fund similar to the National Endowment for the Arts Treasury Matching Funds that could encourage businesses to make contributions to the arts—a "line of credit" concept for financing the arts.

We should begin to make long term financial commitments which can make long-range planning and long-term expansion of the arts possible.

Our priorities to date have been to:

1. Support "the best we have" stabilizing the arts organizations and cultural institutions financially and administratively.

2. Develop these as necessary resources of communities and of our State

3. Create new organizations and activities as we need them.

4. Provide adequate housing for the arts.

5. Continually evaluate and adjust our goals and activities to meet the needs of the arts and of all the people of our State.

I propose to you the following specific objectives to meet the over all goals for the arts of Tennessee:

1. Increase the State funds for the underwriting of professional touring companies by starting next year with a State reparetory theatre.

2. Add professionals in the Arts to our State Department of Education as supervisors of theatre arts, dance, music, art, in our local public educational systems.

3. Allocate a percentage of our State's building costs for the purchase of works of art.

4. Continue the clearinghouse function of the Tennessee Arts Commission by collecting more data on the arts so that we can have the facts on which to make good decisions that I mentioned earlier.

5. Develop support for full-time managers and directors of art organizations and cultural institutions, either with direct State grants, low interest bearing loans guaranteed by State funds or community fund raising activities.

6. Build arts facilities strategically located about the State.

We have always relied on your help: Help us now.

(1) How can we build a stronger arts constituency?

(2) How is our support of the arts different from private efforts? Or should it be different?

(3) What would more money for the arts mean in new ways of operating and programming?

(4) How can we make our objectives known and clearly understood? How can we bridge the gap among the arts and the forces of influences and support?

(5) How should we provide the financial support for professional arts enterprises and the facilities to house them?

(6) How can we provide more opportunities for education in the arts in our Public School systems?

Remember, our efforts in finding the answers and solving the problems are limited

only by our imagination, our enthusiasm, our dedication, our convictions to our cause ------ that of providing the loom on which to weave artistic expression and esthetic experience into the fabric of everyday living for all our people in Tennessee whether they live in the Mountains of East Tennessee at Mountain City, or on the Cumberland Plateau at Jamestown, or on the Banks of the Mississippi at Memphis.

REMARKS OF VICE ADM. H. E. SHEAR BEFORE THE AMERICAN OCEANIC ORGANIZATION

HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, in September, Vice Adm. H. E. Shear was the guest speaker at the monthly meeting of the American Oceanic Organization. I am pleased to include in the RECORD Admiral Shear's speech for the information and enlightenment of all:

SPEECH OF VICE ADMIRAL SHEAR

Your theme for 1971 and 1972 "ocean priorities—a need for action" is most appropriate, for us here . . . members and guests of the American Oceanic Organization . . . though our immediate objective and approaches may be quite different, there is a common purpose in our efforts to understand the sea and its behavior. In line with your theme I want to discuss with you a matter which deeply concerns us all.

Today our continued ability to freely utilize the world's ocean for maritime commerce and military movement is being put to question. Tomorrow it could be contested. Of particular interest to me is the significant growth in Soviet submarine capabilities. They are putting increased emphasis on the construction of numbers of modern submarines. The Soviet undersea fleet consists of over 340 submarines, two and one-half times the size of the U.S. submarine fleet. Over 95 of their submarines are nuclear powered. Their nuclear submarines are modern and up-to-date units and they are operational in a number of classes.

The United States, as you know, has 41 Polaris-type submarines; 31 of these are being converted to the Poseidon missile. The Soviets have a construction program of similar submarines—we call the "Yankee class" submarines. They also fire 16 missiles. These are being built at a rate of about eight per year, and they have some 20-odd in operation already. At the current rate of construction, they could exceed the number that we have in the United States in early 1974.

The challenge posed by Soviet submarines is both tactical and strategic. Tactically the challenge is comprised of new construction torpedo firing attack units such as the Victor, and the latest cruise missile launching submarines such as the Charlie, strategically, we face a ballistic missile threat from the Yankee.

The Soviets are also operating their submarines with a high degree of confidence in a total ocean environment. They clearly do not intend to follow their previous strategy of defensive submarine employment. Russian submarines are no longer tied to the homeland by a logistic umbilical cord and are no longer thought of as a defensive measure against Allied sea power projections. Rather they operate all over the world and make frequent extended patrols.

The significance of the Soviet submarine threat, both strategically and tactically, cannot be over-emphasized. It is extremely serious in every respect. This is particularly so when one considers the broad modern shipbuilding facilities in Russia today, their technological base, their scientific expertise, and the continued progress which they have demonstrated during the recent years . . . such as the several new classes of high performance, nuclear submarines which have become operational one after another in quick succession. Such progress will certainly continue. They have demonstrated their ability to make significant improvements in nuclear power plants, in hull design, in underwater speed, in noise reduction, and in whole families of tactical and strategic weapons.

In the tactical area, the Charlie class cruise missile creates one of the most serious tactical problems to both merchant and naval ship formations with which we have ever been faced. In the strategic area the Soviets are now maintaining Yankee-class strategic deterrent submarines similar to our Polaris units on station off both of our coasts. They are deploying a missile of about 1300 nm, which corresponds roughly to our first-generation Polaris A–1 version which we took to sea in 1960. There is not much question but that there will be continued families of improved strategic missiles for their Yankee or later submarines, just as we went from the A–1 to the A–2 to the A–3 to the Poseidon family in our own sea-based strategic deterrent endeavors. Everything in the Soviet nuclear submarine capabilities is going to improve in the years ahead. What we are facing today and even more in the future is a thoroughly competent far-reaching Soviet submarine navy which is in fact potentially the most threatening which the U.S. has faced on the high seas.

A significant fact that all of you gentlemen here today should grasp is that antisubmarine warfare (ASW) has changed as the character of the threat has expanded in such a quantum manner. No longer is ASW a matter of a tight screen of surface escorts close around a naval or merchant ship formation. We must be prepared today to handle submarine strikes against naval forces and shipping on the high seas at ranges miles from the units themselves. It is a sea control problem making it more difficult by the fact that ASW today includes anti-air warfare (AAW) as well, since the first indication which you might have that you are under attack is a submarine launching cruise missile coming at you, low on the water, giving you minimal reaction time.

The challenge of future antisubmarine warfare is a menacing one, and the problems we face in this important area are difficult. The solution of these problems is of the utmost importance to all Americans since the security and welfare of our Nation depend on our ability to combat the submarine threat.

Military and civilian needs are often closely related. Industrial capabilities based on civilian needs form the base on which we draw in emergency and permit quick response in solving problems not foreseen.

The interrelationship is particularly close in matters to do with the oceans. This has been so because of the dependence of our country on oceanborne commerce and on the lines of communications to our friends and allies overseas. As we proceed into the future, this will become even more significant. As our knowledge of the ocean environment increases and as the growth of populations continues the nations of the world will have increasing need to look to the vast resources of the seas.

Very little remains unexplored on the land surfaces of the earth. Yet, despite the curiosity and inquisitiveness of man and the challenge of the unknown . . . our knowledge of the ocean depths is meager. Only recently have we begun to make a major effort to gain this knowledge which is vital to antisubmarine warfare and so important to our future.

Thus, we are faced with two challenges: the first is a challenge of self-preservation. The detection and destruction of the deep diving, missile-carrying nuclear submarine is a foremost military challenge confronting this country of ours. The other is the intellectual challenge of trying to solve complex scientific and engineering problems in the field of ASW oceanography. These problems are as great as those faced in any other scientific discipline or field of endeavor.

To say that oceanography is required in solving ASW problems would be a gross understatement. ASW remains the single most urgent problem supported by naval oceanography. Over 96 million dollars, or 47% of the navy oceanographic program supports ASW.

Our ASW vehicles are only as good as the intelligence supporting their mission, the professional expertise of their commanders . . . the operational character of a potential enemy and detailed knowledge of the medium in which antisubmarine warfare will be waged must be second nature to navymen from skippers to acoustic sensor operators. We know a great deal about Soviet submarines, however. We need to know more about oceanography and the propagation of sound in the ocean's depths. ASW forces must be evaluated in three dimensions, the length, breadth, and depth of oceans. The late President John F. Kennedy observed that oceanography and an intelligent use of ocean resources, particularly with reference to its applications in ASW, might well affect our very survival. Without a question, our future work in oceanography can directly and indirectly enhance our economic and military posture.

Primary to the navy's quest for knowledge in oceanography is the need to better understand the ocean and its effects on anti-submarine warfare systems. Sonar design is based on the fact that acoustical energy is propagated through water for significant distances. When transmitted energy encounters a large impedance mismatch, echoes are produced from which distance and bearing can be deduced. Such energy is influenced by temperature, depth and salinity, as well as by biological and chemical solids suspended in seawater. Success in using new techniques such as bottom bounce sonar to extend detection ranges is dependent upon ocean bottom topology and composition. This is a brief sample of information in science wherein our absolute knowledge is fragmentary. With each added bit of data we collect related to predicting happenings in the oceanic medium, new accuracy and reliability in ASW performance can be achieved.

Of particular interest is propagation of sound in the deep sound channel. More complete knowledge of low frequency sound phenomena will undoubtedly pave the way for dramatic extensions in our ASW detection ranges.

To understand, exploit, and predict the capabilities of antisubmarine detection systems . . . The Navy needs first to understand the ocean's sound speed structure from surface to bottom . . . the temporal and spatial variability of this structure . . . the nature of the surface and the bottom, and the effect of all of these on sound.

The vastness of the ocean, its variability in time and the general inaccessibility of much of the ocean . . . make it difficult at the present time to gather enough physical data for a synoptic analysis of the state of the ocean . . . such as the meterologists do with the atmosphere over the land. So long as it necessary to depend on sparse sampling at sea . . . it is mandatory that the

Navy understand the cause-and-effect relationships between solar and atmospheric driving forces and ocean response. We must know this well enough to extrapolate relatively small data samples over wide areas . . . and to extend our analysis by reasonable prediction.

The Fleet Numerical Weather Central (FNWC) at Monterey, California, is doing this by processing meterological and oceanographic information for short-term forecasts of environmental conditions. FNWC also makes a variety of acoustical computations and operates a sonar prediction service for the fleet. FNWC's sophisticated computer programs are unique in their field. The center is unsurpassed in its ability to furnish complex information on short notice.

We have come a long way in a short time in developing and understanding oceanography. However, I think we have just begun to scratch the surface. Increased know-how can go a long ways toward making our limited defense dollars come closer to doing the full ASW job.

No single system can cope with the submarine in all its tactical and environmental variations. For as far into the future as we can see and plan, we believe it will be essential to maintain a variety of weapon systems to counter the submarine. We see the continued use of all present platforms in ASW—the destroyer, the aircraft, and the attack submarine. Again, the understanding of the interaction of oceanography on the sensors and weapons systems will determine the employment and effectiveness of these platforms.

Let me briefly describe the direction we are taking with each of these platforms.

In air ASW a top priority is the S3A. This aircraft, by extending the operational proficiency first realized in the P3C, will give us far greater open ocean ASW capabilities. When we have these planes on each carrier, we will be able to provide ASW air surveillance over a large ocean area and we will be able to achieve fast response to contact information developed through other sources.

The S3A is on schedule and I am confident that it will perform up to our expectations. The late 70's should see the P3C/S3A team in full operation. We're getting the sensors now and we'll have the vehicles to carry them effectively. As good as these sensors may theoretically be, they are still dependent on real or near real time oceanographic data for effective employment.

In surface ASW the DD-963 holds much promise. This will be a fine ASW ship. It will have a complete ASW package, an impressive self defense capability, and most importantly . . . room for growth has been built into the 963 program. As new technologies evolve, our 963's will be able to accommodate them. One new sensor really highlights the future of surface ASW . . . the new shipborne helicopter system.

The range limitation of active sonar systems on ships imposed by oceanographic parameter, which results in minimum detection time, has caused us to investigate passive detection systems for surface platforms. This will allow the detection of submarines at greater distances below the troublesome layers which have traditionally hampered surface ASW operations.

Our major problem in surface ASW is numbers . . . we will lose ships much faster than new deliveries over the next few years. Some alternatives, like the PF "Patrol Frigate" concept, are being actively investigated. The PF is calculated to be a cost-effective answer to the need for more surface ASW ships. It will include ASW helicopter and a medium powered sonar suite.

I might also mention another concept, the air capable ship, or more properly the sea control ship. At this point, this ship will provide a sea base for long range helicopters and VSTOL aircraft in ASW and anti-surface missile defense missions. It will be a valuable addition to our total ASW capability.

In submarines, it is essential that we maintain a modern submarine force which keeps pace with advancing technology. Our submarines now have a technological edge over those of any potential enemy, and our programs are designed to keep it that way. We are devoting a great deal of effort to maintain superiority in sensors and weapons. The new SSN-688 class high speed submarine will be equipped with an advanced sonar and the MK 48 torpedo. Both the new sonar improvements and the MK 48 will be backfitted in our present generation of attack submarines .

The success or failure of a submarine weapon system . . . depends to a significant degree on the ability of the submarine to match its sensor to the ocean environment for best target detection.

These, then, are the principal new platforms and equipments coming along in the 1970's. We are convinced they will be effective and believe they will equip us to meet whatever challenge may arise, provided, of course, that we get them in sufficient numbers and we continue to expand our knowledge and use of oceanography.

In summary, gentlemen, please remember . . . that ASW is *not* an exact science. It is extremely complex—involving surface ships, aircraft and submarines. Nearly all scientific disciplines and most engineering fields are involved in antisubmarine warfare. The ocean is a vast, interactable medium, dense and impenetratable. Our success in ASW in the future will be directly proportional to our exploitation of oceanography in the solution of our problems.

With respect to the future, our ultimate ability to cope with the submarine threat depends on what we do with the time and funds available to us . . . and on our vision and dedication.

If we run very fast, it is probable that we can at least stay where we are, and perhaps even get ahead a bit in spite of future submarine advances. If, however, we waste time, one can foresee a situation in which this Nation's ability to move freely on the world's oceans will be in grave danger.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to review this matter of great importance with you. I cannot exaggerate the threat in any sense. I solicit the help and assistance of the oceanic organization . . . in solving the intricacies of oceanography . . . so vital to our successful prosecution of the Soviet submarine threat with which we are faced today and in the future.

CULVER URGES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO TAKE FARM COALITION ADVICE

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the Secretary of Agriculture to recognize the necessity of changing the direction of the administration's farm policies, by adopting the recommendations made last week by the national farm coalition.

Record crops of corn and other feed grains in 1971 assure the American people of abundance but can spell disaster to Iowa farmers caught between high production costs and lower market prices. Iowa and the other States of our great Midwestern heartland are faced with major blows to their respective economies as a direct result of what is now happening to agriculture and the American farmer. I hope the Department of Agriculture has enough commonsense to take the advice of the farm coalition—the men who directly know the problems of the farmer.

Because of the developing crisis on the farms, representatives of the National Farmers Organization, the National Corn Growers Association, the National Farmers Union, National Grange, Midwest Farmers Association and Sorghum Producers met with the Secretary of Agriculture and his Director of Economics, Don Paarlberg, on October 7, to recommend immediate steps the Department of Agriculture should take to increase farm income.

In order to prevent hardship and abandonment of family farms in the grain-producing Midwestern States, the coalition recommended, and I strongly support, that it is essential to:

First, modify the administration's set-aside program, as authorized by the Agriculture Act of 1970, to reinstate controls for major crops such as feed grains and wheat.

This year's crop of more than 5.2 billion bushels plus record crops of barley oats, rye, and grain sorghum means depressed prices for feed grain producers and threatens hog and beef producers with lower prices in the future.

Second, increase the 1971–72 corn loan to $1.25 to raise present prices from the 90-percent level and to induce farmers to put more grain under loan, keeping it off the market at harvest time.

Third, get approval of a strategic grain reserve which would be held in storage, insulated from the market but readily available if the need arose.

The House Agriculture Committee has approved such a bill and I hope it will be acted on as soon as possible in view of the deteriorating agricultural situation.

The Secretary of Agriculture has the influence and authority to act. He must recognize the need for changing the direction of farm policies in order to strengthen farm income, just as President Nixon has recognized the necessity of changing his economic policies to meet changing economic conditions.

MESSING UP

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, our involvement in Vietnam has long been the focal point of widespread concern to the American people. One of the main reasons for opposition to the war has been its terrible toll in deaths and injuries. Until just recently, we have virtually overlooked another terrible product of this war.

I am referring to the increasing numbers of drug addicts who come home daily from the front. They have drug habits that they can neither afford nor legally sustain.

Most cannot "kick" the habit, and they too frequently turn to life of crime to support their habit. They go downhill and their families are dragged down with them.

David, a Vietnam veteran from Louisville, never really adjusted to being back home. The habit which he picked up overseas haunted his civilian life, and finally left him awaiting prison sentence.

For the benefit of my colleagues and all others interested in a concrete example of what drug addiction does to a person, I would now like to enter into the RECORD a Courier-Journal article by Stan McDonald about David. It is entitled "Messing Up."

The article follows:

MESSING UP—FOR DAVID, HEROIN ADDICTION WAS WORSE THAN WAR

(NOTE.—The ex-GI subject of the accompanying article; his wife, and his family cooperated with Courier-Journal reporter Stan MacDonald in the hope that one man's pitiful dilemma would deter others from a similar fate. The ex-soldier gave permission for his real name to be used. However, to protect his family's future, his full name has not been used. All other names, facts, and records are real—as is the story.)

(By Stan MacDonald)

When David came home from the Vietnam war as a private his family knew he was different, but they didn't know why.

"The first day he was real nervous. He bit on the side of his mouth. It seemed he wanted to sleep a lot," his wife recalls.

"His eyes were different," one of his younger twin sisters remembers noticing.

David knew but he couldn't tell his family. He was ashamed. He kept believing he could shake it.

Perhaps the trouble was what happened to him in South Vietnam, the family thought. War can twist men, cripple them inside. Although David spoke little about what it had been like, he said enough to show hurt.

"He was a medic and he felt bad because he couldn't do more than he could," his wife said. "He had to tell the men they were going to be all right even if they were hit real bad."

There were the hard memories to live with—mangled bodies, buddies killed, the stench of death, the fear of dying.

Yet it was something more. David was irritable and distant. He wasn't the good-natured 20-year-old man who was married 11 days before he shipped off for Vietnam in December 1967. The "good athlete" now looked thin and tired.

At first David said he had been taking "pep pills." His wife began to understand.

"There were some articles in the paper about drugs," she said, "and I suspected it then. One Sunday he took $7 to buy a car jack at a hardware store. I knew he didn't need one and he wouldn't go on Sunday to get one."

When David came home from the war in late 1968 he brought a Purple Heart, a Bronze Star with a "V" for valor and bad memories.

His wife soon realized he had also returned with an addiction to heroin.

David had smoked marijuana and tried other drugs before he went to Vietnam. But he said he had never taken heroin and never was addicted to any drug before he went to war.

From his return home in December 1968 to this summer, his life has been a string of failures. Heroin had enslaved him.

David was arrested June 4 outside an apartment house in Jeffersonville, Ind., on a charge of first-degree burglary. On Thursday he pleaded guilty to a lesser charge and faces a prison term of one to 10 years. And he also is under indictment in Louisville, his hometown, on eight counts of dwelling-house breaking. Police say five of the counts are in connection with break-ins at apartments just off Brownsboro Road.

They debate the war across the land; they have debated it for many years.

It goes on. But David, the husband of a pretty, petite wife and the father of an 18-month-old girl, doesn't listen.

For him the war is over. For him the most important thing is to try to "really be thinking right and get my health back."

He looks older than his 24 years, although when he smiles you see a younger man. He stands 5 feet 10 inches, and weighs about 140 pounds (he gained weight in jail). His skin is very pale; his face is drawn.

His hair is receding from the forehead, there is a tattoo on his right arm which says "Dave" and inside his left arm above the elbow the blue vein stands out, scarred from the needles.

His bluish eyes sometimes look passively through you, as if you're not there. Sometimes they seem to hint at an urgency. Now he's trying to sort it out, trying to see why it happened.

"It feels like I'm waking up from out of a dream. Just like I didn't do all of those things," David said during an interview at the Clark County, Ind., Jail. "I always wonder why He let me make it through this hell."

The heroin-created hell was worse for him than the war. When he returned home he began to realize the extent of his addiction. His body would "ache all over," he said, when he was without the drug. He had to have it. He hurt too much without it.

SOCIETY TRIED BUT FAILED

In Vietnam it was easy to buy heroin at the little roadside stands, he said. But at home it was harder to get and very expensive. You had to take grave risks, but still you had to have it.

His family tried to help but couldn't. David was society's problem too. And society—through its institutions—tried to help. But although various approaches were tried, none proved to be the answer for him and David kept on heroin.

He went to a Louisville hospital under the care of a psychiatrist, then to a federal drug rehabilitation center at Lexington and early this year he joined a methadone program in Louisville. But each time he dropped out for the next fix.

He was hooked. His mother said later: "There's something about that drug. It overpowers a person. It completely controls them."

His habit grew to two and three fixes a day. There was nothing more terrifying for him than to be without the narcotic. It took precedence over everything. But it was expensive and he couldn't hold a job. He said he had to steal to keep it up.

His family said they were relieved when he was arrested in Jeffersonville. They were thankful he was still alive.

David was born March 25, 1947, the second of five children of a mill operator at a metal plant. The family lived on the second floor of a large house on N. 26th Street in western Louisville.

David's childhood apparently was a happy one, except that he had his first run-in with the law at an early age.

The Rev. James M. Harney, who has known the family for many years, said David had a good family life. They were "average middle-class people," and David was an "average kind of American kid," Father Harney said.

At the National Institute of Mental Health Clinical Research Center, Lexington, David told an interviewer that his mother was "a good mother who only thinks of her children, not herself—the best mother." He said his father, who died last November, was "very good-natured and a good man—the best father."

"COULDN'T STAY IN SCHOOL"

David attended St. George, a parochial elementary school, and served as an altar boy at church until the eighth grade. He showed ability on the athletic field but was less proficient in the classroom, dropping back one grade.

At Flaget High School in western Louisville he earned barely passing grades his freshman year. He did worse the next year, at one point failing four subjects and often being absent from school.

It was that year—in January 1964—that David dropped out of school. He never went beyond the 10th grade.

He said he really didn't understand why he left school. His mother explained, "He was just sort of nervous, the restless type, and he couldn't stay in school."

School records show that he was not a major discipline problem. He was rated "above average" in cooperation and appearance and "average" in ability and dependability.

But as a 13- and 14-year-old juvenile David was booked by police on various charges, including car theft, and served a short stretch in the Children's Center, according to the record at the Clinical Research Center. (David gave his written permission for the center to release information on his record.)

David said he and his friends did these things for "fun," with a daredevil attitude.

"We were tough kids, but we always had everything we wanted," said a friend of David's since the first grade. He took chances for "thrills," not for money, the friend added.

There is one aspect of David's early character which in retrospect may be significant in explaining his drug addiction. Although at times he could be stubborn, he also apparently could be easily influenced. The friend put it this way:

"I'M SO EASILY SWAYED"

"It seemed he was the kind of person that lay back and took advice more than he gave it out"—David often would "go along" with what people said.

David himself touched upon this point several times in discussing his experiences with drugs. One time he remarked, "I'm so easily swayed."

For about two years before he was drafted into the Army David worked as an apprentice printer at a Louisville printing company that specializes in magazines. It was during this period, he said, that he started using drugs.

At first it was marijuana. Then when he was off work he took an amphetamine-like drug packaged in a nasal inhaler. The drug could be purchased without a prescription, according to a phamacologist, who also said it is not physically addicting.

To get the kick, David would draw the drug diluted with water into a syringe and shoot it into his veins. It was a first step. He didn't realize how close he was.

Although he was taking this drug irregularly in the months before he went into the Army, the period seemed one of relative stability and happiness. He had a job. He also had a girl.

She was working at a dairy store in David's neighborhood. She was 18. He was 20. His future seemed bright. He dreamed an old American dream: a pretty wife, kids, a good job, a comfortable home.

But ahead was the service and the drugs. About two weeks before he went off to Ft. Knox, Ky., he tried morphine once, he said. "When I was that age we hung around in a group and one guy would suggest something and we would all end up doing it," he explained.

About a week before entering the Army, he and his sweetheart were engaged.

She recalls that David told her he had grown out of the stage of "being mixed up and not knowing what you want." He did not discuss drugs, she said.

He went into the Army on July 15, 1967. He was married on Dec. 2 of that year and 11 days later he left for Vietnam.

David was saddened to leave his new wife and his family. But he wasn't opposed to the war. "I felt like we were doing right while I was over there."

For the first six months he served "on the (front) line." He was a medic with the First Battalion, 27th Regiment, 25th Infantry Division and he did his job. He helped the wounded back to safety.

He was awarded the Bronze Star with a "V" for valor for his "heroic actions" on Jan. 4, 1968, during an operation in Hau Nghia Province. The Army citation read in part:

"When his unit was pinned down by heavy enemy fire, Private . . . immediately moved forward to treat several wounded men. Although repeatedly exposed to intense hostile fire he continued to treat the wounded men, assisted in their evacuation and was of immeasurable value to the successful completion of the mission."

David said he smoked marijuana when he was first in Vietnam but not when he was in any action. He said he never took hard drugs when he was on the line. It wasn't until he was stationed in the rear areas the last six months of his Vietnam tour that he began injecting heroin.

"ALWAYS BEEN INQUISITIVE"

"I don't know how it happened really," he said. "I didn't hear what was bad about it. They only tell you what was good. The bad part you have to find out for yourself."

He had about three months left when he met some men he knew in the infantry.

"I went over to a hootch one day and they introduced me to it. They asked me if I wanted to try it. They said it wouldn't hurt me. I've always been inquisitive. I've always wanted to try everything."

He didn't start by smoking opium or sniffing it. He started by "mainlining" heroin in the vein in his arm.

It was a good, very good feeling, he said. It eased the boredom in the rear areas. It eased the painful memories of lost buddies . . . of decisions of whether to rush to the wounded or wait until it was safe . . . of all the rest that goes with war.

"It's a feeling over there. Nothing matters over there. You're just worried about getting home," he said.

But why did he take the drug? Why?

David cannot give a complete answer. Perhaps it was the boredom, perhaps it was his vulnerability from his earlier experiences with drugs, perhaps it was because "anything that somebody wanted to do, I would just go ahead with it." Maybe it was all these things and more.

"Over there," he said, "you can't always do what you think is right."

Just before he returned to the States he was taking a fix about every other day. When he came home in December 1968, the urge continued. He was a prisoner. Heroin had been easy and cheap to obtain in "Nam," but at home there was no ready supply.

"KNOWLEDGE SHATTERED WIFE"

The first few days back David experienced withdrawal symptoms. His body ached. Only another fix would take away the pain, he thought.

He served the last six months of his service career at Ft. Knox. He and his wife lived in an apartment in Shively, and he commuted to the military post.

He said he met "a guy" at the base who told him where he could buy dope in a western section of Louisville. His wife said he would often stop in Louisville on his way to or from Ft. Knox and purchase heroin.

In a short time the family realized what was wrong with David. He was thin, nervous and worried. It was shattering for his wife. She suffered a nervous collapse and was hospitalized for three days.

Dr. Richard Roth, of Louisville, had treated her for an ailment and had talked briefly to David. He urged David to turn himself into the Army before he was discharged so they could provide medical help and the financing it would require.

But David would have none of it. He believed he was "strong enough" to get off dope, and he did not want the Army or those close to him to know that he took heroin in Vietnam.

"I was afraid that people would think I got those medals because I was on drugs and I didn't care," he said. "It's the only thing I had to be proud of."

David feared that his service record would be badly blemished if he admitted his addiction to the Army. He had reason for this fear.

Today the Army says a soldier with a drug problem can voluntarily join the Drug Amnesty Program without disciplinary action being taken against him. The program, which went into effect worldwide in December 1970, provides treatment for GI addicts until their discharge. They then may become eligible for further treatment at one of the many drug centers now being established at Veterans' Administration hospitals across the nation.

"NO PROBLEMS' IN 1969"

But David was discharged before the program was started. "There weren't programs because there weren't problems," a Pentagon spokesman said flatly. The number of addicts in the Army has grown alarmingly since David's discharge in July 1969, although recent figures vary widely.

Dr. Jerome H. Jaffe, President Nixon's special consultant on drug abuse, estimates on the basis of tests given to 22,000 servicemen that 5.44 per cent of returning GIs from Vietnam are heroin users.

Others, however, contend this figure is far too low. Rep. George Danielson, D-Calif., recently returned from a study of GI narcotics problems in the Far East, estimates that 8 to 10 per cent of returning servicemen are addicted.

Col. Erik Johnson, chief of the Army's public information division, Washington, D.C., said it is likely that David would have been given an "undesirable discharge" for the "convenience" of the Army if he had turned himself in.

Johnson acknowledged that there was little "impetus" to cause David to admit his problem to the Army. But he added that one "can't ignore the fact" that the Army has always had chaplains available for help as well as a complete medical service.

After his discharge, David returned to work at the Louisville printing company. The job was very important then, especially since his wife had recently learned she was pregnant.

But David found it impossible to hold down a job and deal with his habit at the same time. After two weeks, he says, he took a leave of absence from the company and spent a short time at a Louisville hospital under the care of a private psychiatrist.

When he returned to his job his troubles recurred.

"I started messing up," he admits. "I'd leave in the middle of the day and then try to get back before the foreman would know. They caught me doing it."

He had to have his fixes. But he couldn't work like that. He lost his job. And it grew harder.

"We'd just barely make our bills and then finally it got to where I opened a checking account and I ended up writing a bunch of checks that weren't any good," he said. "My brother picked them up, but that was just the start of it."

Heroin was the cause of the difficulties and yet, ironically, it seemed David's only route of escape from his failures, his "messing up."

He said he felt "good and calm" when he was on it. "You can have all the troubles in the world but after you shoot dope you don't worry about nothing," he explained.

Life was no more than the next fix. He had to have it or else go through the extreme pain of withdrawal. He described a debilitating, hopeless cycle:

Get the money—any way you can. Buy the small bag of light-colored powder. Place the powder in a spoon, add water and dissolve the mixture under heat. Draw the liquid—calmly without shaking if you can—into the syringe, sink the needle into a vein and shoot it. Let your body be taken away. Float and forget. But when it wears off, get the money again—any way you can. . . .

On the eve of 1970 David was arrested forging a check. He was immediately released on bond.

In Jefferson Criminal Court in March 1970 David pleaded guilty to an amended charge of attempted forgery. The judge gave him a probated sentence on the condition that he pay restitution and go to the Clinical Research Hospital in Lexington.

"NOT SUITABLE FOR TREATMENT"

Dr. Harold Conrad, chief of the center, said David was admitted March 23, 1970, and was discharged as "not suitable for treatment" April 1. Conrad said the two examining physicians at the center concluded that David was a narcotic addict but he also was "not likely to be rehabilitated because he was not motivated."

David had gone to the center as the terms of his probation required. But he only stayed 10 days and after he left there apparently was no follow-up by the committing courts, who were notified of his release. In one sense, going to the treatment center may have been a way out of going to jail.

Conrad described the center as an "open therapeutic community" where a major aim is to motivate the patient to help himself.

But David said he asked to be let go. He complained that it was not rehabilitating being around the other addicts at the center. He said the talk always revolved around drugs and "that's all you could think about." His wife said David told her he made "many new connections" at the center.

David also contended that drugs could be obtained at the clinic. But Dr. Conrad said the contraband drug problem involved only 2 to 4 per cent of the center's population. He said most of this contraband was more the sleeping pill variety than opiates.

Conrad said David's complaints may have been his "excuse for avoiding treatment" and not facing his problem.

After Lexington, David picked up where he had left off—jobless, needing money, running against the law.

The night of July 7, 1970, David said, police arrested him inside a service station near Bardstown Road. The police arrest slip stated in part, "The vending machine (in the station) was forced open and he had burglary tools in his possession."

At this time police charged David with other offenses as well as the gas station incident.

In Louisville Police Court in January, 1971, David pleaded guilty to attempted storehouse breaking and dwellinghouse breaking. The judge sentenced him to six months in jail but probated the sentence for one year on condition of "good behavior." Two other charges—possession of burglary tools and a second storehouse breaking count—were filed away.

David said he never carried a gun when he broke into places because he "didn't want to hurt anybody." He also said he really didn't think about the risks involved. He was too desperate.

"You just don't worry about it. I'd just as soon somebody shot me in the head. I

wasn't living. I was just existing from day to day."

Dr. C. Milton Young III, who runs a methadone program in Louisville which David joined, is familiar with the desperation of the "addict-burglar."

"HE'S GOT TO GET GOING"

Young said the "average thief" might make a haul and then sit tight for awhile "doing the things the average middle-class person would do." But the addict-burglar, he said, has to continually steal because whatever he makes is quickly "consumed in heroin."

The average thief, Young said, might wait until a family leaves home for a vacation, but an addict-burglar "would just wait until you get asleep 'cause he is in a rush. He's got to get going."

The addict will turn to crime "because the alternative (being without narcotics) is too unthinkable," Young said. It is not a "pleasurable feeling" that keeps the addict going but the fear of sickness which comes when he's without hard drugs.

Withdrawal can rack the addict's body. It can induce vomiting, diarrhea, severe intestinal cramps, profuse sweating, running eyes and nose and involuntary muscle spasms.

Acording to Young, the addict needs more and more narcotics because his requirement grows. A $10 habit today may soar to $60 a day In a few weeks or months. The addict may eventually need a fix every few hours to prevent withdrawal sickness and meet his requirement level.

David said the cost of his habit climbed to about $60 a day.

David is only one of an estimated 250,000 drug addicts in this country, and there are indications the number is growing. Although there apparently are no precise figures, it is estimated that addicts are responsible each year for property thefts valued at millions upon millions of dollars.

Louisville Police detective Capt. Emmett Paul says addicts are a major cause of crime. "It's a hell of a serious problem," he adds.

After being arrested at the service station David spent 10 days in the Jefferson County Jail before being released on bond. He said jail was a nightmare because they gave him almost nothing for withdrawal.

Father Harney remembers visiting David in the jail. "He looked like he was in the DT's. He was shaking all over."

When he was released he tried to stay off dope. He still thought he could start "thinking right" again.

"DAVID WAS INCOHERENT"

His wife's employer got David a job as a groundskeeper at a local cemetery. The employer hoped the "outdoor work would be beneficial." But again David didn't last.

"On two occasions," the employer said, "David's foreman found him sitting under a tree beside a lawnmower staring into space. The foreman said David was incoherent."

The employer has made several efforts to help David but now he sees no hope "unless David can receive prolonged and confined treatment."

In January, 1971, after being fired from the cemetery job, David sought help at the Veteran's Administration Hospital in Lexington. Dr. Aaron Mason, hospital director, said David was told that he could be admitted for medical and psychiatric care, although it also was explained to him that the hospital does not have a "drug unit," which would specifically treat addicts.

The Louisville methadone program run by Dr. Young also was suggested. Mason said David felt this program would be better than hospitalized care because it would enable him to continue working.

So from Jan. 25 to March 18 of this year David took a daily dose of methadone at one of the pharmacies participating in the program.

Methadone is an inexpensive, though addictive, synthetic narcotic that blocks the effects of, and the craving for, heroin.

Because of legal limitations, Young is permitted to run a methadone withdrawal program but not a "maintenance program which he says is more effective.

David said he did "real good" in the program. The methadone replaced that heroin and there was no need to steal.

A pharmacist who gave David his methadone doses said David "never complained about his dose and seemed to be getting along very well." He added that David "seemed to be a cinch to free himself of drugs."

The methadone is served with an orange-flavored drink and the doses are gradually reduced to nothing. The last two days before David stopped coming to the pharmacy his dose contained no narcotic drug. He was temporarily free.

"'SOME BEER,' THEN A BREAK-IN"

Although the pharmacist said David seemed to be progressing well, his wife said he became restless because the methadone doses became "too small" to satisfy his urge.

David dropped out and returned to heroin. "I was in the methadone program seven weeks," he said, "and then a friend called up and asked if I wanted to go out and drink some beer."

But it went farther than that. "We went over and broke into his uncle's house and got money." David said they used the money to buy dope. "I'm so easily swayed," he added.

Young said about 300 persons—including about 37 persons who claimed they were hooked in Vietnam—have been or are in his methadone program which began last year.

Yet it has been frustrating. Young said about 80 per cent of those in his program return to drugs.

"I could only provide a certain portion of what they (addicts) needed," Young said, He explained that as addicts are being withdrawn from methadone they need close counseling and rehabilitative treatment. But Young said he ran his program on his own time and money and could not enlist additional help for follow-up services.

On May 3 David returned to the methadone program. But he stopped May 16 because Louisville police were looking for him in connection with breaks-ins in the city's eastern neighborhoods. He knew they would stake out of the pharmacies. He asked Dr. Young for a supply of methadone to take with him but Young said he told David that was impossible.

David was on the run the last weeks before his arrest in Jeffersonville. He didn't stay at home but hid in different locations. He was driven by fear. He was "terrified," his wife and brother said, of being sent back to the Jefferson County Jail and again going through the torture of withdrawal.

"I was afraid that someone would shoot him. We tried to convince him to give himself up," his wife said. But he couldn't. At one point, she said, David "decided he would leave town and make a new life for himself." But he couldn't do this either. "He wanted to be close to his family. He wasn't independent really," she said.

Louisville detectives Donn Wolfe and John Laufer continued their search for David. They said they told his family they would help him as far as they legally could if he turned himself in.

"IT'S JUST PITIFUL"

Wolfe said, "We knew he had a bad habit and he would need some help. Our main interest was to get him and stop him from getting (breaking) in."

Then David was arrested in Jeffersonville. The running was over.

Detective Laufer saw him a short time later in the Clark County Jail.

"It was hard to believe a person could look the way he did," said Laufer. "He was sweating. His face was all blotchy red with white spots. When he started talking about his family he started to cry."

"If you arrest a guy when he's in need of narcotics and watch him react, it's just pitiful," Wolfe said.

At the arraignment Thursday David and a man arrested with him pleaded guilty to an amended charge of entering to commit a felony, which carries a prison sentence of 1 to 10 years. The judge asked David how he got into the apartment. "With a screwdriver," said David.

Why? the judge asked. "We were looking for money for drugs," said David.

When it was over David exchanged smiles with his mother and older brother and then a guard led him back to the Clark County Jail to await sentencing Aug. 17.

Robert R. Riggle, the Clark County public defender, who handled David's case, said David probably will be sent to the Indiana State Reformatory at Pendleton. The state parole board, Riggle added, will decide the length of David's prison term. Riggle believes it will run about 15 months.

After that David probably will have to stand trial in Louisville on the eight counts of dwelling house breaking.

Now David is trying to sort out what's behind him and what may lie ahead. He says he will "have to fight it for the rest of my life." But he also believes he can.

He says he needs time away from drugs, time to get "thinking right" again.

And he is wondering "why He let me make it through this hell."

PRAYER AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, the Journal-News of Nyack, N.Y., a member of the Gannett Group, wrote an editorial on September 28 which every Member of this body should take the time to read concerning the pending prayer amendment to the Constitution.

This country was founded on the basic principle of the separation of church and state after the bitter experiences of our forefathers with European governments. I hope no Member of this body would wish to cast a vote against this tradition.

However, the amendment is clearly aimed at the offering of prayers in the schools. It would open up the church-state controversy already charged with emotion because of the dangers in the simplistic interpretation which could be placed on a "nay" vote.

For these reasons I was most heartened to read the strong editorial which points out the amendment for what it is, "hypocritical mischief." It is my hope that this analysis may encourage a very careful assessment of what the House should do in this instance and that other newspapers will take the lead of this editorial to make their views on the amendment known. The editorial follows:

(From the Journal-News, Nyack, N.Y., Sept. 28, 1971)

PIETY IN THE HOUSE

Schools aren't specifically mentioned in the wording, but a proposed constitutional amendment the House seems intent on passing at this session is designed to restore prayers to public classrooms.

If this piece of hypocritical mischief comes to a floor vote, naturally it will pass. Few congressmen, after all, have the courage to risk accusations that they voted against God and for atheism—which is how the ignorant and malicious would readily categorize a nay vote.

Here's how the amendment reads: "Nothing in the Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayers."

If his measure were to achieve final approval, it would overturn Supreme Court decisions dating to 1963. And it would rekindle a divisive, emotional controversy all over the national landscape—and needlessly so.

For what spiritual nourishment is there in a nondenominational prayer mumbled by rote? If the Supreme Court decisions did nothing else, they made a lot of Americans acknowledge that religious training is squarely the responsibility of the home, the church and the synagogue.

Why not leave it at that?

If Congress wanted to do something useful in this realm, it could set about clarifying the first Amendment proviso that Congress shall make no law "respecting an establishment of religion."

In the context of American history, it would seem simply to preclude an official established church such as England's. But it has been stretched by the courts to bar all sorts of conceivable or imaginary relationships between government and religious institutions.

School prayers are the least of the casualties. More to the point is the clouded legality of aid to parochial schools and church-sponsored colleges and universities.

As it is, aid to those sorely pressed institutions has taken devious, semi-fictitious, tippy-toed approaches so as not to run afoul of the courts and their quaint interpretation of the constitutional ban on establishing a state religion.

A new constitutional amendment pinpointing what the First Amendment forbids in that area would have the simultaneous effects of clarifying what it does not forbid.

Congress would do better to address itself to that serious, unresolved riddle than to grab for easy votes by touting all-purpose prayers.

TELEVISION SHOW COMBINES MESSAGE WITH ITS MEDIUM

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend to you and my fellow colleagues the television show, "The Partridge Family," which will be telecast over ABC television Friday, October 22. It will make 27 million Americans aware of the ruthless exploitation of whales which are being hunted to near extinction.

Officials and writers from Screen Gems and producers of "The Partridge Family," consulted with John Prescott, vertebrate zoologist and curator of fish and mammals for Marineland of the Pacific, in preparing the research necessary to assure the accuracy of the script's material regarding the exploitation of whales. I certainly want to commend Screen Gems and all of the people connected with this particular show for their contribution to conservation and ecology through this production.

Mr. Prescott indicates:

One can't say flatly that extinction of the species (whales) would lead directly to the extinction of man.

But I am particularly distressed in the slaughter of whales because they are not even an efficient source of protein. Cattle reproduce themselves quickly and can be marketed at almost any age. Whales, on the other hand, don't reach sexual maturity until the age of seven and then only produce one offspring every two years.

Surprisingly, the peak period for whale hunting was not during the early 19th century—the period of Herman Melville or of the Confederate naval raids on Union whaler fleets—but during the 1950's when modern technology made the hunt so successful that the whale herds were almost totally destroyed. An additional trend which disturbs me is that the whale herds have been so depleted during that peak hunting episode that now some nations are experimenting with exploitation of other sea mammals.

Japanese factory ships operating in the central Pacific have conducted experimental processing of porpoise and dolphin concurrently with their tuna operations, according to Mr. Prescott. In these cases, the meat was processed for human consumption or for byproducts such as blood meal.

It is against this background of ecological threat that the story line for "The Partridge Family" segment was developed, after one of the writers, Peggy Chantler Dick, had read material on the humpback whale published by the New York Zoological Society. When the show's producers, Bob Claver, Larry Rosen, and Dale McRaven, decided to proceed with this story line, they conducted further research at Marineland. Among the information provided to them there were these facts: First, there is documented proof of whales and porpoises saving the lives of swimmers and shipwrecked sailors; second, the major modern reason for the hunting of whales is a source of meat, that is, pet food; and third, that whales are being endangered despite the fact that they are an intelligent form of animal life.

Since "The Partridge Family" involves a modern California family aware of the problems of the California coastline, it is natural for them to express their concern on topics such as oil spillage, the effect of insecticides on birds, and the killing of seals and other sea mammals. Music is an important part of the show, with the star, Shirley Jones, and her screen children forming a popular singing group. For this episode, Shirley Jones sings a special song which focuses on the plight of the whale. The song, written specifically for this show, points out that if the whale is in trouble and birds are in trouble, man also is in trouble and something must be done to protect us all.

Screen Gems has done an outstanding job of maintaining an entertaining, humorous show in which they present an intelligent, effective look at a real problem. I want to commend Leonard Goldberg, vice president in charge of production, along with the series, producers, stars, writers, and all others who participated in this effort for the benefit they have provided in making the public more aware that as man endangers his environment, he equally endangers himself.

FINAL DATE FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM INDOCHINA

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the war in Southeast Asia continues to drag on and on, and the President has not yet told us when he intends to end our participation in the conflict.

Day by day more and more of our responsible public officials are urging the President to set a final date for the total withdrawal of our military forces from Indochina contingent, of course, upon the release of all Americans who are held prisoner.

Last week, I was especially pleased and proud that my dear friend and able colleague, whose district adjoins mine in Virginia, the Honorable G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST, added his strong voice to our effort. Congressman WHITEHURST and I represent districts which are especially heavily impacted by the military-industrial complex. It has been most reassuring to us that thousands of our constituents who are involved in this great effort support our stand.

We also share heavy representation among our men who are engaged in Southeast Asia. And most importantly, our constituencies include many of the dependents of those who are held prisoner or listed as missing in action. Congressman WHITEHURST'S statement, as was mine of several months ago, was made with the courage of his convictions in behalf of all these gallant Americans.

I am pleased to include his statement in the RECORD. I hope the Members will read it and will make their feelings known to him.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN WHITEHURST

OCTOBER 6, 1971.

Next month President Nixon is scheduled to make another announcement regarding troop withdrawals from Vietnam. In view of the fact that Vietnamization has progressed at a steady rate and our own force level has dropped to approximately 200,000 men, I think that the time has come to set a final date for the total withdrawal of American military forces, contingent on the release of American prisoners in Indochina. I think that June 30, 1972, would be a reasonable date.

Several additional factors lead me to this conclusion. We have, I think, fulfilled our commitment to the South Vietnamese to provide them a reasonable opportunity to prepare their own defense. Our own military forces have been faced with a number of morale problems, which are a natural result of an army whose initial mission has ended. We have reached a point of diminished combat activity, so that it is so longer to our advantage or in the best interests of this army to be kept in Vietnam in a semi-combat situation.

I earnestly hope that the North Vietnamese and their Communist associates in South Vietnam and Laos will speedily agree to the release of all prisoners on the basis of withdrawal of American military forces. Should that condition not be fulfilled, I would favor maintaining a meaningful American combat force in Vietnam until such time as the Communists agree to release our men.

NEW NATURAL GAS ACT AMENDMENTS VITAL TO AMERICA'S ENERGY NEEDS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill to amend the Natural Gas Act now pending before my Communications and Power Subcommittee is the most important gas legislation to come before the House of Representatives in 5 years. This bill, H.R. 2513, introduced by Congressman JOHN MURPHY of New York, is an attempt to alleviate our natural gas shortages by giving producers adequate incentives for exploration and development of new reserves. Mr. Speaker, this bill recognizes that Government regulation has kept the price of natural gas artificially low and by doing so has threatened our gas supply capabilities.

On the one hand the regulated low price of natural gas has prompted many consumers to convert to natural gas from other energy sources. As a result, natural gas now accounts for one-third of American energy requirements. At the same time, the low price of natural gas has not provided sufficient return on investment to induce producers to take the costly risks necessary to find and develop new reserves. Demand is skyrocketing, but development of new reserves is dwindling.

For example, in 1970 we consumed 21.8 trillion cubic feet of gas, but added only 11.1 trillion cubic feet in reserves. We are consuming just about twice as much as we are adding in new gas. Further, all trends point to an even greater increase in future demand. It has been brought out in hearings on the bill that the use of natural gas could double in 20 years if we could count on an unlimited supply. Yet it was also pointed out that because of the current shortage five major pipelines serving 26 States are now unable to meet their existing contract requirements.

Some heavy consumption areas of the country are forced to turn to foreign suppliers to meet demands. We are now importing liquid natural gas from Arab sources that is being converted to dry gas. This gas in Massachusetts is costing approximately $1.04 per thousand cubic feet compared to the artificial low domestic gas pipeline price of 68 cents per thousand cubic feet. From our own national defense viewpoint we must not become too dependent on oil and gas from the Arab's Middle East supplies. America must also concern itself with self-reliance.

Mr. Speaker, a major factor contributing to this rising demand is the fact that gas is a clean fuel. Many of our environmental protection programs are geared to a heavy reliance on natural gas as an energy source. It is estimated that to comply with new antipollution standards, seven major U.S. cities will have to increase their dependence on natural gas by an amount equal to 15 percent of the current total national consumption.

It is clear that America's energy needs are soaring. Let me outline the problems faced by the natural gas producer in meeting those needs.

Under existing law the gas producer does not know how much he will be paid for his gas, or how long he will be paid a specific price, or how much gas he must deliver, or for how long he must continue to make deliveries. In short, any contract a producer now makes with a consumer is continually subject to review and revision by the Federal Power Commission and particularly under section 5 of the Natural Gas Act, the so-called "rollback authority." Taking a highly simplified example for illustration purposes, let us say that a producer signs a 20-year contract with a consumer at a fixed price of 20 cents per thousand cubic feet. The FPC duly approves the contract. Two or 3 years later the FPC determines that the price being charged by the producer is too high. The Commission issues an order to the effect that all future deliveries under the contract will be made at a price of 17 cents per thousand cubic feet, in effect "rolling back" the original agreed contract price.

Mr. Speaker, this tends to discourage the producer from seeking out and developing new reserves. For example, if a small producer needs to finance new drilling, he finds that the gas sales contract he has obtained receives little consideration from the banks. The banks are aware that the terms of the contract are subject to change by the FPC at any time and are reluctant to extend credit on the basis of such an uncertain document. The large producers, whose exploration activities are usually financed internally, may be reluctant to risk their assets on a costly domestic project whose rate of return may be subsequently reduced by an FPC order. The companies may feel that a foreign operation guarantees a much more favorable return on their investment. As a consequence, between 1956 and 1968, "wildcat" drilling dropped 40 percent; geophysical activity, 56 percent; and total wells—wildcat and development—drilled were down 43 percent.

Another byproduct of this contract uncertainty is a heightened preference for the producer to sell his gas in the intrastate market where he can make a valid, binding, and enforceable contract, without the delays and obstructions of Federal regulation, and where he may generally obtain better prices. For example, in our own Permian Basin in Texas, some intrastate gas may sell for 10 cents per thousand cubic feet higher than the price allowed by the FPC for interstate gas in this area. Since our greatest demands for natural gas and our most critical shortages have occurred in the nonproducing consumer States of the eastern seaboard, it is imperative that more of our reserves be committed to the interstate market.

Mr. Speaker, it is my feeling that H.R. 2513 provides a fair and reasonable solution. First, as regards new contracts, the bill requires that all contracts covering gas deliveries which begin after the effective date of the bill must be submitted to the Federal Power Commission. The Commission can disapprove the contract, at which time it becomes void. It may approve the contract subject to stipulated conditions and if the parties accept those conditions the contract is validated. Or, and this is the most important feature of the bill, the Commission can approve the contract and thereby make all terms and conditions of the contract final and binding. In short, it guarantees the producer a price for his gas which cannot be afterwards reduced by FPC intervention.

Second, the bill provides for the exemption of small producer contracts from FPC control. A "small producer contract" is defined by the bill as a contract for 10,000 cubic feet per day or less. Only about one-third of the new gas would be exempted from FPC jurisdiction while over 85 percent of the Commission's paperwork on new gas would be eliminated.

Third, the bill assures that existing contracts will continue to be subject to the Natural Gas Act. However, as in the case of new contracts, prices which have been approved by the FPC in existing contracts cannot be reduced after the bill is enacted.

Fourth, H.R. 2513 establishes new guidelines for the FPC in determining the rate levels applicable to producers. In the past the Commission has attempted to regulate the prices charged by producers as if it were regulating a public utility. These prices are based chiefly on the exploration and development costs incurred by the producer in bringing in the new reserves. Because the costs of bringing in new wells vary widely and because of the difficulty of allocating costs between oil and gas produced from the same well, the Commission has encountered tremendous obstacles in trying to establish a fair price rate. As a result the courts have been heavily burdened with complex and lengthy litigation initiated by both consumers and producers in challenging FPC rate decisions which they consider inequitable.

The new guidelines will prohibit this "cost of service" utility base rate method of rate determination and instead focus more on marketplace forces. The Commission will consider present and future supply requirements and recognize economic indicators and trends and cost factors, but the "cost of service" aspect will be precluded. This will in effect bring producer prices closer to free market price determination.

Mr. Speaker, this bill merits our full support here in Congress. It provides constructive measures for meeting the tremendous natural gas requirements of this modern America. Most important, the chief beneficiary of this legislation will be the American consumer, a fact recognized by my many colleagues from consumer States who have joined in co-

sponsorship of the bill. The distributors, the pipelines, and the producers have all agreed that H.R. 2513 affords a regulatory framework in which they can work together effectively without any sacrifice of the public interest. Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored this bill with Congressman MURPHY. I have heard the testimony of witnesses for months as they came before our gas committee. This bill is essential to produce America's energy needs. I hope the House will give this urgently needed legislation immediate attention.

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: LESSONS FOR THE NATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Employment Act of 1971 is being implemented with uncommon speed throughout the country. Following its enactment by the President on July 12 and the full first year appropriation of $1 billion on August 9, an estimated 1,000 workers had been hired by Labor Day. By December, it is hoped that more than 120,000 of the Nation's unemployed and underemployed will be on the job fulfilling unmet public service needs of State and local government in transition to permanent public and private employment.

The emergency nature of the public employment program did not allow much time for careful planning by the various levels of government. Many fears had been expressed that the very short time frame would produce chaos at the local level. One of the first reports on the initial implementation of the act is a paper by Robert Taggart on the program of the District of Columbia. Mr. Taggart is Executive Director of the highly respected National Manpower Policy Task Force.

While recognizing the less than ideal conditions of the program's startup, the preliminary assessment is encouraging, on balance, and is thus a tribute to the responsiveness of our Federal system. Commendation is in order to the Department of Labor and the State and local governments of our Nation. Because of the importance and interest in the Emergency Employment Act, I bring the paper to the attention of my colleagues:

EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—LESSONS FOR THE NATION

(By Robert Taggart)

THE NATIONAL BACKGROUND

It was with a great sense of urgency that President Nixon signed the Emergency Employment Act on July 12, 1971, a law which authorized $2.25 billion over the next two years to provide the unemployed with transitional jobs in the public sector. Declaring that "America needs jobs and it needs them now," the President demanded rapid implementation of the Act. And since then, there has been a feverish pace of activity. The federal bureaucracy, under pressure from Congress and the President, has moved with uncommon speed to draw up guidelines, distribute funds, and approve local plans. State and local governments, which are given wide latitude in the design and administration of the programs, have responded with equal haste to insure their full share of available funds.

On August 9, appropriations were approved for $1 billion over the present fiscal year to provide jobs for between 130,000 and 150,000 persons.

By August 12, $600 million in funds were allocated under Title V of the Act to states and local governments with a population over 75,000; $120 million were made available immediately as "start-up" funds.

Effective August 25, guidelines were issued by the Department of Labor interpreting the legislation and detailing federal requirements.

On Labor Day, one thousand workers were claimed to be hired with EEA funds, and 26,000 jobs had been approved.

On September 21, $200 million were allocated to areas with the most severe unemployment under Title VI of the Act, with the aim that these funds be committed by the end of October.

Before the end of September, all of the $600 million initially available were distributed.

An additional $115 million were allocated to a small number of cities and states on October 8 to determine the impact of concentrated public employment efforts.

Finally, 125,000 workers were to be on the job by Christmas under the EEA.

This breakneck pace of implementation has had dramatic consequences. As its title indicates, the EEA was passed as an *emergency* measure to help cope with what was assumed to be a short-run period of severe unemployment. Its first aim was to get the unemployed back to work as quickly as possible, and in this it has been successful. But the legislation had many other goals, even though these were vaguely stated, often unrealistic, and sometimes contradictory. There is a wide latitude of choice in selecting 130,000 participants out of the 5 million unemployed, and an equal number of jobs out of the hundreds of thousands which are critically needed. The program must be judged not only by how many unemployed it puts on the job, but also by what they do and what is done for them once they are employed. The EEA aims at filling *vital* public service needs *temporarily* until jobs open up in the public and private sectors. Special groups are to be served, including veterans, minorities, and displaced defense workers among the unemployed. Manpower services are to be provided in coordination with other programs to insure that participation in EEA has a long-term impact. The program is also supposed to serve as a catalyst for job restructuring and civil service reform. Finally, state and local governments are given major authority as a result of administrative decisions so that the EEA will be interpreted, correctly or incorrectly, as a test of their abilities and of the feasibility of decentralization under the manpower programs.

Because of its haste to get people on the job, there has been little time to plan ahead for these other goals, and even less to find out whether they are being met. A billion dollars is being committed within three months, involving many irrevocable decisions, with very little opportunity for forethought, oversight, or control. Whether the problems which undoubtedly result from this haste are balanced by the timely assistance it provides to the unemployed can only be decided at some time in the future. We must first catch up with what has already been done.

This catching up process will take time. Data are gradually becoming available, but they will leave many questions unanswered. The anecdotes and "horror stories" which are already filtering to the surface are difficult to interpret and validify. It is clear, however, that experience varies markedly from one area to the next and that generalizations are dangerous. The only way to get a truly balanced assessment is to weigh the aggregate statistics as they come in with the insights gained from careful case studies of particular areas.

Aiming at such a balanced assessment, The Ford Foundation has provided funds to the National Manpower Policy Task Force to administer an ongoing investigation of the Emergency Employment Act in a number of cities, states, and counties, as well as at the national level. The Task Force is a private nonprofit organization of academicians who have a special interest and expertise in manpower policy; and it will be working with manpower experts throughout the country to monitor EEA developments. Though its initial findings will not be available for several months, some of its case studies are already providing insights which have important policy implications. In particular, its investigation of emergency employment in the District of Columbia suggests some lessons for the nation as a whole.

AN ATYPICAL CITY

The District is far from a "typical" city. As the nation's capital, it has an unusual status relative to the federal government. Though it is plagued by the same pathologies as other large central cities—dramatic racial transition, suburbanization of industry and middle-class population, increasing fiscal difficulties, poverty and rising welfare, unemployment and underemployment—the governmental system which must deal with these problems differs in significant ways. First, the District does not have Home Rule. Its mayor is appointed, and its budget must be approved by Congress. The federal government is also a major employer and property holder in the city, accounting for more than a third of all jobs, so that its voice is weighty in District business.

Second, the fact that national policymakers are centered in the metropolitan area insures close working relationships between the functional bureaucracies at the federal and local level. Where other cities may ignore or be ignorant of federal guidelines, District officials operate in a fishbowl.

Third, there is no "layer cake" of governments in the District. Where jurisdictional difficulties with state and county governments are a headache to most mayors, Washington is a state, city, and county. In this regard, it is a direct recipient of federal funds under the various grant programs; and action is not delayed by the allocational disputes which complicate and sometimes impede efforts elsewhere.

Fourth, the District government probably has more highly qualified personnel than most other cities. In order to compete with the federal government, it has had to pay relatively high salaries; and most of its employees are covered under the federal Civil Service requirements. Because of their lower pay scales, few other cities can attract as qualified personnel.

Finally, the District has basically a "republican" government. City politics are low key, and many of the decisions which have become highly controversial in other areas are settled internally here. Whatever its shortcomings in terms of representative democracy, this rule by bureaucrats permits smooth and speedy action when leadership is provided by the mayor.

These atypical characteristics of District government suggest that despite its many problems, it should be more successful than most other cities in carrying out a new program such as the EEA. The good working relationships between District and federal bureaucrats should insure that it is implemented in the way Congress and the Administration desire; and in particular, the fact that the Employment Service is operated by federal rather than state employees should facilitate closer coordination. The closer ties in the budget-making process should provide the basis for integrating EEA into the total District employment picture. The absence of competing layers of government permits the District to progress without squabbles over allocation formulae. With

its highly qualified personnel, Washington should be more prepared than other cities to handle the increased decisionmaking responsibility which is granted to state and local governments under the program. And with its "republican" government, the District can move more rapidly than other areas where actions must first be debated in the political arena. It is also unlikely to see the program as a political plum which can be used for patronage.

The District of Columbia's experience with the EEA will be no indicator of what is happening elsewhere. Rather, it should suggest what can happen under the best (though far from ideal) conditions. In this sense it is a paradigm, where many of the factors which may confuse and retard performance elsewhere are eliminated. The successes of the EEA in Washington, D.C., should therefore set an example of what can be accomplished elsewhere, while its failures should suggest the inherent shortcomings of the effort.

IMPLEMENTING THE EEA IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

The District of Columbia received $2.68 of the $600 million Title V funds and $689,000 under Title VI, providing for more than 500 jobs. This assistance was badly needed both by those who were out of work and by the city government which had severe personnel shortages. In August 1971 there were nearly 18,000 unemployed in the District out of a labor force of some 343,000. The D.C. Manpower Administration estimated that in fiscal 1971 there were over 64,000 persons who were unemployed, employed part time for economic reasons, employed full time but earning less than a poverty-level income, or nonlabor force participants who could be but were not working; all of these are eligible for EEA jobs.

At the same time, there were critical public service needs, at least as far as these were perceived by District officials. In fiscal 1970 and 1971, city agencies were forced to absorb $46 million in cost increases. There were two personnel freezes imposed during this period, and in fiscal 1971 over 900 positions were abolished to trim the deficit. Total employment, which had grown from 38,175 in fiscal 1969 to 42,735 in fiscal 1970, was cut back to 41,249 in fiscal 1971. The budget for the present fiscal year allows for little expansion of personnel since most of the increase is eaten up by mandatory cost rises; even the meager expansion proposed is unlikely because of Congressional pressure. High priority needs of the mayor have not been met, and he claims that personnel are desperately required to provide for community health care, welfare services, education, narcotics treatment, the maintenance of public housing, consumer protection, recreation, and other services.

Despite the existence of both large numbers of unemployed and large number of needed jobs, the process of matching these up, within the guidelines of the Emergency Employment Act, was no easy matter. Normal procedures of budgeting and applicant selection would have taken many months. But a sense of urgency prevailed. On August 10 the D.C. government was notified of its $2.68 million initial allocation, a fifth of which was available immediately to get the program underway. The first decision that was made was to operate the EEA from the mayor's Office of Budget and Program Analysis; this was intended to speed implementation and to insure its integration with budget priorities. The school system, the Environmental Services Department, and the Department of Human Resources were immediately notified and asked to submit proposals for a total of 100 positions which were to be funded within a week. High visibility and rapid implementability were the major requirements for these initial jobs. As a result, the school system was given a major piece of the action even though its proposal involved few disadvantaged workers, and little civil service reform, training or other actions envisioned by the Emergency Employment Act. Forty teachers were hired last year in a trainee capacity and could not be rehired because of the lack of regular funds. The EEA put up $7,500 for each of these teachers, with the school system providing the remainder of the normal teacher's $8,500 starting salary. Since it was anticipated that the 100 proposed slots would pay $5,000 apiece, the funding of forty positions at $7,500 meant that only 50 more could be funded. These were divided equally between the Environmental Services Department and the Department of Human Resources. Twenty-five "environmental corpsmen" positions were established with a monthly wage of just over $500; these were intended for returning noncommissioned officers and promised substantial training and upgrading in liaison work between the central department and various agencies. The remaining 25 slots were used to hire 17 ex-addicts to serve as aides and counselors in DHR's Narcotics Treatment Agency and 8 social service aides for multipurpose community centers. Similar jobs had already been established with built-in (though limited) career ladders and provisions for entering the civil service. These 50 positions probably came closer to filling the "consensus" intent of the EEA than the teaching slots, but all were acceptable under the broad terms of the Act.

Procedures were quickly established to fill the EEA slots as they became available. Applicants were routed through the D.C. Employment Service where they were certified as eligible for EEA and screened according to the job requirements submitted by the selected agencies. Certified persons were then referred back to the mayor's personnel office before being sent to the agencies which made the final selection. The reason for this extra stop was to keep track of all referrals so that if they were turned down for one position they might be rerouted to another. In the case of the first 90 hires, these procedures were largely *pro forma* since eligible applicants were already available for the teaching and narcotics treatment positions. For all the remaining EEA positions, however, the procedures will be fully used.

In the District, the Department of Labor's Regional Manpower Administration and the federally funded and operated Employment Service work hand in glove. Both have good working relationships with the mayor's office. Therefore, the screening role played by the ES creates no problems. At the same time, there is little conflict between community groups and the Employment Service, since to a large measure these groups depend on the largesse of the Manpower Administration. Community groups have been given almost no official role under the EEA program. In the District they can refer applicants to the positions which are listed in the computerized job bank to which they have access, but they have no special referral privileges. The District government has made a laudable effort to notify these groups what has been decided and to give them prior notice as to when jobs will be coming onto the job bank. But they have little role in planning, implementation, or administration. The reason is that speed was of the essence. Rapid decisionmaking and community participation are incompatible, and almost all decisions will probably be made in the mayor's office with little outside consultation. In D.C. this exclusion of community groups is likely to create few problems. But where antagonisms exist, and the EEA probably further undercuts the authority of manpower-based community groups, there is likely to be some rancor over the program.

Once these initial organizational procedures were established, attention turned to the second round of allocations involving the remaining four-fifths of D.C.'s $2.68 million and a total of some 350 positions. All District agencies were requested to submit proposals by August 26, with a final proposal for the city to be submitted by September 17; this deadline was then moved up at the last minute to September 10. Needless to say, only the barest outlines could be worked up in such a short time. The task fell on the Budget Office to flesh out the skeleton proposals and to make the difficult choice between competing bids within a few days. To do this they made many contacts with the separate agencies, selecting the specific positions through a give-and-take process.

The selections were complicated by two factors. First, a hiring freeze was announced on August 18, 1971, along with a 5 percent reduction in District employment ceilings. These measures were in response to President Nixon's wage and price controls, his order to cut back grade escalation in the Civil Service and his announced reduction in federal employment ceilings by 5 percent; since the District receives direct appropriations from Congress which supplements its own revenue, it was also pressured into similar actions. The mayor's office issued a memorandum stating that 1,000 District positions would be abolished within 90 days and an additional 1,150 in the fiscal 1973 budget. Most of these were intended as "redirections," where new positions would be proposed in the budget for those which were no longer needed; but given the present mood of Congress, it is unlikely that there will be a one-for-one substitution. The end result will probably be a substantial cut in D.C. personnel. Quite obviously, this cutback undermined any aggregate impact that the EEA would have since its funds provided for only 500 positions. It was rather paradoxical that at the same time agencies were being asked to pare down their staffs they were also being asked to submit bids for more personnel under EEA.

Washington, D.C., is not alone in this situation. Other cities across the nation are reducing their manpower to absorb increasing costs or because of eroding revenues. It is entirely possible that EEA funds will fall short of even matching budget cuts so that instead of absorbing any of the currently unemployed they will merely absorb those who are being laid off in the public sector (though the law stipulates that former employees must be laid off at least 30 days before they can be hired under EEA).

In the course of such a process, however, a substantial reallocation could occur if personnel cutbacks affected the better educated and the more easily employable while the EEA jobs were going to the disadvantaged. But the cutbacks create critical shortages, many requiring skilled personnel; and filling these was one of the goals of EEA. So the District's decisionmakers, like those in other states and localities, were forced onto the horns of a dilemma—choosing between the jobs they needed most and those which could help the disadvantaged most.

The second major problem faced by the decisionmakers in the District, and undoubtedly those in other cities, was to decifer the intent of Congress and the Department of Labor. Guidelines were issued on August 25 which are being continuously modified and updated. But these have provided few answers to the specific questions which are left unresolved. Contacts with federal officials by administrators in the District have been little help because the feds simply do not have the answers.

One of the first issues was whom to serve. Eligible participants under the Act must be unemployed, on welfare, or working at poverty-level wages, and they cannot have been employed by the program agent within the last 30 days. As indicated, there are some 64,000 unemployed or underemployed in the District, but only some 500 EEA slots. This left a lot of room for discretion. What is more, positions could be filled, as they were in the District, by "unemployed" teachers or other professionals; and there is, in fact, no

reason why all the slots could not go to teachers. The articulated priorities of the Act are little help. For instance, veterans, persons under 18 or over 45, the displaced in aerospace and defense work, welfare recipients, those speaking a foreign tongue, and migrant farmworkers are all to receive priority. Using estimates based on Employment Service application figures, there are some 5,000 unemployed veterans in D.C., probably fourteen or fifteen thousand unemployed who are under 18 or over 45, and perhaps 2,000 Spanish-speaking D.C. residents who are out of work. What system do you use to select among these, especially when the categories may not be mutually inclusive? For instance, there are probably enough unemployed defense, aerospace, or technologically displaced workers in D.C. to fill all the slots, though these persons may be comparatively well educated and nondisadvantaged in other respects, and though they represent only a small minority of the unemployed.

The fact that no single one of these groups was so clearly in need that it could become a target group left the decisionmakers without a clear guide. On the other hand, there was so much variation in the severity of need and the abilities of the individuals within the broad target groups that almost any job could be filled while still meeting the guidelines, and anywhere from the most severely disadvantaged to the most marginally handicapped could be employed. Despite the guidelines, the substance of the program was left up to local discretion.

A more difficult question facing the decisionmakers in the mayor's office was posed by the contradictory wording of the federal legislation and the Department of Labor's regulations. On the one hand, the Act set a goal of moving one-half of EEA hires into permanent positions on the local payroll. This meant that the selected EEA jobs had to be in areas where shortages existed and where funding could be expected in the future. Ideally, the slots would prepare workers for permanent positions with high vacancy and turnover rates. In the District there are many such unfilled positions because of the personnel freezes.

But another goal of the EEA is to insure that local governments do not merely substitute federal funds for their own, hiring workers on the EEA payroll who would otherwise have been hired out of local resources. The law provides that no funds can be used to pay for work which would otherwise have been performed out of federal, state, or local monies. Thus, the D.C. Manpower Administration made it clear that this provision would be strictly enforced so that there would be no "paper hires" as in some other cities, where workers were laid off regular payrolls and then called back under EEA.

These two aims of the Act presented somewhat of a dilemma to the District's decisionmakers. Authorized and critical jobs left unfilled by the freeze could not be funded under EEA even though these would provide the best opportunity for permanent employment once the freeze was lifted. Furthermore, there were questions whether disadvantaged workers could be hired as paraprofessionals which would substitute for the existing unfilled professional jobs. The D.C. Manpower Administration required that any restructuring of this sort would have to be carefully justified, suggesting that it would later be questioned. Even though District officials realized that such job restructing was one of the goals of the Act, they decided to "play it safe" since there were many other criticial needs. For instance, five medical technician slots which could have been filled by the low skilled were abandoned in favor of hiring veterans part time at Federal City College; though there may have been other reasons for this change, the need for justification of the technician slots was a major factor. Given more time, the D.C. decisionmakers might have been able to do much more in the way of job restructing using EEA funds.

Depite these complications, the hard choices were made and a proposal was submitted for an additional 324 jobs on September 10, 1971, though it has subsequently undergone some revision. The decisionmaking process was necessarily hasty and judgmental, and it is not easily second-guessed. For instance, nine jobs were assigned to the Fire Department; even though this was not one of the mayor's high priority areas and even though it did not have excessive personnel shortages, it was felt that turnover through retirement would soon open attractive permanent opportunities for disadvantaged EEA trainees. There were 21 slots assigned to the National Capital Housing Authority for maintenance and repair work; these positions were desperately needed since public housing in Washington is literally falling apart. Here, the critcal demand for relatively low-skilled workers fit in perfectly with the design of EEA (though there was subsequently some dispute with the D.C. Manpower Administration over the provision of District funds to a federally financed housing agency). Four consumer advisor positions were created at an average salary of $8,600; these were probably chosen because of the mayor's proposed consumer protection unit in the Office of Economic Development was stripped from the last budget. There were several other higher paying positions chosen which would not serve the hard-core unemployed; but this was the exception rather than the rule.

The following list of proposed slots shows that the average annual salary is only $6,600, which is well below the $7,400 reported for the nation as a whole. This suggests that the District has probably been more oriented to serving the lesser skilled and disadvantaged rather than hiring professionals. Altogether, only 79 professionals positions were proposed, including the 40 for teachers; and only 68 jobs pay more than $8,400 annually. There are more than 200 aide or trainee positions providing, at least in design, some paraprofessional experience or upgrading potential, and most of the remaining slots can be filled by the low skilled. The evidence is clear that the Budget Office followed to the best of its ability what it interpreted to be the intent of the EEA: primarily, to help the disadvantaged in an immediate way while filling some critical public service needs for lesser skilled personnel.

The list follows:

EEA JOBS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

	Number	Monthly wage
Public schools:		
Elementary teacher	40	$858
Student workers, Federal City College	[1]30	313
Environmental Services Department:		
Environmental corpsman	25	517
National Capital Housing Authority:		
Fence mechanic	1	666
Plasterer	1	633
Pest controller worker	1	633
Painter	1	633
Carpentry worker	1	633
Building maintenance mechanical worker	1	633
Mechanics helpers	5	563
Trades helpers	5	563
Laborers	5	466
Public library:		
Library aides	5	460
Do	5	408
Office of Community Services:		
Service area aides	9	578
Clerk-typist	2	517
Youth Opportunity Services:		
Specialist	1	873
Do	1	715
Adult assistants	4	517
Office of Human Rights:		
Community relations specialist (trainee)	2	715
Do	2	578
Field representatives	2	578
Secretary	1	578
Clerk-typists	2	517
Department of Recreation:		
Heavy-duty truck drivers	2	$633
Work leader	1	563
Fence erector helper	1	563
Gardener helper	1	563
Building and grounds specialist	1	563
Laborer	1	572
Recreation aides	3	460
Department of Highways and Traffic:		
Tree trimmer trainees	3	541
Landscape gardener trainee	2	541
Department of Corrections:		
Correctional officer trainee	10	578
Do	10	517
Counselor aides	10	517
Records clerk	3	517
District of Columbia Manpower Administration:		
Manpower development specialist	2	578
Manpower aide	2	460
Information clerk	1	408
Planning and Zoning:		
Administrative assistant trainee	1	644
Clerk-typist	1	460
Public Defender Service: Legal aide	8	578
Fire Department:		
Communications repairman	2	563
Mechanics aides	4	563
Clerk-typists	3	517
Office of Budget and Program Analysis:		
Program analyst	1	1,051
Budget analyst	2	873
Office of Economic Development:		
Legal assistant and hearing officer	1	1,480
Consumer advisory	2	1,051
Reporter	1	1,051
Consumer advisor	2	873
Auditor	1	873
Investigator	3	873
Application examiner	2	715
Secretary	1	715
Clerk-typist	4	578
Housing inspector	2	578
Do	10	578
City Council: Junior legislative assistant	4	715
Department of General Services:		
Research aide	1	517
Printing-planning aide	3	517
Special police trainee	15	460
Clerk-typist	2	460
Laborer:		
carpenter trainee	1	466
plumber trainee	2	466
painter trainee	1	466
Department of Human Resources:		
Office of the Director:		
Clerk-typist	2	408
Information and reference specialist	2	460
File clerk	1	408
Community Health Services Administration:		
Personnel clerks	5	460
Storage specialist	5	578
Health aide	1	460
School health aide	7	408
Nursing assistants	3	408
Nursing home investigator	3	578
Laboratory trainee	1	408
Neighborhood health aides	2	408
Pharmacy assistant	1	578
Billing clerk	2	460
Social Services Administration:		
Clerk-typists	4	361
Do	8	408
Case aides	5	408
Clerk-typists	10	408
Social service aides	5	408
Nursing assistant	10	361
Hospitals and Medical Care Administration:		
Nursing assistants	14	408
Case aides	7	408
Laboratory aides	3	408
Mental Health Administration:		
Program assistant trainee	1	460
Social work aides	2	460
Teacher aide	1	460
Nursing aides	2	408
Institutional counselor aide	2	408
Nursing aide	2	408
Multiservice centers: Human resource aide	8	408
Narcotics Treatment Agency: Social service aide	17	408
Commission on Status of Women: program assistant	1	873
Complaint Center: program assistant	2	873
Commissioner's Office: Junior executive assistant	2	873
Office of planning and management:		
Statistical assistant	1	578
Do	1	715

[1] Halftime.

Note: (1) Applies only to the $2,680,000 title V, EEA allocation to the District (2) list is undergoing some minor revisions

Many issues remain to be resolved, but the choice of the job slots and their content was the most crucial. Future administrative actions must largely be carried on within the framework which has been established. Some positions can be shifted, coordination with manpower programs may enrich their content, and efforts may be made to break down civil service barriers so that EEA participants can move more effectively into permanent employment roles. But there are limits to such improvements which are implicit in the job choices already made.

For one thing, the jobs were selected on the assumption that few additional services would be provided from other federal manpower programs. The D.C. planners made every effort to find out how to integrate EEA with existing manpower programs; but the Department of Labor, which was swamped with the details of getting the program underway, did not provide the guidelines. The slots were, therefore, selected on the assumption that most of the training would be in-house, and the bulk of the 10 percent local share provided by the District was allocated for training. Many of the positions will be filled before any formal linkages are established so that if Public Service Careers or Manpower Development and Training program funds later become available for training EEA participants, they will be of less use than if they were planned for from the outset. Though manpower programs may refer their participants to EEA, and though some arrangements are being made on an informal basis between District planners and the operators of local manpower efforts, there is not likely to be much formal coordination. In other cities where the manpower programs are more fragmented, there will probably be even less coordination.

In terms of civil service reform, there is little leverage now provided by the EEA for such action. According to a Civil Service ruling, EEA positions are excepted from Civil Service rules; but this was not even announced until after the District's major EEA proposal was submitted. The district, therefore, planned to hire mostly those who could qualify for comparable Civil Service positions in order to meet the EEA's permanent employment goal of moving one-half the EEA hires onto regular payrolls. The more severely disadvantaged were to be hired in aide slots, which under previous reforms already had a special exempt status along with special arrangements for later meeting Civil Service requirements. Put in another way, the urgency of the situation led the D.C. government to choose positions and personnel where there would be no need for civil service reform, since this would delay progress. Now, they have little leverage to assure further change, though EEA will help them implement the reforms which were previously negotiated. Other cities which do not have special aide arrangements and which have not already reformed their civil service laws are not likely to make many changes.

But there is still little time to concentrate on improving the administration of the program. For one thing, people have to be hired to fill the positions which are already approved. At the same time, a new proposal must be made and implemented. On September 23, the District was notified that it had received an allocation of $689,000 under Title VI of the EEA which provides $200 million for use in areas with over 6 percent unemployment. This means roughly 100 more positions will be funded, and a proposal was requested by October 5. The D.C. government was simply unable to meet this deadline since these monies were meant to serve areas in the city with the highest unemployment and since some new procedures had to be worked out. But a proposal was submitted three days later. Among the previous agency submissions which had not been accepted, it concentrated on those requiring few skills which could be filled by the disadvantaged and which offered decentralized services in the city's most deprived neighborhoods. The temptation in this case was undoubtedly to resubmit any requested positions which could not be funded under the initial allocation, and other cities which do not have such a conscientious staff and which are not under the watchful eye of the Manpower Administration might be expected to succumb to this temptation. In the District, however, it is anticipated that the areas of severe unemployment will, as intended, received most of the help out of the $689,000 allocation.

The various problems which may have resulted in the District and elsewhere from this rapid implementation of the EEA must be balanced against its beneficial impact on participants. While it is true that jobs could have been enriched to a greater degree, that some civil service reform might have been initiated, and that more careful choices might have been made in deciding specific jobs, these goals would probably have contributed only marginally to the welfare of those who are being hired. What they needed most were jobs. The fact is that reasonably worthwhile positions will have been selected and filled, and otherwise unemployed or underemployed workers will have benefited from a higher income over the several months which more careful planning would have taken. Looking back in the future, the shortcomings may loom more significant; but the employment and public service benefits of rapid implementation are far more important right now. It is no mean feat to get over 400 persons on the payroll within three months in what are clearly worthwhile rather than make-work positions. But this is what the government in the District of Columbia will do. So many are in need of assistance and so many critical public service needs are going unmet that the exact choice among them may not be really significant.

Unfortunately, this effective and rapid implementation of EEA in the District may be undone by other developments so that its already meager aggregate impact will be further reduced. At the end of September, the House District Committee urged the city to cut its budget for the current fiscal year by $34 million in order to reduce its deficit. This would involve a number of personnel cuts including the elimination of 572 proposed or already authorized jobs in the Human Resources Department, 78 in the Corrections Department, 100 at Federal City College, 172 at the Recreation Department, 54 in the Public School System, and 39 from the Human Relations Commission. Only a few of these jobs are now filled while the majority have been caught by the freeze. But if this cutback is made, the net employment impact of the EEA will be more than wiped out. The whole effort will have been completely pointless and a waste of administrative effort.

The implications of this potential cutback are ominous. The D.C. Manpower Administration and the other regional offices of the Department of Labor have made a conscientious effort to insure that EEA funds do not go to fill jobs which would otherwise be provided. Yet Congress is threatening to cut out an even larger number of very similar jobs in order to balance the District's budget. If the federal government sets this example, there is little likelihood that states and localities will do any differently. Once EEA positions are established, their commitments can and probably will be cut back. Federal EEA funds will be substituted for other state, local, or federal funds in the next or current budgeting process. This is the real threat: that EEA will be used to relieve fiscal burdens rather than to provide additional jobs.

LESSONS FOR THE NATION

To the extent that Washington, D.C., is a "model city" in which conditions are favorable (though far from ideal) for the successful implementation of the Emergency Employment Act, the District's experience to date contains some important lessons on both the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Even the broadest generalizations from a sample of one may prove to be misleading; but until equally intensive information is gathered for other areas, such generalizations can serve as working hypotheses which suggest the problems which may need attention and the successes which may be realized. The following conclusions are suggested by experience in the District of Columbia.

First, jobs are apparently available which can be rapidly filled while at the same time helping the unemployed. The basic assumption of the EEA was that the unemployed could be matched up with critical public service needs, and this has occurred in D.C., at least on the limited scale of the EEA. Whether other choices of jobs and participants would have been better is a difficult judgment, and the wisdom of second-guessing is questionable.

Second, the District and other area governments have demonstrated their ability to move quickly within the broad mandates of federal legislation when needs are dire and money is up for grabs. The Emergency Employment Act was meant as a temporary measure during periods of high unemployment. Detractors claimed that meaningful jobs could not be funded and filled quickly enough to have any countercyclical impact. But experience has proved otherwise. It is very likely that 125,000 will, as claimed, be on the job throughout the country by Christmas. This will make a countercyclical contribution, however marginal it may be.

Third, the rapid implementation of the Act has had some costs. Articulated goals, such as job restructuring, civil service reform, and coordination with manpower services, have been pushed to the back burner in the rush to get the dinner on the table. It is not at all clear that these goals can be realized *ex post facto;* and without the funding incentives which were dissipated with the acceptance of local plans, little more than token efforts are likely in most areas.

Fourth, decisionmaking was highly centralized in order to get the program implemented as rapidly as possible. It will not be until the jobs are announced and partially filled that the public and the vested interest groups will begin to realize the choices which have been made. In the District this will probably lead to little difficulty since a very sincere effort has been made to balance the needs of all groups in the community and since there were not many positions to begin with. In other areas where there is greater friction between community groups, the mayor's office, and the functional bureaucracies which operate the program, and where greater resources are involved, later repercussions may be devastating.

Fifth, the developments in the District suggest that the EEA's already diminutive aggregate impact may be further reduced. The 125,000 jobs it will fund nationally make an obviously small dent in the 5 million unemployed and the many millions more who are underemployed. It does no good to belabor this point. If, however, these 125,000 jobs merely replace those funded from other sources, the whole effort will have been pointless. The Department of Labor is policing against "paper hires," where local personnel are fired from the regular payroll and then rehired under EEA. But it cannot police against local budget cuts where payrolls are reduced in the aggregate with the implicit

recognition of the needs which are being filled by EEA. In Washington the House District Committee has suggested just such a move though its intent was simply to balance the budget. Other states and localities cannot be expected to do any differently since they also have to balance budgets. Thus, while attention is being focused on protecting against paper transfers on a job-by-job basis, the battle may be lost on the aggregate budgetary level. Certainly, this is a development which must be forestalled if possible (at least until the employment situation improves.

Sixth, the EEA offers a poor test of the abilities of state and local governments to plan and administer manpower programs. Officials in the District are highly competent; and because they operate in a federal fishbowl, they have tried very hard to follow the exact intent of the Emergency Employment Act. Unfortunately, the legislation is extremely vague and neither Congress nor the Department of Labor are clear on what they want. The ambiguities in the legislation can only be resolved by thousands of decisions in state and local governments, and these are difficult in the extreme given the almost impossible deadlines for implementation. If Washington, D.C., is an example of what can happen under close federal oversight and the best of local expertise, other areas can be pardoned if they make judgments contrary to the after-the-fact preferences of manpower evaluators. Given the time constraints and legislative ambiguities, a lack of success with EEA is no indication that state and local governments are unable to handle a greater degree of control.

And finally, it is becoming increasingly clear that the Emergency Employment Act is trying to do too much with too little. The something-for-everyone approach of the legislation is totally unrealistic, and it is bound to lead to frustrations from those expecting any particular accomplishment such as extensive civil service reform, job restructuring, upgrading of the underemployed, or meaningful aid to any particular group such as engineers and scientists, welfare recipients, or ghetto residents. The danger is that these frustrations will obscure the marginal but still important contributions which can be made under the program, and which have been made in the District.

These generalizations from the D.C. experience are only tentative. There is no way or reason to render a final judgment of performance at this early date. However, these lessons suggest some things to look for and provide some food for thought. It is already clear that there are both positive and negative features about the experience to date. But if every city in the nation could implement the EEA as effectively as the District of Columbia, it would be an unquestioned success.

WINNERS OF THE 1971 DAR ESSAY CONTEST

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride and pleasure once again in entering the winning essays of the Constitution Week Essay Contest sponsored by the Francis Broward Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Broward County, Fla.

This group of boys and girls has, through their intelligence, industry, and grasp of American history reaffirmed my faith in the basic love of American Government by our youth. Too often only the negative aspects of the younger generation are publicized. Throughout the country, however, there are thousands of youngsters who participate in contests like this every day, expressing their respect for this Nation and our form of Government.

The first prize winners in each category are: elementary school; Jeffery Lariccia; Bayview Elementary School, Fort Lauderdale; junior high school; Mandy Webb; Pompano Jr. High School, Pompano Beach; and high school; Page Gardner; Fort Lauderdale High School, Fort Lauderdale.

The following are the winning essays:

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN—1706–1790

(By Jeffery Lariccia, fifth, Bayview School)

He was a Jack of all trades.
And he was a student of bright.
Dealing with the Constitution.
He always had to fight.
Poem by poem, wish by wish,
He always made money in the dish.

Benjamin Franklin was a great American of two hundred years ago. He was one of the men who did the most to make the United States free and independent country. He was the oldest of the patriots who were called the founding fathers. Because he was considered to be the wisest American of his time, and one of the wisest men in the world, the other patriots looked to him for advice in everything they did. The new country that was to become the United States relied on him to conduct matters with European countries because he was so respected.

Benjamin Franklin was born in Boston in 1706. His father made candles and did not earn much. There were 16 other children in the family, and this made things harder. When Franklin was eight years old, his father had sent him to school. But when Franklin's father thought about how much it would cost to send him to college, he decided the boy should go to school where he would learn reading, writing, and arithmetic. When Franklin was 10 years old, he left school to help his father. He did not like cutting candles and running errands. He much preferred to read, and so his father decided he would make a good printer.

In 1776, the year the Declaration of Inpendence was signed and the colonies began calling themselves the United States of America, Franklin went to France on a government mission. There he helped make an agreement with France which caused the French to send their fleet to help the Americans fight England. He also got the French to lend money to the United States. After the American colonies won their freedom from England, Franklin came back home to Philadelphia. There he took part in the most important work of his life, the framing of the Constitution of the United States.

Some of the things we use today were invented by Benjamin Franklin. He got the idea for the lightning rod, and no one has found a better way of protecting houses from lightning. Franklin also invented a kind of stove for heating a room. The Franklin stove still can be found in places where people use stoves.

WHAT I FEEL IS THE MOST IMPORTANT ARTICLE

(By Mandy Webb)

All the articles and amendments of the Constitution of the United States of America seem very important to me because no one article can govern the United States. But the article which is the most important to me, remembering that the rest follow it in importance, is Article 5. Article 5 states that it provides for amending or changing the Constitution. There is a process that Congress goes through to change an article. Approval by the states of an amendment called "ratification" may be obtained in two ways. First by the legislatures of the states, second by special conventions called in the states.

The first ten amendments are called the Bill of Rights. There are fifteen other amendments that also include change to the articles.

Article 5 is one of the most important ideas included in our American form of government for here the American people have a means of making changes in the Constitution. Without change, the laws that governed people two hundred years ago would still be in effect. Since those people knew that America would be changing, that the laws would have to change with the people and for the people. They prepared for us and people to follow so they can alter or amend laws that don't conform to their time of life. The people only make changes when they become necessary or desirable, but only when a large majority of the people want change.

There are two ways an amendment may be proposed. First, by a two-thirds vote in the Senate and House of Representatives. Second, in a national convention called by Congress when asked to do so by the legislatures of two-thirds of the states. This has never been done. All twenty five amendments have been proposed in Congress.

I think Article 5 should be first on the list of articles to show to anyone studying our government that we in a democratic society can change our own rules if they are not doing their planned best for the good of the majority of the people.

The framers of the Constitution purposely made it hard to put through an amendment. More than 3,500 amendments have been proposed, but only 27 have been passed by Congress and submitted to the states. Of these only 22 have been ratified. The United States Constitution is harder to amend than any other Constitution in history.

HOW DOES THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE PROTECT SPARSELY POPULATED STATES AND SHOULD IT BE PRESERVED?

(By Page Gardner)

The controversy over the electoral college began in January, 1965 with a constitutional amendment dealing with the election of the President and Vice-President. The provisions pertaining to the electoral college are generally unfamiliar to most Americans. The electoral college was devised as a safeguard for the people; it was to protect the vote of the minority from the tyranny of the majority. This is why it is not lightly discarded.

This is a brief explanation of why many cumbersome provisions pertaining to the electoral college were put in the Constitution. In practice it has not served its purpose.

There is a tendency to regard the electoral college as obsolete because under the present system the President and the Vice-President are elected indirectly by the people through their direct choice in November of presidential electors in each State. Current usage has converted the elector's votes into ceremony.

The intent of the Constitution was to give voters the same numerical representation. This has been thwarted by many things. One thwarting agent is the unit rule or winner-take-all. This system began with the introduction of the general ticket in 1832. The rise of the two-party system altered electoral procedures. The majority party of each State saw that it had maximum influence in electing a President through consolidation of its voting strength. The political party winning in a State wins the electoral vote. So twelve states having the largest cities can provide all but eight of the electoral votes.

Another flaw in this system is each voter in each State has as many votes as his State has presidential electors. The general ticket

system is a system of weighed voting which in fact operates against the smaller States, and the minority which is lost when added to the majority vote of the winning electors.

Why was this system chosen by each State? The answer is that the majority of States adopted this system so they could exert maximum influence; the other States had little choice but to do the same.

The disparity in viewpoints in changing the system resulted in the proposal of four basic approaches. These are: eliminating office of the elector but retaining the unit method of each State's electoral vote, the direct system, the proportional system and direct national election.

The plan of the unit rule without electors would bring about the most change in the Constitution. It would retain the unit rule in casting votes to which each State is entitled but it would eliminate the office of the elector. This plan was a part of the President's proposed amendment. The basic problem with this is ticket splitting could not be avoided. If the people cast separate votes for the President and Vice-President and if their electoral votes are counted on the basis of popular vote, ticket splitting is inevitable.

The district voting plan would retain the electoral college but operate to prevent the use of the unit rule. The district plan is stated in the Mundt Amendment. This amendment provides that electors shall be elected within single electoral districts corresponding to Congressional districts. This would bind the elector to vote for the candidate in whose behalf he ran. This plan corresponds closely to the intent of the Constitution. The electors would be appointed the way Congress directs. This would lessen the power of the States.

Those against this plan see the danger of gerry-mandering of districts or realigning voting boundaries to favor one party. The courts could prohibit this, though.

The proportional plan has won the highest percentage of support. In it the electoral voting strength of the States would be retained, but each candidate who polled a fraction of the State's popular votes would receive an identical fraction of the State's electoral vote. Many feel this would weaken the two-party system and give undue importance to less populated areas.

The election by popular vote plan would abolish the electoral college and make every vote equal. It would eliminate the need for a contingent election procedure and prevent the election of a minority President.

The main objection is it would reduce the role of the States and permit nationalization of election procedures. The large States could virtually elect the President.

Personally I am in favor of the revising of the electoral college and adopting the proportional voting plan. The plan seems to have the least faults and it can be controlled by the State and Federal governments.

THE AIR WAR IN LAOS

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, in preparation for the Department of Defense briefing October 5 on U.S. bombing policy in Laos, 15 of us House Members decided to hold a prebriefing session September 27 and have several outside experts give us their opinions on exactly what the United States is doing in Laos.

One of the men who briefed us was Fred Branfman, director of Project Air War. For those of you unfamiliar with this operation, Project Air War is a nonprofit educational organization aimed at raising public consciousness about the ongoing air war in Indochina. Mr. Branfman spent 4 years in Laos, from March 1967 to February 1971. He spent his first 2 years as a volunteer with International Voluntary Services, Inc. As a volunteer he learned to speak Laotian and French. His final 2 years in Laos were spent doing research, writing, interpreting, and working as a freelance contributor to Dispatch News Service International. During this period he interviewed several thousand refugees from American bombings; dozens of American pilots and air war officials; and local government and embassy officials in Laos, South Vietnam, Thailand, and Cambodia.

Mr. Branfman and his associates prepared a memo for our September 27 briefing. It is an eye opener and is simply one more illustration of how the Congress of the United States is not consulted by the executive branch in waging war in other countries.

For the benefit of those Members who were unable to attend the meeting, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE AIR WAR IN LAOS

I. An Unconstitutional Exercise of Power by the Executive.

II. Dimensions of the Air War.

III. Some Basic Questions Congressmen Might Ask Defense Department Officials.

IV. Appendix: The Debate Over the Bombing of Villages in Laos.

FOREWORD

The air war in Laos raises a basic issue: are officials of the Executive Branch to have the sole authority on deciding how American technology will be used abroad?

Issues raised by the bombing of Laos go far beyond the destruction of that tiny and lovely land:

(1) Unless Congress demands some say in the use of American air power, there is every reason to believe that the war in Indochina will continue indefinitely.

The Executive has fought a war for 7 years in Laos now, without large numbers of ground troops. It can continue fighting such a war for another 7 years throughout Indochina, unless Congress acts.

(2) Unless Congress acts, the Executive may again use air power anywhere in the third world in the decade to come, solely as it deems fit.

(3) And unless Congress acts to gain participation in the use of American technology, there is little protection for our own citizens against Executive abuse.

The Attorney General today claims that the Executive has the sole right to determine which American citizens will be wiretapped, just as the Executive claims unilateral authority to determine what will be bombed in Laos.

I. AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL EXERCISE OF POWER BY THE EXECUTIVE

The Executive Branch has dispensed over $10 billion on the air war in Laos over the last 7 years; it has sent over 1200 American men to be killed, wounded, or captured in Laos; it has involved some 30-50,000 American airmen in the bombing campaign.

A particularly serious legal and moral issue has been raised by the massive evidence that American planes have frequently struck inhabited villages. (See Appendix: The Debate Over The Bombing of Laotian Villages.)

Until now, however, Congress' only monitoring of the bombing has been to call before it those very officials who are responsible for the bombing of Laos, and who, as the Pentagon Papers reveal, feel little obligation to accurately inform Congress of their activities.

The spirit and letter of the American Constitution clearly calls upon the Executive: (a) to seek the advice and consent of the Senate before engaging in war; (b) to truthfully inform the Congress as to all war-making activities after they have been initiated; (c) to respect all international conventions ratified by the Senate, such as Nuremberg Principle VI, clause b, which specifically prohibits the wanton destruction of cities, towns and villages not justified by military necessity.

The Executive has fulfilled none of the Constitutional obligations in its bombing campaign in Laos:

(a) In May, 1964, it initiated the bombing of Laos without consulting Congress. It has executed the bombing campaign ever since without once seeking the advice and consent of the Congress.

This is especially true for the bombing of Northern Laos, which Ambassador Sullivan has testified is the "other war" unrelated to American ground activities in South Vietnam. Therefore, even the now repealed Gulf of Tonkin Resolution has never applied to Northern Laos.

(b) From May, 1964, until October, 1969, the Executive consistently evaded and misled the Congress over its bombing campaign in Laos.

A recent hearing by the Senate Armed Services Committee, revealed that Senator Symington, head of a Senate Subcommittee on Laos, was kept out of that country by the American Ambassador in the mid-60's.

Senator Fulbright charged in the Fall of 1969, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been misled about the nature of American bombing in Laos during a 1968 appearance by former Ambassador Sullivan.

(c) It was not until October, 1969, that the Executive first informed Congress that it was bombing in Laos—5½ years after it had begun.

(d) It was not until April, 1971, that the Executive first informed Congress that it was using B–52's in Laos—14 months after it had begun.

(e) And until today Executive officials continue to maintain, under oath before Congress—and publicly—that American planes had not bombed civilian targets in Laos.

The bombing of Laos is one of the most striking violations of our constitution in the history of this republic.

II. DIMENSIONS OF THE BOMBING OF LAOS

1. Size

(a) *Duration:* May, 1964—present, twice as long as bombing of North Vietnam.

(b) *Sorties:* Over 500,000 (Source: Cornell Air War Study Project).

(c) *Aircraft Involved:* F–4, F–105, A–6, A–7 jets; A1E, A26 and T28 prop bombers; B–52's.

(d) *Tonnage:* Over 1.5 million tons (Source: Cornell Air War Study).

(e) *Kind of Ordnance Used:* Napalm, white phosphorous, fragmentation, high explosives, guava and pineapple anti-personnel bombs; laser and teleguided missiles.

(f) *Immediate Cost Per Sortie:* $3,000 per prop sortie; $7,000 per jet sortie; $28,000 per B–52 sortie.

(g) *Overall Cost of Bombing Campaign:* $10 Billion for bombing plus $2–$3 billion for installation of McNamara line. This overall figure includes cost of support and reconnaissance sorties, maintenance of 10 bases and 2 aircraft carriers involved in bombing of Laos, and 30–50,000 airmen. (Source: McNamara estimate of $20,000 per sortie in 1967, Document 118, *New York Times* Pentagon Papers.)

(h) *American MIA–POW's in Laos:* 225—Mostly airmen (Source: DOD.)

(i) *Americans killed and wounded in Laos:*

Over 1,200, mostly airmen. (Projection from Pentagon prereleased figures of 200 KIA in Laos, 1962 until Oct. 22, 1969; and 95 KIA and 262 WIA from March 6, 1970 until present.)

2. Nature

Most of the bombing has gone on in Pathet Lao controlled regions of Laos, a 50,000 square mile region inhabited today by nearly 800,000 civilians according to an estimate by Ambassador Godley before the Senate Armed Service Committee in July, 1971, testimony. There are some 2,000–3,000 villages in these ones, according to Ambassador Sullivan.

The original purpose of the bombing was to strike at such military targets as roads, trucks, bridges, and military camps. An effort was made to avoid civilian targets.

In a poor, rural land such as Laos, however, there is a paucity of such military targets; the guerrillas are also adept at hiding in the thick forest covering Pathet Lao zones, and moving constantly in small groups under cover of the night.

The result has been American planes frequently striking at villages. There is overwhelming evidence (see appendix) that hundreds of villages have been struck, tens of thousands of civilians killed and wounded, and hundreds of thousands driven underground or into refugee camps.

As hundreds of planes poured into Laos after the bombing halt over North Vietnam in Nov., 1968, one of the purposes of the bombing became—in the words of Robert Shaplen writing in the April, 1970, issue of *Foreign Affairs*—"to destroy the social and economic fabric in Pathet Lao areas."

The most dramatic example of American bombing in Laos was on the Plain of Jars, a society inhabited by over 50,000 civilians when the bombing began in 1964. After 5½ years of intense bombing of villages, the people were taken off the Plain in September, 1969. It is today a deserted wasteland.

Most of the bombing in Laos has been done by American planes. Royal Lao Air Force bombing has constituted at most, 10–15 percent of the total sorties.

Theoretically, control of the bombing rests with the American Ambassador to Laos. But he has only one junior staff officer to oversee the hundreds of approved targets, as the staff of the Kennedy Subcommittee has pointed out. Photo recon is not done after each strike. No known disciplinary action has been taken against pilots for bombing villages.

The result has been that although bombing of military targets has contributed, the United States has carried out the most protracted bombing of civilian targets in the history of warfare, as well!

3. Secrecy

The bombing of Laos has been marked by intense efforts at secrecy by the Executive. Since such efforts were not made in South Vietnam, this apparently is not due to any need for military security. Rather, the goal seems to be to keep the truth from the American people.

The press is still prohibited from going out on bombing raids over Laos, though they have had a free hand to do so in Vietnam; the press is still prohibited from having free access to American pilots in Udorn, who do most of the bombing of Northern Laos, although reporters can talk freely with pilots in South Vietnam about the bombing in that country; sorties and tonnage figures are still classified for Laos, though they are freely available for South Vietnam; American casualties in Laos from 1964 to the present have still never been made public, although they are easily obtainable in South Vietnam.

4. Ineffectiveness

By any standards, the bombing of Laos has been monumentally ineffective: today, after 500,000 sorties and an expenditure of 10 billion dollars against some of the poorest people on earth, Communist guerrillas control far more territory than they ever did.

The bombing has not stemmed the flow of supplies, as indicated by present Communist offensives in Cambodia and the discovery of supply complexes everywhere from the Plain of Jars to the A Shau valley during the last year; the Pentagon Papers reveal that American defense planners agreed that the bombing of North Vietnam was ineffective, as when the CIA stated that 27 months of U.S. bombing "have had remarkably little effect on Hanoi's overall strategy." In North Vietnam, American bombers had relatively lucrative military targets to strike. In Laos, where they do not, the bombing has been even less useful.

By the accounts of refugees, former Pathet Lao soldiers interviewed in defector camps, and American pilots: a) American bombers cannot easily locate guerrillas, trucks or storage complexes; b) even when they do, they often do not destroy them.

American bombing in Laos has been marked by a tremendous wastage of American lives and resources, and untold agony for those living under the bombs, to little military effect.

III. SOME BASIC QUESTIONS CONGRESSMEN MIGHT ASK DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS

1. Size

(1) The Pentagon Papers give former Secretary McNamara's estimate back in 1967 of $20,000 per bombing sortie, presumably including all supporting costs. Assuming a rise in costs due to inflation, how much is the overall cost per sortie today?

(2) Assuming the definition of a bombing sortie is still one plane taking off with its bombs, delivering them, and returning to base, how many U.S. sorties were flown in Laos in 1970? How many thus far in 1971? How many Royal Lao Air Force sorties were flown in the same period? How many sorties have been flown in northern Laos, how many in southern Laos, by U.S. planes year by year since 1964?

(3) How many tons of bombs have been dropped on Laos since 1964? What percentage napalm, white phosphorous, fragmentation and anti-personnel bombs?

(4) How many Americans have been killed in relation to air operations between 1964 and today in Laos? How many wounded? How many captured or missing in action?

2. Nature (the bombing of villages)

(1) The United States Information Service Report, U.N. advisor Chapelier's study, and dozens of newspaper reports, all indicate that many villages were bombed up on the Plain of Jars from 1964 through 1969, that many civilians were killed and injured. Why did Ambassador Sullivan and Mr. Doolin not make this clear to the Symington subcommittee in the fall of 1969, the Kennedy subcommittee in May 1970 and April 1971? Is there any question that the dozens of photographs of bombing victims are in any way untrue?

(2) It is clear that the stated policy of the bombing is to avoid bombing villages. The question is what actually happens (a) for example, what controls does the American Ambassador have to ensure that villages are not struck? Ambassador Sullivan testified that approval of targets "took up a lot of time". Why, then, was there only one junior foreign service officer working to approve targets for the Ambassador, why not more? How many targets were there a week for him to check out, how long would it take him to adequately check each one?

(b) Was photo reconnaissance available after every strike? What process would the embassy have to go through to check out whether villages which had not been approved had been struck or not?

(c) Has disciplinary action ever been taken against an American pilot for striking a village in Pathet Lao areas? If so, how many times? If not, why not?

(3) Ambassador Sullivan has estimated that there are now some 2–3000 villages in Pathet Lao zones. What percentage of these are estimated to be now standing? What percentage of those which are partially or totally destroyed have been hit by bombs? How many villages are totally intact behind Pathet Lao lines now, never having been hit by any sort of bombing?

(4) As one looks at photo reconnaissance film of Pathet Lao zones, an area estimated by Ambassador Godley to be inhabited by 800,000 people, what signs of life does one see? Where exactly are the 250,000 or so people living in southern Laos located, if not in or near the areas we bomb? What about the numerous press reports that the people spend much of their time in caves, and tunnels or out in the forest?

(5) Are ricefields or other signs of agricultural cultivation ever bombed? Have hospitals ever been bombed?

(6) Ambassador Sullivan has testified that the town up on the Plain of Jars, Phonesavan, was bombed only after the people had been cleared out. Yet both the residents of Phonesavan interviewed by Congressmen McCloskey and Waldie, and columnist, Jack Anderson, indicated that they were still living in and around it when it was bombed. How do you explain this contradiction?

What steps are taken in the heat of a bombing campaign to ascertain whether or not the people have cleared out? How can you tell where the people are hiding from 5,000 feet?

(7) What are the official estimates for civilians killed or wounded by the bombing?

3. Secrecy

(1) Why are reporters barred from flying out over Pathet Lao zones, though they have always flown anywhere in South Vietnam? Why is the press not given free access to pilots bombing Laos, as they have in South Vietnam for pilots bombing that country? Why have sortie and casualty figures not been made as easily available as those for South Vietnam?

(2) Would there be any objection to Congressmen visiting Udorn Air Force Base and looking through pre-1971 target folders? Fresh photo recon film of Pathet Lao areas? To allowing Congressmen to go out on FAC flights over Pathet Lao areas in northern and southern Laos? To visiting the Plain of Jars, now in friendly hands?

(3) Why was the USIS survey not immediately made available to Congress and the press after its completion? Why have transcripts of interviews with refugees from Pathet Lao zones now on file in the USAID office of refugees not been made available long ago to Congress and the press?

(4) Is it not true that the advice and consent of Congress should be sought before we decide to go in and bomb a country like Laos? Why wasn't Congress informed of the fact that we were bombing in Laos until October, 1969, 5½ years after it began? Of the B–52 raids until 14 months after they began?

4. Effectiveness

(1) Why, after 7 years of bombing and $10 billion, do the communists now control more territory in Laos than ever? Couldn't this $10 billion have been better used to meet our serious domestic needs?

(2) The press reported that our side found sizable amounts of supplies up on the Plain of Jars, in the Ashau Valley, when we captured them a few months ago. There is a sizable communist offensive in Cambodia now. Does this imply that the bombing is ineffective in stemming the movement of supplies?

(3) It is not a question of doubting anyone's word, but after the publication of the

Pentagon Papers, much of the public simply doesn't believe official statements anymore. What proof is there that there are 80,000 North Vietnamese soldiers fighting in Laos? What proof is there of the number of trucks destroyed, arms depots struck, soldiers killed?

IV. APPENDIX: THE DEBATE OVER THE BOMBING OF VILLAGES IN LAOS

1. The official record

To this day spokesmen for the Executive Branch continue to deny that American planes have bombed civilian targets in Laos.

In the Symington subcommittee hearings, former Ambassador Sullivan testified, under oath, that "the USAF contribution was limited to striking (military targets) . . . it was the policy not to attack populated areas." Colonel Tyrell, Sullivan's Air Attache, testified that, "villages even in a free fire zone are restricted from bombing." On May 7, 1970, Assistant Secretary of Defense Doolin claimed before the Kennedy subcommittee that, "if a proposed target does not meet the criteria imposed to prevent civilian casualties it will not be struck." In April, 1971, before the same subcommittee former Ambassador Sullivan declared that even in Pathet Lao areas, "if they are inhabiting a village they are not a military target." At a press conference the following day Mr. Doolin added that such protection extended to villages even if enemy soldiers were present in them. On July 12, 1971, Congressman Gubser entered testimony into the Congressional Record from sources such as: present Ambassador Godley, former Ambassador Sullivan, former targeting officer Archer, and Brig. Gen. Daniel James Jr., all to the effect that villages are not bombed in Laos.

2. Selected documentation of the bombing of civilians

(1) April 1971 Staff Report of James Lowenstein and Richard Moose for the Symington Subcommittee on U.S. Agreements and Commitments Abroad: "There are plenty of incidents known to American civilian employees who have been in Laos for some years in which civilian targets have been bombed."

(2) September 1970 Staff Report for the Kennedy Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees: "The United States has undertaken . . . the support of and participation in a large scale air war over Laos to destroy the physical and social infrastructure of Pathet Lao held areas . . . throughout all this there has been a policy of secrecy . . . (in 1968 the) bombing began to be conducted on a more regular basis and was directed increasingly against populated areas."

(3) April 1971 Kennedy Subcommittee hearings—Chairman Kennedy: "It is my conclusion after the efforts and the work and the review we have done . . . that the bombing in Laos contributes to at least 75% of the refugees."

(4) July 1970 U.S. Information Service survey of refugee attitudes based upon interviews with more than 200 refugees from nearly a hundred villages: Conclusion "The bombing is clearly the most compelling reason for moving—95% of the respondents indicated their village had been bombed, 49% could not count the number of times. 68% had seen some one injured and 61% had seen a person killed. 57% indicated that they would return to their villages if the bombing stopped."

(5) Refugee survey from the Ban Na Sou-Ban Xon area with approximately 100 refugees: 68% had seen bombs dropped frequently, 80% said "they could not eke out more than a bare subsistence living after the attacks started." 25% had seen people killed.

(6) While in Laos, Congressmen McCloskey and Waldie conducted their own series of refugee interviews, "unanimous in describing the destruction of every single home in each of the seven villages." The Congressmen reported, "the refugees commonly described . . . that they had to live in caves or holes, farming only at night when the bombing became so intensive in 1969."

(7) USAID Mission Reports, "In the summer of 1970 the Office of Refugee Affairs for USAID carried out extensive interviews with refugee village chiefs. The reports are classified, but when asked about them, USAID Director, Jack Williamson, replied, "Sure all the refugees talk about the bombing."

(8) Comprehensive Refugee survey from the Plain of Jars. Conducted by former IVS volunteer Walt Hanley and validated by high ranking State Department officials, the hundreds of interviews and photographs describe the bombing of dozens of villages.

(9) U.N. report by George Chapelier on conditions in the Plain of Jars, "By 1968 the intensity of the bombing was such that no organized life was possible in the villages . . . in 1969 . . . jet planes came daily and destroyed all stationary structures . . . the villagers lived in trenches and holes or in caves . . . bombings were aimed at the systematic destruction of the material basis of the civilian society."

(10) James Malia, former Director of IVS in Laos, "We have bombed civilian areas in a systematic destruction of the human basis for society."

(11) Deputy Director USAID Hafner, "Sure some villages get bombed, there's no other way to fight a war out here."

(12) A multitude of journalists have interviewed refugees and a smaller number have travelled through the devastated zones. Jacque Decornoy, Southeast Asian Desk Editor for *Le Monde*, indicated that in one 30 mile stretch surrounding the town of Sam Neua, not one structure was left standing. (*Le Monde*, July 1968)

(13) Daniel Southerland, *Christian Science Monitor*, May 14, 1970. Based on refugee interviews, Southerland indicates that the tens of thousands of inhabitants of the Plain of Jars were forced by the bombing "to move out of their homes and into trenches, caves, and bunkers . . . by all accounts the situation has been somewhat similar for the estimated 192,000 people living in Sam Neua Province . . . one Western diplomat reported whole communities living underground."

(14) Jack Anderson on June 5, 1970, reported: "Refugees too inarticulate and too simple to repeat the same lie have sworn to this column that U.S. fighter bombers have conducted systematic raids on villages in Laos, killing defenseless civilians."

(15) Richard Ward, UPI release, August 2, 1970, "the destruction (in the Lao town of Sam Neua and the surrounding villages) was more than I have seen in North Vietnam."

(16) J. Doyon, March 2, 1970, *Le Figaro*. Doyon reports the bombing of a school in the Mekong which he witnessed.

(17) Tammy Arbuckle, April 28, 1971. Arbuckle reports that Americans in middle level posts in Laos indicated that in August 1969 American aircraft "bombed towns around the Plain of Jars 'out of existence'."

(18) Carl Stock, *New Republic*, May 9, 1970. Based upon refugee interviews Stock writes "everything that stood and was not controlled by the government became a target."

(19) T. D. Allman, October 21, 1970, *New York Times*, "The main U.S. targets according to sources both in the Laotian government and the Pathet Lao are the rebel economy and social fabric."

(20) Robert Shaplen, April, 1970, *Foreign Affairs*. Based upon an investigatory visit to Laos, Shaplen wrote, "A goal of the bombing has been 'to destroy the social and economic fabric in Pathet Lao areas'."

REGARDING THE CONFIRMATION OF HOWARD P. MACE AS AMBASSADOR TO SIERRA LEONE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have tried to bring to public attention the deplorable conditions at our State Department where loyal employees who dare to "rock the boat" are sometimes rewarded by coercive treatment from the long established ruling clique and are at times ousted from State for their efforts. As I noted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 1, legislation was introduced in 1968 to establish a fair grievance procedure for Foreign Service officers, who, for the most part, do not have the protection accorded civil service employees.

In addition, as a member of the House Internal Security Committee I have questioned officials of the State Department on their Federal employee security program in which Executive Order 10450 dealing with employee security regulations plays a major role. Executive Order 10450 has as its first paragraph this requirement:

> Whereas the interests of the national security require that all persons privileged to be employed in the departments and agencies of Government, shall be reliable, trustworthy, of good conduct and character, and of complete and unswerving loyalty to the United States . . .

Executive Order 10450 goes on to state, among other things, that these requirements of a Federal employee are subject to question in any individual case when deliberate misrepresentation, falsifications, or omissions of material facts or the use of coercion enter a given case. As was brought out in one of our hearings, these factors are applicable to the highest officials in the State Department.

With the above in mind, it is not hard to understand why I was particularly interested in the nomination of Mr. Howard P. Mace, formerly the personnel director at State, to be Ambassador to Sierra Leone.

On September 30 Mr. John Hemenway, whose case was discussed at our hearings, testified in opposition to Mr. Mace's confirmation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Shortly thereafter, Mrs. Cynthia Thomas, the wife of Charles William Thomas, called to the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee, the tragic circumstances in the suicide of her husband who had been selected out of the State Department and who for 2 years had sought a redress of grievances without success. Finally, the case of another State Department employee, Alison Palmer, who had won her case on a charge of sex discrimination, came up in the Mace nomination hearings.

I cannot, in all fairness, comment on the merits of this case, but the charges certainly should be fully aired and refuted before Mr. Mace's nomination is approved.

I insert at this point the testimony of Mrs. Cynthia Thomas before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate along with a copy of a letter addressed to Chairman FULBRIGHT, a copy of which I received:

TESTIMONY OF MRS. CHARLES WILLIAM THOMAS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am happy to appear at your invitation to provide your Committee with whatever knowledge I have which may help it reach a conclusion on the hearings related to the nomination of Mr. Howard Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. Let me make it very clear at the outset that I do not know Mr. Mace personally, that I have never worked for him nor do I have knowledge as to his personal qualities.

As you know, I do have sad and personal experience regarding the functioning of the Department of State's personnel system, under the administration of Mr. Mace, particularly as it related to the promotion or alternatively to the selection-out of a Foreign Service Officer. Unhappily, my late husband, Charles William Thomas, was selected out rather than promoted, much, of course, to our distress, and if I may say so, to the great loss of the Foreign Service.

My husband, Charles William Thomas, was involuntarily retired for time in grade at age 46 with 18 years of superior achievements for the Foreign Service without a pension or a right to appeal. Stripped of his career and denied the opportunity to further serve his country which was all he ever asked, he was dismissed improperly and illegally in my opinion by changes in regulations which shortened time in grade. There were also precepts to promotion panels which shortened this time in grade even further. He was not even given the same consideration for promotion within his rank.

The Supreme Court has ruled in a number of cases where governmental action seriously injured an individual—that individual is entitled to a hearing. I used to think no one could be deprived of his livelihood by governmental action without due process. All attempts made by Mr. Thomas, members of Congress and myself prior to his tragic death to rectify the "miscarriage of justice" were denied or ignored by the personnel authorities of the State Department of which Mr. Mace was director.

These personnel authorities for at least two years before my husband's death and ever since, have tried to make it appear that this was a "mediocre officer"—just hte "unfortunate victim of a highly competitive system and that his case was handled properly within the rules." They attempted to gloss over their own errors in their sorry handling of all efforts to have a review of the circumstances relative to his involuntary retirement.

I would like to submit letters signed by Mr. Howard Mace to many American citizens throughout the country who have expressed concern to the President of the United States on the mishandling of the Thomas case. I would like to point out to this Committee that the packaged contents of these letters were given to you, Senator Pell and Senator Cooper when you cited the miscarriage of justice and lack of due process. I would also like to point out that it took the State Department's administrative officials nine months to answer Senator Bayh's letter, nine months to answer Senator Pastore's letter, nine months to answer Senator Muskie's letter, nine months to answer Congressman Chet Holifield's letter, Congressman Ross Adair's letter and many others. They never answered Senator Yarborough's letter. Obviously my husband's career and his life was a matter of indifference to these personnel authorities. When I speak of them I have no choice but to question the man, as the system cannot speak. For better or for worse, Mr. Mace embodies the system as do the other officials who signed the same form letters to your Senators which continue to obscure the true conditions.

In letters which the personnel authorities addressed to Senators before my husband's death and even in the letter to Senator Fulbright recently they have attempted to convey the simple impression that my husband merely did not measure up to the "competition" in the Foreign Service. What they conspicuously failed to mention in any of their letters to the members of this Senate, or to employers where my husband sought employment, were the blunders attendant to the misfiling of a Senior Inspector's Evaluation Report or the extensive commendations received and ignored by these same personnel authorities.

Most notable of the letters was a five page letter written in 1968 from Ambassador Fulton Freeman, my husband's chief in Mexico to the Director General of the Foreign Service, Ambassador John Steeves.

"To sum it up, I believe for the reasons outlined above that there may have been a miscarriage of justice in the failure to promote Mr. Charles Thomas to Class 3. But I feel even more strongly that the Foreign Service stands to lose an able, effective, competent, dedicated and sincerely respected team if the Thomases are forced to resign because of time in grade—a loss which at this critical juncture of the Foreign Service can ill be afforded."

At no time, to the best of my knowledge, did the Director of Personnel, Mr. Mace, attempt in any way to take action which would have attempted to provide a reasonable solution to the obvious problem of an extraordinarily qualified officer trying to correct the consequences of ludicrous personnel errors not of his making. Still at this date, the final judgment of Mr. Mace is that there was no error, no basis for a complaint, no denial of due process.

Even my appeals to the Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, Mr. William Macomber, after my husband's death to rectify the miscarriage of Justice, to close this black chapter for the Department of State, and allow other officers due process were in vain.

If you would permit me, I would like to read a few excerpts from Ambassador Robert McClintock's report of October 20, 1966. This was the misfiled Inspector's Report that has been referred to in my husband's case. I would like to submit the entire report for the record.

From past efficiency ratings and from a present evaluation of Mr. Thomas' work, it is evident to the Inspector that he is one of the most valuable officers in the political section of Embassy Mexico. He has a very good mind tempered by a broad educational background and by extensive practical experience in the Foreign Service. Mr. Thomas seems to be very effective not only in making contacts with Mexican officials and other important citizens of this large town, but also in translating the results of these contacts into lucid English prose.

"He is an excellent drafting officer. The FSI ratings indicate Mr. Thomas' very real ability in foreign languages. The report is being submitted without delay because the Inspector would hope that the Selection Board now sitting will take it into consideration in judging Mr. Thomas' qualifications for immediate promotion. It seems to this Inspector that promotion is long overdue since his last advance in grade took place in February 1961.

Mr. Thomas as a lawyer has brought his professional skill in assisting the Embassy in very protracted and difficult negotiations with the Mexican Government on various longstanding claims. *This Inspector would suggest that upon his departure from Mexico City he be given a year's assignment at one of the senior service colleges.* His past background as a naval aviator might suggest an assignment to the Naval War College. *Thomas is a very valuable officer and I believe that a War College tour of duty would round him out with a view to positions of much greater responsibility."*

I understand quite well that you gentlemen are not sitting here as members of a promotional panel considering the qualities of my husband's performance over an extensive period of years. The reason I am inviting your attention to these documents and excerpts is simply to point out to you that under the type of personnel system that my husband was exposed to, which was so deficient in simple elementary justice and fairness no matter how outstanding and extremely complimentary were these documents and no matter what errors were committed by the personnel authorities he never had a chance. I repeat he never had a chance to "compete" given the type of personnel administration that was going on in the Department of State from 1967 to the present time. And this was the system administered by the nominee before you.

I have here, Senators, a Development Appraisal Report that is the most important document that promotion panels consider. It was submitted by Duncan Mackay, First Secretary of Embassy Mexico, July 10, 1967. I submit the entire report for the record and will read you one heading.

ADVANCEMENT POTENTIAL

" 'Suitable for Advancement to Highest Rank.' Mr. Thomas is a dynamic person with a broad knowledge of the political, economic and social forces at play in the world. Receptive to new ideas, he has the intellectual and moral force to make sound recommendations on matters requiring change. He has an ability to lead people. He should be advanced rapidly through a series of executive positions."

I would like to point out that in that same letter of Ambassador Foreman that I referred to earlier he reinforced Mr. Mackay's evaluations:

"The excellent, highly praiseworthy report prepared on Mr. Thomas' departure by Mr. Duncan A. D. Mackay in which he characterized the former as a 'highly effective negotiator . . . (and) a versatile political generalist . . . whose well reasoned and brilliantly drafted reports have established him as a first class political officer with a highly promising future.' "

He also invited the attention of the misfiled Inspector's Report. I would like to read that paragraph and submit the entire letter for the record.

"I understand that, by an unfortunate quirk of fate, the highly laudatory report prepared by Foreign Service Inspector Robert McClintock on October 20, 1966, in which he recommended Mr. Thomas both for promotion to Class 3 and for assignment to the National War College, wound up in the file of another Charles W. Thomas, and therefore missed consideration by the Selection Board then in session."

I understand from a variety of sources that the official attitude among personnel authorities at that time was that letters of this kind were disregarded almost completely because they were usually sent when a man reached the end of his tenure. Surely when an Ambassador takes the time and effort to invite the attention of the Director General of the Foreign Service about a subordinate of his it was worthy of some attention by these same personnel authorities.

My husband still believed in his last year of the Foreign Service even under the shortened time in grade rules then in operation that the system would operate equitably in

his case because he believed in the institution of the Foreign Service.

He was serving as chief spokesman for the United States Government at the UNESCO General Conference held in Paris in 1968 when the promotion panel selected him out. I enclose for the record a letter of commendation by the Chairman of the delegation. I will read you only a paragraph.

"As Acting Chairman of the United States Delegation to the Fifteenth General Conference of UNESCO, which took place at Paris October 15–November 20, I would like to confirm that one of the reasons for our notable success in shaping the UNESCO program for the period 1969–1970 and beyond was the excellent work done by Foreign Service Officer Charles W. Thomas as an adviser to the Delegation . . . Mr. Thomas' cool head, easy way with people, linguistic ability, and understanding of the political implications of UNESCO's ramified science programs made him a very effective negotiator. Our collaboration with Mr. Thomas provided us a fresh reminder of how much we need the knowledge and skills of professional Foreign Service officers."

The last efficiency report in his file states:

"In the half year since we first learned of Mr. Thomas' imminent departure, we have been unable to find a replacement for him. I have looked through a number of personnel files, most of them of officers quite senior in rank to Mr. Thomas . . . I have asked whether it would be possible to retain Mr. Thomas' services by converting him to FSR status, but administrative technicalities prevent such a solution."

I would like to conclude, gentlemen, by reading a sentence from my husband's application to the Foreign Service in 1951. He just graduated from the University of Paris with a Doctorate in International Law.

"I would like to serve in the United States Foreign Service because I believe in the civilization for which it stands. That civilization has offered me maximum opportunities for education and personnel development which I can best repay by a positive effort on its behalf."

Let us all do no less. Thank you.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
October 5, 1971.

Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Comtee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: I have recently reviewed the transcript of the hearings concerning the nomination of Mr. Howard P. Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. I was naturally very much interested in his testimony concerning my case. I note from the transcript that Mr. Mace said he himself had not participated in discrimination against me; that he had nothing to do with the case; that all of my charges were levied prior to his assumption of his present assignment (Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel); and that he had testified at my hearing that I had been discriminated against by several Ambassadors.

The facts are as follows: Mr. Mace became Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel in November 1967 (Page 63 of transcript—attached). I filed my charges of discrimination in October 1968. Mr. Mace was involved in the discrimination against me because he rejected the findings of the Foreign Service Inspector who investigated my charges and who stated in an official report that I had been discriminated against. These findings were summarized in a four-page memo dated August 8, 1969 (Enc. 1) which the Deputy Under Secretary for Administration requested both Mr. Mace and Mr. John Burns, Director General, to sign before he acted upon it (P. 131). Mr. Pollard, Equal Employment Director for State, testified that he presented this memo to Mr. Mace many times in 1969 (p. 115) but Mr. Mace refused to sign it (p. 135–138). Similar testimony of Mr. Mace's having seen the memo in 1969 was given by his special assistant, Mr. Tice (p. 436) and by Mr. Gordon (p. 1500), special assistant to Mr. Macomber. Nevertheless, Mr. Mace denied that the memo had been presented to him in 1969 (p. 60).

Mr. Mace showed me the memo and the investigative file in March 1970 and told me that he had refused to sign the memo because he did not accept the findings of the inspector, he did not agree that I had been discriminated against, and he did not accept the recommendations which appeared on the fourth page of the memo (p. 62, 63). (You are aware, I am sure, that the EEO regulations do not permit any government agency to reject the results of an EEO investigation). At my hearing in June 1971 Mr. Mace testified that he had not read the investigative file at the time he discussed the report with me. Mr. Mace told me that he would send me a copy of the memo and would also place a copy in my file. He did not do either. I did not receive a copy of the memo from him (I later managed to obtain the first three pages) and he placed only the first three pages in my file. The fourth page contained the recommendations for remedial action and also a signed statement from the Legal Counsel that the investigation showed adequate evidence of discrimination.

In his first day as a witness (under other) at my hearings, Mr. Mace said he still would not sign the memo; he offered as a reason his desire to read the investigative file (p. 62). He also stated that he had not been familiar with the details of my case prior to the time he met me in March 1970 (p. 58, 59). Mr. Pollard testified that he had discussed the details of my case many times with Mr. Mace in 1969, and this is borne out by the fact that Mr. Mace wrote a memo on my case in December 1969 (after I had asked Senator Smith to make inquiries as to the reasons for delays in processing my case). Mr. Tice also testified to having discussed the case with Mr. Mace in 1969. Mr. Mace said at one point that it is unrealistic to expect him to be familiar with "each such case" since there are 12,800 employees in the Foreign Service (p. 63). I am sure you are aware that my case is the first and only formal discrimination complaint filed by a Foreign Service Officer, so there is only one "such case."

When Mr. Mace returned to the witness stand on June 23, he testified that he had not known there was a fourth page to the memo until it was brought to his attention during the hearing. This fourth page was shown to me by Mr. Mace in March 1970 and was discussed in detail in a letter to me dated June 27, 1970 (Enc. 2) which Mr. Mace cleared. With this official record, it is difficult to understand how he could testify under oath that he did not know until June 1971 that the fourth page existed.

Mr. Mace's statement to you that he had testified in my hearing to my having been discriminated against is not supported by the official transcript. He was asked on June 23 whether he would accept the memo by signing the fourth page, and he said he would sign but only with the understanding that he was accepting the recommendation, not the findings contained in the first three pages of discussion of findings of discrimination (p. 1469). When the fourth page appeared in my file a few days later (Enc. 3-memo dated 6/23/71) he had not signed the memo despite having said under oath that he would do so. He eventually signed after I notified the hearing examiner (Enc. 4). This was also after Director General Burns had been transferred and ceased to be Mr. Mace's supervisor. Mr. Burns was one of the Ambassadors charged by me with discrimination.

Mr. Mace's action in refusing to sign the memo for two years blocked the processing of my case. When I notified the Department of my intent to proceed with the case, in 1969, I received a letter which said Mr. Mace thought my career would be adversely affected is I did so (Enc. 5). Mr. Pollard and Mr. Tice both testified that Mr. Mace said this (116, 117, 445). Mr. Mace denied having said it (p. 68, 69). Mr. Mace also approved a memo to the Secretary of State on October 28, 1970 (five days after I requested the Civil Service Commission to handle my case) which attempted to prevent my having a hearing as provided for in the EEO Executive Order (Enc. 6). Mr. Mace's Deputy, Mr. Sohm, cleared a policy statement a few days later saying that the Secretary of State rather than the CSC would make decisions on equal employment (Enc. 7). I believe that Mr. Mace's attitude towards equal employment in the Foreign Service is clear from these two documents, which set up an in-house "high-level review" to close positions to minorities and women. When asked about this by the hearing examiner, Mr. Mace said he hoped these documents would be consistent with the CSC regulations, apparently not realizing that they in fact violate these regulations (p. 1460, 1461, 1462). The high-level review was rescinded as the result of my hearing but for almost a year the State Department was in violation of equal employment regulations.

It seems to me that the record of Mr. Mace's participation in this case is different from the way in which he described it to you. It is for this reason that I am bringing these records to your attention. There were other aspects of testimony by Mr. Mace and other officials in my hearing which may be of interest to you. For example, Mr. Mace stated that there is no action which the State Department can take with regard to an Ambassador who is violating security (p. 1473, 1474). This same conviction about the Department's inability to control Ambassadors was expressed by the Director General (P. 34, 35). There was also considerable testimony that many State Department management officials consider themselves free to interpret any executive order and decide whether or not it applies to the Foreign Service (p. 1176). The Legal Counsel representative said that such decisions are implemented regardless of advice from the Counsel that the Department is violating an executive order, and the Counsel considers that it has no responsibility to notify a higher official (such as the Secretary) that a Department official is defying an executive order (p. 1541, 1548, 1549, 1550).

I noted with interest your questions to Mr. William Harrop, especially as to whether he wished to express any opposition to Mr. Mace. As the attached documents show, Mr. Mace was instructed by Mr. Macomber in February 1971 to investigate charges against Mr. Harrop of unfair labor practices. We are still waiting for the investigation to be carried out. (Enc. 8 and 9).

It seems to me that there are a number of questions which might be asked as to whether the Secretary knows that violations of executive orders on security, employee-management relations, and equal employment have occurred or are occurring, with the knowledge in some cases of the Legal Counsel. I do not know whether the Secretary is aware of his Counsel's position not to inform the Secretary of such violations.

Finally, you may be interested in knowing that I am presently a candidate for ordination as a priest in the Episcopal Church. I intend to remain in the Foreign Service while training for this ministry and after ordination. (enc. 10).

Sincerely,

ALISON PALMER,
Foreign Service Officer.

THE HUNGRY ARE STILL WITH US

HON. PARREN J. MITCHELL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, violence, crime, and prison reform are topics very much emphasized in today's society. However, it is often the case that other problems, just as important, are shrouded behind the misrepresentation that they are being completely solved. Among these are starvation, and malnutrition, which remain unsolved, due to the general complacency of the public and the incompetent and ineffective actions of the Federal food programs.

The following article is, therefore, of extreme importance, for it exposes the myth that the hunger problem is being resolved by Federal programs and illustrates the abuses of these programs.

Colman McCarthy should be congratulated for writing this interesting article and I highly recommend it to all my colleagues:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1971]

ONLY THE ISSUE IS GONE—THE HUNGRY ARE STILL WITH US

(By Colman McCarthy)

On many of the crucial fronts in the war against hunger, hunger is winning. The poor who pass from meal to meal with empty stomachs are not dropping dead in the streets but they are dropping from sight. This might be worse. An illusion, as well as a disaster is created, the illusion being that "well, we solved the hunger problems, what's next—prison reform?"

The federal government has tried to feed its poor people—meaning those who cannot make their own way, either because they are too young, old, sick, crippled or whose skills are not needed by our technologized job market—by three main programs: food stamps, school lunches and the direct food distribution program. An estimated 13 to 14 million people—the hungry poor—are meant to receive food from the government through these programs. The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, through hearings and investigations, has been a useful prod to see to it that the first two of these programs have been made to work with modest—though far from total—effectiveness. Thus, as astonishing as it may seem to some, many of the poor who are intended by Congress to receive food through these programs are actually receiving it.

This is less true, however, with the third program—the direct food distribution program of the Department of Agriculture. Begun in 1935, this effort operates today in 1,061 counties in 34 states and is intended to serve more than 3.5 million people. On the local level, a hungry person—whose hunger has been made official because he or she filled in the proper forms at the county level—goes once a month to a county-run warehouse; there, he or she believes 27.5 pounds of food can be picked up for each member of the family. Too, often, though, the hungry person finds the cupboards of the warehouse bare. "Sorry," the county man might say, "no peanut butter this time nor applesauce or meat or cheese. Come back next month, maybe we'll have it in."

The denied poor man may go away with arms empty thinking that he just came at a bad moment. Perhaps. But in many cases, timing had nothing to do with it. Instead, the poor are victimized by indifference and mismanagement from a number of sources: Congress, the Department of Agriculture, local officials. For example, in Waco, Texas, the welfare director will not talk to pregnant women on Mondays, nor give food to a mother on AFDC (aid to families with dependent children). In Tennessee, an elderly couple cannot get food assistance if their income exceeds $130 a month. In Vermont, to get food, the hungry person is often asked to sign over the property rights to his house—even if a shack or cabin—to the county, not his children. In California, some recipients must travel 100 miles, one way, to get food. In more than a few warehouses, food is stored in what even the Department of Agriculture calls "dangerous conditions."

This grim information on how the government treats its helpless was gathered over the past summer by an investigating team from the Nutrition Committee. One of its members was Robert Choate—best known for his studies on the nutrition value of American breakfast cereals—who served as a consultant. Choate's team came back from visiting some 20 warehouses in 10 states to testify at hearings held by Sen. Charles Percy (R-Ill.) in mid-September. Choate was aghast at what he found out. "It's strange. If you stay in Washington too long, you forget that hungry people are still out there. Kids, old people, sick people. But the hungry haven't gone away, only the issue of hunger has. Then also, another strange thing is that many of the flaws found in the food distribution program are in counties having lush and high-producing farms. Thus, the hungry are surrounded by food. But it is all shipped out to middle and upper class America. And sometimes the hungry know the cruelest irony of all—the farm they look at is government subsidized."

The four days of hearings before Senator Percy were notable for several reasons. This was the *first* time in 35 years—since the Agriculture Act of 1935—that the food distribution program was reviewed by Congress from the viewpoint of the receivers. A curious double standard is created. Other Department of Agriculture programs, especially those that benefit wealthy farmers and their crop subsidies, get constant congressional attention. The politicians want to be sure these programs are being well run by the bureaucrats and that the subsidy checks are going out on time.

A second odd fact about the hearings was the lack of information, and even interest, shown by the Agriculture officials about the food distribution program. A series of critical witnesses had detailed abuses and flaws which demanded explanation. These abuses included insufficient food (calorie deficiency), nutritional imbalance, dangerous storage conditions, inaccessible warehouses and thick jungles of certification standards through which no poor person could pass.

On the last matter, for example, it was known that the Agriculture Department saw the problem and was about to issue national standards of eligibility. Senator Percy asked about this. "Yes," replied Richard Lyng, an assistant secretary of Agriculture, "we believe there would be some advantage to national eligibility standards. We have not, however, completed our work on them nor do we expect to propose them in the immediate future. There would be a rather substantial increased cost . . ."

Elsewhere in the Lyng testimony, questions from Percy are left unanswered. "I don't have any information on that at hand," Lyng replied to one question. "We'll give you a complete report on this" to another. Committee staff workers say that the department had six weeks of notice before the hearings: a week before the committee sent a list of questions to Agriculture officials that would likely be asked. When queried about this, Lyng said that administering this program is "a complicated legistical problem but we're working on it." Candidly, he confessed that the hearings were not a high moment for his department. "We could have answered better. We goofed. It's stupid to be evasive." Amen, said one nutrition committee staff worker. "I was amazed. These officials showed no inclination to improve their program. Take it or leave it, was their attitude. After all, it's only poor people."

All this takes place in Washington where news of another ill-working program hardly causes a pause. Everyone means well toward the hungry, there is no deliberate plot to starve them from our presence. But neither is there must deliberateness in executing such a simple task as getting food to hungry people. A telling, and strange, dialogue occurred at one point between Senator Percy and Assistant Secretary Lyng. What can Congress do to improve the food distribution program, asked Percy. Lyng: "Well, action by Congress would perhaps force our hands, force us to move more quickly than we might otherwise do." Talk to us in the language of pressure, said this official of the people, we understand no other tongue.

JOURNALIST DEFENDS TRUTHFUL REPORTING

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jim Bormann, retiring director of news and public affairs for WCCO radio in Minneapolis, recently delivered the keynote address before the 25th International Conference of the Radio TV News Directors Association in Boston, Mass. Mr. Bormann provided a stirring defense of the "great first principles of journalism: Integrity, fairness, accuracy, and objectivity." He also delivered a sound public spanking to those in journalism who have betrayed their honored profession by interjecting deliberate bias in the reporting of factual news.

Mr. Bormann speaks with many years of experience under his belt, and I believe he has performed a fine public service by defining the problems that exist and urging corrective action by his professional colleagues. I am pleased to insert his entire address at this point in my remarks:

TWENTY-FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE, RADIO TV NEWS DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS., SEPT. 29, 1971

When a man has spent his entire adult life in pursuit of the news, he forms a high regard for his craft. This feeling of affection may drive him to defend his kind of journalism when it comes under attack. It would seem timely—and necessary—to do so today in this keynote address.

As a pioneer in broadcast news and a former president of RTNDA, I've seen many changes over the years. I've been a part of most of them. Change has been good for broadcast journalism, on the whole, and so I am not among those who would now champion the status quo.

But I do hope that my 36 years in journalism may provide the credentials for commenting on what I think I see on our journalistic horizon. RTNDA is a quarter of a century old, and although we're still a young organization, it may be time to size up where we've been in 25 years, and where we're likely to be headed.

As I said, I feel compelled today to defend our kind of journalism from attack—not the attacks from critics *outside* journalism, but the assault on journalistic practices from *within*.

It's clear enough that the media is under bombardment; not just from the Spiro Ag-

news, but from thinking members of our audiences. I'm sure that every news director hears the kind of complaints I've heard—even our best friends are telling us to shape up.

They tell us about their distrust of the media. Sometimes that growing skepticism about what they read or hear is simply based on a misunderstanding of our methods or of the realities of news reporting.

But sometimes it isn't.

Sometimes—I should say "too often"—they tell of personal knowledge of details of a story that has been badly reported—dishonestly reported. Their faith is shaken. They no longer can rely on what they have read in the newspaper or heard on the air. They begin to regard the news they get from media in the way the Russians read Pravda. They search for the truth *between* the lines.

This is happening with increasing frequency. Indeed it has become an American epidemic. And we cannot afford to be complacent or merely defensive about it any longer. If confidence in the media is being undermined from within, it's up to us as responsible journalists to identify the problem and then eliminate it.

If we lose our credibility, we have lost everything. And that's exactly what is happening—both to the newspapers and to a lesser extent to the broadcast media.

Why? Have we really changed so much? Have we strayed so far from the first principles of journalism: integrity, fairness, accuracy, objectivity?

There *are* those who disbelieve we owe that kind of reporting to our listeners. David Brinkley is quoted as saying that complete objectivity is unattainable. And there are those—some of them in journalism school—who use that quote to describe objectivity as a myth. Instead of holding it up to students as a goal to be sought, even though it may be elusive, they scorn it as a hinderance to the new kind of journalism they're teaching.

That kind of journalism has been described variously as the journalism of involvement, advocacy journalism, or activist journalism. Alex Kendrick spoke well of it at a CBS news affiliates session I attended when he said he thought a good reporter in the modern milieu should not be afraid, while covering a riot, to throw a few bricks himself.

Rather than standing on the sidelines as a competent observer and then going to the mike to "tell it like it is," Kendrick urged the contemporary newsman to get involved and then report what he "felt inside."

It seems to me this kind of advice gives a clear clue as to what has gone wrong in our craft. It is simply outrageous to think that we as modern practitioners have any rights or duties or privileges to deal more lightly with the truth than the journalists of another age may have had. That kind of advice should be challenged. And it *was* challenged on the spot.

Yet that's the kind of thinking that is emerging from many journalism schools today. I'm sure you all have interviewed young graduates whose chief interest in journalism is to use it and the media as tools for shaping a new social order.

By no means am I accusing *all* journalism faculty members of betraying their profession—either as journalists or as teachers. But the clear fact is that many of them are so intent on demolishing the establishment—and the universities along with it—that they would blindly destroy the credibility of the media in the bargain.

These are the real villains—the root source of our "crisis of confidence" with the public.

The young journalists who accept their advice may not realize that they are being sold a bill of hypocrisy. For whatever else the new journalism may be called, the accurate name for it is "dishonest reporting."

Professor Curtis MacDougall, of NWU, who has been named as one advocate of the so-called New Journalism—but denies it—recently said:

"I agree that coloring the news, editorializing in the news, writing what should be a straight news story into a personal comment, all that is to be deplored. We do not teach that in any school of journalism as far as I know. We never have and I certainly do not advocate it. In my book, the best interpretation is presented as being the complete truth, all the facts."

Hardly anybody could argue with that, but Professor MacDougall then continued with this:

"In every area of life, the old order is being challenged. You can not sit smugly. You can not answer it by repression. To feel that the revolt is not going to infiltrate journalism is unrealistic. It has, I would say that any young person today who is not dissatisfied with something is a jerk. He does not know what is going on. His education has been a failure."

Whatever may be the coloration of the Professor's attitude toward the unchanging values of journalism, I would side with John Madigan of WBBM, Chicago. Here is his answer to Professor MacDougall:

"Now I know what's lacking in all these young newsmen and newswomen coming along these days. They're being trained apparently to become participatory journalists, rather than reporters. They want to make moral and political and social judgments on their assignments, and then take sides. Nevermind getting the facts straight and writing a strong, fair lead, and striving for compactness and balance. Just get out there and participate. For as Dr. MacDougall said, 'those brilliant young kids are tired of being scooped by Ralph Nader! The journalism schools need to teach accuracy and honesty and style and balance—not personal involvement.'"

To John Madigan's editorial comment—plainly labeled as such—I say: "That's laying it on the line!"

Nobody is seriously insisting that journalists must be neutral on the great issues of the day. We all have a right to our opinions and we have the right to express them in editorials and to some extent in writing clearly labeled interpretive articles. But we reject the idea of imposing those opinions on our readers, listeners or viewers under the guise of *factual* reporting. There's no dedication to truth or to the public interest in that. Yet that's exactly what the new journalism has brought about.

Is it any wonder that we are in danger of breaking our pick with the public?

I submit that the honest journalist has always pursued his craft with the public interest uppermost as he wrote. He digs for information, he searches behind the handout for the true facts, he's too smart to be conned-out of the truth by any news source. But he realizes that in order to win and hold the confidence of the public he must strive for the truth, and must submerge his own feelings in order to provide an honest report.

But the reporter who fails to mention in reporting a welfare protest that out-of-town organizers were on hand to stage-manage the demonstration—that reporter has compromised journalistic integrity to score a point for the demonstrators. That's the new journalism. It is a growing practice, and it threatens the craft I love.

I realize that what I have said may have tread on some tender toes and knocked a few noses out of joint. There may even be some here who disagree with the views I have expressed. And perhaps it is true that a guy who has been around as long as I have may tend to grow some moss on his mental processes. Perhaps I'll be dismissed as a traditionist.

I hope not. I hope that the years I have invested in journalism have not led to the threshold of a phony, plastic kind of reporting that puts the prejudices of the reporter above the right of the people to be *reliably* informed.

RTNDA has a code of professional practices that is gathering dust. It also has a committee on ethics and standards, headed by a reputable and competent journalism faculty member. I hope that committee will get cracking immediately on this problem, and deal with it forcefully before it becomes insurmountable. It would be interesting to see what might happen to elevate our craft if some new journalism practitioners were *cited for* violations.

And now, if you'll forgive a personal note:

In this, our 25th year as a professional organization of news broadcasters, we may be feeling the polarizing of the times more than ever before. A new generation of broadcasters has grown up within our ranks. But I think it is fair to say that we generally see eye-to-eye on professional matters. We may disagree on political matters within the organization—as we certainly did last year in Denver—but as I retire now from this organization and from my active news directorship, I feel I have seen broadcast news come of age.

We have problems, perhaps more difficult than ever before. But RTNDA has the maturity to deal with them effectively. I'm proud of RTNDA and what it has become. I hope you'll forgive me, if that sounds a bit proprietory, but I can't help it. This organization has been an important part of my life and the lives of many other guys who date back to the crystal set.

RTNDA has become a strong influence in the world of communications. Radio in the daytime and television at night have overtaken the newspapers as the media people depend upon most for information. This is a truly great achievement. We can keep it that way only if we remain strong and united. We can have our healthy political hassels, but we must find a way to close ranks when the ballots have been counted.

The year 1971 will be remembered as the year of Dr. Stanton's great victory in Congress on behalf of the preservation of the First Amendment guarantees for broadcast journalism. But Bill Roberts and Jim McCulla have warned, we can't relax.

If we are to turn aside further attacks and regain lost confidence, we must look to our own shops, strengthen the journalism we practice, and remain true to the unchanging principles of honesty, fairness, and *real* objectivity.

MRS. CHARLOTTE REID'S APPOINTMENT TO THE FCC

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in congratulating Congresswoman Charlotte Reid on her appoinment to the FCC.

Mrs. Reid, one of this body's ablest legislators, will bring to the FCC the grace and charm for which she is justly celebrated here in the House of Representatives. And, still further, her remarkable administrative abilities will strengthen one of this country's most important regulatory bodies. Television and radio, after all, have an enormous impact on American life and on its principal institution—the family. It is high

time—indeed, well past the time—that a woman served on the FCC.

As a mother of four, Mrs. Reid is only too keenly aware of the role the FCC plays in safeguarding the public's airways.

During her 9 years on the House, Mrs. Reid has already amply demonstrated the qualifications President Nixon recognized in appointing her to the FCC.

I served with her on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Speaker, and I can testify personally to those qualities: diligent work, a keen intellect, political savvy, and the kind of engaging personality that allows her to get along with virtually everyone.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations and best wishes to Mrs. Reid. She will be missed here in the House.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE BASIC MINIMUM SAFETY STANDARDS FOR OUR NATION'S YOUTH CAMPS

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today Representative PETER A. PEYSER, of New York, and I have sent a letter to all Members urging them to support title 19 of the higher education bill. This title provides for the adoption of basic minimum safety standards for our Nation's youth camps.

This bill has received the wholehearted endorsement of Dr. John J. Kirk, national president of the American Camping Association.

I submit Dr. Kirk's letter for inclusion in the RECORD.

AMERICAN CAMPING ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Martinsville, Ind., October 7, 1971.

Hon. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Select Committee on Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DANIELS: I have just had the opportunity of reviewing the Youth Camp Safety Bill H.R. 7248 with amendments, and I personally feel it is one of the most outstanding pieces of proposed legislation that I have ever seen. It is my hope that the members of your committee and your colleagues in the House of Representatives will look favorably upon this bill and that very soon it will become the law of the land.

As a camp director of over twenty years, I know I speak for all responsible camp directors in saying that we commend you and the members of your committee for proposing such meaningful and needed legislation. If this bill becomes a reality, it will contribute most substantially to the safety and well-being of millions of children who now attend our summer camps.

On behalf of all camp directors and the millions of parents who send their children to camp each summer I wish to thank you and the members of your committee for your thoughtful and detailed analysis of the youth camp movement in America and for the efforts you and your colleagues on the Select Subcommittee on Labor have expended in proposing this fine piece of legislation. May I wish you every success in securing its approval and immediate passage.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. KIRK,
National President.

WHEN A FRIEND IS IN TROUBLE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the President has received much criticism for his efforts to stimulate the purchase of American goods and improve our balance of payments. It is indeed encouraging to realize that many foreign observers understand our current difficulties and appreciate America's last quarter century of massive assistance to the economic and political stability of our free world allies. I include at the conclusion of my remarks two articles from the Glasgow, Scotland, press which are of particular pertinence to this subject:

WHEN A FRIEND IS IN TROUBLE

(By Angus Miudi, M.P.)

The economists and other experts are busy telling us that the American crisis and Mr. Nixon's emergency measures were predictable and inevitable. That it has long been obvious that the international monetary system had broken down, and so on.

This being so, it seems a little strange that so many governments and central banks—including our own—were taken so obviously by surprise that they appear to have been stunned into insensibility.

Not only do they not seem to know what to do about it; they don't even have anything coherent to say.

If this is the effect on the political and financial top brass, it is hardly surprising that ordinary people have simply given the whole thing up as incomprehensible. Amid the general bewilderment, however, there has been a perceptible sense of shock.

The shock has been caused by what is to many people the first revelation that the world's greatest super power is just another nation after all, subject to some of the problems and instabilities that have so regularly afflicted smaller countries in the West. It is a little like the sense of incongruity felt when an adult gets mumps.

CHUCKLE

And just as the common reaction to an adult mumps is always tinged with hilarity, despite the discomfort and even danger known to be involved, so there has been the suspicion of a chuckle—not always devoid of malicious satisfaction—about some of the public reactions to the troubles of the United States.

To some people, of course, the fall of the mighty is always gratifying. For many people in Britain, however, the feeling is more specific.

They remember the American role in the humiliation of the Suez fiasco. They recall the occasional self-righteousness of American comments on the economic crises of European countries.

Above all, they have not really enjoyed the experience of having to be bailed out of trouble so often by a manifestly more powerful ally.

Well, all this is no doubt a very human reaction, and harmless enough if it is tempered with a judicious realism. But it seems to me that we should do well to keep three things firmly in mind.

"The first is that what happens to the United States economy, and to the dollar, is going to affect the prosperity and the jobs of every one of us in Britain.

We, too, are a nation that lives by international trade, and the policies and economic health of the world's biggest international trading nation will affect us in a variety of ways.

Rolls-Royce provides only one obvious example of the implications. Moreover, the dollar is in effect the world's standard currency whether we like it or not. We had better hope that Mr. Nixon's measures work—and Britain had better do whatever it can to help him.

Second, it may be salutary to recall that those who have received news of the American crisis with open and obvious satisfaction are not openly the enemies of the United States; they are our enemies as well.

They are dedicated to the overthrow of the system by which we live, and to the destruction of the traditions and institutions which have made us a reasonably civilised and tolerant society. If the disintegration of the United States and its world power and influence is so earnestly desired by *these* people it can hardly be welcome to us.

Lastly, and perhaps most important should we not continually remind ourselves of what we in Britain actually owe to the Americans over the last quarter of a century?

It is not just a question of adding up the totals of loans, and emergency credits, and Marshall Aid. It is more a matter of recognising, with frankness and a measure of humility, that we have relied absolutely on the United States for our defense—and that of Western Europe—during two whole decades.

It is not too much to say that we owe our peace, our preservation, and much of our prosperity, to a succession of American administrations supported by the agreement of the American people.

BENEFITS

If the British have particular cause to feel gratitude for benefits they themselves have received, they should also consider the almost unbelievable scale and scope of the benefits the United States has conferred on the free world as a whole.

It is not too much to say that without these efforts an even larger part of the world would have been given over to anarchy or Communist domination.

Of course, the Americans—rulers, officials and people—are neither saints nor supermen. They have from time to time been unwise, tactless, incompetent, smug, misguided, and even perhaps a little vulgar. Haven't we all?

Their actions have never been wholly devorced from consideration of the United States' national interests: the preservation of these is, after all, the prime duty of all rulers.

Nevertheless, it is a simple fact that there has never been in history an example of sustained national idealism and generosity comparable with what America has given to the world since 1945.

If the cynical have sometimes sneered at the naivety of the attitude of some Americans towards their world role, and if others have become a little impatient with their desire to be loved and appreciated, does this in any way detract from the achievements and the sacrifies that made it all possible?

Whatever one may think of the strategy and the miscalculations of Vietnam can any honest and unbiased person really doubt that this tragic conflict has been sustained for so long by the mass of the American people from motives that were almost entirely selfless?

Let us remember then that we are watching the crisis not only of our nearest and least dispensable ally, but of a great nation whose influence has been on the whole overwhelmingly beneficial to the civilised world.

BALANCE

Finally, it may not be quite irrelevant in the middle of our "great debate" about Europe, to strike the balance of our relationships and debts with the various countries involved.

Do we owe to any single country of Western Europe—or indeed to all of them to-

gether—a tenth of what we owe to the United States? In material benefits, in protection, or in loyal support in most of our difficulties?

Which, for example, has been the better and more unselfish friends to Britain and the rest of the Western world: France or the United States?

America is in a mess. Not just in a financial and economic mess, either, but torn by social problems which are in part a product of prosperity (and thus a warning to us all).

The United States is a nation rich enough and strong enough to survive the economic crisis; and the Americans are fundamentally a people great enough and stable enough to pull through their social crisis in the end.

Once again, we had better hope they do, for they are still our shield and our ultimate sheet anchor.

Meanwhile, may we hope that our Government and people—even, perhaps, our bankers—will react to the American crisis with sympathy, generosity, and the maximum of practical help? It seems a small enough return to make for inestimable benefits received.

CURRENT EVENTS BY JOHN GORDON

Remembering how, when we had money troubles, some Americans were inclined to be pityingly patronising, naturally it now amuses us to see them having their dollar cheques sniffed at.

But don't let us carry the joke too far. When a tremor shakes America's economy inevitably it shakes our economy too. And that we cannot contemplate with equanimity.

But we can afford some pleasure over the fact that the all-conquering Japs are taking a bit of stick from the Americans. Japan has become the third largest industrial nation in the world. We are constantly advised to admire her brilliance and follow her example.

But what are the real reasons for her phenomenal progress? Primarily that she spends virtually nothing on defence, relying on the U.S. to protect her. She also spends virtually nothing on foreign aid, in contrast to the Americans. Comparatively little on social welfare, and underpays her workers compared with American and European rates.

As nearly one-third of all her exports go to America where they sell easily because the yen is undervalued, the Americans could hardly be expected to stand idly by and watch their balance of payments go steadily into the red.

So now they strike back, producing squeals of rage from Japanese industrialists. The squeals should be music in the ears of British workers, also hard hit by a flood of cheap Japanese goods.

NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce for appropriate referral a bill which would make available a source of credit within the means of families of modest income with which they can obtain funds to maintain and improve their homes.

As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee's Housing Subcommittee, I have, over the past year, had the privilege of participating in a very intensive study of just how our existing housing programs are operating. To grossly over-generalize, I would say that the most basic and significant findings to come out of our study were the following:

First. If national housing goals are to be achieved, exclusive emphasis on actions which tend to stimulate housing production will not be sufficient. Total housing production requirements for low- and moderate-income families will reach impossible proportions unless there is much greater emphasis and expenditure of effort on the preservation and maintenance of the existing housing supply; and

Second. If national housing goals are to be achieved, a fundamental restructuring of the basic delivery system of Federal housing assistance is essential.

With respect to the latter finding—the need to restructure the basic delivery system for Federal housing assistance—the Housing Subcommittee now has under active consideration, legislation which would do just this. The bill which I introduce today, addresses itself to one aspect of our other finding—that there is an urgent need for a program which will provide funds for housing preservation and improvement at rates the current owners of the housing can afford.

The major existing Federal program in the area of housing preservation—the section 312 rehabilitation loan program—is very limited in coverage, and even this limited program is scheduled to be phased out as a separate program within the next few years if either the administration's urban development special revenue-sharing proposal or the Housing Subcommittee's community development block grant proposal is enacted. What is needed, and needed urgently, is a program which could perform the same functions as the section 312 program, but with much broader coverage and at less cost to the Federal Government per unit repaired or rehabilitated.

At recent hearings of the Housing Subcommittee, Congressman DON FRASER provided some very ingenious and constructive recommendations for the Subcommittee's consideration. His bill, H.R. 7882, would expand the special FHA home improvement loan programs authorized under sections 203(k) and 220(h) of the National Housing Act to include the provision of section 235-type interest subsidy payments on behalf of owners of modest homes. The chief difficulty I have with this proposal is that the provision of interest subsidies alone is not enough to make it workable.

At present, the sections 203(k) and 220(h) are, to all intents and purposes, dead programs. The current FHA interest ceiling of 7 percent does not provide sufficient inducement for private lenders to originate what are essentially second mortgage-type loans, and I would certainly not advocate authorizing a much higher interest rate for these loans, with a Federal subsidy making up the difference between the higher rate and one which would be reasonable to families of modest income: the cost of such a program would be prohibitive.

There is precedent, however, for utilizing the services of the Federal National Mortgage Association and the newly created Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation to make funds available and keep financing costs at reasonable levels for middle-income homeowners. Title V of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 was designed to do this by having private mortgage lenders make 7-percent mortgage loans on homes costing less than $20,000 in low-cost areas or less than a maximum of $30,000 in higher-cost areas. These mortgages could then be sold by the lender to the Federal National Mortgage Association—FNMA—or to the newly created Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation.

FNMA and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation were established by Congress as quasi-private corporations to provide a secondary market for mortgages. Both agencies finance their mortgage acquisitions by issuing bonds, and their operations are expected to be fully self-supporting. Therefore, they could not be expected to purchase these 7-percent mortgages unless they were reimbursed for the difference between their net earnings on the 7-percent mortgages and their current average cost of borrowing. At the time title V was being considered by the Congress, their average cost of borrowing was close to 8 percent. Under title V, the difference is to be made up by quarterly subsidy payments from the Department of Housing and Urban Development. These payments may extend over the life of the mortgage. However, if interest rates and the cost of borrowing decline, the subsidy payments would be correspondingly reduced. HUD has authority to contract to make the subsidy payments over the life of the mortgage for as long as the difference in net mortgage yields and average borrowing costs exists. However, the amount of contract authority may not exceed the amounts approved in annual appropriation acts.

Under the bill I am introducing today, the same subsidy scheme already enacted by the Congress in title V would be used. It should also be noted that as under title V, the borrower would be required to increase his loan payments if his income increases. This would tend to reduce the cost of the subsidy over a period of time. In order to obtain the benefit of a 7-percent loan, a prospective borrower would have to allocate at least 20 percent of his income to the cost of housing. If the family's income increased, it would still be required to continue applying 20 percent of its income to housing expenses. Thus a rise in income would require that the homeowner gradually increase his interest payments up to the contract rate on the loan. This would increase the yield of FNMA or FHLMC on the loan and thus reduce the required subsidy payments.

Mr. Speaker, a top priority must be given to maintaining and preserving the existing housing stock if our housing goals are to be achieved. The bill I introduce today is intended to be a major step in that direction.

I commend my colleague, Congressman DON FRASER, for his very constructive efforts in this vital area of housing preser-

vation and rehabilitation and urge both my fellow members of the Banking and Currency Committee and all other Members of the House to give both Congressman FRASER'S and my own bill their careful consideration.

I believe the unique subsidy approach authorized in title V of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970 could, and should, be applied to home improvement loans also. That is precisely what my bill would do. If there was one issue on which there was very nearly universal consensus during the recent House subcommittee hearings on housing and urban development legislation, it was that there must be much greater emphasis on preserving and maintaining our existing housing stock. My bill would help to do this by providing families of modest income who wish to repair and maintain their homes an opportunity to do so at prices they can afford.

THE JAPANESE TEXTILE QUOTAS THREAT TO U.S. FARM MARKETS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the President's announced deadline of Friday for Japan to agree to American textile quotas is disquieting for U.S. farmers.

Japan is their first and only billion-dollar-a-year customer. As such, it deserves the utmost in courteous consideration.

Currently negotiations are under way between Ambassador David Kennedy and representatives of the Japanese Government in Tokyo. If quotas are imposed unilaterally, as hinted by the President, the pain of this action must somehow be eased. An excellent way would be to lift the 10-percent surcharge. The President must give high priority to the interest of American farmers and their need to sell major portions of their products to Japan.

If Japan is not permitted some concession such as the lifting of our surcharge, it could easily shift a considerable amount of its purchases of corn, wheat, and food oils to other countries. The recent tour of foreign nations by Japanese Emperor Hirohito shows his nation's interest in developing better relations with Europe. No doubt these include expanded trade possibilities.

Exports of agricultural goods have been the life blood of American agriculture during the past few years. They have also been the single bright spot in our balance-of-payments picture. This year we hope to export the production of 70 million farm acres out of a total expected harvest of 290 million acres—more than one-fourth of our farm production.

In my State of Illinois the export portion is even greater. We sell in overseas markets the production of 1 acre out of 3.

Soybeans are the best example of trade expansion. Farmers have doubled their soybean production in the past 12 years. They exported the soybean harvest from 23 million acres during the most recent crop year. Before 1960, U.S. farmers did not even grow that many acres of soybeans altogether.

Japan has been our leading customer for soybeans sold overseas. Last year they purchased $305 million of soybeans and soybean meal paying for them with dollars. The Japanese also purchased $333 million worth of feed grains last year.

In the past year, Japan purchased more than $1.2 billion worth of our agricultural products, up 20 percent over the previous year. This is an excellent market which American farmers are coming to rely upon more and more.

Despite the fact that Japan has delayed far too long removing its restrictive quotas on imports of U.S. grapefruit and citrus juices, and many other items, we must not lose sight of the fact that this tremendously productive country is our best single customer for agricultural products and has been expanding its purchases each year.

Whatever action our negotiators take in obtaining an agreement on the volume of textile imports, we must reassure Japan that our surcharge will be lifted soon. Japanese leaders must be offered a settlement they can accept with honor. We must not force Japan into a position unacceptable to its people. This would be particularly serious at a time when our relationship with nearly all Asian nations is changing. We expect Japan to play a leading role in providing stability in Asia, and we must not diminish her ability to do so.

If we force Japan to bow to textile quotas, the American farmer, already hurt by depressed grain prices, could suffer lost markets.

The American farmer certainly does not need any new problems. In obtaining a textile agreement with Japan our negotiations must proceed with the utmost caution, restraint, and consideration.

ST. PAUL IS FIRST WITH COMPLETE RECYCLING CENTER

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, while we all recognize that awareness of a problem is the first step toward its solution, little is accomplished after awareness if we only point and moan. In the last year and a half we have become increasingly aware of the threat man poses to his environment and the damage he has already done. Since then, we have continued to hear the rhetoric of the pointers and moaners—which I would hardly want to criticize since they do serve a purpose—yet we infrequently hear from the people who are going about their business and accomplishing something worthwhile.

Minnesota, a State with so many environmental opportunities to offer to the outdoorsman, the sportsman, and the average citizen who enjoys nature, has often been first in the fight to preserve and clean up the environment.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that once again Minnesota has scored an environmental first and equally happy that it has happened in my district of Saint Paul.

We are aware that the environment not only means the forests and the lakes, but also the urban and suburban environment around our homes and offices.

We urge our fellow citizens to clean up the mess and also to preserve the preservable, but all too often the means to do that are not readily available.

Recycling is a prime example. We first looked upon recycling as something of a panacea to many of our urban environmental problems. Unfortunately it has turned out to be a major disappointment.

That is why I would like to direct your attention to the efforts by the Theodore Hamm Co., the Coca-Cola Bottling Midwest, Inc., and the Occupational Training Center to set up and operate a complete can and bottle recycling center in St. Paul—a first in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this could be a model for the future—private enterprise working with a public spirited attitude to help clean up our environment.

For the complete details of this environmental first, Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an article from the October 7, 1971, edition of the St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch by Bob Goligoski.

The article follows:

MOST COMPLETE U.S. CAN, BOTTLE RECYCLING PLANT TO OPEN HERE

(By Bob Goligoski)

The most comprehensive bottle and can recycling center in the United States will open Oct. 26 in St. Paul's Midway district.

Officials of the Theodore Hamm Co. and Coca-Cola Bottling Midwest, Inc., announced today that the center will be operated by the Occupational Training Center (OTC) in a former factory building at 66 Pelham Blvd.

To launch the program, they gave $50,000 to OTC executive director John DuRand at a news conference in Minneapolis.

The two firms plan to give OTC an additional $50,000 to cover any operating losses OTC may incur during its operation of the center.

Hamm's and Coca-Cola also will spend $25,000 for center promotional and educational activities.

OTC, a nonprofit organization offering jobs and job training to disabled Minnesotans, will operate the center with an initial staff of 20 workers.

DuRand said he has checked with food and beverage container manufacturers and been told that "our program surpasses any permanent, full-time recycling effort in the United States. We will be accepting all types of clean glass containers and all types of clean metal containers, everything from catsup bottles to soup cans, except aerosol, paint or oil cans."

Midwest president Robert E. Moore explained that income received from glass and metal companies for reclaimed materials will be divided equally between OTC and those who bring containers to the center.

OTC will pay one-half cent per pound for clear and amber glass bottles and one-fourth cent per pound for green glass bottles. Steel cans will be redeemed at the rate of one-fourth cent per pound while aluminum cans will bring five cents per pound.

Robert T. Gorman, executive vice president and chief operating officer at Hamm's, said that after examining various recycling programs throughout the country Hamm's found that most of the programs are not rousing success stories because they generally accept only one kind of container (glass or metal) or are operated only part-time.

"We determined," stressed Gorman, "that we had to establish a comprehensive recycling center in order to provide significant service to our major metropolitan area."

Initially, the center will be open from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Tuesdays through Saturdays. The facility will be named the Metropolitan Bottle & Can Recycling Center.

Much of the $50,000 seed money will be used to buy equipment including trucks, crushing devices and metal separators.

DuRand said organizations planning to bring containers to the center can obtain additional information about the program by calling 488–0334.

FORCED BUSING

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, two recent articles from newspapers in the 18th District of Michigan offer an excellent analysis of the forced-busing issue.

They are commendable not only for their discussion of the problem itself but also, because they address the possible consequences of forced busing.

The first article was written by Mr. Henry Hogan, publisher of the Eccentric of Birmingham, Mich. The second was authored by Mr. Richard P. Miller, the publisher of the Daily Tribune of Royal Oak, Mich.

Mr. Speaker, I found them to be valuable restatements of the issue and I feel that they should be included in the RECORD for the benefit of all.

The articles follow:

[From the Birmingham (Mich.) Eccentric, Oct. 7, 1971]

A REAL THREAT

It will do little good to react emotionally to U.S. District Judge Stephen J. Roth's action asking for plans to improve integration in Detroit even if it means the involvement of suburban school districts.

On the other hand, it would be equally foolish to ignore the magnitude of any conclusions which could sound the death knell for school districts which strive to provide quality education for taxpayers who are willing to pay the extra money.

We always have believed that school districts should get out of the transportation business and spend what monies they have on improving the quality of education offered in the individual school districts.

The main question, though, posed by the Judge Roth action is a constitutional question of whether or not a federal judge can virtually dissolve existing governmental bodies by fiat.

The courts uphold the concept of "due process," and under our governmental system that means by legislative action.

It is not really a question of whether busing is a good or bad concept. There are arguments pro and con.

But if a federal judge has the power to dissolve duly constituted governmental body in the name of a good cause, might not a less noble judge use the power for a bad cause?

If Judge Roth's intention is really to challenge the due process equity of the state by criticizing the manner in which it develops formulas for the distribution of state aid, that is one thing. But if by his action he challenges the right of local districts to regulate their school policies, then we believe he is reaching beyond the authority invested in him.

In any case, hysteria among suburban residents will do little to focus sharp attention on the real threat, which is the possibility that local control of school districts could be jeopardized if what Judge Roth does is ultimately upheld by appellate and and the U.S. Supreme Court.

[From the Royal Oak (Mich.) Daily Tribune, Oct. 8, 1971]

WHAT'S BEHIND BUSING?

(By Richard P. Miller)

Hard to think of school busing as part of a smoke screen blown up by a conservative group, isn't it? But in the case of Detroit school integration it was just such a group that first publicly proposed children be bused to and from the suburbs.

It's just like the fox's brush. Remember? One fox lost his tail, and went about trying to persuade all the other foxes that tailless was the only way to be. He figured, if I can't have one, neither should anyone else.

The fox in this case is the Concerned Citizens for Better Education organization of Detroit, a conservative group largely responsible for the recall of several liberal school board members in that great, gray city.

There is still school segregation in Detroit; children there are still divided by race, even though they live amongst each other. CCBE is not interested in changing this situation very far or fast.

Under attack, the finger-pointers of dingy Detroit have, typically, turned their backs on their own problems and sought scapegoats afield. Recently, "those gun-crazy suburbs" served as their emotional outlet. And now, those who adhere to the Detroit CCBE line figure: "If they're going to pick on us, we'll see that those 'limousine liberals' out along Woodward get picked on, too."

I don't think it's possible to misread the economic and political character of South Oakland County and Warren to a greater degree than did the man who coined "limousine liberals." But that is merely the insult added to the proverbial injury.

No, there are so very many bad things about the kind of busing program being studied in Detroit and Lansing that one can scarcely decide where to begin enumerating them. When a public proposal is promoted by the apparent malicious envy of a pressure group, little else can be expected.

After its maliciousness, the proposal's lack of logic impresses me the most. Is the quality of public education in inner Detroit substandard? Few would disagree. Certainly, the children who would be bused from Detroit to the suburbs would enjoy better schooling.

But what, then, of the suburban children who are taken to Detroit? If equal standards of education are the aim, as some would have us believe, does busing erase the inequality or only continue it with different victims?

Some busing proponents, for a variety of reasons, would have every town, every block in the area balanced exactly by the racial proportion of the metropolitan area. And their answer for the lack of racial balance in the Detroit area is to swap kids for the day—every day.

Let's pursue this reasoning. There are many blacks in Mississippi. There are few in Idaho. Do we line up jumbo jets at the airport every day and swap kids between Idaho and Mississippi? It is as logical as Judge Roth's interest in Detroit metropolitan busing.

Consider the arbitrary boundaries for busing proposed by the CCBE. My brother, Jan, lives in Berkley about 100 yards north of Eleven-Mile. We live in Royal Oak, about 100 yards north of Twelve-Mile. Does this mean that his son gets swapped and my daughters don't, just because the proposal sets "twelve miles from the City-County Building" as an arbitrary radius?

Does this mean that Hazel Park, Oak Park, Ferndale, Huntington Woods, Pleasant Ridge and the southern halves of Royal Oak, Madison Heights, Berkley, Warren and Southfield are racist or something, and from there on northward everything's fine?

If we can all be arbitrary, I've a different radius to propose: eight miles.

The point is that all such boundary lines are arbitrary. And unless the lines end in farm fields north of Sterling Heights, Troy and Pontiac, or beyond West Bloomfield, Novi or Livonia, they will create such irrational conditions as some neighborhood children bused while others are not.

But extending the boundary lines to the farm fields may well magnify the already formidable logistics problem of moving all those kids, twice-a-day, every day during rush hour.

That could well be why CCBE reduced its proposed plan from including 85 school districts throughout the tri-county area to 60 districts within the 12-mile radius when given a week by Judge Roth to formalize their earlier proposals.

And now consider the kids. I don't want mine to grow up thinking the only people in the world are white, suburban people. Nor should a black kid have to grow up thinking the world begins and ends on Brush Street. But packing my kids, and black kids, into buses and putting them on the expressway in long, expensive yellow caravans twice a day answers neither need in a realistic fashion.

It only answers the need of a Detroit organization to spill its spleen on someone else, and Detroit's need to get on a horse and gallop off in any direction but that of facing its own ugly realities and solving them in Detroit.

Well, they're not going to do it with my kids.

RURAL MIGRATION

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a revolution in rural America. Agriculture, once the domain of the independent family farmer, today is concentrated in the hands of big business. Increasingly, farms are industrialized, food and fiber production is mechanized, and markets are monopolized.

This has been a revolution of enormous consequences. A hundred thousand farms a year have folded for each of the last 30 years—3 million farms in all—and the end is not in sight. For each of those shutdown farms, it is estimated that one smalltown businessman has had to close up shop. In all, 30 million people have been forced to leave rural America and flee to the cities. Left behind are 14 million people in rural poverty, and millions more in near poverty. Whole towns are being boarded up and abandoned.

The cities have had to absorb these rural refugees, and neither the cities nor the refugees were prepared for each other. A visit to the black ghettos of Newark and New Haven, a walk through the "white Appalachian" shanty towns of Columbus or Chicago, and a trip to the barrios of Los Angeles or Houston makes clear what the cities and the refugees have done to each other.

Mr. Speaker, on August 27, 1971, NBC Television broadcast an hour-long documentary on this important public issue. Entitled "Leaving Home Blues: An NBC

White Paper on Rural Migration," the documentary probed into the human consequences of the migration. NBC filmed in three States—North Carolina, Nebraska, and Texas.

The network went into the city of Houston, Tex., into some of the neighborhoods of my own congressional district in that city, and interviewed people who had migrated there from the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. For years, Houston has been a lure to those fleeing from the deprivation of their rural homes. During the 1950's, east Texas blacks came off their farms and poured into Houston, where they now make up a quarter of the population. In the 1960's, Houston has provided the same kind of attraction for rural Mexican Americans in south Texas. The figures are dramatic—in 1960 there were 75,000 Mexican Americans there; today, the number is estimated to be more than 170,000. There is an increase of 125 percent, while the rest of the population was increasing by 31 percent.

What do these migrants find in Houston? First of all, there most likely will be a job. Dr. Sam Schulman, a professor of sociology at the University of Houston, conducted a study in the summer of 1970 which revealed that nine of 10 Mexican-American migrants into Houston came without a job in hand, but that 90 percent of these newcomers found employment within 2 months of arrival. While underemployment is widespread in Houston, the unemployment rate in this city stands at the remarkably low rate of 2.5 percent.

This does not mean that these immigrants from the Rio Grande Valley have entered the American mainstream. They take jobs at the lowest rung of the economic ladder, and their take-home pay will allow no frills. The houses in Houston are no better than those that were left behind; often they are much worse. Food is more expensive, and the cost of travel is prohibitive. For these rural refugees, city life itself is so alien and so oppressive that hundreds of families pile into cars, buses and trains every weekend to make the long trek "home" for a visit in the valley.

But they come back to the city. Whether real or not, there is the expectation that things can be better in Houston. And that expectation is better than the known reality of hard times back home.

Mr. President, the NBC documentary offers an important insight into the tragedy of rural migration. It is dramatic documentation of this country's abject failure in the countryside. Private decisions, taken by businessmen in pursuit of economic efficiency and greater profit, have been allowed to alter the fundamental face and character of rural America. There has been a massive failure of public leadership to develop a national rural policy to serve national—rather than vested—interests.

It is possible yet to make a difference in rural America. There is no inevitability of agribusiness concentration, leaving only migration as an alternative for rural America's majority—small farmers, farmworkers, small-town businessmen, and others outside a narrow definition of economic efficiency. This Government has the means, and it clearly has the responsibility, to meet the needs and aspirations of a total rural population.

The NBC documentary is a major contribution to the public's understanding of what has happened in rural America. So that all Members of Congress might have the opportunity to benefit from the documentary, I include the transcript at this point in the RECORD:

LEAVING HOME BLUES—AN NBC NEWS WHITE PAPER ON RURAL MIGRATION

(NBC News correspondents Garrick Utley and Edwin Newman; Produced by: Martin Carr)

BIGNAL JONES. The only way you're going to solve your city problems is to solve your rural problems.

FRANK REAMS. We found that they're all migrating. Everyone, white, Indian, and Negro.

BOY. New York . . .

GIRL. Going North . . .

GIRL. Going straight to New York.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I'll tell you, it's true, there's nothing down here.

BIGNAL JONES. What I think is going to happen, what you've got to have, you've got to put these folks back in the country because the cities can't take them.

RICHARD STOLLE. Most of them leave this area, because of the lack of opportunity here.

GIRL. Washington, D.C.

BOY. To Chicago.

BOY. I have to go up North to try to make enough money to help myself to go to school next year, and also to help my parents in some way.

Mr. DAVIS. They can't wait to get out of there and head either to Washington, D.C. or New York City.

GRANDMA COTTON. It's hard for your children to leave home. It is hard. Nobody knows how hard it is.

GIRL. Going up North.

BOY. Going to New York.

GIRL. I'm leaving.

TOM BROWN. So this is a tremendous outmigration. And, of course, the reason is simply that if they can't make a living here they can't stay here.

Senator MONK HARRINGTON. If someone comes back down, we'll say, from New York City, he'll tell them all about the great life in New York, and next thing you know two or three carloads is going up there.

HORACE KORNEGAY. They go, and they have an aunt or an uncle or a cousin who has already gone to one of the large cities, and they move in with them. First thing you know, they're running out the doors and the windows.

ROY SOWERS. The day of the small farmer seems to be rapidly leaving us.

BIGNAL JONES. What the farmer gets for his crop, he just can't, he can't do it, so he quits.

JOY HYSLOP. I can't figure out why I remain. I know better, I know I have to get out.

JAMES GARRISON. What do we have in Halifax County at this time? We have the very old, the disabled and the young.

OTHAL BRAND. Once we educate the young people, they're not going back into the fields.

Mr. DAVIS. So there's only one place for the kids to go, as they see it, and that's up North.

JAMES GARRISON. We pat them on the back, and wish them luck as we put them on the bus, and send them to other states.

DANIEL ACEVEDO. So I guess I might have to go up North, either Chicago, Toledo, or some big city.

BOY. There's a lot of money up there in New York, and down here, they don't have any good paying jobs.

Mr. DAVIS. Friday night they graduate, Saturday morning they're going to get on a bus, or hitch-hike their way to Washington, D.C. or New York. That's where it's at.

UTLEY. All of us are aware that there are too many people in America's cities. But few of us know why this is so. We have spent the last five months trying to find out why—looking into the causes of Rural Migration. We selected three areas of the country to examine closely. Tonight we present our results.

For most young Americans, high school graduation is the beginning of a bright future. For these young graduates, in Scotland Neck, North Carolina, it is a forced separation from family and friends. The beginning of a long journey north, in search of the work and future they cannot find at home. Going North has become such a standard part of graduation here, it's been said that these youngsters graduate with a diploma in one hand and a bus ticket in the other.

A welfare worker in Scotland Neck, North Carolina commented, "These people have only three places to go: heaven, hell and Baltimore." Over 175,000 blacks have left North Carolina for the cities in the last ten years. In the same period, the entire South has seen an exodus of almost one and a half million blacks. Although it is still easier for a white to get a job in the South than a black, the problem is not racial, it's economic. This graduating class would fill more than 20 percent of the town's industrial jobs. But the jobs are not available.

Scotland Neck township hasn't been able to support its children for a long time. It's lost 12 percent of its population in the past ten years.

The town's quiet charm can no longer hide the increasing numbers of abandoned houses along its streets and back roads. Scotland Neck is slowly dying, as are many small towns in North Carolina. Last month, the state legislature passed a bill in which 96 towns were legally wiped off the North Carolina map.

Towns die when people leave. Producer Martin Carr asked Principal Stewart Wooten about the graduation exodus at Scotland Neck High School.

CARR. Of the 147 students who will be graduating, how many of them will be leaving?

WOOTEN. Approximately 96 or 97 percent.

CARR. Is anything done here to prepare the student for the eventual graduation when he's on the job market?

WOOTEN. Yes, we have vocational type courses here. For example, bricklaying.

CARR. Do they go out and actually build brick buildings?

WOOTEN. Yes, now we have students who have built walls in buildings here, to help to develop more classroom space in the school. They have been to other schools in this area that needed work done on buildings and they have done beautiful work.

CARR. Can't any of these students go out and get jobs as bricklayers in this area or do they have to head for the cities?

WOOTEN. Well, they have to go to larger urban areas either in state or out of state. For example, there are probably only two small local contractors here in this community.

CARR. And there are no jobs with them?

WOOTEN. That's right.

DWAYNE WALLS. The kids who get out of high school find when they get out of high school that society has deceived them. Society has told them that they—if they stick it out and get a diploma from high school, that diploma will be negotiable in the job market. And they find that it isn't, and so they leave, and they go straight north into the urban ghettos—and they don't want to leave. That's the tragedy of the rural to urban migration thing. In this country, every man theoretically is guaranteed the right to live where he shall—where he wants to live, and earn a living the way he wants to earn a living. These people are denied those two rights.

CARR. You graduate on Friday and you're leaving on Saturday?

RAYMOND. Yes.

CARR. How come so fast?

RAYMOND. Well, first of all there's no good money down in North Carolina, especially in Scotland Neck.

JOSEPHINE. There are not very many jobs here, and the money is very scarce. And you can barely make a living. Especially if you have a family.

AARON. I think if there were some jobs down here, you could make it down here. But all the jobs are up north.

CARR. Do you want to leave?

WILLIE LEE. Well, not really because I like North Carolina. But as I said earlier, I want to go where I can make it.

CARR. How does your mother feel about your leaving?

WILLIE LEE. Well, she's agreeing to it, but I really don't know.

CARR. How do you feel about his going?

WILLIE LEE'S MOTHER. I would hate to see him go.

CARR. Do you depend on him?

WILLIE LEE'S MOTHER. Well, he is a big help to me.

CARR. How will you be able to get around for instance now that he's gone?

WILLIE LEE'S MOTHER. Be kind of hard to do.

CARR. Do many of the children have their parents living already in northern cities?

WOOTEN. Many of them. I'd say approximately 56% of the seniors in our class have parents living in Northern areas.

CARR. Who do you live with when you're going to school down here?

ANNIE. My grandparents.

CARR. And you've lived with them since you were how old?

ANNIE. Oh—let's see—oh—well, I don't know—just so long, ever since I was small.

CARR. And you only see your parents every once in a while. Your mama every once in a while.

ANNIE. Yes.

CARR. You've lived in Washington, D.C.

ALBERTA. D.C. for 23 years.

CARR. Where is home?

ALBERTA. My home is in North Carolina.

CARR. You still think of it as home.

ALBERTA. Oh this is—this it is. My home right here. When I left here—it is not the point that I want to go north, but I just want to better myself. But believe it or not, when you go there—it's just a racket. It's something that—really makes you want to come back home. There is nothing up there to really base yourself on. There is nothing up there.

DWAYNE WALLS. The young blacks we are sending into the urban areas are truly gentle people. They aren't angry, they have been given short shrift all their lives. They have been deceived by society, they get out of high school and they find that they can't live there, even though they don't want to leave. They go into the city afraid, anxious, but not angry. They're not angry people. They are truly gentle people. What happens later. What, when we find the urban rioting, and there are studies which have shown that the place of birth of a great many of those people charged with rioting or looting was the South, but these people were created by the city. The city did that to them. When they left rural America, they weren't rioters and looters. They became rioters and looters at some indeterminate point—they no north looking for the promised land, hoping that this is what will give them that nice comfortable little home. They get there and in a few years they find, no, this is not it. And they feel denied, and I can understand why.

CARR. So you've said goodbye to nine children and four grandchildren are leaving you now—

GRANDMA. Are leaving me now.

CARR. That's 13 people you've said goodbye to.

GRANDMA. Thirteen head of children I've had to say goodbye. And I hope you all well in the world. It is sad. It is hard. To raise your kids—don't know how they will be in the world. But you hoping and praying that they would do success. I tell them over and over, I say children do the best you can. There is better things in the world for you if you just look for it. Don't stop here, look further in the world.

UTLEY. Thirty million Americans in the last thirty years have migrated from rural America. More accurately, they have been driven from rural America. Left home, gone North, toward the cities. 800,000 people for every year of the sixties, and the end is nowhere in sight.

Today 75 percent of us are crowded onto less than 2 percent of the land. In just thirty years from now, the Urban Land Institute predicts that 100 million more Americans will be crammed into the big cities, where 150 million already live. From Maine to Virginia, 67 million people will live in one continuous urban mass. 59 million will live in another megalopolis that starts at Utica, New York, extends unbroken all the way west to Green Bay, Wisconsin, and south to Cincinnati.

A California city of 42 and a half million people will reach from San Francisco Bay to the Mexican border.

A fourth concentration of 13 million people will turn the state of Florida into one huge city.

For a nation grown numb to numbers, such statistics may mean little. But when we go beyond the statistics we are confronted with both a human tragedy and a national crisis. The numbers take on new significance when we realize this is forced migration: the movement of people from rural America who don't want to go. Who would not go if they had a choice. But the choice is gone: devoured by markets and mechanization in agriculture and the failure of industry or government to provide new or adequate jobs.

These issues are not confined to any one area of the country. They cut across racial and regional lines. It is a national problem. A national crisis.

If the cause of migration from North Carolina can be traced to any one source, that source is tobacco.

Two-thirds of America's flue-cured tobacco is grown in the fields of North Carolina. It accounts for 60 percent of the state's crop income, and is raised in 83 of its 100 counties.

In the past, tobacco required more hand labor than any other single crop. Now empty tenant houses line the edges of North Carolina's tobacco fields. A change is taking place, reminiscent of the change that occurred in the cotton fields of the Deep South two decades ago.

Modern agricultural techniques have emptied these houses and tobacco harvesting machines just being introduced will empty many more. According to the Department of Agriculture, 300,000 people in the past ten years left the tobacco growing regions of the South; 177,000 from North Carolina alone. And this is just the beginning.

Two years ago, Worthington Farms, one of the largest in the state, listed the depreciated value of its farm machinery at almost $100,000. In 1968, tobacco accounted for more than half of the farm's gross income.

Producer Martin Carr discussed the disappearing farm worker with one of the owners, Chester Don Worthington.

CARR. How many tenant houses were there on this land at one time?

WORTHINGTON. Approximately 40.

CARR. About 40. That's a lot. About how many of them are empty now?

WORTHINGTON. Well, we don't have many empty ones because——

CARR. You rent them out?

WORTHINGTON. We have torn most of them down or burned them.

CARR. You've torn most of them down.

WORTHINGTON. Right. Right.

CARR. How many permanent employees do you have on the farm?

WORTHINGTON. Eight besides my family.

CARR. You're very highly mechanized.

WORTHINGTON. I think so.

UTLEY. The Coastal Plains Regional Commission estimates that, in four years, more than 100,000 farm families will be surplus labor. Not only is the farm worker being displaced, the small farmer is forced to leave as well.

Jake Lovegrove told us about some of the problems facing a small North Carolina tobacco farmer.

LOVEGROVE. We bought this farm by working on it and paying for it, but it is kind of hard to even keep the taxes going on it now.

CARR. Why is that? Is it that the labor costs have gone up?

LOVEGROVE. Well, it is the labor, the machinery and everything have gone up except what we're raising.

CARR. In other words you need machinery now to run a farm.

LOVEGROVE. Yep. And by the time you buy a piece of machinery and get it paid for, it is obsolete.

CARR. Do you know other farmers around here who are able to buy the machinery?

LOVEGROVE. Well, they are still getting them. I don't know how they are paying for them.

CARR. Are they bigger than you?

LOVEGROVE. Oh, yeah. Much bigger. Looks like the big one is going to be here and the little one is going.

CARR. You think you'll ever have to give up the farm and really work year around, picking up jobs?

LOVEGROVE. Well, yeah, I think I'll eventually let some big fellow have the farm.

UTLEY. It might seem unlikely that a university would turn farmers into migrants. But North Carolina State University has done just that, by developing the tobacco combine.

The head of the University's Agricultural Engineering Department, Dr. Francis J. Hassler, was in charge of its development.

CARR. Dr. Hassler, this is the tobacco combine?

HASSLER. Yes, sir.

CARR. This machine was developed in this lab?

HASSLER. Yes, sir, it was designed and constructed in this lab.

CARR. In general, then, how many years went into the development of the tobacco combine?

HASSLER. About 23 years.

CARR. About 23 years. And about how much money would you estimate that it cost to develop this machine?

HASSLER. About three-quarters of a million dollars.

CARR. About three-quarters of a million dollars—now that the machine is developed, your work is done.

HASSLER. No, we will continue to make whatever improvements that we can. Our ultimate aim is to provide the farmer with the means whereby one man can handle about 20 acres of tobacco.

UTLEY. A prototype of this tobacco combine was turned over to the Harrington Manufacturing Company which is, at present, producing and selling the machine. The cost of the development of this prototype was paid by the American taxpayer. Last year more than 219 million tax dollars went to 69 colleges across the nation. Called land-grant colleges, they were established to improve agriculture. Over 26 million of these tax dollars went to the School of Agriculture and Life Sciences at North Carolina State.

In other laboratories at this University years have been spent improving the tobacco leaf, the yield per acre, and even the process by which tobacco is turned into cigarettes. All this is of immediate benefit to the large tobacco grower and the cigarette companies; of little benefit to the small farmer, or the farm worker thrown off the land without a

job. The Wall Street Journal has described the land-grant college as a "tax paid clinic for major industry."

For the three major tobacco companies in North Carolina, tobacco is a billion dollar business. Six billion dollars a year. Right now, for industry's benefit, North Carolina State University is perfecting a freeze drying process to cut in half the amount of tobacco needed for a cigarette. A loss for the farmer, a boon to the manufacturer.

Recent developments suggest that soon there may be a cigarette requiring even less tobacco. We discussed this with the dean of the East Carolina State University School of Business, Dr. James Beardon.

BEARDON. In West Virginia a plant is being built now by the Celanese Corporation to develop a substitute tobacco. When you see headlines which say a company is ready to produce a substitute for tobacco and this was a major paper in the state, then—you have to plug that into the possibilities for the future. It has to be discussed. Nobody likes to talk about these things and—yet there has to be a dialogue. I think the responsibility of the company is to at least—enter such a dialogue. At the same time I think there is a responsibility of the government to say what they project their view of tobacco to be 10 years down the pike.

UTLEY. With the future of tobacco in jeopardy North Carolina has been trying to create new jobs by attracting new industry. At the same time, the major tobacco companies are diversifying outside the state. Although North Carolina is the 12th most industrialized state in the union, the type of industry it has been able to attract, mainly textiles, has not been impressive. According to the bureau of labor statistics, as recently as June of this year, only the state of Mississippi paid its workers a lower average industrial wage. The Director of North Carolina's Department of Conservation and Development, Roy Sowers, explained some of the problems involved in attracting industry to the state.

SOWERS. In some areas of our state, there was an anti-industry attitude. We found that some local communities, that the industrial complexes in some of our places were tied to the status quo, so to speak—they didn't want to have new industry because it would upset their labor supply.

CARR. Their supply of cheap labor?

SOWERS. Right.

CARR. In other words, the industries you have attract the unskilled worker.

SOWERS. The existing industry, by and large.

CARR. Would you characterize much of the industry in the state as "runaway industry?"

HOBBY. A great deal of it is runaway industry, moving down from the North—and most of it is moving into the rural areas. We estimate that anywhere from 50 million to 75 million dollars worth a year of overtime pay, discrimination pay between women making less money, and the fact that the workers are not paid the minimum wage is going on here in North Carolina, and we're catching only about 8% of it.

CARR. The way things stand now, would you blame a worker for leaving the state?

HOBBY. No, I wouldn't blame a worker if he could pick up and leave the state, take his family and get a decent job somewhere else.

CARR. Did you apply for any jobs down here?

BATTS. Yes, I did. I was interviewed and—they said I was qualified for the job and they would call me. So—I went home and waited and waited. So I never get called. So I never tried for more jobs here.

CARR. Where are you going now that you've graduated from Scotland Neck High School?

BATTS. Well, I'm going to Atlantic City first, for a summer job. And then after my summer job ends, I hope that I could go to Delaware and get in GM or Chrysler Corporation.

CARR. You hope.

BATTS. I hope I will.

CARR. Do you like it up north?

BATTS. Not particular I don't. Because where I'm going I don't have no relatives and seem like I will always be lonely and I will always think about home and I will always think about my mother.

CARR. Are you lonely when you are up there?

BATTS. Yes, I am. You always think—of home—last summer when I was away, when I get up I walk by a telephone booth, I would think of my mother. And—most mornings when I got up I would call her. I would call, tell her I am on my way to work. Then some evenings I will call—even nighttimes when I'm out. I remember one night when I was out I would call her. Just to know how things was going and let her know I'm doing all right. I wish I could get myself a little money, enough money to come back home to North Carolina.

UTLEY. In Nebraska even the small farms are huge—between 500 and 1000 acres—usually covered with grain, and stretching as far as the eye can see.

Huge farms run by small families mean that machines are necessary. And machines cost money. More and more money each year.

CARR. How much does one of these things cost?

HIEMER. Well like this here tractor here, it's a 706 and when I bought it it cost 7,260 dollars.

CARR. Over 7,000 dollars.

HIEMER. Right.

CARR. Have equipment prices gone up?

HIEMER. Oh, tremendous. I remember when I started farming I started out with a Nym tractor and it cost me 1,850 dollars—and look at the difference in the price—and I was farming this same farm.

CARR. About 1800 to 7000.

HIEMER. 7,000 for a tractor like this, right.

UTLEY. Farmer Richard Hiemer pays more for everything now, as all of us do. Not only is equipment three or four times more expensive; clothing, seed, taxes, even the food he buys at the supermarket, cost much more. But while food prices have risen, the price he receives for what he grows remains the same.

HIEMER. Well, if you buy a loaf of bread for 37 cents, there's only 3 cents of our wheat that goes into that loaf of bread. So, all the rest of that money you're spending on that loaf of bread goes to other areas.

CARR. Right now, you'd like a larger share of the loaf.

HIEMER. Right, right.

ZITEK. We have an economic situation in agriculture that is driving people off the land. For instance, we have about a 3% return to investment in agriculture. This compared to better than a—probably—a 20 or 22 percent return to investment in all the related industries in the production and distribution of food.

CARR. If it's so bad, why are you a farmer? and why are you letting your kids, for instance, grow up on a farm? Why aren't you training them for something else?

ZITEK. I am not training my sons to be farmers. They are picking that up as a result of the situation here, where I am a businessman and I don't have enough income to be able to hire labor, so I put slave labor to work. We do have child labor laws in this country, but as long as you've got your own kid working, and he doesn't get paid, then it doesn't make any difference, but it does enable me to produce corn for a buck and society benefits.

CARR. Looking ahead, do you think your children will be able to live on the land?

ZITEK. As far as my children are concerned, it's their choice. And that's what I do, and I do this because I feel they must have a choice. But the economic situation right now doesn't give them that choice.

UTLEY. There's a saying in Nebraska. You either marry a farm or inherit it. Land prices are high, driven even higher by the speculation of banks and large corporations. They are now beyond the reach of most young farmers. Claude Jensen is the exception.

JENSEN. I started farming, I didn't have any money at all. And then three years ago I bought this farm, and I—got a loan to buy it. And then these cattle, uh—their purchase price. I borrowed that money.

CARR. How much money do you have sunk into the farm?

JENSEN. Oh, there's about 45,000 dollars in the farm.

CARR. That's a lot of money.

JENSEN. Probably the biggest thing is, getting ahold of some land and some money and some labor, all at the same time.

CARR. Where does your labor come from?

JENSEN. Myself. Then I hire some.

CARR. You're not married, are you?

JENSEN. No.

CARR. Are there many young ladies left in this neighborhood?

JENSEN. Not that uh—are—farming or living on a farm. Most all of them are working in Lincoln or going to school.

CARR. What happens when you, say, meet a girl in Lincoln? I don't want to get too personal, but can you get a young lady to get interested in coming out, living on a farm today?

JENSEN. Most of them aren't much interested.

CARR. They don't want to come out here?

JENSEN. No.

CARR. What do they say?

JENSEN. A lot of them just shrug their shoulders and say "Oh, you're a farmer—" And that's it.

CARR. If you're the only young person, what's it like for you?

JENSEN. Well it seems like most everybody is—that's farming is 20 years or more older, and—they just—work and play in different circles than I do.

NEIDERMEYER. We have a lot of fun here; we do, really. A bunch of us in the evening sometimes—it don't happen too often that enough get together—we have a card game then or something like that. Just a little friendly game.

CARR. Mostly older people now, huh?

NEIDERMEYER. Yeah. Yes. Old or at the school age . . . of course, they're here yet.

CARR. The ones in the middle are gone.

NEIDERMEYER. Mostly.

CARR. What about the other little towns around—are they growing?

NEIDERMEYER. No, I don't think any of them is. Just about the same class this one is—trying to hold her own, but just kind of—slowly keep—

CARR. You think they're dying?

NEIDERMEYER. Dying, yeah.

UTLEY. Today, Nebraska competes with Iowa and Florida in having the most aged population in the country. In the last ten years, 73,000 more people moved out of Nebraska than moved in. 20,000 farms went out of business. Family farms, closed down, moved to the city.

HYSLOP. I could take you around the countryside here and show you several farmsteads that are vacant, some of them have even been torn down and the buildings are gone and they are actually farming over where someone lived maybe five or ten years ago.

CARR. You say you're going into debt.

HYSLOP. That's right.

CARR. How deeply into debt?

HYSLOP. Well, quite a bit. My standard of living now, I'm quite a bit below what our government considers poverty level.

CARR. And yet it's your own home. Your own farm.

HYSLOP. That's right. Course I don't own it clear. There's a mortgage on it, naturally.

CARR. What are you going to do about it?

HYSLOP. I don't really know. I wish so much that I could stay on the farm, because I like

it. I like the kind of living, but I guess I'm going to have to go off. I don't know whether I can find, for instance, find a job nearby that I could stay living on the farm or not. A couple of years ago I worked in electronics plants in Lincoln. I worked during the winter, but it was strictly a bench job, setting, you know, 8 hours a day, and I just couldn't set. I liked the job, but I was tied to one place, and this I just couldn't seem to get used to. I'm going to have to I guess.

UTLEY. Now the only sign of life on many Nebraska farms is a windmill, vainly spinning near an abandoned house.

And the abandoned houses, empty stores, and forsaken churches, stand as mute reminders of a rural America that will no longer be.

Carl Sandburg put it this way:

Two years, ten years, and passengers ask the conductor:

What place is this?

Where are we now?

I am the grass,

Let me work.

UTLEY. 20,000 Mexican-Americans come to Houston every year looking for jobs, bringing with them everything that is portable including their unique and distinctive culture.

This is a Mariachi Mass, in Houston's Church of St. Stephen, celebrated just as it was before these people left the Rio Grande Valley in South Texas.

"Magic Valley" they called this land, watered by the Rio Grande which separates it from Mexico. "Magic" because of the fertility and abundance of its more than one and a half million acres which once gave the United States more than 200 million dollars worth of fruit and vegetables a year.

But the magic is gone, along with 95,000 farmers and field workers who have left the valley in the last ten years, heading for the cities—most of them Mexican-Americans descended from families who worked the land before Texas was a state.

NBC News Correspondent Edwin Newman, along with Leo J. Leo, the mayor of La Joya, a small town in the lower Rio Grande Valley, visited a few of the farmers who did not leave.

LEO. You know all these houses were occupied by people who used to work in the farms around here, but now they're gone because there was no work for them here . . . Antonio Vidamontis now owns a little home in Idaho . . . and in this one over here, the Valdez family used to live. I used to deliver groceries for them. I knew them all. We have only two families working in this farming operation where they used to have at least 15 or 20.

NEWMAN. What's the explanation of this, Mr. Leo?

LEO. Well, the tomato patch here belongs to Mr. Cerda—he has no market for his tomatoes. They're only worth a penny and a half a pound right now. He couldn't possibly come out of it if he were to try to market them at the price that they're giving him for it.

NEWMAN. And of course there—used to be a lot of tomatoes planted here. And now, there's what? just a fraction?

LEO. Very, very, very few tomatoes planted. There were thousands and thousands of acres planted here say as late as ten years ago.

NEWMAN. Well, where have the tomatoes gone then?

LEO. They're over there, across this Rio Grande River of ours.

NEWMAN. And these tomatoes, Mr. Leo, that I see here—what happens to them?

LEO. Well, they'll—they'll rot on the vine.

FOSTER. The problem here is to do—a tremendous amount of imports coming into this country from Mexico.

NEWMAN. Imports of what?

FOSTER. You can just about name the produce as far as the vegetable line is coming in, and increasing more every day. The main reason is labor. See Mexico is not selling produce, in my opinion. What they are selling is twenty cent-an-hour labor.

NEWMAN. You say Americans are doing this? They are going into Mexico and they are allowed to ship the stuff out without any customs difficulties?

FOSTER. The duty is so low on a box of tomatoes, if one used it for a hypothetical example, they pay one cent a pound duty.

NEWMAN. To the United States government?

FOSTER. To the United States government to cross this produce. They have already set it down on this side for 45¢, whereas just to get it out of our field it costs us 80¢.

UTLEY. 191 million dollars worth of fruit and vegetables crossed the Mexican border last year, to be sold in every major American city—shipped there not only by American growers, but by packers and distributors who now buy from Mexican farmers.

Griffin and Brand is the largest grower and importer in the Rio Grande Valley. Its 20 million dollar a year business is supplied by three times more acreage in Mexico than it uses in the United States. Othal Brand, president of Griffin and Brand, defends his operation. He claims it benefits the economy.

BRAND. We do find ourselves and all others in the business of importing are from time to time under attack and are criticized for bringing in a product in competition with something manufactured in the United States. It's true in steel, clothing, radios. I simply defend what we do in Mexico on the basis that it's legitimate business and needed business both in the United States and Mexico.

UTLEY. More than fruit and vegetables cross the Mexican border. People come too. They live in Mexico, where the cost of living is low. And they work in Texas, where the wages are higher. In the United States they can earn five times as much as they would in Mexico, and still save money for American employers, who can avoid paying the minimum wage. They enter under an immigration quota which allows 150,000 Mexicans into this country each year. They are called Greencard workers, for they must carry a green immigration permit to enter the United States. These Mexicans are crossing Reynosa International Bridge—at a time when unemployment is high in the south Texas region; at a time when many American workers must uproot their families and leave home to find work. These people who gather here at dawn every morning are among the poorest of Mexico's poor. They are taking jobs and lowering the wages of some of the poorest of America's poor. This is a result of a deliberate government policy enforced by government officials.

CARR. Mr. Martinez, you're with the Texas Employment Commission?

MARTINEZ. Yes, sir, that's right.

CARR. Who are these people that are standing around down here?

MARTINEZ. Well, they're farm workers that come here from across the river and around the area, coming here to look for work

CARR. They're what we know as "greencards"?

MARTINEZ. Green cards, yes.

CARR. And why do you, as part of the Texas Employment Commission, come down here in the morning?

MARTINEZ. I know a lot of the crew leaders around here and . . .

CARR. Do the crew leaders give you a list of the jobs that they need filled?

MARTINEZ. Oh, yes.

CARR. And you come down here and you fill the jobs here?

MARTINEZ. Yes, right.

UTLEY. Unemployed Americans are not as fortunate. No government officials come to them with jobs. They must go out and look for work.

Last year over 16,000 people visited the McAllen office of the Texas Employment Commission. But as Manager Richard Stolle points out, only a few can be helped.

NEWMAN. What percentage of the people who come in here are you able to help?

STOLLE. Oh—we probably are able to help—roughly 10% of the people who come in and this may even be a little high at certain times of the year.

NEWMAN. Is the problem here made more difficult by the amount of production that is being done, for example, in Mexico?

STOLLE. The fact that we have farming in Mexico, and the crops are sent into the United States, this decreases the number of farm jobs over here.

NEWMAN. A good deal of American industry has gone into Mexico that didn't come from this immediate area. . . .

STOLLE. Yes, sir, that's right, some.

NEWMAN. Could that industry come here? Could it—could it be absorbed here? Wouldn't it help?

STOLLE. Tremendously, yes, sir.

UTLEY. More than 200 of the best known American manufacturers have Mexican addresses, where they produce goods to ship back to the United States. This plant, owned by Sarkes Tarzian, is in Nuevo Laredo. Here Mexican women are assembling television tuners. Four years ago, Sarkes Tarzian had plants in Mississippi and Arkansas. But the minimum wage in the United States is $1.60 an hour. In Mexico a worker costs 50 cents an hour. And Sarkes Tarzian, sanctioned by official United States policy, moved to Mexico. The 600 women it had employed in Mississippi and Arkansas have been replaced by Mexicans.

NEWMAN. Do you ever say to people who come in here "don't waste your time. Go somewhere else."?

STOLLE. We recommend that they go to the cities—primarily to Houston or to San Antonio or to Austin, Dallas.

ACEVEDO. I've been to Toledo, I been to Chicago, and I went to look for work in Dallas, but I couldn't find it.

CARR. You like living up north?

ACEVEDO. It's one thing I don't like to be away from my family. I don't like that.

CARR. You had to say goodbye to your brothers—older brothers?

ACEVEDO. Yeah—uh—most of them–they're all scattered different places. I remember the first one started going up north, then the other one, and the other one, and the other one.

CARR. What about your friends? What about the other families up here, the same thing happened?

ACEVEDO. Yes, most of them live up north—big cities—working there.

UTLEY. Houston is the most rapidly expanding city in the Southwest. There is building everywhere. Houston's population has increased 31 percent in the last ten years. Its Mexican-American population has soared 125 percent.

Houston, the sixth largest city in America now has the same problems as the other large urban areas. Most of the new arrivals settle in the worst areas of the city. According to a recent study by University of Houston sociologist, Dr. Sam Schulman, these Mexican-American ghettos have three times as many sub-standard housing units as the rest of the city, with twenty percent more people crowded into them. Here the average family income is only half of Houston's other citizens; but unemployment is twice as high. The ghettos grow larger every year.

Unable to live in the valley, but not at home in the city, a new type of American has been created by rural migration: the displaced person.

CARR. What made you leave Donna, Texas and head for Houston?

BEATRIZ. Well, there's no future there for a young person after they graduate from high school. You become a nobody. Because there's

no real work that you can do. You can't make very good money. And there's just no future there.

CARR. Did you graduate from high school in the valley?

BEATRIZ. I graduated, yes. In 1966.

CARR. Were you working down there?

BEATRIZ. Yes. I was lucky to have a job. And I knew I wasn't making very much money and I couldn't bear to think of living that way for the rest of my life. I don't belong down there. I go down there, I try to go down there as least as I can and when I go down there I get a real eerie feeling, I get all scared because I don't feel at home.

CARR. What have your jobs been like here in Houston?

BEATRIZ. I have worked here as an insurance secretary for the last four years and I'm very pleased with it, I enjoy my work. And yet I know that here in Houston I don't feel at home either. And it's really very scary because you're not—where do I belong? I really don't know.

UTLEY. For most Americans, Atlantic City, New Jersey means vacation, salt water taffy, and the annual Miss America Pageant. For Joseph Batts, it means a sumer job; the first step in his journey north from his home in Scotland Neck, North Carolina.

JOE BATTS. I'm alone now. I live in a West Side boarding house. I have one room—one room, and I pay $7.30 a week for it.

I wash dishes, and that's about all right now. It's not a job that anyone would like for—to have a high school diploma to wash dishes. At least I don't like it. You couldn't get yourself set up off of washing dishes all your life. If you try for another job and someone ask you what kind of experience you have, what was your last job, you said dish-washer, they might tell you you might not be no good to them.

When I'm off, not working, you find me on the boardwalk. It's beautiful at night. Really beautiful. When you get a crowd out, a nice warm night up on the boardwalk, you have a whole lot of excitement up there. People from all over the world come here. It's exciting to me. Most of the time some people stop and they're talking to you and before you wind up you know you're talking to someone from your home town.

FRIEND. Like man, at night time, man, we ain't got nothing to do. You know, just come out here on the boardwalk, mess around awhile.

BATTS. That's me, yeah.

The rides on the boardwalk—I don't ever go on them, but I go up and watch them, because they're kind of expensive.

I walk alone sometimes. I think about things that I did when I was home, like going to see my girl friend, playing ball. I know all those days now are over with. It don't feel good to be out in the world alone, by yourself, if you don't have nothing to look forward to, some friends or nothing; you're just lost. I miss my mother very much.

Yes, operator, I'd like to make a long distance telephone call to North Carolina, Scotland Neck, North Carolina.

OPERATOR. The number?

BATTS. The number is 826——

OPERATOR. 826.

BATTS. Yes, 374——

OPERATOR. 374.

BATTS. Yes.

MOTHER. Well, how are you doing?

BATTS. I'm doing all right.

MOTHER. I miss you so much.

BATTS. I miss being there too.

MOTHER. What time did you get off?

BATTS. Well, I got off at two. I went to work, I worked twelve hours yesterday.

MOTHER. Is that right?

BATTS. Yes, ma'am. So I went to work this morning. I worked six hours. Just enough to make eight hours. You know.

MOTHER. Uh-huh.

BATTS. So I been working at that. And I been off all day.

MOTHER. Uh-huh. What time do you go back to work in the morning?

BATTS. I go to work at 5 o'clock tomorrow evening.

MOTHER. M-hum.

BATTS. M-hum.

MOTHER. What you doing all day tomorrow, rest?

BATTS. Play ball.

MOTHER. What did I tell you about playing ball?

BATTS. Yes, ma'am.

MOTHER. Now, you call me. You know you have a dollar to spare to talk to me at least for two or three minutes.

BATTS. Yes, ma'am. I'll call you.

MOTHER. I'll be so lonesome on the weekends. And when are you going to write me a nice long letter?

BATTS. I'm going to sit down and start—I'm going to start on it tonight after I fill my application out.

MOTHER. I know you hate to write, but anyway, you just take the time sometime and write me a nice long letter.

BATTS. Yes, ma'am.

MOTHER. All right, Mama's so glad to hear from you.

BATTS. Yes, ma'am.

MOTHER. And you know I love you now.

BATTS. And I love you too.

MOTHER. O.K. now, you take care, you hear?

BATTS. Yes, ma'am.

JOE BATTS. I don't like the North. I never lived in a place like this before. And I always say I like where I was raised and born in. That's home, and that's where I want to be.

UTLEY. The 1970 Census has just confirmed, if confirmation was needed, that this galloping flight from rural America is continuing, and may even be accelerating. The United States Department of Agriculture predicts that another one million farms will disappear by 1980—a short nine years away. One farm organization says that for every six farmers who quit farming, one rural business is forced to close. More than 150,000 small town businesses can start boarding up the windows.

Yet the President has proposed no measures, and Congress has enacted no measures that come anywhere near to being adequate in dealing with these problems.

A drive along the back roads of rural poverty, as well as a walk into any urban ghetto, is evidence enough that there is a need for balanced growth in this country.

This is not a rural problem or a farm problem, not a black, brown, or white problem. It is a problem for all of us. Something is leaving our national life. Something that no set of statistics, no matter how accurate, can measure. We just haven't asked ourselves, "Where shall we live?" and "How shall we live?" We haven't asked ourselves whether we can allow private enterprise, guided by short-term economic considerations, to make that determination.

THE SCHOOL PRAYER AMENDMENT: AN EDITORIAL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the October 8, 1971, Christianity Today, a leading national journal on religion, a recent editorial comment presented some thoughtful and provocative arguments against passage of the proposed constitutional amendment on school prayer.

The editorial follows:

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT

In November the House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on a proposed amendment to the Constitution that says, "Nothing in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer." We think that passage of this amendment would be a mistake.

For one thing, persons already can and do voluntarily assemble for prayer in public buildings. For example, many religious groups hold meetings regularly on campuses. Congregations rent public school facilities for small fees. Evangelists hold meetings in public stadiums. Where local authorities prohibit this, they cannot legitimately argue they do so because the Constitution forbids it. The Supreme Court has said the First Amendment prohibits government promoted religious exercises, but it has upheld the study of religion and rights of voluntary assembly and propagation of one's faith. By not reading these decisions carefully, many people, including government officials, have misrepresented what the Supreme Court has done to protect religious freedom.

Secondly, this amendment is hardly the way to promote a revival of true religion. Undoubtedly the backers of the amendment have worthy motives. Perhaps they wish to recapture some of the spiritual vitality that sometimes prevailed in our country's past. Genuine piety is fostered not by government, however, but by families and individuals who practice reverence for God and obedience to him in all their activities and associations.

Finally, this amendment leaves open the possibility for some to assert that denominational prayer should not be permitted in public buildings. We must recognize that in this context "denomination" would almost certainly be interpreted to mean Buddhist, Christian, Jew, Muslim, and the like, not merely Baptist, Lutheran, or Catholic. If a group of Orthodox Jews wish to hold a prayer meeting in a public building at some suitable time, they should be allowed to do so even though Reformed Jews, not to mention Christians, would be unable to join in at least some of the petitions. Youth groups such as Campus Life or Inter-Varsity should be able to meet in schools for explicitly Christian prayers without fear that misguided authorities will say only groups praying in a way that is acceptable to all religions are now constitutional.

We urge our readers to reflect seriously on the implications of this seemingly innocent amendment and to convey their views to their representatives.

LOWERING THE AGE FOR FEDERAL JURY ELIGIBILITY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it has been wisely noted that the only thing in life which is permanent is change.

If a society is to maintain its viability, its laws must change to keep pace with reality.

Congress and the States recently amended the Constitution to lower the voting age from 21 to 18, in recognition of the increasingly early maturity and sophistication of young people today.

There are many other rights and responsibilities of citizenship which turn on one's age. Jury service is an example. At present, a citizen cannot serve on a Federal court jury until the age of 21, the magic age of majority which harkens back to medieval times when most young men under 21 were not physically capable of donning a full suit of heavy armor.

Today, by the time a young man or woman is 18 years old, he or she has attained full physical maturation, and has been exposed to more knowledge and experience than the average adult encountered in a lifetime a century ago.

There is no sound reason for excluding these young people from the full range of participation in civic affairs. They serve in the military. They vote in Federal elections. They should also bear their fair share of participation in the judicial process, by serving on civil and criminal juries. Jury duty is a right and a privilege of citizenship which should be shared as broadly as possible by all responsible citizens, if the concept of trial by a jury of one's peers is to retain vitality.

I am pleased to introduce today a bill which would amend title 28 of the United States Code to lower the minimum age qualification for Federal jury service from 21 to 18 years of age. A similar proposal has been introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER.

We have given our young people the privilege of participating in the electoral process. I am confident that they will accept, just as willingly and as capably, the responsibilities of jury service.

STATUS REPORT ON PAKISTAN

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, more than 6 months have elapsed since the West Pakistani Army began its fierce attack against East Bengal. By now the American public has been satiated with a stream of reports describing a tale of terror. The rape, torture, looting, killing, starving, and systematic burning of villages have continued unabated since March 25.

No end is in sight. The number of refugees who have fled across the border now totals 9 million and relief workers in India are bracing themselves for an additional 3 to 11 million others who are expected to arrive before the end of the year. By all accounts this constitutes the largest mass exodus of human beings in modern history.

Unlike last winter's natural disasters which took a toll of a half million lives, the present holocaust has taken twice as many lives and is entirely man made.

East Bengal's leader, Sheikh Mujibur Rahman—whose party received 95 percent of the seats at stake in the east in the December 1970 election—is now secretly imprisoned in the western sector and is being tried for his life by the military government. Until he is released and until the people of East Bengal—Bangladesh—are allowed self-determination, there will be no hope of ending the suffering.

The U.S. Government maintains that Pakistan's current difficulties are an "internal" matter and that the goal of U.S. policy is to exert "leverage" upon the Pakistani Government in order to stave off a disastrous climax. Behind this cloak of impartiality however, lies an entirely different story: U.S. arms, military equipment, and economic assistance continue to flow to West Pakistan, providing the major financial backing for General Yahya Khan's program of suppression. Some sources estimate that as many as 80 percent of the weapons being used by the West Pakistani Army in Bengal are of American origin.

At his August 4 press conference, President Nixon clarified his administration's policy with a brief statement:

> We feel that the most constructive role we can play is to continue our economic assistance to Pakistan. . . . We are not going to engage in public pressure on the Government of Pakistan. That would be totally counter-productive. These are matters that we will discuss only in private channels.

Why does the President insist on covering up Pakistan's ruthless and premeditated campaign of genocide when the rest of the world is crying out with horror? The 11-member nations of the aid-to-Pakistan consortium agreed to cut off all aid to Pakistan after a World Bank delegation saw at first hand the destruction perpetrated by Yahya Khan's soldiers. The United States alone intends to continue feeding the Pakistani war machine.

Any end to the suffering in Bangladesh requires a realistic political solution in addition to a rapid distribution of relief equipment and food. Indeed, under the present circumstances the provision of food grains by itself may actually serve to retard any potential resolution. In the past, 95,000 tons of Public Law 480 food grains presented for relief use in the east have been diverted to the west by the Central Government of Pakistan and 24 U.N. vehicles intended to be used for distribution of humanitarian supplies have been commandeered by the Pakistani generals and used instead to transport troops into battle.

What assurances are there that the 200 jeeps, 26 coastal vessels and nine minibulkers recently given to the United Nation will not be similarly commandeered? How can the 70 U.N. observers—all of whom are presently huddled together in the sanctuary of the Capital City, Dacca—prevent misuse of funds, food, and medicine by the Pakistan Army? It is foolish to think that that army—a foreign force occupying a distant land and speaking a strange language—will suddenly stop gunning down Bengalis to graciously offer them the needed supplies. In a war of genocide food is often just as deadly a weapon as bullets. Until the people of East Bengal can determine their political future the torment will continue, the refugees will flee in ever greater numbers and the Indian subcontinent will remain a powder keg only waiting to explode.

TRIBUTES TO OUR LATE COLLEAGUE, JAMES G. FULTON

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues, some of the fine tributes paid our late colleague, The Honorable JAMES G. FULTON of Pennsylvania. In the form of letters, telegrams, and newspaper articles, the deservedly laudatory comment gives graphic expression to the sense of loss we have all felt since JIM left our midst.

The tributes follow:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., Oct. 8, 1971.

TO THE FAMILY OF HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
Care Robert Fulton,
Dormont, Penna.:

Mrs. Nixon and I want to express our deepest sympathy to you on the death of Congressman Jim Fulton. During the course of our long association, we gathered many happy memories of him which we shall always cherish. We hope that the knowledge that he was so admired by the people he represented and so respected by his colleagues and friends brings you comfort now, and that your own remembrances of him will be a source of strength to you in the years ahead.

RICHARD NIXON.

AUSTIN, TEXAS,
October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Office of Honorable James Fulton,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Mrs. Johnson and I were saddened to learn of Jim's passing and send our deepfelt sympathy to you and the family. We share your loss, just as we shared your pride in his service.

Our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

UNITED STATES ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I heard with deep regret of the death of your brother, Congressman James G. Fulton. His loss wil be felt keenly by the Committees on which he served, as well as his constituency in Pennsylvania.

This Agency worked closely with Congressman Fulton over the years as a result of his long service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I wish to extend to you for myself and for the Agency our sincere sympathy.

Sincerely,

PHILIP J. FARLEY,
Acting Director.

SEOUL, KOREA,
October 12, 1971.

JAMES G. FULTON FAMILY,
Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Learned with great sorrow of passing of your beloved brother. May God give you comfort and courage in this darkest moment.

LEE DONG WON,
Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee,
Republic of Korea National Assembly.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: It was with much regret that I learned of the death of your

brother, Congressman James G. Fulton, and I hasten to extend to you my deepest sympathy during this time of sorrow.

Your brother was a public spirited, fine citizen, and he will be greatly missed by a large circle of friends.

Please convey my sympathy to the other members of the family, and with kindest regards, in which Mrs. Thurmond joins me,

Very truly,

STROM THURMOND.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Office of the Late Rep. James G. Fulton,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I wish to convey my heartfelt condolences to you and your sisters on the passing of your dear brother, and my colleague, the Honorable James G. Fulton.

His sudden and untimely death came as a deep shock; I was proud to call Jim my friend and shall feel his loss most profoundly.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE G. WILLIAMS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I was distressed and saddened this morning to learn of the death of my good and longtime friend, Jim Fulton. He and his family before him have served his State and his Nation well for more than 200 years. He will be missed by many, many people.

Jim served with distinction on the Science and Astronautics Committee and contributed much to our country in that capacity. His interest in foreign affairs has never gone unnoticed.

I share with you the deep loss of his family, his friends and his country. He was one of my very closest friends.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I was extremely sorry to hear about Jim.

It has been my pleasure to know him for many years and also to have served with him since 1961 in Congress.

We sat together on Monday afternon and he seemed to be okay at that time. It was a real shock when we heard the news today.

Jim was a very fine fellow, very dedicated, and hard-working.

He will be greatly missed by all of us.

Most sincerely,

J. IRVING WHALLEY.

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I had the good fortune to serve in the House of Representatives with your brother, Jim. We all feel a great sense of loss, and I know that he will be missed greatly in the House and in his Congressional District in Pennsylvania which he served with such dedication for almost fourteen terms.

In behalf of the Members of the Republican National Committee as well as for Mrs. Dole and myself, I want you to know how much we appreciate your brother's service to the Republican Party and extend to you and your sisters our great sympathy.

Sincerely,

BOB DOLE, *Chairman.*

LAUDERDALE, FLA.,
October 7, 1971.

Miss MARTHA CAMERON and office staff and family of Congressman JAMES G. FULTON
New Federal Building, Pa.:

Our Nation lost a great citizen. Heaven gained a great soul. Our prayers are with you.

FATHER SCHERER,,
Chaplain, Holy Cross Hospital.

PITTSBURGH, PENN.,
October 8, 1971.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Care, Beinhauer Funeral Home,
West Liberty Avenue,
Pittsburgh, Pa.:

I extend to you my personal sympathy and that of the priests and people of the diocese of Pittsburgh on the death of your beloved brother. He was always interested in the affairs of the church and gave his services to help us in any way possible. His loss will be felt by all of us. Most reverent.

VINCENT M. LEONARD,
Bishop of Pittsburgh.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT FULTON,
Dormont, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Mrs. Volpe joins me in extending to you and the members of your family our sincere condolences at the passing of Cong. Jim Fulton. I was very well acquainted with Cong. Fulton and his intense dedication to duty and country. We had recently traveled together and his grasp of affairs, domestic and foreign, was outstanding. His 26 distinguished years as a member of the Congress, as a delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, and his prior service in the U.S. Navy and the Pennsylvania State Senate have proven his love of country and State, May the Lord comfort you at this time.

JOHN A. VOLPE,
Secretary of Transportation.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.,
October 11, 1971.

ROBERT FULTON,
Dormont, Pa.:

I wish to express my condolences to you and the other members of your family on the passing of your brother James. Representative Fulton was a tireless legislator, a steadfast proponent of equal rights and a great Pennsylvanian. Along with many other Pennsylvanians, I will keenly feel his loss.

ALEXANDER F. BARBIERI,
Justice, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania.

WESTINGHOUSE BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Espy Avenue,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Although we do not know each other, I knew your brother Jim well and valued him not only as a Representative in the Congress, but also as a friend. He was never too busy to respond to any request and always most helpful.

On August 25th of this year, he responded by telephone to a request that I had made of him for information and in the course of conversation he was philosophizing about the responsibility of Congressmen to their constituents and he said, when I die, I would hope that they would put on my tombstone a simple phrase—"At least he tried."

Please know that our sincerest sympathy is extended to your two sisters and yourself.

Sincerely,

EDWARD WALLIS.

WESTINGHOUSE BROADCASTING CO., INC.,
Washington, D.C., October 8, 1971.

THE FAMILY OF CONGRESSMAN FULTON,
Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Please accept my sincere condolences in the passing of your brother. In addition to being an able and faithful Congressman, he was an unfailingly kind man . . . a pleasure for any reporter to cover. We too, shall miss him.

Sincerely,

NEIL CURRIE,
Congressional Correspondent,
KDKA, Pittsburgh.

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
October 11, 1971.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Pittsburgh, Pa.:

We deeply regret the untimely death of your brother Rep. Jim Fulton. His whole life was spent in service to his community and to his country.

PITTSBURGH SECTION,
National Counsel of Jewish Women.

PENNSYLVANIA HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Harrisburg, Pa., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
c/o Office of Congressman Fulton,
New Federal Office Building,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

DEAR MR. FULTON: In behalf of the Pennsylvania Heart Association, I wish to express our deep sympathy to you and your family.

Your sadness is shared by our volunteers and staff who recall your brother with much affection as 1970 State Heart Fund Chairman and member of our Western Chapter for over twenty years. His interest and great helpfulness will be remembered by the many persons who were fortunate to have known him.

We hope the thoughts of his friends in Heart may be of some comfort to you.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. GIBSON,
Chairman of the Board.

WESTERN PENNSYLVANIA HEART ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

CONGRESSMAN FULTON LAUDED BY DR. ADLER

Dr. Lawrence N. Adler, president of the Western Pennsylvania Heart Association in the House Bldg., 4 Smithfield Street, today lauded Congressman James G. Fulton with these words:

"He was one of the outstanding heart leaders in the county, state and nation giving freely of both his time and his money in the fight against the nation's No. 1 killer, heart disease.

"He was a member of the board of directors of the Heart Association since its founding 22 years ago and was the chairman of the record-breaking 1970 Heart Fund campaign in Pennsylvania.

"All of us who are engaged in the fight against heart disease will miss Congressman Fulton."

MENLO PARK, CALIF.,
October 7, 1971.

Dr. MYLES W. MACDONALD,
Mt. Lebanon United Presbyterian Church,
Washington Rd., Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Shocked and saddened by the passing of Jim Fulton. We express deepest appreciation of his friendship and of his dedicated life as a Christian in politics. His passing will be loss on the local and national scene.

CARY WEISIGER AND CLIFFORD SMITH,
Menlo Park Presbyterian Church.

(Former pastors, Mt. Lebanon United Presbyterian Church).

WASHINGTON, D.C.
October 7, 1971.

ROBERT D. FULTON,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The officers and members of the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees extend deepest sympathies to the bereaved family of the Honorable James Fulton, Congressman from the State of Pennsylvania and distinguished servant to the citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., his many friends and

admirers affectionately called him Jim. Jim Fulton will be missed by many especially the Postal and Federal Employees who found him to be a true friend.

ROBERT L. WHITE,
National President of NAPFE.

I was shocked to read in this morning paper of Jim Fulton's death. You had told me in a telephone call a few months ago that he hadn't been well but I didn't think it was serious.

Jim was a real friend and helped me in many ways. I will always look back on our war time association and later friendship with pleasure, but will realize I have lost a friend.

My deepest sympathy to you and his family.

Sincerely,

W. B. WHALEY,
Rear Admiral, USN (Ret.)

OCTOBER 8, 1971.

DEAR MR. FULTON: It is with sincere sorrow that I must write to you to acknowledge the passing of Mr. Fulton. He was a dedicated public servant and a sincere friend of his alma mater.

I am personally indebted to him for the help he has given me in my work for Penn State in Washington.

NEWTON CATTELL,
Government Relations, Pa. State University.

SOUTH HILLS CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL,
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 8, 1971.

OFFICE OF JAMES G. FULTON,
New Federal Building,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

To all who knew James G. Fulton, I wish to express my deepest sympathies. Mr. Fulton had a quality which is rare in most statesmen, as a matter of fact which is rare in most people. He was involved with people, not on a vote-getting basis or whatever, but for the people's sake. Whenever I went to a fish fry or graduation he always seemed to be there, warmly greeting people and communicating on a person to person basis with those around him. When my family went to Washington D.C. and wanted to see the Congress of the United States, he saw to it that we got passes, personally. I am now applying to the Naval Academy, and he has written me countless letters on the procedure involved and information on whatever I needed. Mr. Fulton was a great man. I am writing this letter on my own behalf, but I'm sure everyone at my high school, South Hills Catholic, feels the same. Probably everyone who has even met or seen this man feels the same.

Sincerely,

JOHN FIESCHKO,
SHC Student Council.

[From the Pittsburgh Post Gazette, Oct. 7, 1971]

REP. FULTON DIES IN WASHINGTON; 14-TERM LEGISLATOR HEART VICTIM

Rep. James G. Fulton, Dormont Republican, died of an apparent heart attack last night in Walter Reed Medical Center in Washington. He was 68.

The veteran congressman who suffered a heart attack last year, had entered the medical center for a checkup Monday, after complaining of stomach pains, an aide said. Death came at 8:17 p.m.

He was serving his 14th term as representative of the 27th District in a congressional career dating back to 1944.

Fulton was the ranking Republican on the House Space and Aeronautics Committee, and as such had traveled extensively througout the world.

Fulton was considered a most liberal Republican congressman and was recorded on the rolls of the Americans for Democratic Action as a congressman who voted mostly their way.

He was a bachelor, and heir of a very wealthy family, who formerly ran a string of seven newspapers in the South Hills.

His heart attack last year came during a springtime trip to Florida. He was detained there several days before returning to Washington.

He was the third House member to die this year and the second for Pennsylvania. The other was Republican Robert J. Corbett of Ben Avon Heights.

Fulton won re-election last May by whipping Democrat Douglas Walgren by some 30,000 votes. In 1962 he defeated Walgren's mother for the same post.

A two-year member of the Pennsylvania State Senate prior to World War II, Fulton was appointed U.S. delegate to the United Nations by President Eisenhower in 1959.

He also served on the House Foreign Affairs Comittee and the manned space flight subcommittee.

Fulton was at his seat in Congress on Monday and voted on a bill. He saw a doctor later, and entered the hospital that evening.

On Tuesday evening, his secretary, Miss Martha Cameron, visited him at the center. She quoted him as saying that he felt fine and was encouraged by the results of medical tests.

Fulton was the first major Pennsylvania GOP politician to support Richard Nixon for the presidency in 1968. He also was reported to be the first to be angered by Nixon when Spiro Agnew was picked as Nixon's running mate.

Fulton said, "I would like a more liberal man on the ticket, a Hatfield or a Lindsay or a Percy," referring to then Republican liberals.

A measure of Fulton's liberalism was the fact that registered Democrats heavily outnumbered Republicans in his district in recent years, but Fulton continued to hold onto his seat.

Fulton was the 1970 chairman of the Pennsylvania Heart Fund, and received the Silver Quill Award that year for outstanding writing on science and space.

He was a board member of the Pittsburgh Opera, and also served on the boards of the Pittsburgh Playhouse and Pennsylvania Academy of Science.

In 1970, he was chosen Man of the Year in Government by the Pittsburgh Junior Chamber of Comerce.

Fulton founded the newspaper chain, starting with the Mt. Lebanon News, in 1945. At one time the papers employed 90 persons. He sold the chain in October, 1969, to a Newark, Ohio, publishing firm.

Democrats who tried unsuccessfully to unseat Fulton sometimes expressed astonishment at the number of persons in the 27th District who said Fulton had done favors for them.

It was said his secret weapon was doing for people what they couldn't do for themselves in Washington.

It was Fulton who arranged the airplane and other niceties for the family at the funeral of the late Pennsylvania Justice Michael A. Musmanno.

After his heart attack last year, Fulton was away from duties for four weeks.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 7, 1971]

FULTON RITES HERE MONDAY

Services for U.S. Rep. James G. Fulton, who as a congressman for 28 years formed a personal acquaintance with thousands of South Hill constituents, are scheduled here for 2 p.m. Monday.

Friends and congressional colleagues of the 27th District Republican are expected to attend the rites at Mount Lebanon United Presbyterian Church.

Mr. Fulton, 68, died of a heart attack last night in Walter Reed Army Medical Center, where he was admitted Monday for a checkup, after returning to Washington from his home in Dormont.

He had a history of heart problems and suffered a mild attack a year and a half ago while vacationing in Florida.

He was the senior Republican in the Pennsylvania delegation to the House of Representatives and the ranking GOP member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. He also served on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

The House canceled its legislation program today, and tributes to Mr. Fulton were offered by various colleagues, including Speaker Carl Albert, D.-Okla., and Pennsylvanian John P. Saylor of Johnstown.

Saylor now becomes chairman of the state's Republican delegation, a post held by Rep. Fulton.

The South Hills congressman's last act on the floor was to demand a roll-call vote Monday on a resolution calling for the humane treatment and release of U.S. war prisoners held by North Vietnam and its allies in Asia. The resolution passed 369 to 0.

In Washington, flags on all public buildings flew at half staff.

Speaker Albert will name a committee to attend Mr. Fulton's funeral. It will consist of all Pennsylvania congressmen, U.S. Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker and various Fulton colleagues, especially those on the Space Committee.

Mr. Fulton was active almost to the end.

On Monday, he participated in the floor debate over the proposal to award federal pay raises (he voted for them) and later met with a delegation of Pennsylvania industrial labor leaders. He promised them his support of legislation to impose a moratorium on imports.

Mr. Fulton, a bachelor, is survived by a brother, Robert of Dormont, and three sisters, Mrs. Elizabeth Krivobok of Rochester, Minn., Mrs. Emilie Thomas of Greenville, Mercer County, and Mrs. Fredonia Gephart of Pittsburgh's East End.

Fast-moving and far-ranging, the 14-term congressman based his career on personal service to the voters and their families. No favor was too large, or too small, for him to perform.

He coaxed the Air Force into flying Vietnam veterans home for weddings.

He welcomed Pittsburgh visitors to his Washington office and then escorted them to the House.

He obtained "Capitol" flags for veterans' organizations.

He handed out tickets to White House tours and praised ethnic groups in the Congressional Record.

Somebody said that whenever three South Hills residents got together, Mr. Fulton usually was one of them.

A hand-shaker par excellence, he attended hundreds of meetings each year, showing up at fish fries, volunteer fire carnivals, covered dish picnics, civic seminars, weddings, christenings, and bar mitzvahs.

The amiable lawmaker with the sunny grin often surprised women by pinning nosegays on their lapels. On one occasion, he even distributed new hats to women in attendance at a party affair.

Over his career since 1944, he had mailed to his constituents many thousands of government do-it-yourself booklets on subjects ranging from carpentry to Japanese beetle control.

He always claimed he never campaigned until two weeks before an election, but his opponents claimed he was running all the time. He was unbeatable.

In 1961, he defeated Mrs. Margaret Walgren of Mount Lebanon. Last year her son, Douglas Walgren, tried to knock Mr. Fulton off—and lost by 30,000 votes.

Many voters could have cared less how Mr. Fulton voted; they liked him personally, and they liked the attention he devoted to the district.

He preferred to be called "progressive"

rather than liberal, because, he said, liberals are too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

Some voters thought he was occasionally eccentric. In 1961 he disclosed he had bought the two stone piers that remained in the Monongahela River after the Wabash bridge had burned down.

But he never explained his action.

"Some people like to collect stamps," he once said, "I like to collect piers."

One of the nation's biggest boosters of the space program, he though there was little it couldn't accomplish.

On one occasion he suggested that "two-dimensional tomatoes" be grown on "space gardens."

He also was convinced that severe heart patients should be placed in space, to make them weightless and ease the pressure on their hearts.

Mr. Fulton was born in Dormont, the son of a banker and a member of a family that had been active in public affairs for nearly two centuries.

ELECTED IN 1944

Mr. Fulton was first elected in 1944 while serving with the Navy in the Pacific.

In addition to his congressional duties, he served a term as a delegate to the United Nations and as a space advisor to the U.S. mission at the United Nations.

When he left the Navy as a lieutenant in 1945, Mr. Fulton began buying suburban weekly newspapers around Pittsburgh.

His chain grew to seven, but he sold them two years ago to an Ohio firm "because their growth demanded too much of my time."

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 8, 1971]

CONGRESSMAN PAY TRIBUTE TO FULTON—CITY REPRESENTATIVE WHO DIED AT 68, LAUDED BY SENATORS

(By Douglas Smith)

WASHINGTON.—The House laid business aside yesterday while members of both parties paid tribute to Rep. James G. Fulton, R-Pittsburgh.

They lauded him as a man who rarely missed a roll call, who served his constituents well and whose wit and humor lightened many a dull occasion.

Rep. Fulton, serving his 14th term, died late Wednesday of a heart attack in Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington.

WOULD NOT SLOW DOWN

"He would not slow down," said Rep. John P. Saylor, R-Johnstown, the senior Pennsylvania GOP member who announced Mr. Fulton's death to the House and yielded time to all who wished to speak.

Saylor said, "Though a bachelor, he was married to this House of Representatives. His office was his home."

Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, D-Fredericktown, called Mr. Fulton one of his state's distinguished citizens. "We came here together in 1945. I have lost a neighbor and a friend."

Rep. William S. Moorhead, D-Pittsburgh, said Mr. Fulton was "a delightful person who was never afraid to speak his mind. This Congress and my city have lost a great individual."

Rep. Joseph M. Gaydos, D-McKeesport, said, "Jim Fulton was a man all of us learned to love. He had a dedication and a rare understanding of people."

LIST OF TRIBUTES

Also speaking were Reps. Albert W. Johnson, R-Smethport; Lawrence Coughlin, R-Montgomery, and John H. Ware, R-Oxford; and a number of members from other states, including GOP Leader Gerald Ford, GOP Whip Leslie Arends, Democratic Leader Hale Boggs, and Rep. Wayne L. Hays, D-Flushing, Ohio.

The record was ordered held open for five days for written tributes from others.

Sens. Hugh Scott, R-Pa., and Richard S. Schweiker, R-Pa., issued statements.

Speaker Carl Albert appointed a committee of 40 to represent the House at the funeral, including all the Pennsylvanians, Arends, Space Committee Chairman George Miller and Rep. William McCulloch of Ohio, top Republican on the Judiciary Committee.

Scott and Schweiker will accompany the group.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Oct. 9, 1971]

WHAT MEASURED JIM FULTON?

In the P-G article on the death of Jim Fulton it was stated that the measure of his liberalism was the large number of Democratic votes that he carried. As one of the Democratic voters who always voted for him, I'd like to say that it was rather the measure of Jim Fulton, the man.

The article also stated that his secret weapon was doing for people what they couldn't do for themselves. I think in an age when congressmen more resemble computers and Madison Avenue personalities it was refreshing to be represented by a man who made you feel that you counted.

No letter was too small for Fulton and his staff. Most of the favors done were also for the small constituent, not always for the big people in the political world.

I know that this was to a great extent politics but it was politics with a heart.

I never met the man personally, but his passing is like the losing of a good friend of the family.

WILLIAM P. MILLER,
Dormont.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 10, 1971]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—REPRESENTATIVE FULTON LAUDED FOR AID TO PEOPLE

In this day of distant, impersonal government, Congressman Jim Fulton's representation was still "for the people." We mourn his passing and wish to pay tribute to him for his many years of devoted service.

There are few in the South Hills 27th district who have not had personal contact with him. When everyone else was unavailable, he was there with advice and information, bringing our government to us.

He visited our homes, our churches and our clubs. He was numbered as our friend.

And when our loved ones were only statistics in the far-removed Pentagon, Jim Fulton came to help us bury our war dead.

Within Jim we saw the American ideal and to him sadly say, "farewell."

MRS. ROBERT WILSON,
Carnegie.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Oct. 12, 1971]

PRESIDENT SENDS WREATH—HUNDREDS ATTEND RITES FOR REP. JAMES FULTON

Funeral services for U.S. Rep. James G. Fulton, of Dormont and Mt. Lebanon, a Republican who had served the Democratic 27th Congressional District for 28 years, were held yesterday.

Scores of fellow politicians from Pittsburgh and Washington, many of them named as honorary pallbearers, joined hundreds of others in Mt. Lebanon United Presbyterian Church.

The flag-draped coffin which contained the congressman's body was carried from the church by eight midshipmen from the district, all appointees by Mr. Fulton to the U.S. Naval Academy.

They had stood for an hour, in alternate pairs and at ramrod attention, as guardians of the coffin as the church slowly filled for services that began at 2 p.m.

There were few flowers, in keeping with a family suggestion. Of half a dozen sprays and wreaths, one was from President and Mrs. Nixon.

The service was conducted by the Rev. Dr. Myles W. MacDonald, pastor of the church, and Dr. Winston Trever, pastor of the nearby Mt. Lebanon Methodist Church. The eulogy by Dr. MacDonald consisted primarily of excerpts from messages and statements made by public figures after Fulton's death last Wednesday night.

These portions came from President Nixon, James D. Fletcher, administrator of National Aeronautics and Space Administration; New York Sen. Jacob K. Javits, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, of Montana; former U.S. Rep. John W. McCormack, of Mass., who was speaker of the House; U.S. Rep. Gerald R. Ford, of Mich., Republican floor leader in the House; Bishop Vincent Leonard, of the Pittsburgh Diocese, Roman Catholic Church, and Rep. George H. Mahon, of Texas.

There were two groups of honorary pall bearers: one composed of uniformed mail carriers, to whom Fulton was a legislative friend, and the other made up of local political, judicial, labor and personal friends of the late Congressman.

A delegation of 20 congressmen, most of them from Pennsylvania but one from as far away as Washington; Pennsylvania's U.S. Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker, several military personalities, an aide to the President and several NASA officials, flew in from Washington aboard a plane provided by the White House.

Among the latter was Astronaut Bill Anders (Apollo 8) who now is executive secretary of National Space Council.

Altogether, Fulton's funeral was as bipartisan as the home service that he provided in his district during his 14 terms in Congress.

That was well, for he did not believe in politics in church, where he made it a point not to shake hands. "Handshaking is politics," he once told an aide. "I don't come to the Lord's house to do business."

The congressman is survived by a brother, Robert, of Dormont; three sisters, Mrs. Emilie Thomas, Greenville; Mrs. Fredonia Gerhart of the East End and Mrs. Elizabeth Kribokok, Rochester, Minn.

Burial was in Mt. Lebanon Cemetery.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Oct. 12, 1971]

JIM FULTON

No one would accuse U.S. Rep. James G. Fulton of having been a standoffish or a hard-to-know figure. Just the opposite was true.

"Jim" Fulton, whose funeral was yesterday, turned political sociability into a fine art, and there weren't many in Allegheny County's 27th District who hadn't met up with him during his 28 active years in Congress.

Mr. Fulton was more than just sociable, however.

He prided himself in service to his constituents, and no request from them seemed too insignificant to warrant his personal involvement. His willingness—eagerness, even—to perform small favors in Washington became his hallmark.

So Mr. Fulton's death at 68 removes a familiar and friendly presence from an otherwise impersonal and hard-to-penetrate governmental bureaucracy—no small loss for South Hills residents.

He will be missed, particularly by the many constituents whom he served as an effective ombudsman.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Oct. 13, 1971]

NATION LOST ITS FINEST

In losing our Congressman James Fulton, the nation lost one of its finest and most loyal citizens. He gave his life for his country as much as anyone killed at war.

He never ceased working for his highest ideals and he was tireless in his efforts to achieve what was best for the United States.

There are thousands of people who are grateful for his kindnesses and for his friendship. He will never be forgotten.

HELEN C. FRICK,
Pittsburgh.

IN MEMORIAM

(Aero Club of Pittsburgh)

It is with a sad heart that your editor records the sudden death of a veteran member, James G. Fulton. Jim joined the Aero Club in 1947 and his interest in the club continued since then. His continuity in Congress added to his prestige and his importance in national and world affairs. At his death, Jim was the ranking Republican on the Aero Space Committee.

Although so very busy, Jim always read the weekly Aero Club bulletin. When an item appeared on which he could be of some aid, he was prompt to phone . . . maybe a question . . . maybe a bit of information . . . but always something of interest and benefit to the Aviation Industry.

Will his successor be equally as concerned? We hope he will.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1971]

REP. JAMES G. FULTON, 68, DEAD; DEAN OF PENNSYLVANIA DELEGATION — TOP REPUBLICAN ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS UNIT WAS SERVING HIS 13TH TERM

WASHINGTON, OCTOBER 6.—Representative James G. Fulton of Pennsylvania, a Republican who was serving his 13th term representing a predominantly Democratic district, died Wednesday night, apparently of a heart attack, in the Walter Reed Army Medical Center. He was 68 years old.

Mr. Fulton was dean of the Pennsylvania delegation in the House and ranking minority member of the Science and Astronautics Committee.

Mr. Fulton, a bachelor, is survived by a brother and three sisters.

WON SEAT IN ABSENTIA

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative Fulton had a hand in the high—and sometimes comic—affairs of state in a legislative career dating to 1944.

In that year, he was a Navy lieutenant in the Pacific when he decided to run for Congress, in absentia. He ran and won and saw action some more before returning to occupy his seat, which he would hold for 26 years.

Mr. Fulton was a member of an old and prominent Western Pennsylvania family, a lawyer and former owner of six weekly suburban newspapers. In his early terms—when he was known to Capitol secretaries as the only handsome Congressman—he was not one to shun controversy and publicity.

In 1949 he offered to turn himself over to the Chinese Communists in exchange for Angus Ward, an American consul jailed in Manchuria. The offer was not taken up.

Mr. Fulton caused an uproar in 1954 when he criticized the United States aid program to Latin America as inadequate, leading the United States Ambassador to Brazil to publicly un-invite him to a fancy embassy dinner.

In between, he managed to spot a rare Gilbert Stuart portrait of George Washington in Madrid and have it brought back to this country.

When Premier Fidel Castro visited the United States as the newly victorious Cuban leader in 1959, Representative Fulton joined others in praising him and urged, "I think we ought to help him."

That year he was appointed by President Eisenhower as a delegate to the 14th General Assembly of the United Nations.

Before the 1960 Republican National Convention, the outspoken Congressman announced that he intended to nominate President Dwight D. Eisenhower to run as Vice President under Richard M. Nixon for President.

A strong proponent of civil rights, Representative Fulton repeatedly opposed sending sports teams to the South to compete in segregated events. He also urged the rewording of the Pledge of Allegiance to include phrases emphasizing "equality of opportunity and equal justice under law for all." In recent years he was a strong advocate of changing the current measuring system to the European metric system.

Although his 27th congressional district in Pittsburgh had about 35,000 more Democrats than Republicans, Mr. Fulton was consistently re-elected. Along the way he won high marks from the liberal Americans for Democratic Action as well as more conservative groups.

In 1964, he disassociated himself from the campaign of Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona, his party's candidate for President.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 8, 1971]

GOP LEADER FROM PA.—REP. JAMES G. FULTON DIES

(By Martin Weil)

Rep. James G. Fulton, 68, ranking Republican member of Pennsylvania's congressional delegation and one of the most colorful members of the House during his 14 terms, died Wednesday at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Death was attributed to an apparent heart attack. Rep. Fulton had entered the hospital for a checkup on Monday after feeling ill over the weekend.

As ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, and a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Congressman took a keen interest in the activities of both panels.

Although frequently eager to eliminate what he viewed as waste in some NASA programs, he fought hard for other programs that he viewed as necessary to keep the nation from "dropping out of the space race."

It was also Rep. Fulton who, in 1958, 11 years before Americans landed on the moon, volunteered at an Astronautics Committee hearing to serve as a space pilot.

Rocket expert Wernher von Braun, who was then testifying before the Committee, declined his offer.

In 1949, Rep. Fulton had volunteered to serve as a hostage to secure the release from China of Angus Ward, a U.S. diplomat held by the Chinese Communists.

Earlier this year, the congressman appeared bemused at a Foreign Affairs Committee inquiry into attitudes on African politics held by the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

A Presbyterian himself, Mr. Fulton expressed the wish the church would abandon what he called its interest in revolution and concentrate on "getting us all to heaven."

As a delegate to the United Nations, he once voted in a committee against his instructions from the State Department.

Pungent phrases and colorful actions seemed to form an integral part of the career of the banker's son from the Pittsburgh area, who recalled winning his first campaign for Congress "without making a speech or spending a cent."

Elected while serving as a deck officer on an aircraft carrier in the Pacific during World War II, Rep. Fulton was flown back to Washington to be sworn in Feb. 2, 1945.

One of the first three congressmen to back the original bill that eventually led to the establishment of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts here, Rep. Fulton was a patron of the arts in Washington and Pittsburgh.

In his home district, he was a member of the boards of the Pittsburgh Opera and the Pittsburgh Playhouse. His congressional office here was crammed with paintings and sculpture.

In contrast to most congressmen, he kept most of his staff in his home district office. His aim was to make the aides more accessible to constituents there and to keep office activities from possibly damaging the works of art in his office here.

On Sept. 4, 1957, Rep. Fulton asked the President to keep the West Point football team from going to play Tulane in the Sugar Bowl because of segregated seating in Louisiana.

On Sept. 16, Army shifted the game from New Orleans to West Point. Rep. Fulton hailed the move as "an important step in the segregation issue."

He graduated from Pennsylvania State University (in mathematics and political science) and from the Harvard Law School.

Founder and former owner and publisher of seven suburban Pittsburgh weekly newspapers, he held several journalism awards in science writing.

President Nixon praised Rep. Fulton in a statement yesterday, asserting that he will be "especially remembered for his unfailing support of our space program."

Survivors include a brother, Robert G. of Dormont, Pa., and three sisters, Elizabeth Krivobok, of Rochester, Minn., Emilie Thomas of Greenville, Pa., and Fredania Gephart of Pittsburgh.

[From Newsweek magazine, Oct. 18, 1971]

Died: Rep. James G. Fulton, 68, dean of the Pennsylvania Congressional delegation, a liberal Republican from Pittsburgh; of a heart attack, in Washington's Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Oct. 6. A bachelor and a colorful, outspoken legislator, Fulton liked to recall winning his first campaign for Congress "without making a speech or spending a cent," after running in absentia while serving as a Navy lieutenant aboard an aircraft carrier in the Pacific in 1944. Though his district has always been predominantly Democratic, he was elected to fourteen consecutive terms, becoming an expert on the space program as the House's ranking minority member of the Science and Aeronautics Committee.

[From Time magazine, Oct. 18, 1971]

Died. James G. Fulton, 68, Pennsylvania Congressman for 27 year and ranking Republican on the House Science and Astronautics Committee; of a heart attack; in Washington, D.C. Navy Lieut. Fulton was serving in the Pacific during World War II when he decided to run for Congress *in absentia*—and won. Though his Pittsburgh district was predominantly Democratic, Fulton was re-elected 13 times, partly because he was ever ready to do a constituent a favor and partly because he never tired of making appearances anywhere he could find a few voters. Also known for eccentricities, he proposed in 1960 that Dwight Eisenhower become Richard Nixon's candidate for Vice President.

THE SECOND VIETNAM VETERANS JOB MART

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the second Vietnam Veterans Job Mart was conducted at the Hynes Memorial Auditorium in Boston October 6 and 7, and the success of this year's Job Mart is a source of great encouragement to me. As a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee of the House, and as one deeply concerned with the well-being of our returning Vietnam veterans, I found it highly gratifying to have visited and

participated in the Job Mart. Administrator Donald Johnson of the Veterans' Administration, who attended, and William Davis Taylor, publisher of the Boston Globe, and his associates, whose effective assistance made this year's mart most successful, deserve high credit for their contributions. This program, which enables returning veterans, who desire to obtain guidance and placement in areas of their competence, is a most worthwhile one, and the presence at the Job Mart of the representatives of a great many Federal agencies, State Departments, and community assistance programs provided a multiplicity of sources of aid and direction to the many veterans, and their families, who attended the Job Mart to take advantage of the offerings. It is a pleasure for me to extend my congratulations upon the success of this program, and to bring attention to this relevant approach to the placement and assistance of our returning and returned Vietnam veterans, and I do hope that the outstanding success of the Job Mart will motivate similar such programs throughout the various States of the Nation.

INFLATION AND THE MONEY SUPPLY—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I recently reported to my people on the money supply as a cause of inflation. I insert my report in the RECORD at this point:

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON INFLATION AND THE MONEY SUPPLY

Because inflation is indicated as the number one problem facing our nation by you the people of the Sixth District who have responded to the opinion poll questionnaire, I thought we'd talk about inflation again today.

I had previously pointed out that those hardest hit by inflation were the retired people on fixed incomes—those retired from the railroad, Esso, Ethyl, the retired teacher and public servant, the retired person living off of social security, and the widow trying to make ends meet on an ever shrinking income from social security or interest on savings.

Basic economics defines inflation as "an increase in money and credit without a relative increase in goods or production." That is, something to spend the money for.

Wage and price controls attack the symptoms of inflation but not the root causes. Mr. Nixon expressed this truism when as a candidate for the Presidency in 1968 he said:

"The imposition of price and wage controls during peacetime is an abdication of fiscal responsibility. Such controls treat symptoms and not causes. Experience has indicated that they do not work, can never be administered equitably and are not compatible with a free economy."

In applying the wage and price freeze to curb inflation, President Nixon's action might be compared to that of a physician who prescribed an aspirin for a patient suffering from cancer. In either case, any relief will be but temporary and the condition will continue and probably be worse when the aspirin wears off. The cancer will continue to spread until it is stopped or its cause cut out. In the case of the inflation, rising prices will continue until the basic causes are treated or removed.

There are two basic elements which constitute the cause of inflation—the amount of money and credit available and the availability of goods.

When an uncontrolled competitive market is free to operate, the profit motive and the common sense of people keep the supply of goods and services more or less in line with demand. The other problem is then the money supply. How do the people regulate the amount of money and credit?

The U.S. Constitution provides that Congress shall issue our money and regulate its value. A fact of which many Americans are not aware is that the issuance and regulation of our nation's money supply was delegated by Congress in 1913 to a privately owned organization—the Federal Reserve Banking System—and in some uncertain measure the value of foreign money in 1945 to a world organization, the International Monetary Fund, which is above and beyond the laws of the United States and our Constitution.

In my opinion, our country is faced with a monetary crisis which if not brought under control may end up in the loss of our Constitutional Republic form of government. It is imperative that responsible Americans, rich and poor, young and old, in all walks of life inform themselves regarding the basic truths of our monetary system. The mysteries of the Federal Reserve, fractional reserve banking, the IMF, Special Drawing Rights, and Bretton Woods are matters about which the public, especially our young people, must become informed. I say especially our young people because their future—whether it be a bright one full of hope and great expectations or a dismal one full of despair and apathy—depends on a fair and just money system. A dependable medium for earnings, savings and wealth.

We must return control over money to the people.

The love of money is said by the Bible to be the root of all evil. I contend that a dishonest money system—one which favors international bankers and furthers destruction of our nation—is the root cause of most of the problems plaguing us today.

Understanding our present money system as well as the tenets of an honest and scientific monetary system by the people is then essential if we are to bring about monetary reforms so as to return power to the people over their money.

What is money? It hasn't always been here. It wasn't here when the first settlers arrived. Moreover, the supply of money changes from year to year.

In 1929, the total money supply was $26 billion; in 1956, it was $213 billion; today it has increased to about $500 billion. The supply of money must increase to accommodate the increase in population and volume of production. But where has the extra money come from? It has been created—manufactured—by people. And, I'm sorry to say, too much lately has been created from air—printing press dollars.

Disregarding our metal coins (pennies, nickels, dimes, quarters, and half dollars), there are two kinds of money in our country. About 10 percent of our money is actual private banker printing press money—the green Federal Reserve Notes you carry in your wallet or purse. The other kind of money is in the form of bank deposits. The great bulk of all business deals today are handled by exchanging the ownership of bank deposits by what we know as checks. So, our money is considered to be the total of all bank deposits in all of the banks of the country plus the currency in circulation outside the banks.

As I have said many times, a main cause of inflation is deficit financing by the federal government.

Candidate Nixon in 1968 expressed the same idea as follows:

"The accelerated rise in prices in recent years has resulted primarily from an excessively expanding money supply which in turn has been fed by the monetization of federal government deficits. The way to stop inflation is to reverse the irresponsible fiscal policies which produce it."

The Nixon Administration ended the past fiscal year with a deficit of about $26 billion. In other words, the government paid out $26 billion more than it took in. No one can run a business that way. If we did, we'd end up in jail or bankrupt. Yet, the government must pay its debts to keep confidence. Where and how does the government get this money?

It has been reported that when the federal government needs $1 billion, it takes action as follows:

(1) The U.S. Treasurer advises the Federal Reserve Bank.

(2) The U.S. Treasurer advises the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to print $1 billon U.S. bonds on our debt.

(3) The U.S. Treasurer advises the Bureau of Printing and Engraving to print $1 billion Federal Reserve Notes. (The Federal Reserve Bank pays the relatively small cost of the ink and paper.)

(4) The U.S. Treasury deposits the $1 billion with the Federal Reserve which in exchange credits the U.S. Treasury with $1 billion on the books.

(5) The Federal Reserve Bank can deposit $1 billion U.S. bonds with the Comptroller of the Currency and draws $1 billion in U.S. currency. Yet, the interest on the U.S. bonds held in escrow by our U.S. Treasurer is payable to the Federal Reserve Bankers. No money whatsoever has passed hands. It's like a hidden shell game.

The U.S. Government can then pay its obligations by writing government checks on its bank account with the Federal Reserve Bank. The Federal Reserve can hold or sell the U.S. Bonds on which the taxpayers pay interest which this year will amount to $21.1 billion.

Federal Reserve notes are obtained by the member banks all over the country from the Federal Reserve banks. The $1 billion Federal Reserve notes are used by the Federal Reserve System through the fractional reserve principle to create a check book currency and expand the money supply. Under the rule of fractional reserve, the member banks can lend approximately ten times the amount of currency being held on deposit. This money manipulation by mere bookkeeping entries allows the Federal Reserve banking system to create money and to make vast sums by lending this created money—money that doesn't exist—at interest. And the taxpayers still pay interest on the created money.

It is essential that citizens understand the fractional reserve principle. One of the simplest explanations of it was given in a Report of the Committee on Economic Policy of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce published in 1951 and entitled, "The Economics of the Money Supply":

"Before the invention of deposit (paper) money, gold and other metals were the accepted medium of exchange. Throughout much of the history of civilization it was necessary for persons transacting business to keep a supply of coin or bullion on hand. This was hazardous, as well as inconvenient; and in the later Middle Ages it became common for persons owning gold to deposit it with the local goldsmiths for safekeeping. The goldsmith gave the depositor a receipt for his gold.

"It was not long before the depositors found that it was unnecessary to draw out the gold each time they had a payment to make. It became customary for buyers and sellers to consider the gold receipt "as good

as gold," and the receipts became a primitive form of paper money.

"In time, the goldsmiths discovered that, normally, they might expect withdrawals of gold by the owners to amount to only a fraction of the total gold on deposit. It was possible for a goldsmith, then, to lend out a substantial proportion of the deposited gold, which he did not own, but for which he could get interest, keeping on hand enough gold "reserve" to cover the demands that he might normally expect the owners of the gold to make on him.

"In this way a system of money based on fractional reserves came into being—that is, gold reserves amounting to only a fraction of the note issue based on them."

Today, what backs our money is neither gold and silver nor paper certificates which can be exchanged for gold or silver as was once the case but simply U.S. bonds—government obligations or debt, or public confidence. The change in backing for our money can be shown by taking a look at the currency issued from time to time.

U.S. Notes known as "greenbacks" were issued by President Lincoln in 1863. This currency was issued debt free by the U.S. Government. Some of these are still in circulation. Had they been issued by private bankers, the taxpayers would have paid considerable interest on them.

Silver certificates redeemable in silver dollars stipulated on the face of the bill:

"This certifies that there has been deposited in the Treasury of the United States of America one silver dollar payable to the bearer on demand."

Subsequently, silver certificates guaranteed payment at one dollar in silver instead of silver dollars.

The Federal Reserve Note that we are using today merely states on its face:

"This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private."

In contrast to the U.S. Notes issued debt free by the U.S. Government during the Administration of Lincoln, the Federal Reserve notes are costing the American taxpayers billions in the interest annually.

It is ridiculous that the taxpayers should have to pay a private banking concern, the Federal Reserve System, interest to issue and use our money. Thomas E. Edison expressed this idea well when he said:

"If our nation can issue a dollar bond, it can issue a dollar bill. The element that makes the bond good, makes the bill good also. The difference between the bond and the bill is that the bond lets money brokers collect twice the amount of the bond and an additional 20 percent interest, whereas the currency pays nobody but those who contribute directly in some useful way.

"It is absurd to say that our country can issue $30,000,000 in bonds and not $30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer and the other helps the people.

"It is the people who constitute the basis of government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edge credit by receiving non-interest-bearing currency—instead of bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest-bearing bonds? If the United States Government will adopt this policy of increasing its national wealth without contributing to the interest collector—for the whole national debt is made up on interest charges—then you will see an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise."

The private Federal Reserve Banking System over which Congress has no control—there has been no independent audit of this Organization since its establishment nor a congressional investigation—well, this organization controls the supply of money available. When money is plentiful it sells bonds. When money is tight it buys bonds. Increasing the supply of money, whether it be currency or bank deposit money out of all proportion to consumer goods available produces sharp price increases. On the other hand, decreasing the money supply out of all proportion to consumer goods available for exchange causes a sharp decline in prices.

This power to control money supply which is so essential to maintaining stability of the dollar should be returned to the people through their elected representatives in the Congress as required by the U.S. Constitution.

In a fair money system, the money would be issued debt free, thus greatly reducing the national debt at a tremendous savings to taxpayers. Fractional reserve banking to the benefit of bankers would be halted. Those entrusted with the power to issue currency bearing the imprint of the nation, would issue it or withdraw it in proportion to goods available for exchange and consumption. This would maintain price stability and avoid inflation and manipulation.

As a start in this direction, 3 years ago I introduced H.R. 351, a bill to vest in the Government of the United States the full, absolute, complete, and unconditional ownership of the 12 federal reserve banks. The enactment of this bill plus additional indicated monetary reforms would return power to the people over their money and enable them to see "an era of progress and prosperity in this country such as could never have come otherwise."

Remember if Congressmen fail in their duty to protect wages, prices, and savings you can vote them out of office—you can't vote out of office international bankers nor the Federal Reserve bank members—most of whom you do not even know the names.

REINSTITUTING THE BRACERO PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I am introducing legislation to reinstate the bracero program. As will be remembered, the bracero program existed from 1951 to 1963.

Looking back, the bracero program was the kind of program that had substantial appeals for those involved in it. U.S. farmers and ranchers like it, because it helped them meet their labor demands by supplying steady dependable help and at reasonable costs. Mexicans who participated in the program like it, because it enabled them to make significantly more money doing agricultural work in the United States than they were able to earn doing similar work in Mexico. The Government of Mexico favored the program, because it provided an additional means of obtaining U.S. dollars and it partially helped Mexico's domestic employment problems. In fact the only primary dissatisfactions with the bracero program stemmed from certain liberal politicians and organized labor representatives who viewed the program in the light of misguided idealism at best; and union organizational needs at worst.

I regretted the passing of the bracero program, and I have viewed with interest the varied attempts the detractors of the program have made to find a workable substitute. To date, nothing has really been developed. Farmers and ranchers in northwest Texas and throughout much of the Southwest still stand in dire need of steady and dependable farm labor. I would point out here that the high unemployment rate has not materially changed this labor shortage situation, because there are just not that many people who are interested in working in agriculture. I say this despite the fact that the Department of Labor claims there are workers available in general and in northwest Texas in particular. I say this, because I know from bitter experience what other farmers and ranchers know; namely, that the chronically unemployed cannot do the needed jobs on farms and ranches—they just cannot do the work. The simple fact of the matter is farmwork is hard work. There is no real timeclock, work is governed more by the light of the sun and the state of the weather. Moreover, wages are typically low, because farmers do not make enough money themselves to pay top dollar for farm labor. In this regard, as I and other farm State Members have often stated, the level of food prices in the marketplace depend more on distribution and packaging costs than they do on farm production costs.

Mr. Speaker, the present welfare system and unemployment compensation system also have contributed to the farm labor shortage. In some cases individuals can make more money by drawing welfare and unemployment compensation than they can make by either working part-time or not working at all.

When all is said and done, when the liberals are through gnashing their teeth over the supposed immorality of encouraging Mexicans willing to work on U.S. farmlands, and when the labor organizers are through bemoaning the fact that the Bracero program undercuts their efforts to unionize American farmworkers, then one central fact remains. The farmers and ranchers of this Nation need new sources of farm labor and they need it desperately.

In an attempt to meet this need I am introducing a bill to reestablish the Bracero program, put it under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and empower the Secretary to establish certain program standards governing the provision of adequate wages, hours, and conditions of employment. Under my proposal, U.S. farmers and ranchers will have the opportunity to get more help, and Mexicans who want to better themselves and better care for their families by earning more money will be free to do so in this country.

As those of us who live in border States know, there is a thriving trade going on right this minute involving Mexicans illegally entering the United States to work. To combat this illicit trade the members of the U.S. border patrol are working overtime. Their efforts have not stopped the flow of Mexican workers from illegally entering the country, because the United States-Mexico border is simly too long to be adequately patrolled and there are too many spots suitable for passage between the two nations.

Mr. Speaker, on balance it seems to me

there is a clear need for instituting a new Bracero program or something close to it. Not only would it benefit American agriculture, it would also appeal greatly to Mexican farmworkers. Such a program would strike a new equilibrium between the labor resources of Mexico and the agriculture labor needs in the United States. It would better enable the food and fiber producers of this Nation to continue to provide their needed goods at reasonable costs to the American consumer.

TRUTH ABOUT NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last night I read a very interesting newspaper article written by the Reverend Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., and published in the National Catholic Register of Sunday, October 17, 1971. It concerns the situation in Ireland and is authoritative insofar as my knowledge of Ireland is concerned.

I include Father Lyons' newspaper article:

TRUTH ABOUT NORTH IRELAND

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

It is extremely difficult for most people to learn the truth about what is going on in Northern Ireland. Conservative and liberal publications alike seemed determined to keep the basic facts from being known.

What are the basic facts? 1) Ireland was one country for thousands of years and it should be reunited within the next 20 years. 2) Catholics in Northern Ireland are the victims of the most bitter discrimination imaginable in regard to employment, housing and the right to vote. 3) Protestants in southern Ireland, under a Catholic majority, are treated completely fairly.

Yet National Review (October 8) tells us with a straight face: "Nor is it a struggle for civil rights". Writes its London correspondent, Anthony Lejeune: "The indignation expressed by Mr. Lynch, the Prime Minister of Southern Ireland, was pure hypocrisy . . . he has not even dared to patrol the border effectively". A united Ireland would cause "bitter Protestant discontent in Eire." How come there is no discontent among the 250,000 Protestants there now?

Why the National Review relies on its London correspondent for the truth about Ulster I cannot imagine. Yet he continues: "The 'Provisional' wing of the IRA is controlled by Maoists and Trotskyists." Easy to say. What is his proof?

The TV audience in Britain, according to Lejeune "grows weary of what seems to them a pointless fight." I am sure it seems pointless, since BBC is not going to tell them. Her Majesty's Government is perpetuating such a bigoted anti-Catholic regime. Concludes National Review's correspondent: "The real issue is not civil rights . . . (but) whether violence is going to be shown, yet again, to pay political dividends."

It paid off for George Washington, and who is to condemn him? The denial of civil rights in Northern Ireland is much worse than those against which Washington fought, and the grievances are of much longer duration. Ever since Cromwell drove the Catholics out of the North 300 years ago, Catholics have been the victims of severe political and economic discrimination.

That was true in all of Ireland until the 26 counties gained their independence. Unfortunately they had to do it by revolution. They were condemned at the time, just as Washington was condemned. But who dares condemn them today?

Another conservative columnist, John Chamberlain, whose writings are generally sound, makes the astonishing statement (Human Events, Oct. 2): "The Presbyterians—the 'Scotch-Irish'—have been there from the 17th Century. So have Catholic Irish."

The Catholics have been there for thousands of years, (though they were not converted to the Faith until the 4th Century.)

If people like Bernadette Devlin are bitter it is because, like countless thousands of others, they had their property confiscated by a foreign ruler and given to Protestants. It is because her father, like so many thousands in the North, had to leave Ireland in order to get a job because he was a Catholic, and was barely able to afford a trip home from England once a year during his holidays.

There is no discrimination against Catholics in England, just as there is no discrimination against Protestants in southern Ireland. The only solution is for England to take over the government of Northern Ireland and rule it as she rules England.

In 10 years time, after the discrimination against Catholics has become a thing of the past, the northern six counties could be voted into the south. Ireland must be united once again, as it was for thousands of years before England so arbitrarily divided it in 1921.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IN FREE CHINA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the observance of the 1971 Captive Nations Week in our country and abroad proved to be a productive and successful one. Despite neoisolationist and implosive trends here and in many parts of the world, it is heartening to witness our citizens and allied friends raise their voices in behalf of over 2 dozen captive nations in the Red empire. They realize the long-run strategic importance of the captive nations to American and free world security.

One of the outstanding observances of the week took place in the Republic of China by facing up to realities in the world, it cannot be overlooked that mainland China constitutes in the long list of captive nations the largest of them all. The remarks by our Ambassador to the Republic of China, the Honorable Walter P. McConaughy, stress the meaning of Captive Nations Week for the captive mainland Chinese as well as others. I commend to the reading of our Members these remarks addressed to a rally of over 2,000 participants in Taipei, along with the address of Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the rally, the messages by President Chiang Kai-shek and Vice President Yen Chia-kan, and the declaration and message to the people of the captive nations adopted at the mass rally.

REMARKS BY AMBASSADOR MCCONAUGHY AT CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY

Mr. Vice President, Chairman Ku, Committee Members, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is a great honor for me again to participate in the annual Taipei observance of Captive Nations Week.

The most unfortunate of peoples are surely those who are prevented from enjoying man's inalienable rights of freedom and liberty. But this condition is not only unfortunate, it is also unnatural; for the natural, inextinguishable desire of the human spirit is for independence and basic human freedoms. So, while we sorrow for those who must continue to carry the yoke of oppression, we nevertheless remain confident that someday the human spirit will prevail and that someday each country will be governed by a leadership that respects freedom, liberty and justice.

The United States of America's War of Independence was fought to lift the yoke of oppression. Fortunately for America, we have not known the absence of liberty since that initial victory in 1783. Partly because our nation was born in a fight for freedom, Americans retain a special concern for the plight of those who are still denied their right to liberty, national independence, and justice. It was this American concern that resulted in the 1959 Joint Resolution of the Congress of the United States requesting the President to proclaim the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week until such time as freedom and independence should have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world. It is appropriate that we rededicate ourselves here today with our friends and allies in the Republic of China who share with us these basic goals and ideals.

I must be candid: the twelve years since the Joint Resolution was passed have not been years of great progress toward ending the cruel injustice of a world partly enslaved. The path of freedom is not an easy road to follow. In fact it often seems easier to accept oppression than to resist it. In the long run, however, the modern oppressors are doomed to the same fate that has befallen all the oppressors that have gone before.

It is our fond hope that the day when we will no longer need to observe a Captive Nations Week is not too far in the future. That day will indeed be blessed for mankind everywhere. Until that day, however, it is proper that we pause at least once a year to remember those suffering from oppression, and to recall that the fate of our brothers is very much our own concern.

ADDRESS BY DR. KU CHENG-KANG, CHAIRMAN OF THE "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK" RALLY

Vice President Yen, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen: The "Captive Nations Week" was started in 1959, as proposed by the House and Senate of the U.S. Congress and proclaimed by President Eisenhower. The objective was to help captive nations and their peoples gain freedom and attain a true status of liberation. The support that the Congress and Government of the United States gave to this anti-Communist movement of the people reflected the spirit of Eisenhower Administration's liberation policy and the profound understanding as well as the solemn sense of responsibility possessed by all the Americans with regard to their historic mission. For this reason, the movement has been enthusiastically responded to by the various circles of the Republic of China with "Captive Nations Week" activities each July. This and the Freedom Day Movement, that was first observed on January 23 of 1954, are now two bright banners leading the global fight to

tear down the Iron Curtain and win victory for man's freedom.

Today, 12 years since the start of the "Captive Nations Week" Movement, the evil Communist forces of enslavement obviously are still strong and the captive nations and peoples under the Communists still continue to suffer and face even more cruel oppression and rule of slavery. Because of Communist aggression and attempts at subversion, some free nations today are just a few steps to butchery and enslavement. This is a truly serious situation. Even so, a number of nations are now stepping back from the battlefront of fight to protect freedom and even showing signs to appease and make compromise with the international Communists. This is why the free world is at such an ebb tide today.

Compared with the Communist bloc, the freedom camp has truly righteous goals, lofty ideals and mighty power. But why is it that no swift victory has been possible in the fight against Communists in the last 20 years? My opinion is that we have been marching in a correct direction but not necessarily with right methods.

Firstly, the freedom camp has never made up its mind resolutely to destroy the Communist rule of slavery. This indecisiveness has been reflected in prolonged fighting without any intention to win. Free world policies have been shaky, shifty and retreative, thereby permitting the Communists to grow bolder and increasingly fanatic.

Secondly, the freedom camp posture has been passive and defensive, very rarely offensive. There have never been really determined efforts toward a joint anti-Communist front. As a result, the freedom camp has often been in the predicament of just receiving blows.

Thirdly, there has been no anti-Communist fighting on any front except on military battlegrounds, and the freedom camp has never had any determination or action to take the struggle right into the enemy camp. No internal confusion of Communist rule has been utilized to the free world advantage. By underestimating the captive people's hidden strength against tyranny, the free world has missed many an opportunity to conquer the enemy.

Even in the face of the present difficult situation that has resulted from mistakes of the past, some free nations unfortunately are trying to run away by coupling retreat with compromises, when they actually should be endeavoring to overcome the difficulty with progressive spirt and correct approaches. As a result, the line between us and our enemy is now vague and confused and the anti-Communist fighting spirit of the free world as a whole is now even lower, allowing the reverse current of appeasement to rage everywhere.

But we firmly believe that free man will never accept the fate of defeat and enslavement and will wake up in time from his mistaken dream of appeasement. We are particularly confident that the United States, with its outstanding long record of fight for freedom, will once again fully shoulder the responsibility to safeguard human freedom and protect international justice. The free world has hit a low mark but this is only for the time being. If only free people everywhere rise in time and unite for joint endeavors, the ebb tide of freedom will immediately turn into a high tide. We all are being subjected to the test of times. We must stand through the test and endeavor continuously toward an era of victory for freedom.

The most serious realistic problem that now confronts us relentlessly is that of attempts to let the Peiping regime into the United Nations. That regime has brought scourges to the whole of China and destruction to all of Asia and is preparing to bring further threats and damages to the entire world. That regime is the masterminder of crimes and has been accused by the United Nations as an aggressor. Admission of that regime into the U.N., should that be unfortunately allowed to happen, would not only lead to the collapse and distintegration of the world body but also bring total confusion and disruption to the entire freedom camp. At this important juncture of history, we sincerely hope that all the free nations will bring forth their conscience and reasoning power, give full play to their courage and strength, and join hands to smash all attempts to introduce the Chinese Communists into the United Nations.

Recently we have been witnessing a rising tide of mass exodus from the Chinese mainland in addition to the continuous fighting of the mainland people against Communism and tyranny. More and more people are risking their lives and breaking out of the Iron Curtain. This shows all the more clearly that Peiping's rule is far from being stable and absolutely cannot represent the Chinese people's interests and viewpoints. This is one major reason why we are strongly opposed to that regime's entry into the U.N. Struggles against slavery and for freedom are indeed spreading everywhere behind the Iron Curtain. This being the case, I must say that another important guideline for free world endeavor is to give all the necessary spiritual encouragement and effective actual support to the Iron Curtain people's struggle for freedom. The anti-Mao and anti-Communist revolution of the Chinese mainland people today, the current freedom and independence movements of East European peoples and the struggle against autocracy and tyranny now going on in Soviet Russia are all eloquent expressions of a surging revolutionary tide. With political and economic support from the free world, the Iron Curtain people will surely bring their anti-slavery struggle for freedom to a new climax. This not only will check and diminish the Communists' forces of external expansion but at the same time will permit freedom-fighters to hit the enemy from within the enemy camp. The Communist rule of slavery will be uprooted and destroyed in this way. The captive nations will regain their independence and the captive peoples will return to full freedom.

We feel very much honored to have with us today the Honorable Samuel S. Stratton of the U.S. House of Representatives. We heartily thank him and welcome him. As we all can see, even though the appeasers are rampant today, the righteous forces of the world also are rising in unity. In the United States, for example, the tide against appeasement has been rising recently in the Congress and in many sectors of society. We are sure that Mr. Stratton will bring back to his fellow Americans the Chinese people's voice of righteousness, firm stand and correct endeavors with regard to the present world situation. By doing so, Mr. Stratton will help bring about closer cooperation between the two great nations—the United States of America and the Republic of China—for further unity of all the freedom-loving people of the world and for continuous common endeavors toward the final goal of victory for freedom. This way, we believe, the "Captive Nations Week" Movement that was started by the U.S. Congress will write down a brilliant page in the history of man's struggle for freedom.

PRESIDENT CHIANG KAI-SHEK'S MESSAGE TO THE MASS RALLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, SAFEGUARDING THE FREEDOM OF MANKIND, AND OPPOSING THE ADMISSION OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

"Safeguarding mankind's freedom and resistance to Communist enslavement" is the unequivocal banner raised by the movement to support Captive Nations Week. The flying of this banner coincides with the tides of the present and also points to the correct direction for the common struggle of free mankind. Once the U.S. Congress had made the initial proposal, the Republic of China rallied behind it and in 1961 took the lead in supporting the movement to help peoples of captive nations regain their independence and freedom. Enthusiastic support was subsequently forthcoming from all the other member states of the World Anti-Communist League. The movement has accelerated the pooling of anti-Communist strength wherever it is found. It also has reinforced the determination and courage of those enslaved by the Communists in their struggle for freedom and survival.

The rampancy of Communist enslavement and violence and the spreading countercurrents of international appeasement constitute serious threats to the freedom of mankind. Nevertheless, we have not the slightest doubt that enslavement and violence are like the flames of a fire and soon will be extinguished. Throughout history, there has not been a single tyrannical regime and enslaver of the people which was not overthrown by those who struggled against slavery. When faced with oppression and humiliation, even the cowardly advocate of appeasement will awake from bewilderment and turn from turnidity to lucidity and from flaccid inaction to bold action. Recently I told our compatriots that the National Revolution of the Republic of China is not merely a revolution for the independence and freedom of a single nation and that the anti-Communist struggle of the Chinese race is not merely an anti-Communist struggle for the survival and safety of a single race. We must strengthen our conviction of immutable victory over Communism, display our persevering spirit and raise up our morale in the unceasing effort to preserve freedom and justice. Internally, we must unite all our compatriots at home and abroad; externally, we must rally all who love freedom and justice throughout the world to join in our common struggle and thus assure history's most brilliant victory in the fight for the freedom of humankind.

The current smiling diplomatic offensive of the Maoists seeks to divide and confuse the free world, to smuggle the regime into the United Nations and to use the international organization as the base for the regime's international united front. If this conspiracy should succeed, the United Nations Charter would be emptied of worth and the noble spirit and great objectives of the United Nations would sink into decadence. In the end there would be division and the dissolution of the United Nations organization. Any concessions or appeasement of the intriguers could only encourage enslavement and assist aggression. The 700 million people of the Chinese mainland would be subjected to ever more tyrannical persecution. Free countries of Asia and the rest of the world would face the calamity of increasingly serious infiltration and subversion. Endless catastrophe would be the lot of mankind. To crush this intrigue of the Chinese Communists, we must call upon the free peoples of all the world to build up their moral courage and rally all the forces of justice. We must urge the parliamentary organs, the governments, the civic bodies and the mass communications media of all countries to repeat and amplify our summons so that a great tide of the times will surge forward to oppose the enslavement and aggression of the Chinese Communists and prevent their admission to the United Nations. In so doing, we shall achieve the noble objective of safeguarding the United Nations and world peace. Humankind will be assured of immunity to Communist enslavement and guaranteed the enjoyment of freedom in perpetuity.

VICE PRESIDENT YEN CHIA-KAN'S MESSAGE TO THE MASS RALLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA SUPPORTING CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, SAFEGUARDING THE FREEDOM OF MANKIND AND OPPOSING THE ADMISSION OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr Chairman, Honorable Guests, Freedom-Seekers, Ladies and Gentlemen: The people of the Republic of China from all walks of life have been gathering once every year for a mass rally in support of Captive Nations Week. This year's rally is also held to endorse the righteous summons for the safeguarding of mankind's freedom and to oppose the admission of the Chinese Communists to the United Nations. I feel greatly honored to be invited to attend this rally.

The Captive Nations Week movement was initiated by the Congress of the United States 12 years ago and promptly received the backing of the free nations. It has become an international anti-Communist undertaking of just purpose and noble ideal. The Republic of China is the nation which has suffered the most from Communism and was also the first nation to stand up against the Communists. However, the Chinese mainland continues to be occupied by the totalitarian regime of the tyrannical Chinese Communists and our 700 million compatriots are suffering the misery of enslavement. We of the Republic of China have, therefore, a profound and poignant recognition of the meaning and purpose of Captive Nations Week and give our strongest possible support.

The war against Communism will conceivably be a protracted one, filled with hardships and difficulties, and to be complicated by a variety of factors. Unlike previous wars, this struggle requires continuous firmness, unswerving courage in the face of adversities and enduring high morale in order to defeat the enemy and win through to victory. We must also point to the current deplorable situation in which the world remains half free and half slave. More than a billion people are living under the new slave system imposed by Communist totalitarianism. Even in the half of the world which is free, there is a tendency for some people to lose their faith, abandon their position and go astray in their actions. A few shortsighted politicians are raising their voices in advocating appeasement and compromise. It has become increasingly clear that for the sake of short-term benefit, some countries would abandon the principles of righteousness and justice. and have compromised their position in order to please the aggressors. As President Chiang Kai-shek has said, "The rampant tendency toward appeasement has sparked voracious and spreading flames of violence, has brought about the ebb of moral strength, and has damped and dimmed moral faith and legal principles." This deplorable situation saddens friends and gladdens foes, and grievously threatens the security of the free world.

We are especially regretful that some of the free nations should have forgotten the history of the illegal occupation of the Chinese mainland by the Maoist rebels. These nations are either too ignorant to pay any attention to the facts or so deceived by their own illusions that they resort to subjective and wishful thinking and formulate new foreign and trade policies for dealing with the Chinese Communists. This trend is extremely dangerous, because it may not only give aid to tyrants but also invite the destruction of themselves. All the nations which hope to "build bridges" to or have trade with the Maoists apparently have forgotten that up to now the Maoist regime is still an aggressor condemned by the United Nations and that it continues to be the principal instigator of the war in Indochina.

Because of its inherent nature, the Maoist regime has tried from its very beginning to enslave the Chinese people, to invade neighboring Asian countries and to subvert other free nations. These have been the Maoists' major tasks with their final goal to conquer the whole world. Their conspiracy has never changed. Recently they have become so arrogant as to urge "rebellion against whole mankind and revolutionizing of all the world." If such an evil and violent regime were to be admitted to the United Nations at the insistence of some misguided countries, what would become of the spirit of the United Nations and what would be the future of this world organization?

President Chiang has repeatedly told the people of the world that Communism is the source of all wars of aggression and that the Maoists are the chief perpetrators. He has also said that as long as the Chinese mainland continues to be occupied by the Maoists, there will be no peace in the world. This succinct but emphatic warning is born of bitter experience in our struggle against the Communists during the last several decades. If the free world should close its ears to this admonition, the Maoists would be further encouraged to carry out their plans for expansionism and would pose more and increasingly serious danger for mankind.

The government of the Republic of China has been elected through legal processes under a Constitution which was formulated by the will of all the Chinese people. This country is a founding member of the United Nations and its membership is specified in the Charter. Thus only the Government of the Republic of China can represent the Chinese people in the United Nations.

I want to explain once more to all the people of the world that the struggle of the Republic of China against Communism and for the recovery of the Chinese mainland is based on the will and has the trust of all the Chinese people. Our objective is not merely to win the freedom of a single nation, which is China, but also to eliminate the root of all evils and prevent further world holocausts. We are all familiar with the past tyrannical regimes in the history of China and other nations, and we all know that none of these ever escaped its destiny of destruction. The disregard of human nature and the oppression of the people by the Maoists have gone far beyond the worst records of their predecessors. So we can be certain that the Maoists will not escape the judgment of history; they will eventually collapse and be exterminated at the world tribunal of righteousness and justice.

In his message to the Captive Nations Week mass rally last year, President Chiang made points which can, in my opinion, serve as a permanent endorsement of the movement. I should like to quote him today. President Chiang said: "Peace cannot be had without toil and freedom must be gained with moral courage . . . A bright world of real peace can emerge only when the earth no longer has an iron curtain and an international society of lasting security can emerge only when mankind is completely free from slavery."

DECLARATION OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RALLY IN THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Sixty years ago, Chinese compatriots and patriotic youths attained a great unity, domestically and overseas, under the banner of national revolution and, by sacrificing their blood and lives, finally overthrew the tyranny of Manchu dynasty and established the first democratic republic in Asia.

Today, when the Republic of China is sixty years old, Chinese compatriots and patriotic youths have again attained a great unity, domestically and overseas, in the cause of anti-Moa and anti-Communist revolution which is directed to overthrow the barbarous Maoist regime and its slavery system and establish a modern China based on the Three People's Principles.

For the last twenty years, the Maoist gang has, domestically, enslaved the 700 million Chinese people on the Chinese mainland by terror and violence and, externally, adopted a belligerent and aggressive policy which has constituted an evil influence over the world and posed a grave threat to Asia and the whole mankind. But their erroneous policy and aggressive lines have also aggravated internal contradictions and crises. The turbulence created by the "Great Cultural Revolution" was a reflection of these contradictions and crises. From the fact that the whole Chinese mainland after the "Great Cultural Revolution" still remains in a tumultuous state, we can realize that the Maoist regime has by no means overcome their difficulties. On the contrary, the situation has been worsening from day to day.

Present Chinese mainland situation indicates that the Maoist regime is far from able to stabilize its rule and it can only maintain its control over the people by military support. This is why, up to present, the regime is still unable to convene the "National People's Congress" and normalize its administrative system. The unceasing disturbances including violent power-seizing struggles, armed factional strifes, warlords' militarism as well as people's revolts and flights are indications that more crises and turbulences are developing.

Nevertheless, international appeasers ignore these facts and say that the Chinese Communists have stabilized their rule over the Chinese mainland. Furthermore, they even try to introduce the illegal Maoist regime into international society. These absurdities have not only intensified the Chinese Communist tyrannous rule over the 700 million Chinese people, but also encouraged their aggression and subversion in Asia and increased their threat to the whole world.

Therefore, we solemnly appeal that, for the sake of the future of whole mankind, all justice and freedom forces should join together in the effort to stop the maneuvers of appeasement. The most urgent task in present stage is of course to defeat the plot of introducing the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations. The Chinese Communist regime has ever had a growling animosity towards the United Nations and unalterably taken the enslavement of whole mankind as its primary goal. It is self-evident that to introduce the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations would be of suicidal stipudity on the part of free nations.

We firmly believe that only when all justice and freedom forces are closely united, we can attain the goal of victory for freedom. We are glad to see that the great majority of American people have awakened to the danger of appeasement, Asian peoples' anti-Communist movements have grown much stronger than ever before, the silent majority of the people of free nations have been awakening, and the freedom struggle behind the Iron Curtain is in active development. All these convinced us that the force of freedom is irresistible. The Chinese people have been always in the utmost front of the struggle for freedom and against slavery. We should unflaggingly endeavor to march forward under the guidance of President Chiang: "Attain self-support with a solemn attitude, don't be scared when come upon unexpected accidents, make sound judgment after careful deliberation, and hold fast on the principle of national independence." With these words in mind as our guiding principle, we are sure that we will overcome all difficulties in the way and achieve our final victory for freedom.

MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

Dear Friends Behind the Iron Curtain: Since the start of the Captive Nations Week observance in the United States in 1959 through Congressional decision and proclamation by President Eisenhower, we people in the Republic of China have enthusiasti-

cally responded to the call with mass rallies and other activities in July of each year. Furthermore, the movement has been expanded by the World Anti-Communist League into a massive campaign of all the free world nations supporting the U.S. policy to free the Iron Curtain people. The Captive Nations Week is now one of the two major annual events of the world that stand for freedom and against slavery. The other event is the Freedom Day each January 23 that marks the choice of freedom made by more than 22,000 Communist prisoners-of-war of the Korean War 17 years ago. Today, to mark the 12th anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Movement, we people of the Republic of China are gathered here in Taipei for a mass rally in support of your continued struggle for freedom and independence in opposition to Communism and slavery. We are here to pledge that we will continue to fight with you aaginst the Communist's evil rule so that the final victory will be ours and all the nations and individuals will be once again free.

The evil Communist rule is now faced with serious internal contradictions, difficulties and crises. But before their complete downfall, the Communists will surely effect further cruel oppression and bring even more serious scourges to all the Iron Curtain people. On the other hand. however, the enslaved people will certainly react with anti-tyranny actions on an unprecedented scale. The Polish people's anti-slavery campaign since last year is now leading to another climax in the Iron Curtain people's struggle for freedom. Far-reaching influences have been exerted throughout Eastern Europe. Particularly shocked are the Communist regimes of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. Also noteworthy is the mounting opposition of the Russians, particularly the intellectuals, against totalitarian autocracy, forcing Kremlin to make certain concessions with regard to internal affairs. The international Communists' split and tendency toward disintegration are now all the more obvious following the 24th congress of the Russian Communist Party last March. The massing of stronger anti-Communist forces inside and outside the Iron Curtain and the severe internal conflicts of the Communist bloc are factors assuring a final victory for the people who long for freedom and stand against slavery. The fast-developing anti-Mao and anti-Communist struggle of the Chinese mainland people is now a brilliant forerunner of the Iron Curtain people's anti-tyranny revolution. Large numbers of people in various free nations are waking up to the truth and rising together against the Communists. The anti-Communist situation of the whole world has been greatly enhanced. We all are of the opinion that freedom can be gained only through incessant struggle and that no pause can be allowed in the fight against slavery and for freedom. We are determined to continue our unremitting efforts and deal a timely fatal blow to the sinful rule of slavery. Together we shall speed up the arrival of victory for freedom following a total destruction of the Iron Curtain.

Dear friends behind the Iron Curtain, the Captive Nations Week Movement will continue to prompt the free world to supply you with spiritual and material strength for your fight against slavery and for freedom. Let us strive as one toward our common goal. Let us from different directions launch joint attacks at Communist tyranny. We all shall fight to the end for a complete elimination of Communist rule.

With our hearty wishes for the victory of our common endeavors,

Sincerely,

Mass rally of the Republic of China's various circles supporting the Captive Nations Week movement, striving to safeguard the freedom of mankind and opposing Peiping's entry into the U.N.

WORLD ANTI-COMMUNIST LEAGUE,
CHINA CHAPTER,
Taipei, July 28, 1971.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
House of Representatives, 1409 House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DERWINSKI: I have the pleasure of informing you that the Captive Nations Week in the Republic of China has been successfully concluded. A mass rally for supporting the Captive Nations Week movement, safeguarding human freedom and opposing admission of the Chinese Communist regime to the United Nations was held in the morning of July 9 at the City Hall of Taipei. Congressman Stratton delivered an inspiring address at the rally. Our distinguished guest speakers included His Excellency Vice President Yen of the Republic of China and His Excellency McConaughy, U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of China.

I was elected of the Presidum Chairman at the rally. The rally unanimously adopted a declaration and messages to President Nixon and the United Nations, reaffirming our stand against admission of the Peiping regime to the U.N. and for liberation of the people enslaved in the captive nations. Under the prevailing atmosphere of appeasement, these documents are indeed a representation of the earnest wishes of the people of the Republic of China. Herewith enclosed are each two copies of these documents and pictures of our observance activities for your reference and for entering into the Congressional Record.

In addition to his presence at the rally, Honorable Stratton delivered a speech at a public meeting and attended a seminar held by freedom fighters. He also made a tour of Kinmen. He won our people's high admiration.

With my best personal wishes for your good health,

Sincerely yours,

KU CHENG-KANG,
Honorary Chairman, WACL, President, WACL/APACL, China Chapter.

MESSAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

To: The Secretary-General and Member Delegations at the U.N., care of Embassy of the Republic of China, Washington, D.C.

The Captive Nations Week observance, started in the United States in 1959, has received enthusiastic responses and support from us people in the Republic of China because of its complete accord with the U.N. stand for human rights and freedom. As we representatives from various circles of this nation are gathered here in Taipei today for another Captive Nations Week rally, we have fixed as our immediate goals of anti-slavery struggle the protection of man's freedom and strong objection to Chinese Communist entry into the United Nations.

To protect international peace and punish the Communists for their belligerent atrocities, the U.N. in 1951, in the course of the Korean conflict, labeled the Peiping regime as an aggressor. In the two decades since then, the Chinese Communists have continued to work for the "burial" of human freedom through their aggressive expansionist moves. They have supported the Vietnamese Communists' attacks on South Vietnam; kindled war fire in Laos and Khmer (Cambodia); instigated the Thai, Malaysian, Indian and Burmese Reds to carry out armed rebellion and subversion; and trained and supported the Red and pro-Red elements in Asia, Africa and the Americas for political infiltration and armed disturbances. Furthermore, Peiping has been operating a worldwide dope-trafficking network in an attempt to poison the bodies and minds of soldiers and other young people. On the Chinese mainland, the dictatorial and tyrannical regime has imposed on the 700 million populace an unprecedented form of slavery and oppression, preparing to sacrifice the people for the regime's fanatic "world revolution." The United Nations indeed should take severe punitive actions against these madly evil Chinese Communists instead of trying to admit them into the world family and help them spread their destructive flames.

Unfortunately, a number of U.N. member nations have time and again attempted to introduce the Peiping regime into the world body. Undoubtedly they have been influenced by Peiping's united front maneuvers and the international appeasers' fear of Communists. Their attempts seriously contradict the spirit of the U.N. Charter and may endanger the valuable existence of the U.N. itself.

Because of their unsurpassed tyrannical rule and all-out drive toward world conquest, the Chinese Communists are now faced with strong opposition from the 700 million people at home and heavy pressure from the anti-Mao and anti-Communist forces abroad. Peiping's rule has never been stable and the regime's internal crisis is increasing intensity. To tide over this turbulence, the regime is now resorting to a diplomatic offensive of smiles, hoping that enough support may be gained for its U.N. entry and assurance of its continued existence. However, membership in the U.N. would give Peiping a solid ground for perpetration of its scheme to bury the whole United Nations. All the statesmen of U.N. member nations should be fully aware of this Chinese Communist intention and heighten their vigilance accordingly.

The Republic of China, as a charter member of the U.N. and a permanent member of the Security Council, has fully accepted and carried out the obligations contained in the U.N. Charter, and has contributed importantly to the U.N. efforts to enhance world peace as well as to man's fight against the Communists' tyrannical rule of slavery. As we free Chinese are gathered today for this Captive Nations Week rally, we have unanimously decided to send this message to Your Excellency Secretary-General U Thant and to all the delegations of U.N. member nations, reiterating the determination of all the people of the Republic of China to safeguard the sacred U.N. Charter and resolutely oppose all attempts to introduce the Peiping regime to the U.N. We urge the whole United Nations to watch out for the Chinese Communists' dark schemes to bury the world body and bring scourges to all of mankind. We request the United Nations to uphold its solemn stand for human rights and against aggression. We ask that the Peiping regime be kept out of the United Nations forever. Furthermore, we hope that speedy and effective steps will be taken against the Chinese Communists' aggression, subversion, rule of slavery and narcotics offensive. Only in this way can the United Nations fulfill its historic mission to protect world peace and promote man's freedom and well-being.

Very truly yours,

Mass rally of the Republic of China's various circles supporting the Captive Nations Week movement, striving to safeguard the freedom of mankind and opposing Peiping's entry into the U.N.

MESSAGE TO HIS EXCELLENCY RICHARD M. NIXON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Your Excellency: For observing the Captive Nations Week sponsored by the United States, a mass rally participated by more than 2,000 representatives of civic organizations in the Republic of China is held today at the city auditorium of Taipei and a week-long observance program is also being carried out throughout this country. The Captive Nations Week, as proclaimed by President Ei-

senhower in 1958 when Your Excellency was Vice President, is a movement of epochal significance and would bear very important effect on the whole world. It is an endeavor which maneuvers to the support of the freedom struggle behind the Iron Curtain and has added luster to the American people's great heritage of righteousness. We consider that, under current world situation, it is imperative for all free people to uphold this movement with positive action. For this purpose, we are sending this message to express our respects for Your Excellency's leadership and request Your Excellency's continuous support of the Captive Nations Week movement in order that it can accomplish its great objectives to liberate the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain and safeguard freedom of whole mankind. We want to point out that any appeasement to international Communists would mean surrender to the Communist slavery system and that the people of the Republic of China are firmly opposed to any attempt to introduce the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations and opposed to any so-called "two Chinas" arrangement. Thus, we earnestly call upon Your Excellency to maintain the just spirit of the United Nations Charter, save the United Nations organization from being frustrated by the Communist plot, appreciate the traditional friendship between the United States and the Republic of China as well as the common interests of the freedom camp. We also earnestly request that the United States as a leading nation of the free world continues to prevent the Chinese Communist regime from entering into the United Nations, eliminate the Communist slavery system, and carry out the positive aspect of the Nixon Doctrine in order to achieve the victory of human freedom in the 1970s.

Very truly yours,

Mass rally of the Republic of China's various circles supporting the Captive Nations Week movement, striving to safeguard the freedom of mankind and opposing Peiping's entry into the U.N.

MESSAGE TO THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

To: H. E. President Nguyen Van Thieu and the Patriotic Soldiers and Civilians of the Republic of Vietnam

In response to the "Captive Nations Week" Movement of the United States, representatives from various circles of the Republic of China have assembled today at the City Hall in Taipei for a rally to express our support for that movement and our determination to safeguard man's freedom and oppose the Peiping regime's entry into the United Nations. We of this meeting wish to avail ourselves of this opportunity to express our highest respect to Your Excellency and the people of the Republic of Vietnam, military and civilian alike, who under your strong leadership have made great accomplishments in their resolute fight for Vietnam's independence and freedom in opposition to Communist aggressors, thereby setting a brilliant example for the other free Asian nations' anti-Communist struggle.

This meeting strongly advocates that the Charter of the United Nations must be protected and that all efforts must be exerted to keep out of the United Nations the aggressive Peiping regime that has been the source of scourges in Asia. The meeting also reiterates the determination of the military and civilian populace of the Republic of China to strive together with the people of the Republic of Vietnam in the fight to eliminate evil Communist forces and scourges from all of Asia. The Republic of China will stand firmly by the Republic of Vietnam for continuous joint efforts to establish a collective security organization for Asia and the Pacific, to put an end to Communist threats, to assure Asian security and to protect man's freedom. May the Republic of Vietnam continue to grow and prosper and Your Excellency continue to enjoy health and well-being.

Very truly yours,

Mass rally of the Republic of China's various circles supporting the Captive Nations Week movement, striving to safeguard the freedom of mankind and opposing Peiping's entry into the U.N.

MESSAGE TO THE ALLIED FIGHTERS IN INDOCHINA

To: General Creighton Abrams in Saigon and All the Allied Soldiers in Indochina

In response to the "Captive Nations Week" Movement of the United States, representatives from various circles of the Republic of China have assembled today at the City Hall in Taipei for a rally to express our support for that movement and our determination to safeguard man's freedom and oppose the Peiping regime's entry into the United Nations. In view of your heroic fighting on the battlefronts of Vietnam, Laos and Khmer and your great achievements in protecting the Republic of Vietnam's independence, in punishing the Communists for their violent aggression and in safeguarding human freedom and world peace, we of the meeting have unanimously decided to send to all of you fighters from free nations our highest respect and heart-felt concern.

As the allied forces are now in the process of adjusting their strategy in Indochina, the Chinese Communists are trying to take advantage of any available gap for massive attacks on allied positions together with the Vietnamese Communists and for further aggressive moves in all of Southeast Asia. To protect Asian peace and accelerate the downfall of the Chinese Communist regime that has been labelled as an aggressor by the United Nations, all the people of the Republic of China, military and civilian alike, will stand resolutely behind the allied forces in Indochina as we all continued to step up our struggles for the elimination of Asian Communist aggression, for the salvation of the Iron Curtain people and for a total victory over the Communists' tyrannical rule of slavery.

With our deep concern and sincere admiration, we are,

Very truly yours,

Mass rally of the Republic of China's various circles supporting the Captive Nation's Week movement, striving to safeguard the freedom of mankind and opposing Peiping's entry into the U.N.

MINNEAPOLIS HEALTH HEARINGS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a number of individuals testified before the hearings I recently held in Minneapolis. Three witnesses, Miss Rose LaBelle, Mrs. Ray Macht, and Mrs. Essye Flaten, discussed the reasons why they supported the inclusion of chiropractic care in medical programs.

Mrs. Macht, in her testimony, urged the inclusion of chiropractic and nutritional services in any program emphasizing preventive care. Also, she favored insurance coverage for the purchase of vitamins to help people stay healthy.

Miss Rose La Belle stated unequivocally that—

No significant improvement in the quality of life in the United States (could come about) until we stopped the war in Vietnam and stop our emphasis on the military . . .

I fully support Miss La Belle's efforts to turn our priorities around.

Mrs. Essye Flaten drew from her personal experience in discussing chiropractic service. She also drew on her experiences gained from working with many senior citizens. Mrs. Flaten and Miss La Belle's remarks follow:

STATEMENT OF MRS. ESSYE FLATEN

I'm delighted to be here. I am a patient, a senior citizen patient. If you know how very important the patient is in judging their own program, I'm here to judge our own program. And I find it lacking in some things. It's lacking in the chiropractic service. Of my three insurances, none of them cover chiropractic insurance. Last fall I slipped a disc and my chiropractor with a number of treatments helped me. The bill was $100. If I went to a doctor and a hospital I would be in traction for a number of days and perhaps it would cost me $100 per night. I would have to pay my $60 entrance fee, and would come out with many bills that Medicare would not cover. I have used chiropractic services for many years. My late husband and his railroad friends found it the best place for their numerous injuries and muscular pains.

Do you realize how many citizens—senior citizens—are using it in spite of the fact that they must pay the bill? Well, I found out. I've come in contact with hundreds of senior citizens in the centers and I have seen many of the programs and I give programs there and I also belong to many of the classes and the activities there. There are so many things that I'm interested in and I talk to the people about them. Even yesterday, somebody told me, why do not the chiro's have Medicare. Why are we not on Medicare for chiro payments? One of the women I played bridge with yesterday said she was going to a chiro for treatments and they know very well that they have to pay for it themselves.

Now we as senior citizens are very accident prone. Today is the third good day for accidents. We have many "itis's"—like neuritis and arthritis and aches here and there. Our problems are really short-term illnesses. As most of our operations have been before we reach 65, now it's a very small minority who have long-term illnesses and they are the ones that are benefitting the most from Medicare and Medicaid. It's the majority of us who have the short illnesses that we have to pay for ourselves.

Now the chiropractic doctor and I think most of them are licensed in the state, I don't know any that aren't, they have six years of training and they're specialized in only one area—now that's contrary to medical men. This is the area of the spine and the muscles of the body and this is where when we are older our major troubles begin. I think it would be wise for you to wait for your special medical program, the Health Security Act of 1971 that you're working on now. Because in November there are going to be around 2,350 delegates from all over the United States in Washington for the White House Conference on Aging and everyone of them are senior citizens and everyone of them have a first interest in our new program. I'm sure that out of this conference will come recommendations for extended health care and one of them is going to chiropractic care.

I thank you.

STATEMENT OF MISS ROSE LA BELLE

Thank you for having the hearings. I'm just speaking on behalf of the private citizens. The first thing I'd like to say is I don't think there's going to be any significant improvement in the quality of life in the United States until we stop the war in Vietnam and

stop our emphasis on the military and turn the priorities or the country around so the emphasis is on building life instead of violence, war, and hate. This sort of thing I think it creates . . . besides the economic things, . . . it creates tensions in individuals that destroys a perspective for our young people and I think it takes a kind of schizophrenia to say well, oh we're going to have health care or this or that for ourselves and I'm afraid we have had the war with us for so long that we just think "Uh—you know—what can you do about it?" But it's very obvious to me that this administration is giving us nothing but double talk and we're going down the same old road and I think we have to keep this in mind.

Another thing that I'd like to say that a number of people have already said and that is that the emphasis in health care should be on the individual and not on money. And you know it's funny because even if you have the money and you're ill and you do go to a doctor and hospital, you resent very much that the first thing they ask you is do you have insurance and where do you work and this sort of thing and you could be, I'm sure it's happened to more than myself, in violent pain. They really don't seem to be the least interested in making you comfortable and having a more human attitude toward people when they're in need of care. I agree with the lady who made the presentation where she just talked about chiropractics because, as I understand it, this is not included. I don't think we would have as many chiropractors if they weren't needed and I don't think the doctors need to worry that they're cutting into their precinct or anything like this. Chiropractors perform a useful function and I think they should be included. I also think that dental care should be included.

It might seem to be a little bit off of the subject of this particular bill but I came to the conclusion that people, one reason why they get sick, they work too long and too hard. The life expectancy of men in the United States is extremely low in comparison to other countries.

We're pretty low on the totem pole and I think—my suggestion—is that we reduce the social security age, to lower the age to 55 because the way it is now, people either don't live that long to even collect social security in many cases or they may live a year or so. And I think that if the age were lowered, if people could have the time for leisure and this rest besides being able to enjoy themselves, they wouldn't pile up the medical illnesses which they would be subject to if they were still having to work.

Thank you.

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an article by Ernest Cuneo, relative to the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which appeared in the New York, Long Island Press on October 7, 1971. In this preconvention period, this should make for informative and interesting reading. The article follows:

FARLEY FEARED SPLINTERING OF MAJOR PARTIES

(By Ernest Cuneo)

WASHINGTON.—In the coming primaries, the wise citizen will do well to distinguish between the size of the bands and the number of pledged delegates. This difference is illustrated by another one of the legends surrounding the grand master of them all, James A. Farley, "Mr. Democrat" himself.

At the Chicago convention of 1932, where he piloted Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt of New York to the nomination, Big Jim stepped out on the balcony to watch a thunderous demonstration in favor of Gov. Ritchie of Maryland, and there met the Free State's governor himself, who asked him what he thought of it.

"Governor," said Farley, "this is one of the greatest demonstrations I've ever witnessed—and it's just too bad that you don't have the delegates to go with it." Farley, who was always short on bands and long on delegates, knew exactly where the votes were and, as usual, he collected them.

While the historians note that the great break came between FDR and his Postmaster General over the third term issue in 1940, they differed on major policy in 1936, with much more lasting results to the country than their open break in 1940. FDR was all for splinter parties in New York, and sponsored the creation of two of them, the American Labor party and the Liberal party.

For Farley, this was worse than party treason. He thought it was bad for the country because he believed the two-party system had produced and should, in the long run, produce abler and more responsible men, if only because the party had to take responsibility before the people for the men it appointed.

It might have surprised some of Farley's Republican friends at the defense he put in for the GOP as a fine responsible partner in the two-party system. But Farley was overruled, the great federal agencies, hardly responsive to the Executive or Congress, came into being—and so did splinter parties, as Farley foresaw.

The first fissure occurred in 1948, when the Dixiecrats and Henry Wallace splintered the Democrats.

But over and above the splintering of the Democratic party is the shattering of the two-party system, precisely as Farley foresaw in 1936. This has deep and tragic connotations for our country, because splinter parties mean election by temporary alliances and, worse yet, government by continued coalition.

This type of shaky alliance repeatedly caused the fall of successive governments of Italy and indeed the republics of Germany and France. Out of chaos comes order—of a kind—which varies from that of a Hitler or a Tito, to those of Greek colonels and de Gaulles.

One of the confirmations of Farley's insight is the present roster of Democratic candidates: Sens. Muskie, Jackson, Humphrey, Bayh, McGovern, Hughes, Mondale and Proxmire. Four of the last five U.S. presidents have been senators.

This means that the country now selects its candidates on the basis of national TV coverage—since in the era before TV, the governors of the big states were the prime nominees. Gone is the two-party system.

Farley's most famous forecast was that the Democrats would carry every state but Maine and Vermont in 1936; but his most profound prediction—in the same year—was that the two-party system was the best for our country.

Events have proven he was correct—but, presumably, none could more ardently wish that he were wrong than himself, for even his erstwhile Republican opponents, while understandably diffident about hailing him as Mr. Democrat, are second to none in acclaiming him as "Mr. American."

In any event, when he challenged President Roosevelt on maintaining the two-party system, Farley was speaking not as Democratic chairman but as an American.

EDUCATIONAL VOUCHERS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been conducting an experiment with educational vouchers which I feel could be the death of the public school system in the United States.

This program now being experimented with in four school districts in the United States permits a parent to take a child out of the public school in which he is enrolled, and to place the child in another private or public school. As a result of this change in enrollment the per pupil expenses which were attributable to that child at the former school would now be paid by the local government to the child's new school. In other words a child could transfer from one school to another and take part of the tax revenues with him. This would certainly create economic chaos and confusion which could lead to terrible uncertainty for school officials, parents, and children. Furthermore, it most certainly would lead to many of the now struggling public schools closing down, and the emergence of a few exclusive private schools to replace them, leaving the inferior public schools as a dumping ground for some children who did not move, or who were expelled from the private schools.

This transferring and switching of children would be an endless process with children moving from one school to another, and with school officials being unable to make any projections of enrollment beyond the present year, or provide for any continuity of the education program.

At the same time, while some students are switching from school to school, perhaps as the result of active participation on the part of their parents, other students whose parents were not so actively involved on behalf of their children would not switch from one school to another, with the possible result that perhaps they would be "stuck" in a then adequate public school. The voucher program would, therefore, not only create uncertainty or confusion or both for our school districts, but it could also have a very detrimental effect on our children.

I do not oppose experimentation in new educational policy areas, on the contrary, as a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, and as a parent with all my children in school, I welcome it. But, I think that the experiment with the educational vouchers is an ill-conceived experiment, and I have conveyed this feeling to OEO officials. I have told them that I feel that instead of thinking of ways to avoid public education, by the creation of new private schools, they should do whatever they can to strengthen our public schools.

I am pleased to say that the Office of Economic Opportunity has realized the merit of some of my criticisms of the voucher program, and they have given

me assurances that they will not expand their experimentation with this ill-conceived program during the next 2-year life of the OEO authorization. I commend them for this decision. For the information of my colleagues in the House I am attaching a copy of the letter in which OEO gives me those assurances:

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. PETER A. PEYSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PEYSER: I have been advised of your concerns regarding the Educational Voucher Experiment and want to assure you that these kinds of concerns are being carefully considered in our planning for it.

Let me emphasize that we view this activity as limited and experimental. We have awarded three planning grants to districts in San Francisco, Seattle and East San Jose, and work under these grants is expected to be completed by the end of the year. At that time the planning process will be evaluated and proposals for implementation of the experiment will be thoroughly reviewed. We will not, however, undertake any full-scale experiment unless there are indications of wide support for it within the community to be served.

Our program planning and funding expectations will limit the experimental sites to a maximum of four. This will allow effective monitoring of operations, will ensure the experimental nature of the program, and will provide sufficient data for evaluation of it.

The data and the evaluation will be made public, for it is our basic purpose in conducting the experiment to share the knowledge gained and to provide a model for replication if, indeed, it is successful.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. WILSON,
Assistant Director,
Planning, Research, and Evaluation.

HON. CHARLOTTE REID

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues Congressman ARENDS and Congresswoman MARTHA GRIFFITHS to pay a deep and sincere tribute to one of the loveliest women I have ever known, our colleague Congresswoman Charlotte Reid from Illinois who unfortunately, is leaving the House of Representatives for a post as one of the Commissioners of the FCC. It is our loss and Communication's gain.

I have had the unique privilege of serving on the Appropriations Committee with Charlotte as one of the two women who have been "liberated" and allowed to serve in that distinguished company of gentlemen. We both had the pleasure of serving with Congressman PASSMAN, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee where I learned to know Mrs. Reid's deep feeling for her fellow human beings around the world.

It is with sincere regret that I see Charlotte leave our committee and leave the House of Representatives, but it is also with my very warmest wishes that I speed her on her way as one of our distingiushed FCC Commissioners.

Charlotte, may your tenure be most productive and may you enjoy your work as much as we have enjoyed knowing you.

BUFFALO HEARING ON CANCER LEGISLATION IS BIG SUCCESS

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., was host last Monday to the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment for a hearing on cancer legislation.

The 1-day trip—on a holiday—to Buffalo permitted the subcommittee to hear presentations by working research and clinical scientists seeking a cure for cancer.

It also permitted the subcommittee to tour the research and clinical treatment areas of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute, the oldest and one of the largest cancer institutes in the world.

Thus, the subcommittee not only had a chance to hear expert testimony, but also to see at firsthand the efforts that are being made to find a cure both in the laboratory and in the very necessary followup clinical treatment.

The subcommittee was represented by its chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HASTINGS), and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. KYROS).

Chairman ROGERS scheduled this hearing as the final segment in testimony on pending cancer legislation. Arranging to have the session at Roswell Park allowed the subcommittee to meet with the staff, as well as some of the patients, and to see the operation of a major cancer institute.

VITAL BACKGROUND AID

This is vital background as the subcommittee considers legislation to implement a drive toward the conquest of cancer.

I am particularly indebted to Chairman ROGERS for setting up the session and to my western New York neighbor, Mr. HASTINGS, for his help with the arrangements.

It was a pleasure for me to be host to the subcommittee since the institute is located in my congressional district. The work of the institute and the overall matter of cancer research has been at the top of my agenda of interest since I came to Washington with the 86th Congress.

I showed the subcommittee a newsletter which I issued a few months after I entered Congress in 1959. The lead item dealt with the "fight for better health," in which I pointed to the billions of dollars which the Congress had voted for the conquest of outer space. The item continued:

It will be a thrilling experience for the first man who reaches the moon. But I would rather be the first to discover a cure for cancer or heart disease or mental illness.

Nearly 21 years later, the late Dr. James T. Grace, then Director of Roswell Park, made a statement which has been reproduced in a bronze tablet now mounted at the entrance of the institute. That statement reads:

If I had my choice between a moon walk and the life of a single child with leukemia, I would never glance upward.

Referring again to my newsletter of 1959, I reported introducing a bill calling for the establishment of a national health research fund to be financed by the issuance of a special 4-cent postage stamp.

Last Monday's hearing, to my mind, was very productive, providing helpful information and insight to the members of the subcommittee, as well as adding to the morale of dedicated scientists in the field of cancer research and treatment.

As part of my remarks I include the text of my opening statement at the hearing, also the text of an article reporting on the pioneer work which Roswell Park scientists did in the development of insulin in the treatment of sugar diabetes.

STATEMENT BY HONORABLE THADDEUS J. DULSKI BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, AT HEARING ON CONQUEST OF CANCER ACT, BUFFALO, N.Y., OCTOBER 11, 1971

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, I want to welcome you to my home city of Buffalo and to express my deep appreciation to you for arranging this combination hearing and on-site inspection of a great cancer research facility.

We in Buffalo are very proud of Roswell Park Memorial Institute. It is the oldest and one of the largest cancer institutes in the world.

From these laboratories, down through the years, have come many discoveries and developments in the desperate fight to find a cure for cancer. Untold thousands of patients have been treated here.

Unfortunately, no one can yet admit to having the answer to the scourge of cancer, but the progress has been tremendous. The prospects are most encouraging.

Scientific knowledge is at a point where I believe that a gigantic push now can bring us success in the foreseeable future.

NEED FOR ALL-OUT EFFORT

That is why I am a supporter of the Conquest of Cancer Act. I speak not of a specific bill—even the one which I co-sponsor. But rather I speak of our basic intent, the basic approach of an all-out program to find the answer to cancer without further delay.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you and your Subcommittee for your diligent attention to this problem.

I respect fully your views, and you can be assured of my sympathetic support of your efforts as you work out your recommendations for legislation. I am well aware that compromises will be necessary—that's really the name of the game in legislating—as we all come to know so well.

My own concern is that we get along—as fast as possible—with the all-out fight against cancer. We have the medical and scientific talent. What they need is greater financial support than we are giving them now.

Several times now, our Nation has put men on the moon for walks around that planet so many, many miles away. This feat was accomplished as a result of a crash space science program.

CANCER VERSUS MOON WALK

Can you imagine what some of these patients here in Roswell may have thought as

they saw the moon walks on their TV sets? As they looked at the picture tube—or perhaps even looked out the window at the moon in the sky—they thought "If they can put a man up there, why can't they help me?"

Mr. Chairman, how could we answer that question?

This building we are in is nearly 20 years old. Thousands and thousands of patients have been treated here. In fact, Roswell has about doubled its operations in the past decade. These and other Roswell facilities are treating six thousand bed patients each year, as well as some 60-thousand out-patients every year.

How big is the problem today? Let me cite just one figure, and this is just for one of our 50 states. Last year, there were 27-thousand New York State residents who died from cancer.

Mr. Chairman, this is a proud day for Roswell—as well as for all of Buffalo and Western New York—for you to interrupt your holiday and come here to see this great cancer research and treatment facility.

WORLD'S OLDEST CANCER INSTITUTE

You have met Dr. Murphy and some of his staff, and shortly you will be able to see some of the dedicated activity here in Roswell. It is the oldest cancer institute in the world.

At the turn of the century—in 1901—Dr. George H. A. Clowes brought the first experimental tumor to this country and spent 17 years in research here at Roswell. During that time he had a key role in the development of insulin for the treatment of diabetes.

Roswell was one of the first to use radium for cancer treatment.

In 1922, Madam Curie came here with her daughter to investigate Roswell's medical progress.

Dr. Karl Cori and his wife, Gertrude, came to Roswell in the 1930's and spent a decade of research which led to his receiving the Nobel prize.

We are fortunate to have had an outstanding and dedicated staff here at Roswell over the years, currently under the able leadership of Dr. Murphy.

I would like to mention two of his predecessors:

Dr. George Moore, who had a significant role in Roswell's major expansion in the 1950's.

Then came the late Dr. James T. Grace, one of the great cancer specialists of our day, whose life was snuffed out in a tragic accident.

It was into the big shoes of Dr. Grace that Dr. Murphy stepped so capably.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, I repeat my cordial welcome to you on behalf of Buffalo and Roswell Park Memorial Institute. I am certain you are going to find this a most rewarding day.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, Oct. 2, 1971]

ROSWELL PARK SCIENTISTS AIDED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF INSULIN

(By Mildred Spencer)

If he had been born 10 years earlier, few persons alive today would ever have heard of Billy Talbert.

But because he was born in 1918, medical science was able to control the previously-fatal disease that manifested itself when he was 10—and Billy grew up to become one of the finest all-time tennis players in the world.

Insulin, the preparation that has given him and an estimated 100 million other diabetic persons throughout the world a chance to lead normal, productive lives, is 50 years old this year.

Five men made it possible. Four were Canadians—Dr. Frederick G. Banting, American-born Dr. Charles H. Best, Scotch-born James J. R. Macleod and Dr. James B. Collip—a surgeon, two physiologists and a biochemist.

The fifth was an English-born American biochemist, primarily interested in cancer research, who had spent 17 of the 21 years before the discovery of insulin at Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

He was Dr. George H. A. Clowes (pronounced "clues"), and it was because of him that Buffalo physicians were able to begin treating their most seriously ill diabetic patients with insulin less than a year after it was first used on a human patient.

Dr. Banting and Dr. Macleod won the Nobel Prize for their contributions. They shared the award money with Dr. Best and Dr. Collip. Dr. Banting was knighted by King George of England. Dr. Best, the only one of the five who survives today, is still being honored throughout the world during this anniversary year.

Dr. Clowes received fewer accolades than the others. The Banting Medal of the American Diabetes Association was presented to him in 1947 in recognition of his "distinguished service in the field of diabetes."

But without Dr. Clowes, insulin, which has been called one of the great medical discoveries of all times, might not have been a practical reality in time to help Billy Talbert.

Diabetes—its full name is diabetes mellitus—takes its name from two Greek words, the first meaning "to pass through" and the second "honey."

DIABETES RECOGNIZED

The name describes what physicians first recognized about the disease—that sugar ("honey") is not stored by a diabetic and used to provide energy as it should be, but passes through the body and comes out in the urine. The presence of an abnormal amount of sugar in the urine was for many years the only method of diagnosing diabetes.

Later scientists proved that the inability of the body to handle sugar was due to a malfunctioning of an oblong gland lying behind the stomach—the pancreas. They suspected, but could not prove, that the pancreas contained some sort of hormone that, in a normal person, prevented diabetes.

Medical statisticians estimate that there are today 3 million diabetics in the United States.

It manifests itself initially by hunger, seemingly unquenchable thirst, frequent urination, slow healing of cuts and bruises, itching and dryness of the skin. Finally, if it goes untreated, it results in impairment of sight and the circulatory and nervous sytems.

Before insulin, there was little that could be done for the severe diabetic, often a child or adolescent. Although diabetes strikes persons of all ages, it is most severe in the young.

The diabetic, whose malfunctioning pancreas cannot burn sugars and starches properly, breaks down the fat in his diet and that stored in his body to get the energy he needs. In doing so he produces more acids called "ketones" than he can use. They build up in his body, causing nausea, vomiting, abdominal pain, drowsiness and finally coma.

Dr. Edgar C. Beck, one of the first Buffalo physicians to prescribe insulin, recalled recently that coma was the most feared development in the untreated diabetic. A child brought into the hospital in a diabetic coma seldom lived to go home.

Patients were placed on strict diets. Exercise was strictly forbidden, since it increased the demand for energy. Emaciated, eating barely enough to stay alive, they were always ravenously hungry.

There was no evidence when William Franklin Talbert was born Sept. 4, 1918, that he would ever have diabetes.

The disease manifested itself in Billy, an only child, when he was 10. He complained of feeling tired all the time, when he woke up as well as when he went to bed. He could not seem to get enough to eat or drink. He got up repeatedly at night to go to the bathroom.

ALTERNATE TO STRICT DIET

His parents took him to one physician, then to another. The diagnosis was definite. Billy had diabetes.

Fortunately for him, diet was no longer the only treatment for the disease. In 1928 there was insulin. As long as he took regular injections, he could eat the well-balanced diet he needed as a growing boy.

Just seven years earlier, Dr. Banting and Dr. Best—neither of them over 30—had found a way to extract from the pancreas of dogs the long-suspected hormone that prevented diabetes. Later perfected techniques had been developed, under the direction of Dr. Clowes, for extracting large amounts of this from the pancreatic glands of cattle for the treatment of human patients.

Other scientists had shown that when the pancreatic ducts (passageways for pancreatic secretion to the intestine) were tied securely in an experimental animal, most of the pancreas shriveled up. But the animal did not get diabetes as it did when the gland was removed completely. Obviously whatever it was that prevented diabetes must be in the unshriveled part of the pancreas—cells known as the "islets of Langerhans" for the man who first described them.

Dr. Banting postulated that the reason other scientists had been unable to extract an anti-diabetes substance from the pancreas was that the other cells in the gland produced a powerful "ferment" that destroyed the hormone in the islets during the process of extraction.

He reasoned, therefore, that the only way to get an effective extract was to tie off the ducts, let the part of the gland that produced the destructive ferment wither and then make the extraction.

Working day and night the summer of 1921, in a laboratory at the University of Toronto loaned to them by Dr. Macleod, Dr. Banting and Dr. Best tied off the pancreatic ducts in dogs and waited for the pancreatic glands to shrivel up.

On July 27 they operated on one of the duct-tied dogs and removed its degenerated pancreas, chopped it into small pieces, then ground these up and added them to a saline solution.

They gave an injection of the resultant extract to another dog whose pancreas had been removed, leaving it with all of the symptoms of diabetes. The dog's blood sugar dropped and its diabetic symptoms disappeared.

They repeated the experiment 75 times. In every case the de-pancreatized dogs lived as long as they received the extract.

When Dr. Macleod returned from his vacation late in the summer, he recognized immediately what the two young-co-workers had accomplished.

INSULIN GET ITS NAME

To assist them, he turned practically the entire facilities of the Department of Physiology over to an investigation of the physiological activity of the pancreatic extract that they had, until then, called "isletin" (for the islets from which it came.) It was he who suggested that it be called, instead, "insulin," a more euphonious, easier-to-pronounce word that means the same thing, since "insula" is the Latin word for island.

Shortly after this Dr. Collip, a member of the faculty of biochemistry at the University of Alberta, joined the team at Dr. Macleod's request to assist in purifying and concentrating the pancreatic extract.

It was December when Dr. Clowes entered the picture.

He had left Buffalo in 1917 to take a wartime job in the research division of the Chemical Warfare Service of the Army in Washington. At the end of the war he had joined Eli Lilly and Co., an Indianapolis pharmaceutical company, as a research biochemist.

He was Lilly's research director in December, 1921, when someone—possibly one of his medical friends in Buffalo—alerted him to what was going on in Toronto.

He called Dr. Macleod, who told him that Dr. Banting was going to give the first major report on insulin in New Haven, Conn., Dec. 26, and advised him to be there if he wanted to know more about it.

Dr. Clowes went, heard Dr. Banting's report and recognized that the Canadians had made a gerat discovery.

He talked to them, pointing out that they would need the services of chemical engineers if they were to make enough insulin available for all of those who needed it. Toronto didn't have them. Lilly did, and was ready to co-operate in the large-scale production of the pancreatic extract.

Dr. Macleod, Dr. Clowes reported later, was "cautious and hesitant about any sort of co-operation with any group outside of Toronto. He thought the Connaught Laboratories at the University of Toronto might be able to do the job.

Dr. Clowes waited while they tried. As a research scientist he had had plenty of practice in waiting.

Born in England in 1877, he had studied at the Royal College of Science in London; Gottingen University, Germany, from which he received a doctor of philosophy degree in chemistry in 1899; the University of Berlin and the Pasteur Institute, Paris.

In 1900 he came to the United States to engage in cancer research at the newly-opened Gratwick Laboratory of the University of Buffalo for the Study of Malignant Disease and today Roswell Park Memorial Institute.

DR. CLOWES HAS ROLE

He was one of four members of the professional staff, and the early reports of the institute reflect his active investigative career.

He wrote scientific papers on the reliability of chemical methods for diagnosis of cancer of the stomach; the influence of X-rays on the metabolism of research animals; immune substances in the blood of mice spontaneously recovered from cancer; the testing of more than 250 chemicals as possible anti-cancer drugs. He proposed a method that later became standard procedure for charting the size of cancers.

He was a charter member of the American Association for Cancer Research and subsequently served as its president.

In 1910 he married a Buffalo girl, Edith Whitehill Hinkel, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Frank Whitehill Hinkel. Her father was clinical professor of laryngology and otology at the University of Buffalo.

The Clowes' three sons were born here—Alexander Temple, who died of leukemia, a malignancy for which his father was seeking a cure; Dr. George H. A. Clowes Jr., professor of surgery and director of research at the Sears Laboratory of Harvard University, and Allen W., an Indianapolis businessman.

While working with the Lily Co. after the war Dr. Clowes returned to Buffalo on visits, and kept in close contact with his friend and family physician, Dr. Nelson G. Russell. It may well have been Dr. Russell who first told him of the discovery of insulin by Dr. Banting and Dr. Best.

In Toronto, two weeks after Dr. Clowes heard Dr. Banting's report in New Haven, the Canadians administered insulin from an ox pancreas to a human patient for the first time, after first testing it for safety on themselves.

But, as Dr. Clowes had foreseen, the University of Toronto had problems manufacturing insulin in large quantities.

Finally, in April, the Toronto team notified Dr. Clowes that they were ready to accept his offer of engineering assistance.

"From this time," Dr. Banting wrote later, "the Eli Lilly Company collaborated with us and was of the greatest assistance in the development of the large-scale production."

Dr. Clowes, in recalling that time, called it "the most strenuous, the happiest and certainly the most interesting period of my life."

The Lilly Co., under his direction, concentrated its research effort on producing, purifying, stabilizing and testing insulin.

INSULIN SHIPMENTS BEGIN

By July and August regular shipments of insulin were being made by Lilly to the Canadian team and in September there was enough to send to qualified clinics elsewhere.

Lilly made no charge for the product in those early days. Dr. Clowes' object was to distribute it as widely as possible all over the world.

That course, he wrote Dr. Banting in September, 1922, would result in a rapid appreciation of the product that should lead to the receipt by the Canadians of the Noble Prize "at a very early date." Just a year later the award of the prize to Dr. Macleod and Dr. Banting was announced.

Four Buffalo physicians were among the first outside of Toronto to get the hormone. They were Dr. Russell, Dr. Beck, Dr. Richard DiNiord and Dr. Byron D. Bowen.

Buffalo General Hospital had established a diabetes clinic a year earlier in its basement and named Dr. Bowen its director. After 30 years in that capacity he was succeeded by Dr. Alfred R. Lenzner, the present director.

Buffalo City Hospital, now Meyer Memorial, had set up a similar clinic under Dr. Beck.

One of the first patients that Dr. Beck treated, a young bride with the juvenile, previously fatal, type of diabetes, lived on insulin 48 years, dying only a year ago.

"The early product was unstable and impure," Dr. Beck recalls, "and patients often had sore arms after an injection, but they were eager to get it anyway. They knew that it was their one chance of life."

Dr. Nelson G. Russell Jr. remembers how his father waited for an airmail shipment of insulin being flown from Indianapolis to Buffalo in an open-cockpit plane for a patient who lay near death in a coma.

"The plane was grounded by bad weather," he relates, "and the family had accepted the imminence of death and was planning the funeral. Then the weather cleared and the plane got airborne again. The insulin arrived and was injected into the patient, who lived another five years."

By the time Billy Talbert's diabetes was diagnosed in Cincinnati, a stable, pure insulin was being manufactured. He took injections three times a day, before meals.

PATIENT TO TENNIS CHAMP

He took up tennis and went on to win more than three dozen national championships, to play with and later captain the American Davis Cup Squad and to become a member of the Tennis Hall of Fame. Last month he served as director of the U.S. Open Tennis Tournament at Forest Hills.

When a longer-acting insulin became available in the 1930s, he was able to reduce his injections to one a day, but today, just as when he was 10, he would be unable to live.

The tennis player manifests his gratitude to insulin by volunteer work for the American and New York Diabetes Associations and by visiting and talking with youngsters who, like himself, must depend upon insulin to live.

Dr. Clowes died of a stroke in 1958. His wife, who died nine years later, and his two surviving sons contributed more than $2.5 million to build a 2200-seat center for the performing arts in Indianapolis that bears his name, Clowes Hall.

Dr. Clowes was not the only Roswell Park scientist to work with insulin. At the Lilly Company's 25th anniversary observation of its discovery, Dr. Sidney P. Colowick read a paper on the action of insulin based on work done by Dr. Carl F. and the late Gerty Cori, then of Washington University, St. Louis, where they won a Nobel Prize in 1947 for their work in carbohydrate metabolism. The Coris had been at Roswell Park in the 1920s.

In London earlier this year, 1200 diabetics attended a thanksgiving service for insulin in St. Paul's Cathedral. The dean asked Dr. Best, who was in London, to read the lesson for the service. He read verses 1–37 of Chapter Four, 2 Kings, about the Shunammite woman whose child died and was revived by a miracle.

Such miracles have become commonplace to Dr. Best in the 50 years since the discovery of insulin, but he found the service, he said, "one of the most moving experiences of my life."

CIRCLE K INTERNATIONAL

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Circle K Clubs International is an organization of college clubs sponsored by Kiwanis Clubs International. At its recent convention in Chicago, Circle K's House of Delegates adopted a resolution calling on all Circle K Clubs on college campuses throughout the United States and in other countries to support the crusade against multiple sclerosis. By lending its support to the excellent work of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, Circle K has shown its commitment to the young people afflicted with this terrible disease, and to the eventual conquest of multiple sclerosis. I applaud the work of Circle K, and commend its resolution to my colleagues.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

Author: New York District of Circle K International.

And whereas, Multiple sclerosis is the greatest crippler of young adults;

And whereas, Dr. Jonas Salk, the man responsible for the major breakthrough in polio vaccine has stated, "Every disease has its time and the time has arrived to find the answer to multiple sclerosis."

And whereas, The National Multiple Sclerosis Society is the only national voluntary health agency supporting national research on this disease;

And whereas, The National Multiple Sclerosis Society urgently needs help to support its patient services, education and research programs;

Therefore, be it resolved, that since Multiple Sclerosis is the disease of young people, Circle K International endorses and urges Circle K Clubs to become involved in the fight against Multiple Sclerosis so a major breakthrough can take place during this decade and help young people to become free from fear of this disease.

(Passed unanimously by the House of Delegates, 16th Annual Circle K International Convention, August 25, 1971.)

JACOB FRIEDRICK VIEWS WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Jacob F. Friedrick, the grand old man of Wisconsin labor, made a strong plea for passage of a National Workmen's Compensation Act at a meeting of the National Commission on State Workmen's Compensation Laws in Chicago on October 4.

Mr. Friedrick is past president of the Milwaukee County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, and labor member of the State of Wisconsin Advisory Council on Workmen's Compensation. His statement follows:

Sixty years ago in 1911 ten States, Wisconsin among them, enacted State workmen's compensation laws, thus following the lead of the Federal Government, which in 1908 established workmen's compensation for its civilian employees.

It took up to 1948 before all of the States had finally enacted State workmen's compensation laws. Such laws had and still have wide variations in their various provisions. For example here follow some of the differences between various State acts in 1970.

COVERAGE

Alaska

Compulsory as to employers of one or more employees.

South Carolina

Elective as to employers having 15 or more regular employees.

INCOME BENEFITS FOR TEMPORARY TOTAL DISABILITY

Arizona

Maximum percentage of wages, 65%.
Maximum weekly payment, $150.00.
Time limit of payment, 433 weeks.
Total amount limit, $65,000.

Mississippi

Maximum percentage of wages, 65%.
Maximum weekly payment, $40.00.
Time limit of payment, 450 weeks.
Total amount limit, $15,000.

INCOME BENEFITS FOR PERMANENT TOTAL DISABILITY

Arizona

Maximum of wages, 65 %.
Maximum weekly payment, $150.00.
Time limit, life.
Amount limit, no limit.

Alabama

Maximum of wages, 65%.
Maximum weekly payment, $50.00.
Time limit, 550 weeks.
Amount limit, $20,000.

Most States base their payments on the rates in effect at the time of the injury so that persons totally disabled but living for long periods during such disability may due to inflation receive a mere pittance in benefits.

MEDICAL BENEFITS

Some 35 States have no time limitations in their laws. Fifteen States do have such limitations, ranging from 10 weeks in North Carolina to 2 years in Alabama.

Some 36 States have no limitation as to dollar amounts. Fourteen States do with South Dakota being low with hospital limit of $1,400 and medical limit of $300.

Loss of arm at the shoulder

Hawaii	$35,100
Wyoming	6,800

Loss of one eye

Connecticut	$19,740
Mississippi	4,000

Perhaps one of the best illustrations of the irrationality between State laws is in the provisions for loss of arm in the laws of the States of New York and New Jersey. New York $24,960—New Jersey $12,000. Crossing the Hudson River to go to work can cut the New York worker's compensation in half and it would be small consolation to him to know that a New Jersey worker going to work in the opposite direction would double his compensation.

One could go on and on and cite illogical, irrational and unjustifiable differences between state laws. But to what avail?

At every meeting of the Milwaukee County Labor Council which I attend as a delegate, I pledge allegiance to the flag and declare that we are one nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

But do we act as one nation indivisible or do we act as if we were 50 economic units competing with each other?

I contend that with the mobility of labor and more so with the mobility of the products of labor we are one nation and one economic unit.

I further contend that if we are to render justice to all we must do so as a nation regardless of state lines.

I am aware of the fact that the cry of "states rights" will be raised. But I am also aware that some who raise the cry of "states rights" do so in an effort to continue "states wrongs."

I submit that the states have failed to provide adequate and just compensation for workers injured or killed in the service of all of us.

Let me illustrate:

I drive a car manufactured in Wisconsin. The steel in this car may have been processed in Pennsylvania. The tires in Ohio. The upholstery in one of the Carolinas or Georgia. The gas and oil I use to drive the car may come from Texas. Now, if workers in Wisconsin were to lose an arm while working in the process of making my car, he could get compensation in the amount of $24,250. The worker in Pennsylvania who processed the steel for my car for the same loss could get $12,900: the worker in Ohio who worked on the tires $12,600; the worker in Georgia or Carolina for the same loss could get ten or eleven thousand, while the worker in Texas who worked to provide the gas and oil I need to operate the car would have to be satisfied with $9,800.

Is there any sense in this?

Even more important, is there any justice in this.

Every one of these workers rendered service to me as the ultimate consumer and I as the ultimate consumer pay the costs of any injuries they may have received. I should like to be fair and just to all of them, but I cannot be under the present crazy quilt system of state workmen's compensation.

I submit that the record shows that the states are not prepared to render equal justice to injured workers who serve all of us in the nation.

It seems to me that the attitude is not how fairly and justly can we treat the injured worker, but rather the attitude of how little can we get by with.

How can we remedy this nationwide, irrational, illogical and unjust situation. Clearly only by national action. By congressional passage of a national Workmen's Compensation Act.

I do not know whether this Commission, when it proposes such national action as I feel it must, will set forth or suggest specific provisions for inclusion in national legislation.

If it will, I would suggest that the maximum weekly compensation be set no lower than the average wage of the employes covered, and that below that maximum wage loss be compensated at 100%. I further suggest that in cases of permanent total disability, or in cases of scheduled injuries, where payments are allocated over a period of several years, such payments be adjusted, as benefits for temporary total are adjusted.

In submitting this statement, I do so as an individual citizen of this great nation who believes that we are one nation indivisible and who wants justice for all who serve all.

DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAM

HON. MORGAN F. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I had the opportunity, with a number of my colleagues from Chicago, to participate in a conference on the politics and issues of the 1972 elections. This forum was sponsored by a group of young Democratic organizations and was aimed at stimulating the interest of young people in the major issues that will be part of the next election. The entire program was very well planned and the discussions most reward ing. I think special mention should be made of Mr. Gregory Trush, the conference chairman, who devoted so much talent and effort to making this a worthwhile experience for all.

I was happy to take part in a panel on education. My particular interest in this discussion focused on the problem of drug education in our schools. I am sure we are all aware, regardless of the area each of us represents, that the use of narcotics by our young is escalating and that our schools, in many instances, are centers for drug traffic. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we must be firmly committed to a total war on the use of drugs. Our tactics in this effort must consist of a multifaceted assault on the problem. To supplement our programs to control the importation and distribution of drugs, we must educate our young in the dangers of using narcotics.

My city of Chicago will soon distribute a drug education guide in all 27 school districts for use in grades from kindergarten through 12th. The guide was tested for 1 year in selected districts and revised as a result of that experience. It will contain lessons for presentation, drug education resource materials, and lists of reference services, hospitals, and drug clinics. The guide is designed to provide a comprehensive program that runs through the entire curriculum. We are hopeful that this program will have a marked effect in reducing the number of our children who turn to drugs and convincing those already experiencing problems to seek professional help.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to support all programs in their districts aimed at providing increased drug education. We must stand ready to provide the needed Federal assistance to create and sustain viable programs to effectively inform our young people of the personal and public consequences of drug addiction. The need cannot be overemphasized. Failure to act could only be labeled as a most flagrant dereliction of our duty to our Nation and its people.

A MESSAGE ON DRUGS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine has a message on drug abuse that every parent and teenager should hear.

Mr. Garland Goldston, of Knoxville, Tenn., has given me permission to share his story with you, and following is his message as he tells it to high school groups:

I'm telling this story primarily for youngsters in Junior High and High School. My name won't make any difference, but I hope my story will. If it will just reach one young person and prevent him or her from following in my footsteps, then this story will be meaningful.

We are living in a time now where all we hear and read about seems to be "Drugs, Drugs, Drugs."

It seems to be the thing now for our youth to talk about taking a trip. Some think of a trip on Mary Jane, some Acid or L.S.D., and some after graduating on the small stuff entertain the idea of morphine or heroin.

But just once! Just to see how it is or how it will feel . . . not to get hooked. Getting hooked is for junkies, but just once won't hurt anything will it?

My story is about a trip. Once a person is hooked, it really doesn't matter how he got hooked. Whether you started using drugs legally, and then *misused* them, or whether you just wanted to try it *once*, and got caught in the drug ratrace.

However it started, legally or not, once you are addicted to narcotics, you are nothing but a Junkie.

I was addicted to narcotics *legally*, after having been injured overseas while in the service and after having bad luck in surgery, almost losing a leg.

Of course I wouldn't even admit to myself for the first six months or so that I was addicted. I kept telling myself that I wasn't addicted, that I could stop, and would just as soon as I got better.

The Veterans Administration furnished my drugs, syringes, needles, etc. But as time passed and my leg healed, I found that I needed more and more morphine, so I went to a private doctor and doubled my allotment of drugs. For a while, drugs from both the Veterans Administration and my private doctor was enough to hold me, but before I knew it, I had to have more and more, so I went to still another doctor giving me three sources to obtain my drugs. I had an injured leg and wore a long leg brace, so obtaining drugs wasn't too hard.

As time passed, I found myself buying from pushers to supplement my three sources of legal drugs. But buying from pushers cost thirty, forty, and fifty times as much as obtaining them legally from doctors.

The extra money had to come from somewhere, and finally I was in trouble.

At the time, I was tired, I weighed about 135 pounds, down from close to 200 pounds. I had quit eating, sleeping, almost existing. I had to have a fix every two or three hours, no more than four. That's around the clock, seven days a week, day in, and day out.

You've heard the expression "I've got the monkey on my back," well, by this time, I had a full grown gorilla.

Now it was really time for me to take a trip. I was sentenced to two years in Federal Court for forgery and two years for uttering government checks, but I was lucky. The judge ran the two sentences together.

I was first confined in the Federal cell in the local county jail and stayed one night in a city jail somewhere in Mississippi while being transferred to the F.C.I. in Texarkana, Texas. I was transferred from there to the Medical Center for Federal prisoners in Springfield, Mo. After treatment at the Medical Center, I requested a transfer to the U.S.P. in Atlanta, Georgia in order to be closer to my home so I would be able to get visits from my family.

When transportation was arranged, I was put on a U.S. Bureau of Prisons bus along with 23 other handcuffed prisoners. Instead of Atlanta, the bus went to the U.S.P. in Leavenworth, Kansas. After about 10 days, another prison bus took 24 more of us to the Federal Institution in Terre Haute, Indiana. From there, another prison bus to an F.C.I. in Ashland, Kentucky, for an overnight stay, then on to the U.S.P. in Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. About a week later, still another prison bus took 24 more prisoners for an overnight stay at the Federal Institution in Petersburg, Virginia, then on to the U.S.P. in Atlanta, Georgia.

All this, and I hadn't been in prison six months yet. What a trip? What a price to pay?

Even though I was paroled after ten and one-half months and my two year sentence, and it has been almost three years now, I am still paying the price.

How many are the nights I have the craving so bad for a fix, I awaken in a cold sweat, or see something during the day pertaining to drugs that literally turn me to despair. All this and more.

With that *trip* through, my conviction, I am a felon, an ex-convict, without even the right to vote, to say nothing of the shame I brought to my wife and children, my parents, my Church and friends.

Some say drugs are bad, and I guess some are, but for the most part, it's really not the drugs that are bad, it's the misuse of them and or the use of drugs without strict and proper supervision of them.

My story? It's something that could happen to anyone else, but never me, *and it did!*

Before you try drugs for a kick, ask yourself: *Is it worth it?*

A PRESCRIPTION DRUG PROGRAM NEEDED FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, approximately 80 percent of the aged population suffers from one or more chronic conditions for which drugs are required. Those persons aged 65 or older use twice as many drugs as do the rest of the population. Their expenses can run into hundreds of dollars annually—expenses hardly budgetable for those living on fixed and limited cash incomes.

In Illinois, over 10 percent of the population is composed of persons 65 years or older, and it is estimated they pay 25 percent of all outpatient drug costs.

In 1967, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was ordered by Congress to study the need of older Americans for prescription drugs and a design of a workable program for their distribution. Their results made it clear that older Americans sorely need assistance to meet the expense of prescription drugs, but no action was taken as a result of the study.

Unfortunately, H.R. 1, which was designed to make improvements in national health programs, passed the House of Representatives without a prescription drug program. To rectify this situation, I am today cosponsoring legislation to amend the Social Security Act.

Under my proposal, a formulary composed primarily of physicians, will select the drugs to be covered by the program. An elderly person may go to the participating pharmacy of his choice. He will incur initially a $1 charge for each prescription filled under the program, and the pharmacy will be reimbursed for the remaining amount by the program. If, however, the prescription drug is not listed by the formulary committee, the beneficiary will do as he always has—pay out of his own pocket.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will be given a hearing and an evaluation at the earliest possible time. We must establish a comprehensive program for the 20 million Americans covered by medicare whose prescription drug problems have been ignored too long.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT CONGLOMERATES

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, in the Evening Star of October 9, 1971, there appeared an editorial, which attests to the Evening Star's watchfulness in assessing the work of congressional committees and to its ability to evaluate matters of great national consequence. The following editorial merits the attention of every Member of Congress:

Unlike the Pentagon Papers, a recently released House subcommittee report on conglomerates lacks the sensation of battlefields, jailings and paperback sales. But nevertheless the massive study contains economic, political, social and moral implications that are stunningly pertinent to every American.

In the past decade, the phenomenon of conglomerates has brought excitement and wealth to the marketplace as well as its attendant reactions of avarice, duplicity and fear. Because they involve giant empires linking such unrelated areas as steel, furniture, panty hose and real estate, conglomerates do not quite fit into the old categories of monopolies in one field.

The investigation by the House Judiciary Committee's antitrust panel involved six representative conglomerates. Atypical as they might be, some of their dealings cannot help resulting in stringent controls levied against all groupings.

Unveiled through testimony was an unsavory picture of corporate raidings, overpayments for stock and the concealment of overpayments by dubious accounting procedures. Some reputable banks were revealed as being deeply involved, often dipping into sacrosanct pension and trust funds to provide takeover money—sometimes on uninsured demand notes.

Management was found to be concentrating more on playing the market than on production and even draining profits of one branch for the benefit of others. Subsidiaries experienced deleterious effects in efficiency, creativity, productivity and corporate values, to say nothing of the demoralization of per-

sonnel unrooted by mergers and acquisitions. Book juggling was attested to as were admissions on plummeting profits.

Competition did not seem to flourish. From 1963 to 1970, mergers and acquisitions numbered 4,462 in one year alone. The report shows that the 100 largest conglomerates hold about half of the total assets in manufacturing. Mergers have cooled a bit lately, but when conditions improve, the movement may be expected to continue. Such growth, warned the investigators, "presages imposition of cartel-like structures throughout American business."

In fairness to the thousands of conglomerates that follow the rules, it should be said that some failing businesses have been saved through merger. Prosperity has been brought or enhanced in many communities. Sometimes a takeover threat has galvanized a sleepy company to more dynamic activities.

The chief recommendation of the report is to set up a new regulatory agency—an Office of Industrial Organization—to govern all merger-like activities and to enforce antitrust laws. Perhaps there will be carping about the shortcomings of regulatory bodies or the political implications of the new agency's White House mantle, yet whether OIO is realized, the suggestion should spur needed regulatory action.

We do not like structures on business, but in view of the evidence brought out in the House report, it may be time to bring to heel all those in the conglomerate field who abuse the free-enterprise system.

CORCORAN'S WILDERNESS

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the National Endowment for the Arts under the able direction of Miss Nancy Hanks, chairman, scored an outstanding achievement with the recent opening of the show "Wilderness" at the Corcoran Art Gallery. The show is a project of the National Endowment for the Arts and the work of Douglas McAgy of the endowment staff. It is the first exhibit created by the endowment whose activities in the past have been various forms of encouragement to other institutions and individual artists. I commend Miss Hanks and her staff. In an article in the Sunday Star on October 10, 1971, which I am including with my remarks, Mr. Frank Getlein states:

This show may turn out to be the most important museum exhibition in the country this year.

The article follows:

CORCORAN'S "WILDERNESS" A SHOW OF VAST IMPORTANCE

(By Frank Getlein)

The Corcoran Gallery of Art has just opened what may turn out to be the most important museum exhibition in the country this year.

The show is called "Wilderness." It has been financed, initiated and executed by the National Foundation for the Arts. It is the first of four projected exhibitions by the Endowment under the over-all title, "The American Art Heritage." These shows will tour the country to coincide with the bicentennial celebrations.

"Wilderness" and its companion exhibitions will do their touring in a new system called an Art Fleet, which in effect will be small mobile museums, the long-established device of the Virginia Museum raised to the tenth power in technical sophistication and in scope.

The plans and a basic unit or two of the Art Fleet are on display in an adjoining gallery at the Corcoran. Moved by tractor-trucks, the fleet consists of inflatable modular hemispheres that can set up almost anywhere on level ground and create their own totally controlled environment for the touring works of art, which are mounted in cases that are sealed at the point of departure and never opened until their return.

EXCITING, IMPORTANT

All of this is exciting and important in itself, heralding a new age and a new audience for art in America, much as Virginia's "artmobile" did in that state. The exhibition is also important because it is by far the most visible achievement the National Endowment has ever shown in its home town.

It also involves the Endowment in the actual production of a major exhibition, an important step in the evolution of the institution. Heretofore most of its activities have been various forms of encouragement for other activities by other institutions or by individual artists. Now the Endowment itself gets into the act of creation and does so magnificently.

For fascinating as the concept and designs for the Art Fleet are—the work of New York designers George Nelson & Company and Charles Forberg Associates—they are overwhelmed by the exhibition and that is as it should be.

The show is the work of Douglas McAgy of the Endowment staff. Although McAgy was long well-known in the museum world for his exhibitions before coming to the Endowment some years ago, "Wilderness" is the first show of his in Washington. Everything about it, from the concept through all the details of the installation must make us hope to see more of his work in the future.

"Wilderness" is also the most complete and successful development yet of an idea for a new sort of exhibition that has been kicking around museums for several years now. This is simply to make exhibitions relate directly to the larger, non-art concerns of the community. "Harlem on My Mind," at the Metropolitan Museum, has undoubtedly been the most famous, or the most notorious, but the best has probably been "Lower East Side," the documentary show of the Eastern European Jewish immigration in New York City.

"Wilderness" takes up the theme of its title and relates it to our present fears and hopes for the environment. Because of the theme, the show is fortunate in the availability of art relevant to it. Wilderness was a major theme in the history of this country, a theme revealed in so many different meanings by such people as Kit Carson, Henry Thoreau, Lewis and Clark, and in such phenomena as the settlement of the coast, the pushing over the mountains and the winning of the West.

"In the beginning, the whole world was America," said John Locke, a quote the show uses, and America was wilderness. Our art no less than our history reflects that concern with wilderness. The exploration of, the sensitivity to, the wilderness dominated American art throughout the 19th century. McAgy had plenty to choose from.

He has chosen well. All the great names are there, often in great examples. But the imagination and knowledge out of which the show has been assembled—and installed—raise it all to a considerably higher level than a mere survey of American painting on the wilderness theme.

For example: Thomas Moran's "The Chasm of the Colorado" is one of the artist's great machines of scenic painting 7 feet high, almost twice that across, vast scenery vastly shown. But McAgy has had the wit to accompany it with another Moran, "Lower Manhattan from Communipaw." This view from the Jersey Meadows in 1880 clearly shows the smog already beginning to form over the city and reveals another level of meaning of the theme:

After we destroy the natural wilderness with the railroad, the axe, the tract housing development, we create a new wilderness of our own, no less wild than the original but a lot less inspiring to look at, to move through, to live in. That development of the theme continues with contemporary photographs of Watts and Harlem.

Through the vision of so many artists, we watch the wilderness exert its fascination on the new race of Americans and we watch that new race press into and over the wilderness. There are views of Niagara Falls by Inness and Morse along with the familiar rainbow in the mist by Church from the Corcoran's own collection. The still incredible Western mountains are there, reviving the awe they inspired in artists like Bierstadt and Bodmer.

The show goes far beyond the great 19th century scenic artists. O'Keeffe, Marin, Hartley, Burchfield and Aaron Bohrod are among the 20th century people and the wide use of photographs gives the exhibition another dimension, Bohrod's painting of the junky outskirts of Chicago and Oliver Lippincott's photo of "A Member of the Pioneer Automobile Party in his Toledo Car at the Rim of the Grand Canyon, Grand Point of View" both open up the ominous present. So do the photographs of the Farm Security Administration project of the New Deal, which furnish a great deal of the Dust Bowl section.

The exhibition could easily have been a mere celebration of an important and generally underrated branch of American painting. Instead, it has related that painting and the past it commemorates to our present and possible future in a way that opens up a new and very promising line of work for art museums.

NO-COST SHOW

More specifically, the enterprise provides the Corcoran, in its hour of need, with a spectacular exhibition at no cost. The Corcoran might very well become the chosen instrument of the National Endowment in such efforts to the great advantage of both institutions.

Speaking of spectacular, that's what the installation is. The great spaces of the double atrium are centered, south, on an early steam engine, north on LEM, the lunar module, while on the walls and columns are projected changing images of the wilderness, culminating in a waterfall cascading down the grand staircase. The rotunda and the main floor above are in darkness, with light picking out and framing the pictures, which are hung on scaffolding structures that greatly increase the available, viewable, usable space.

In every way the exhibition is itself a masterpiece of its own art form and will richly repay repeated visits.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 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?

UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN COMMUNITY TRADE RELATIONS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the privilege of hearing Mr. Guy Vanhaeverbeke, deputy director of the European Community Information Service, address the World Affairs Council of Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. Vanhaeverbeke discussed the subject of United States-European community trade relations in the light of British entry . . . and of President Nixon's new economic policy.

It occurred to me that my colleagues might find of interest the reactions of one "on the other side." Therefore, I take this opportunity to insert Mr. Vanhaeverbeke's comments at this point in the RECORD:

U.S.-EUROPEAN COMMUNITY TRADE RELATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF BRITISH ENTRY . . . AND OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S NEW ECONOMIC POLICY

(By Guy Vanhaeverbeke)

I am grateful to the Dayton World Affairs Council for its decision to maintain this scheduled luncheon program although the original speaker—a distinguished European official—was unable to attend. Your acceptance of such a last minute change assures me you consider the subject important enough to take a chance with a substitute speaker.

This in itself is encouraging to a man who recently had a depressing experience in this respect: one of my friends in Washington asked casually what my task was in the ECIS. I answered that my job consisted mainly in selling the image of the European Community on the North American continent. The friend in question did not react immediately. However, a day or so later he sent me a nicely wrapped book as a present. The book was Arthur Miller's "Death of a Salesman."

Ever since, I have been wondering just how accurate this joke was. Have US-European relations reached the point where those who were allies for so long in peace as in war now are strangers? Is it possible that some even speak lightly of a prospective trade war as though it would amount to little more than a Saturday afternoon touch football game? Is that really the point to which an expanding European Community and US involvement in Asia have brought us?

I still think there is reasonable cause for optimism on US–EC relations, provided responsible political leaders on both sides keep their cool amid the divergent pressures that surround them. Just as important, the channels of transatlantic communication and mutual information must be widened and improved.

Unfortunately, the picture of US-European relations is heavily clouded with a number of cliches. In Europe, one of the fashionable cliches is the so-called "American Challenge." "Penetration of US direct investments in Europe has reached such an enormous level that the second economic power in the world after the US is bound to be—not the Soviet Union, not Japan, not Europe—but US business in Europe."

In the US, there seems to be increasing doubt whether European unification—which so far has been a constant goal of US foreign policy—has in effect been beneficial to the US. European integration is said to have developed essentially in the economic field whereas progress in the political arena has been disappointing. Thus Western Europe—personified by the European Community—is increasingly seen as a major economic competitor. This threat to American economic power has not been balanced by political advantages. Thus American apprehensions about European economic encroachments become still more vivid with the present European Common Market of six nations (Germany, France, Belgium, Netherlands, Italy, Luxembourg) about to add Great Britain, Ireland, Denmark, and Norway to its ranks.

It is my intention today to repudiate such stereotypes.

Without denying that disagreements exist, I contend that:

1) the European Community and the US have been beneficial for each other over the past decade (even if we confine our considerations strictly to the economic area.)

2) the enlargement of the European Community suggests no change in this basically favorable relationship.

I should like to summarize now the extent to which the US has benefited from the Community, particularly in regard to economic activity and growth.

(The US and the Common Market together account for 38% of world trade. The figure will be 55% if the U.K., Ireland, Denmark, and Norway join the Common Market.)

The total US commodity trade with the European Community now exceeds three times the level of trade in 1958, when the Common Market was formed. US exports to the Community have thus risen from about 3 billion to 9 billion. Today, the Community is the US's best customer—excepting Canada—and an expanded Common Market would make it the number one market for US goods. Not only the volume of transatlantic trade is impressive, the pattern of this trade is equally significant: the US has scored a consistent surplus in its trade with the European Community. This surplus reached the 2.4 billion mark 1970. The figures available for 1971 show that the US surplus with the European Community reached $625 million in the first quarter, which is particularly significant in a period when the overall US trade balance is beginning to show a deficit.

Among the factors that have helped considerably the growth of US exports to the European Community has been the rapid rise in the standard of living which accompanied the creation of a large single market in the Community. Indeed we share the belief of the US that the key to economic progress lies in competition. The establishment of the European Community has considerably enhanced competition within the Common Market area, which in turn has boosted the economic growth and the inherent demand for investment and consumption goods. This situation doubtlessly has encouraged the liberal orientation of trade policy in the European Community.

Another factor behind the growth of US exports to the European Community has been the establishment of the Community's common customs tariff and the reductions made in this tariff as the result of major trade negotiations. The Community is now surrounded by the lowest tariff average among the leading industrialized nations (January 1, 1972: 6.9% against 9.3% for G.B., 10.1% for Japan, 10.9% for the US, not including the recent 10% surcharge.)

One of the obvious results of British entry into the European Community would be the reduction of Britain's tariff to the low level of the Community's protection.

The economic relations between the US and the Community not only include the flow of commodities. The rising activity of American firms within the Community must also be taken into account. These investments progressed from $1.9 billion in 1958 to an estimated book-value of $13 billion in 1970. The sales of American subsidiaries located in the Community are more than twice the value of total American exports to the Community. About 1 billion dollars in profits from those direct investments in the Community were repatriated last year. Thus the US economy benefits doubly from European integration: from a considerable increase in US-European Community trade and from the impressive income growth through investments in Europe. Both make a major contribution to the credit side of the US balance of payments.

The Community is one of the most open trade areas in the world—necessarily so because of its heavy dependence on trade for the development of its GNP (trade accounts for 20% of the GNP of the European Community and only for 7% of the US's GNP).

The economic structures of the UK and of the other applicant countries are, in this respect, similar to the structures of the Community countries: a large percentage of GNP is also dependent on foreign trade. Their policies towards direct US investments have also been extremely liberal.

When countries with open trade and investment policies decide to merge into a vast economic union there are good reasons to believe that the subsequent economic blending will bring about an open entity where increased competition creates increased wealth. Logically the US business world should contemplate the enlarged European Community as a more prosperous client and—as every salesman knows very well—the more prosperous a customer, the better chance there is of selling to him. (Incidentally, it is for this very reason that the rich American market is an important factor of world trade.)

The EC's trade approach is equally "open" in its relations with developing nations. The EC was the first economic entity to follow a U.N. recommendation intended to promote industrialization through trade with the developing nations of the world. On June 1st of this year, the EC abolished completely its customs duties on imports of finished and semi-finished goods produced by 91 developing countries. In addition to these generalized trade preferences applicable to the developing countries, the Community felt it had a special responsibility towards a number of specific African and Mediterranean countries. The latter enjoy not only trade preferences, but also special financial and technical assistance programs.

Calculated on the basis of GNP percentages, the total European Community contribution to development aid was 1.2 per cent (whereas the U.S. share, in relation to its GNP, amounts to 5 per cent) in 1969.

American fears and criticisms towards the European Community are greatest in the field of agriculture. Preoccupations dwell both on access to the Community's agricultural market and access to third country markets where U.S. farm exports meet competition from European farm exports aided by subsidies.

The fact is that the European Community remains the largest market by far for U.S. agricultural exports, which totalled 1.6 billion (FOB) in 1970. Since 1964, the last year before the effects of the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) made themselves felt—the Common Market share of American farm exports has remained steady (between 21% and 23%).

During this period, American farm exports to the Community grew by 25% compared to 20% to the whole world and 6.8% to the rest of Europe. Not all of the U.S. agricultural produce has scored the fabulous growth of soybean exports to the European Community (91% over the past five years). Exports of other agricultural commodities remained stable, some have even dropped.

Naturally, such divergent developments reflect problems for which the CAP serves as an easy scapegoat. There is also the problem of conflicting interests between American producers and exporters of interchangeable and competing products.

Forty per cent of U.S. farm exports enter

the Community facing neither duties nor quota restrictions. The other sixty per cent undergo what is called a variable levy or tariff which is the basic CAP instrument of protecting the European farmer against a chaotic world market, against the world market's abnormally low prices. There is no point in denying that such protection exists around the European agricultural market. But there is no point either in pretending that a totally open, non-protected agricultural market exists in any of the industrialized states we know. The methods and devices of protection may be different from one country to another, but they exist in every country.

The U.S. protective system mainly consists of quotas. The European Community has the variable levies. Should we make a comparison of protection in the U.S. and the European Community? Supposing, for example, all supports in all forms were discontinued both in the U.S. and the Common Market. This would come to a $1,300 per capita income drop in the U.S. and a $840 per capita drop in the European Community. In other words, competition between agriculture of different countries amounts in fact to competition between public treasuries of these same countries.

Actually the European Community has tried to get to the roots of the agricultural policies, Such an approach was offered during the Kennedy Round. The U.S. said no.

Will Britain's entry into the Common Market have an impact on the agricultural world trade? The answer is yes. What exactly the impact will be is difficult to predict. There will be no problem of course, for products that have no tariffs, such as soybeans. (The U.K. will have to eliminate its present 10% duty on soybeans. Most of the agricultural products for which British entry may cause a change in trade patterns—butter, bacon, sugar—are not of major importance to U.S. exporters.)

At any rate, the European Community is committed to take special measures to avoid adverse effects to third countries. Mr. Mansholt, who is the CAP's chief architect and manager, made this clear in a Minneapolis speech a few months ago.

The implication is that the CAP is not a rigid set of protectionist devices. It is a practical and relatively homogeneous system, replacing the previously existing panoplies of different national—and often very restrictive—regulations in the field of agriculture. It is conceived according to European agricultural situations, yet it also takes into account the interest of Europe's traditional trade partners.

Finally, the CAP is the prerequisite for the structural changes that will allow Europe to achieve successfully its green revolution.

Fourteen per cent of the total working population in the European Community is still employed in agriculture. The corresponding figure for the United States is four per cent.

Half a million people will leave the agricultural sector in Europe every year in the coming decade.

Allowing this massive process to take place smoothly is one of the goals of the CAP.

You naturally expect this survey of European-American economic relations to include some comment or reaction from me on the present economic and monetary situation, and on the possible repercussions on the future of the European Community as well as on our mutual relationship.

President Nixon said that reactions abroad to his NEP were "measured and constructive". This is certainly the case for the E.C. Indeed, immediate retaliation or trade war were ruled out. The E.C. countries also have reached a common position establishing the groundrules for a thorough and far-reaching reform of the international monetary system.

Yet, in the New Economic Policy Package, a number of measures are seen as unilateral moves which violate existing international monetary and trade rules and which hit European economies very hard.

1. The floating of the dollar actually dismantled the whole basis and framework of the Bretton Woods monetary system established some 25 years ago.

2. The ten per cent surcharge hits about 88 per cent of European exports on the U.S. market and is likely to worsen the already existing European trade deficit with the U.S. It also annuls unilaterally the effects of the Kennedy Round negotiations.

3. The 10 per cent credit on new investments includes an additional trade discrimination—in fact, it is a typical example of a very sizable non-tariff barrier—since this tax credit is applicable only if the investments concerned relate to equipment made in the USA.

4. The Domestic International Sales Corporation is seen as a form of export subsidy.

The cumulative consequences of these measures provoke a sudden shift in tariff barriers of up to 30% for some European goods.

Some of these problems—like the floating of the dollar and the 10% surcharge—are understood to be of a temporary nature. Yet no indication exists as to how temporary these measures will be. Consequently, the whole world and especially Western Europe feels not only the shock effect of the measures but finds it extremely difficult to cope constructively with the situation.

Above all, the decisions announced by President Nixon on August 15th are seen by Europeans not as a routine economic incident but as a turning point in the history of international, political, economic and monetary developments.

The problems deriving from the U.S. decisions not only involve the reform of the international monetary system and the elimination of obstacles to world trade. These problems are also connected with financial participation in defense. The crucial issue is not the dollar but the reshaping of the monetary, commercial and political pattern of the West.

Under these circumstances, it would not be reasonable to assume that simple answers can be found to the problems we face. Also, in this initial phase of a vast process of global readjustments, we must realize that tactical considerations play an important part which, most likely, will be an additional obstacle to immediate solutions.

Unfortunately, the European Community is confronted with this external process of readjustment at a time when it is also going through a delicate phase of internal readjustment: the transition from a Community of six nations into a Community of ten nations and the building of its own economic and monetary union.

Consequently, the first priority of the Community will be to strengthen its own structure, to avoid the temptation of a return to national bilateralism which would deprive the European Community of its only weapon: concerted action to defend the interest of its countries. Together, the Community countries from the most formidable trading and monetary unit in the world. Divided we have the means neither to defend our interest nor to participate in the creation of a better international monetary order.

The other goal of the Community will be to prevent forthcoming developments from leading to a worldwide recession.

Until recently, initiatives of the U.S. Government provoked criticisms but no concrete and constructive proposals from the European side. The mid-August unilateral American measures dramatized the ineffectual decision-making machinery of the European Community.

However, the most recent Common Market's Council of Ministers meeting in Brussels as well as the "Group of Ten" meeting in London, demonstrated that European cohesion is improving.

It must be stressed that the emerging European cohesion and solidarity is not oriented against anybody, and certainly not against the United States. It is fully understood in Europe that it is in nobody's interest not to help the United States out of its present difficulties. But in order to be successful, our cooperation must be a two-way movement. This very idea of mutual concessions underlies the European Community's latest positions:

1) The reforms to be carried out within the international monetary system must respect the principle of fixed parities. Such a system is necessary for the orderly transaction and expansion of trade, in which the Community, as the most important trading unit, is particularly interested.

This will only be possible if a differentiated realignment is introduced in parity relations between currencies of industrialized countries. Such a realignment should include the currencies of all countries concerned, including the dollar.

2) The correct functioning of such a reformed international monetary system requires measures such as a limited increase in fluctuation bands in order to compensate for the consequences of interest rate differences and of appropriate measures to discourage short-term capital movements.

3) International reserve assets will continue to depend upon gold, and to an increasing degree, upon a collectively and internationally created and managed reserve system. This calls for the adaptation and the development of the special drawing rights system in connection with a gradual decrease in the importance of national currencies as reserve assets.

4) The new international payments balance can only be maintained if, in the future, all countries or associations of countries respect the obligations involved in the adjustment process of the balance of payments and if they implement appropriate internal policies.

5) Within the framework of the reformed international monetary system, the authority and range of action of the I.M.F. must be reinforced in all fields of competence.

I started on a literary note, I may just as well end the same way. The word "crisis" is expressed in Chinese with two different signs: the first sign means "risk", the second "opportunities". This is, in short, the state of affairs that confront the U.S., Europe, and U.S.-European relations today.

PROJECT PRAYER

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 21, 1971, 218 Members of this distinguished body utilized the discharge petition to bring House Joint Resolution 191—the voluntary school prayer amendment—to the floor for a vote scheduled Monday, November 8, 1971.

Each day since that historic action by my colleagues, Project Prayer has reported mounting support from individuals, organizations and church groups throughout America. Included are the 38,000 churches of the National Association of Evangelicals, the California American Council of Christian Churches,

and the more than 3½ million members of Project Prayer itself.

One of the individuals to add his support as an advisory board member of Project Prayer is one of the most highly respected businessmen in the world. His name appears on beautiful buildings in major cities everywhere. His civic and philanthropic contributions are legend. For in all his work, there is a dedication to his fellow man, his Nation, and to God. He is truly a perfect example of our free enterprise system and deeply believes we are one Nation under God.

Several years ago this gentleman composed a prayer for peace. Neither he, nor I, is suggesting this prayer he authored be used as the prayer to be used in our public schools when House Joint Resolution 191 becomes a part of our Constitution. However, as a distinguished member of the advisory board of Project Prayer and its 3½ million members who have led the battle for voluntary prayer in our public schools, I believe it quite appropriate to insert this magnificent prayer in the RECORD along with the knowledge that such a great American is on the team asking for a yea vote on House Joint Resolution 191. Following is the prayer written by Conrad N. Hilton, the outstanding American I have been speaking about:

OUR FATHER IN HEAVEN

(Written by Conrad N. Hilton, member, advisory board, Project Prayer)

We pray that You save us from ourselves.

The world that You have made for us, to live in peace, we have made into an armed camp. We live in fear of war to come.

We are afraid of "the terror that flies by night, and the arrow that flies by day, the pestilence that walks in darkness and the destruction that wastes at noon-day."

We have turned from You to go our selfish way.

We have broken Your commandments and denied Your truth. We have left Your altars to serve the false gods of money and pleasure and power.

Forgive us and help us.

Now, darkness gathers around us and we are confused in all our counsels. Losing faith in You, we lose faith in ourselves.

Inspire us with wisdom, all of us of every color, race and creed, to use our wealth, our strength to help our brother, instead of destroying him.

Help us to do Your will as it is done in heaven and to be worthy of Your promise of peace on earth.

Fill us with new faith, new strength and new courage, that we may win the Battle for Peace.

Be swift to save us, dear God, Before the darkness falls.

OPINION ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the use of wage and price controls as a weapon to combat inflation has triggered a wave of controversy and speculation throughout the Nation. There are varied opinions as to what effect these measures will have on our economy.

Mr. Walter J. Burke, secretary-treasurer of the United Steelworkers of America, has outlined his opinion about the administration's action. Because the issue is of major importance and interest today, I feel it is appropriate to include Mr. Burke's comments in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I am confident they will find them interesting and informative.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF WALTER J. BURKE

President Abel in his remarks to you this morning, said that I would talk to you this afternoon about some of the things your Union has been doing concerning the present wage freeze. I think what Abe really meant to say was that I would discuss, in part, what we have been trying to do about the wage freeze as it affects many of our members.

In recent weeks, Abe, and several members of our legal and technical staff, have almost become Pittsburgh to Washington commuters. Numerous meetings have been held with Labor Department people, cabinet officers, and highly placed Presidential advisors, in an attempt to obtain some relaxation or at least clarification of President Nixon's wage-freeze executive order. With one happy exception, these efforts have been to no avail.

The freeze is on with a vengeance, and the Nixon-Connally crew which is administering and interpreting the freeze order, are pre-conditioned to say "no"—even before you ask for approval of a newly negotiated or contractually due wage or fringe benefit.

It has become painfully—and yes, if you will pardon the expression "crystal clear"—that the Nixon administration has no intention of relaxing the freeze, or making special exceptions to it for at least the period prior to November 13th.

The one happy exception to this hard-nosed position has to do with the continued implementation of our incentive arbitration award. I understand that Bruce Thrasher touched briefly on this matter—but it bears re-emphasis. After a great deal of discussion between President Abel, Bernie Kleiman and Elliot Bredhoff representing our Union—and Presidential Advisor George Shultz—followed by a meeting of our Jim Griffin and Ben Fischer with Nixon's Presidential Assistant Arnold Weber, a letter was addressed to President Abel relative to the incentive award implementation problem. I would like to read it to you at this time:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COST OF LIVING COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., September 15, 1971.

Mr. I. W. ABEL,
President, United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. ABEL: I appreciated the opportunity to meet with Mr. Fischer and Mr. Griffin of your staff, Mr. Shaver of U.S. Steel, and Mr. O'Connell of Bethlehem Steel, to discuss the extension of incentive systems to additional employees in selected steel plants.

The Council has now reviewed the details of your contract and the application of Council policy to the administration of the contract and the subsequent Arbitration Award. I am pleased to advise you that you may proceed to implement the Arbitration Award. The extension of the incentive plans to additional employees under the terms of the Arbitration Award is totally consistent with the policies that have been established by the Cost of Living Council.

If I may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,

ARNOLD R. WEBER,
Executive Director and Special Assistant to the President.

You will note, from Mr. Weber's letter, that representatives of the basic steel industry did join with us in our successful endeavor to secure approval for the continued implementation of our incentive award. I am sure their presence was most helpful.

For all practical purposes, however, it is quite apparent that for the present, we must resign ourselves to a "status-quo" on wage and fringe benefit improvements covered by the Presidential "quick-freeze" order—at least until November 13th.

What may happen after November 13th is a different matter, and I would like to use the balance of my allotted time to talk to you briefly about the freeze itself, and at slightly greater length about what we think the future may hold.

In planning this Conference, we initially considered having our attorneys, Bernie Kleiman and Elliot Bredhoff, speak to you about the present 90-day freeze of wages. The more we thought about it, however, the more apparent it became that there really isn't much to say on that subject. Simply stated—wages and fringe benefits are frozen at the levels of August 15th. They will remain in the Nixon deep-freeze until November 13th, and that's it. If any of you have special problems or questions, Bernie and Elliot will be with you tomorrow and Friday and may be able to help you.

Next we thought of trying to give you some sort of meaningful prediction as to what we expect to come after November 13th, but we discarded that idea too. No one can conceivably predict what President Nixon will do. As evidence of this, let me review with you administration statements leading up to the August 15th freeze. Seven weeks before August 15th, Treasury Secretary Connally solemnly assured the nation that no wage-price controls were being considered. Two weeks before August 15th, President Nixon himself, in a press conference, rejected the idea of wage and price controls. Then, on August 15th, he froze all wages and some prices. Obviously we are dealing with a President whose actions are impossible to predict.

However, unless there is another complete reversal of Presidential policy, we think it is very likely there will be some sort of controls, or at least restraints, on wages after November 13th. Therefore, we decided that rather than try to predict what will happen, the thing we might discuss today is what should happen if we are to have a controlled economy. If there are to be controls, what kind of controls should they be?

Let us go back a few years in history. We have experienced wage controls twice since our Union was organized in the 1930's, and as a result, we learned something about wage controls and how they operate.

Wages were controlled during World War II, from 1942 through 1945. They were not frozen—they were controlled—by a War Labor Board on which labor, management, and the public each had equal representation.

Under the policies adopted by the War Labor Board, an initial round of wage increases was permitted, up to a total of 15% above the levels of January 1, 1941. This was the so-called "Little Steel" formula, based on a monumental case our Union presented to the Board. The application of this formula was justified on the basis of a projected 15% increase in the cost of living between January 1, 1941 and September 15, 1942. No further cost-of-living increases were permitted during World War II.

However, various other types of wage increases were permitted—and even encouraged. The first of these was approvable to correct what were called "sub-standard" wages. Anything below 50¢ an hour was initially considered substandard and this figure was later increased to 55¢. It is hard to believe wages could have been that low just thirty years ago, but a lot of them were!

The next type of wage increases the Board permitted were those based on inequities between plants within an area. The War

Labor Board established "going wage rates" for key occupations in labor market areas. Companies and unions were permitted to negotiate increases to bring workers in these occupations up to the going rate. Other jobs might then be raised to maintain a fair rate structure within a plant.

Fringe benefits were also controlled, but not frozen. During the control era, our union was able to initiate some of the first paid vacation plans for industrial workers in America, and other so-called fringe benefits, by means of favorable War Labor Board decisions.

Various other types of wage increases could be negotiated under special circumstances, which I won't take the time to detail here today. All of them had to be approved by the Board, however. It's also important to note that any reduction in pay had to be approved by the Board before it could be put into effect, during the World War II control era.

At no time during that great national emergency did the United States Government attempt to take away by law the fundamental economic recourse of the American workers—the right to strike. However, under the leadership of Phil Murray, our Union and all other CIO unions voluntarily pledged not to strike for the duration of the war emergency. As an alternative, agreement was reached to refer disputes to the War Labor Board, or other appropriate tripartite government agencies for hearing and settlement. In return, the government pledged itself to give us a fair hearing and honorable decisions and further agreed to appoint bona fide labor representatives in all such agencies to participate in making the final decision.

The system of controls developed during World War II was not perfect, but it worked. Most union members fulfilled the no-strike pledge made by their organizations. Most of the time they were able to get a reasonable degree of economic justice from the Board and Agency decisions which were made, although sometimes it took many months.

Our Cooperative Wage Study program, for example—the greatest effort ever made to create fair wage structures throughout an American industry—was originally the result of a War Labor Board decision, handed down in 1944. In the absence of such Board action, we would have been required to strike the steel industry for a long time to force management to agree to the kind of wage rate structure involved in the CWS program, to say nothing of reaching agreement on its cost. Instead of a long and costly strike to accomplish this goal, we reached it through an order from the War Labor Board requiring the companies to join with us in this program.

In spite of government restrictions and red tape which existed during World War II, things were not all bad. The American labor movement increased its total membership from about 9-million members to 15-million members, or by two-thirds, during this period. This growth would never have been possible if workers had not come to believe they could best secure economic justice from government boards and agencies, by being members of organized labor. Following World War II, controls were removed, and America returned to a normal economy, generally free of government wage-price controls. Then came Korea.

During the Korean War we experienced a second period of wage-price controls which ran from January 1, 1951 to February, 1953. Once again, tripartite wage boards were created, at both nation-wide and regional levels, with representatives of both labor and business, as well as the public serving thereon.

The controls were very similar to those which existed during World War II, but they did differ in certain important respects. For example—during the Korean war period, the national Board decided very early in its existence to permit cost-of-living increases. Productivity increases were also permissible, where provided for in union contracts.

Under a cost of living criteria, an increase to bring wages up to 10% above the levels of a year prior to the institution of controls, (or January, 1950) were automatically allowed. Cost-of-living increases based on increases in the Consumer Price Index thereafter were also allowed automatically.

Where union contracts contained built-in "productivity-increase" provisions, these were allowed to operate. Similar increases, geared to productivity, on a newly negotiated basis were also permitted, in most cases.

Inequities between plants in an area, or in an industry, were dealt with on a case-by-case basis—as in World War II. Liberal fringe benefit improvements were also allowed. Our Union had won its first pension and insurance programs in basic steel shortly before the Korean War freeze began. Many of the first such plans in fabricating plants were installed with Board approval during the Korean War control period.

Near the end of the Korean War, Congress amended the Defense Production Act to provide for automatic approval of any wage increase needed to wipe out rates below $1.00 an hour. Again, it's hard to believe wages were so low just two decades ago—but they were!

A very important feature of wage controls during the Korean War, to steelworkers, was the so-called "tandem theory." Under this yardstick, any plant or company could obtain Board approval of a settlement with our Union if it followed the pattern of the 1952 basic steel settlement, and if it could be shown that past settlements in that company generally had followed the basic steel pattern. This approach enabled us to do during both wars exactly what the Nixon-Connally Council on Economic Policy now decrees we cannot do under the present wage freeze.

It is inconceivable to us that a similar tandem approach will not be the very least which is permitted during any "phase II" control program established by the Nixon administration. Anything less would perpetuate an extreme injustice to our affected membership.

Out of these experiences during the 1940's and 1950's we learned how to play our part as a major, responsible union in the decision-making machinery. Many technicians and leaders from the Steelworkers Union were members of the various boards involved. Through them we made a constructive contribution to working people, and to our country as a whole. We also gained much additional invaluable experience.

We learned that wage and price controls were not totally bad for unions or for union members, if they were administered fairly and impartially. In terms of economic justice, we learned how to get just about what we were strong enough to have taken by a strike if there had been no controls. We learned how to use our strength to help and assist our brothers and sisters in weaker unions. And we learned how to use our strength to help unorganized workers organize themselves and secure, through a trade union, some measure of economic justice. As a result of what we learned, we do not fear the principle of even-handed controls, as such.

It goes without saying, however, that any system of controls which may be instituted by government must permit Unions like ours to receive wage and fringe benefit improvements which have been negotiated in good faith prior to the freeze through the process of free collective bargaining. This is a must!

Now, I must point out three major differences between conditions which existed during World War II and the Korean War, on the one hand, and the condition we find ourselves in today. One is good, and two are in my opinion very bad. The "good news," as I see it, is that there is no need for rationing goods at this time. Some of the worst headaches for workers during World War II were the result of shortages of goods and the introduction of rationing—not from controlled prices and wages. We have no shortage of goods in our present situation and this is on the happy side.

But just as there is a surplus of goods now, there is also a surplus of workers, in relation to available jobs, and that's part of the bad news! Instead of a labor shortage such as we had in our wartime experiences, we now have a labor surplus, with widespread unemployment. Back in the forties and early fifties, companies were bidding against each other for labor, and as a result the companies often wanted and needed to raise their wage scale. They helped us persuade the boards to grant wage increases. I do not expect very much such help in this present situation. As a matter of fact, I expect the reverse, with companies refusing to join with us in joint requests for wage increase approval.

The third, and perhaps the worst, difference between the wartime controls and what we can look forward to now is not economic. It is political. American labor has never before faced wage-price controls under a government administration led by men with political and economic ideologies like Nixon, Agnew and Connally.

Even as far back as World War I, the economic controls were imposed by the Democratic Administration of Woodrow Wilson. He was the first President elected with labor support and labor votes since the election of Abraham Lincoln, and the last until Franklin Roosevelt. During World War II—labor's friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt, set up the War Labor Board machinery and appointed its members. During the Korean War another Democrat and good friend of the Steelworkers' Union, Harry Truman, was making the appointments and deciding the tough problems.

Now, unfortunately, we face a different type of man as President, representing the political party of big business. Richard M. Nixon operates from a very different political philosophy. Labor and other liberal forces won the elections of 1940 and 1948, but we did not win the election of 1968. Big business and the big banks won the 1968 election, and we lost it. As a result, our members who should be getting "tandem increases" right now, but are not, are paying part of the price for our political defeat at the polls in 1968.

Remembering the experience of World War II and the Korean War, the leaders of AFL–CIO unions were fearful of inflation when our government stepped up its participation in the Viet Nam War. They felt that history was about to repeat itself. Accordingly, in February, 1966, the AFL–CIO endorsed the principle of fair economic controls, provided they were based on genuine equality of sacrifice.

Congress, however, refused to recognize the need for such controls until four years later, in August of 1970. During that four year period, consumer prices shot up 20%, or one-fifth, just as we had feared they would. By the time Congress finally acted, prices were rising at the rate of 6½% every year.

By the time Congress got around to acting, we also had a new President—Mr. Nixon—who was determined to stop inflation by some means other than controls. His method of doing it—his game plan, if you please—was to deliberately put the brakes on the American economy, and in so-doing, throw people out of work. With a lot of people laid off, according to Mr. Nixon's

theory, they would be unable to buy goods at higher prices. Furthermore, those of us who were fortunate enough to still have jobs would hesitate to spend our money for fear we might be laid off next.

Under this mistaken theory, President Nixon theorized, businessmen would lower their prices, hoping to sell us goods, and this would stop the inflation! It's not a good theory, even if it had worked—but in fact, it did not work. When their sales fell off, many businessmen raised their prices instead of cutting them.

Inflation continued for another full year before the August 15th wage freeze finally came. By this time prices were 26½% above February, 1966, or more than one-fourth higher. The President, by his policies, had succeeded in throwing an additional 600,000 workers into the ranks of the unemployed, during the 12 months preceding the freeze. There were now two million more unemployed people than there had been in 1969 when he took office. Massive unemployment had been achieved, but prices were still shooting up. At long-last, by instituting the freeze, Mr. Nixon finally admitted, in effect, that his theory was wrong, and that two million of our brothers and sisters were out of work because of a mistaken, zaney economic policy.

Certainly there is no satisfaction for labor in being able to say "I told you so." We do have a right to expect, however, that since what we said five years ago has been proven right, and the President's theory wrong, at least he will begin to listen to us! Whether he will or not remains to be seen—but based on past performance, don't count too heavily on it.

If controls are instituted and President Nixon patterns them after labor's proposals, we will return to the kind of controls that were established in the 1940's and 1950's. Representatives of labor, management, and the public will be appointed to serve on the appropriate boards created to approve increases in either prices or wages.

Tandem wage increases will of course be approved, and other wage increases will be judged by their comparability with increases in the cost of living and increases in productivity. Price increases will be permitted where justified by increased costs, but price gouging, such as we have seen in many industries during the last few years, will be prohibited.

So long as wages are controlled, we believe all forms of income should be controlled, including the fees of doctors and lawyers, dividends on stock, interest rates, the price of land—and so forth. Certainly some form of excess profits tax can and must be enacted to control runaway profits, if they develop.

Well—as I have indicated repeatedly, we may or we may not get the right kind of economic controls from the Nixon-Connally team. Their political backgrounds and economic philosophies give us scant comfort. Connally, you know, is the man who refused to meet with a group of poor Texas farm workers who had walked 450 miles in the summer sun to ask him for a $1.25 an hour state minimum wage. Appointing a man like this to watch over our economic destiny is like setting a fox to guard the chickens!

We may well have to go to Congress to get the right kind of controls written into new laws. This also will take some doing! If this is the route we must travel, we are counting on our local union leaders and Staff to help your International Officers carry our message to each and every member of the Congress.

As I see it, no one can now predict how long our economy will be under some form of economic controls. It may be for a short time, or it may be for the rest of our lives. In the foreseeable future, however, it is clear that we will have to bargain with politicians at least as much as we bargain with the employers—and perhaps more. We will be bargaining over such basic issues as the standard of living for our members.

Just as we could never successfully bargain with the steel companies if we were not united as a Union, we will be unable to successfully bargain with the politicians if we are not united politically. Part of our jobs as labor leaders, from this day forward, is to make it clear to each member that his wages and the price he pays for goods will depend largely on the type of men he elects to Congress and the Presidency. This has always been true, to a substantial degree, but more so than ever now.

Wringing our hands and lamenting over the past is rather futile—but let me say this to you in closing! If working people had not foolishingly split their votes for the Presidency in 1968, we would not have lost the election. Hubert Humphrey—not Richard Nixon—would be in the White House calling the shots. And what a blessed relief that would be. Our country would not be in the economic mess it's in and the people of America would have a compassionate friend in the White House to whom they could turn with their problems. We cannot relive the election of 1968—but we sure as hell can get ready for election day 1972!

Let us therefore resolve to unite, through our Union, in the months ahead to secure economic justice on the political front as we have obtained it on the economic front. And let us firmly resolve to work together, fight together and build together politically between now and election day, 1972, to the end that the political catastrophe of 1968 shall be undone.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a bill designed to protect the public health and safety in the District of Columbia by amending the narcotic, depressant, stimulant and hallucinogenic drug laws in the District.

During the 91st Congress the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported out a bill that provided for a sweeping reform of the Federal drug control laws. That particular bill passed the Congress and became Public Law 91–513, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I supported that measure in the House.

After the passage of the aforementioned Drug Abuse Act of 1970, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws on August 7, 1970, using title II of the Federal Drug Abuse Act as a guide, approved the Uniform Controlled Substances Act and recommended its enactment in all the States.

The bill I introduced today is modeled after the Uniform Controlled Substances Act with some appropriate modificatcns for particular situations as they are believed to exist in the District of Columbia. However, the penalties for violations are consistent with those in the Federal laws, and administrative procedures interrelate with their Federal counterparts. I might indicate, however, that there may be some amendments to this bill as introduced that I may wish to make when the measure is taken up in the House District Committee, amendments which I believe may improve on the bill as introduced today. Whatever amendments I may wish to make will be based on the experience which we have had with the Federal Drug Abuse Act to date.

The District of Columbia is certainly no less deserving of legislative reform in the drug control area than the States. In fact, if drug abuse in this city is to be further curtailed, there may be a greater need for such a law in the Federal City so that the local statute may be administered in close cooperation with the Federal enactment.

I believe generally that this bill which is similar to that already enacted in 26 other jurisdictions will place the District of Columbia among those who are in the vanguard against drug abuse in this country. I welcome the cooperation of Congressmen O'KONSKI, HARSHA, BROYHILL, LANDGREBE, and SMITH with respect to this measure and urge prompt action by the House to insure its early enactment.

WORLD ENVIRONMENTAL QUINQUENNIUM

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce along with the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, Mr. WINN, a resolution which would call for a World Environmental Quinquennium.

The pollution of our environment is no longer merely a domestic problem but, one which has expanded into international dimensions. Pollution honors no national boundaries; no one nation is free of its menace. It has become a problem which affects all nations—small, big, agrarian, or highly industrial.

The growing concern over the Baltic Sea area is only one example of how widespread and serious this problem is. Again, the continued operation of British and Russian SST's, despite our veto of a similar plane because of environmental questions, highlights the need for international understanding and cooperation.

On the local level, controls on environmental pollution require efficient manufacturing and a conscientious effort to eliminate waste at the source; but that is not enough. The effect of environmental contaminants are related to time as well as concentration or intensity. Time factors become increasingly important when low concentrations of contaminants do not produce ill affects until months or years of exposure. This is why we must act now for time is our biggest enemy.

Mr. Speaker, we have proven here in the United States that given the time and money we can reduce pollution and restore the quality of our environment. However, unless the rest of the world

follows suit, our efforts will be wasted because our world is too small and pollution so enormous that no country will escape its lasting effects.

This is why I stress the passage of this resolution which would instruct our U.S. delegate at the Stockholm Conference to call for a world-wide movement to combat pollution. The problem of environmental pollution, resource management, and environmental quality are issues of major international concern.

This resolution would call for greatly expanded environmental research to meet the diverse needs of all nations of the world for the collection, assessment, and dissemination of technical information and scientific knowledge for use by each nation and by international organizations dealing with environmental problems.

It would be the policy of the United States that the years 1973 through 1978 should be designated by all nations of the world as the World Environmental Quinquennium.

In conclusion, I respectfully urge immediate consideration of this proposal, the problem is that great and the need for action that strong.

A NEW ERA OF PROSPERITY

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I support the President's efforts for fashioning a new era of economic prosperity. His timely actions have already caused wholesale food prices to go down and increased employment. Such boosts to our economy have been desperately needed for a long time, and I commend Mr. Nixon for his bold and fortright initiatives.

However, when the 90-day freeze order expires, it is my hope that the maintenance of prices, rents, wages, and salaries are permitted at levels contracted for prior to August 15, 1971.

Since contracts are at the heart of our legal tradition, I am convinced the sanctity of these contracts must be honored. The individuals who entered into these contracts felt they would be preserved, and I do not believe these people—such as the laborers and teachers—should be disappointed any longer.

President Nixon made inoperative the terms of such contracts when he announced the 90-day freeze. Legislation I am today introducing does not violate the conditions of the freeze, and does not impose any restrictions on future wage and price controls the administration may deem necessary. My bill merely preserves the sanctity of contracts entered into prior to the initial freeze.

The text of my bill is as follows:

H.R. —

A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to permit the maintenance of prices, rents, wages, and salaries at levels contracted for prior to August 15, 1971

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 202 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Effective November 14, 1971, the authority conferred on the President shall not be exercised to limit the level of any price, wage, rent, or salary (including any fringe benefit offered in connection with an employment contract) to a level below that which has been agreed to in a contract which (1) relates to such price, wage, rent, or salary, as the case may be, and (2) has been executed prior to August 15, 1971."

SCHOOL PRAYERS

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 5, 1971, an editorial appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal favoring House Joint Resolution 191, an amendment to permit nondenominational prayer in public schools and buildings. I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues.

THE BATTLE OVER PRAYER IN SCHOOLS IS HEALTHY

Nine years after the Supreme Court banned official prayers in public schools the controversy ignited by the decision continues.

We find the clash of attitudes and beliefs neither surprising nor unhealthy. For if the court was right, as we believed it to be, in proscribing official prayer, it was wrong in leading citizens to believe that its ban was limited or likely would be limited to that narrow point.

Many churchmen were among those who emphasized that the decision did not prohibit voluntary prayers or recitations. This assurance, of course, overlooked the obvious fact that constitutional decisions generally begin as springs that turn into rivulets and then into rivers.

As one trenchant observer wrote at the time: "My personal regret arises because . . . extremists will not be content with what the court has done but will seek to go much further in outlawing religious observances fn the schools."

This has proved to be the case.

In Netcong, N.J., last year a school principal stood before pupils in the gymnasium, and recited a brief, non-denominational prayer that had been presented previously before the United States Senate. The recitation occurred before school was open and students were advised they were not required to attend.

The New Jersey Supreme Court held it unconstitutional and the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review the case.

So much for the "narrow decision" of 1962.

The heat is now on Congress to approve a constitutional amendment purporting to restore the right to voluntary prayers in the schools. The road to approval is as difficult as the effect of approval would be uncertain.

The language of amendments that seem so clear on the surface often gives rise to complications as bad as the ills they were designed to remedy.

But insofar as the amendment would permit—not require—religious observance in the schools, we support its aims because we believe it was the intent of the Founding Fathers to avoid promotion of a state church rather than to purge public institutions of religious recognition.

Moreover, it strikes us as healthy for citizens to react to government, including the Supreme Court, when it assumes to alleviate every ailment, however minor, that afflicts the body politic.

An opponent of the amendment, Rep. Fred Schwengel of Iowa, rose on the House floor Sept. 14 to say that he did not want to take the risk of authorizing any government role in regulating the religious life of its people.

His point might better have been addressed to the Supreme Court before it accepted the ban on voluntary prayer in New Jersey.

WHAT IS A NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER?

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, in a column appearing in the Baltimore News American on October 9, John Roche takes a very perceptive look at the issue of prayer in public schools. Aside from the constitutional questions this issue has raised, Mr. Roche sees some very practical reasons why a constitutional amendment to allow nondenominational prayer in public buildings is not a good idea. For instance, he points out the questionable value of "mechanized piety" and the difficulty of determining an acceptable nondenominational prayer.

I urge my colleagues to read the column which follows:

NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYERS

(By John P. Roche)

There is something profoundly distasteful, even sacrilegious about organized, mechanized piety. Thus I have always reacted negatively to prayers in the public schools (along with such secular liturgies as the pledge of allegiance to the flag).

I recall, 35 or 40 years ago, starting every school day with the singing of "America," the pledge of allegiance, and a prayer. We went through it like robots (I thought for years it was "one nation, invisible, withlibertynjustusfrall") except that around 1936 the accompanying Nazi-like salute was eliminated. Instead of putting one's arm out, palm out, towards the flag in the corner, you put it out, palm in, and then brought it back to rest roughly on your heart.

The content of the prayers is a total blank, though one can guess that the Almighty was regularly invoked in a supportive, disciplinary role. At any rate, we marched in, went through the drill, marched out. Somewhere along the way a critic popped up briefly and called for an end to the flag salute, but my vague recollection is that my father and his friends of the Veterans of Foreign wars put a speedy stop to that caper. I can't recall anybody protesting against the prayer, probably because the Jewish kids didn't listen either.

The result is that I have never, over the years, been able to work up much ideological steam on either the pledge or the prayer.

The notion that eliminating prayers from schools will breed Godlessness strikes me as preposterous (I have always believed that Sunday schools are truly the devil's workshops.)

On the other hand, school prayers have never impressed me as a bulldozer that was

leveling the wall of separation between church and state. Historically that simply won't wash: note the prayer that opens each congressional day and has since 1790.

However, I was pleased on other grounds when the Supreme Court knocked out school prayers; you might say I found it esthetically cheering. I am deeply moved by the liturgical beauty of a Latin High Mass, and have sat transfixed with grief at a conservative Jewish funeral service as a magnificent cantor poured 5,000 years of suffering into the Kaddish, the prayer for the dead. I am appalled at the thought of millions of little Americans converting religious beauty into a babble of mumbo-jumbo, into a kind of bureaucratic petition.

Moreover, it is an invasion of privacy. Without getting involved in the immensely complex theological question of the efficacy of prayer, we have it on very high authority that when Christ was asked by the Pharisees "when the Kingdom of God should come. He answered them and said, the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . the Kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17, 20–21).

Congress has before it a constitutional amendment designed to legalize something called "nondenominational prayer" in public buildings, e.g., schools. It is, in effect, an attempt to overturn the various court decisions on the subject.

The proposal is simply insane. What is a "nondenominational prayer?" One addressed "to whom it may concern?" Who will formulate such a monstrosity? An expert committee composed of a Muslim, a Jew, a Catholic, a Jehovah's Witness, 15 assorted Protestants, and a Zen Buddhist? All one can hope is that Congress will quietly give this scheme a "non-denominational" funeral and get back to serious business.

CHARLOTTE T. REID

HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 13, 1971

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the distinguished minority whip has made it possible for Members to say a few words about Charlotte Reid. She is a charming and gracious lady and as she leaves Congress voluntarily, she will take with her the respect, esteem, and good wishes of all who have had the privilege of serving with her during her distinguished career as a Member of this body.

Those of us who have served with her on the Committee on Appropriations have had a better opportunity than others to observe her outstanding qualities and to understand and appreciate the excellent service she has rendered the Nation in her dedicated work on the committee.

As one who has considered it a privilege to be associated with her in the Committee on Appropriations and as a colleague in the House of Representatives, I take advantage of this occasion to thank her for her friendship and to extend to her my personal regards and best wishes for a successful and satisfying experience as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. Congress is giving up a valued and outstanding Member but the country will continue to benefit from her great talents as a Commissioner. So our loss is the Commission's gain.

CONGRESS AND VIETNAM

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we plan to consider a motion to instruct the House conferees on the military procurement bill to accept the so-called Mansfield amendment, many of my constituents have expressed renewed interest in my testimony before the Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee on June 23, 1971; and I set it forth in full at this time in the hope that it might be of interest to some of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD W. ROBISON OF NEW YORK

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Subcommittee, your action in holding public hearings this week on the question of United States involvement in Vietnam is most welcome, and I am exceedingly grateful for this opportunity.

I have served in the Congress for fourteen years, now. All of us, I am sure, take great pride in such service. It is a rare privilege we share: To be members of what is one of the greatest—if not the greatest—legislative bodies in the world. During my years here, I have sought to uphold that tradition; perhaps I have not done so with distinction, but my every word and action has been dictated with that thought in mind.

Thus, it is with a troubled heart that I confess my keen sense of disappointment—approaching now a sense of shame—that this great Congress has been unable, since our action so many light-years ago now on the ill-fated "Tonkin Gulf Resolution," to express ourselves in *any* positive fashion on one of the most-important issues of our times: The war in Vietnam.

This fact does not guarantee that we will leave Southeast Asia a united country; as a matter of fact, the odds are still weighted against that. But it does mean that we may leave Southeast Asia still talking with one another—and this is no mean achievement. And, again, insofar as the present Administration has made this possible, it deserves our thanks and appreciation.

But doubts remain. Since agreeing on the shape of the negotiating table, the negotiators at Paris have agreed on nothing save the time periods in which to accuse the other side of bad faith and duplicity. The North Vietnamese have appeared intransigent; but our negotiating stance has hardly been "squishy-soft" either. In Vietnam itself, troops continue to come home, for which we are grateful, but no final withdrawal date has yet been announced, and rumors of a large "residual force" float around Washington with regularity. Meanwhile, the bombing continues—with reports indicating that 700 tons of bombs were dropped on infiltration routes below the demilitarized zone during last week alone—and American support of such as Thai mercenaries is apparently increased. Elections are soon forthcoming in the South, and we have pledged total neutrality, but President Thieu appears to be very much in the driver's seat. Coherent opposition to him has failed to develop—and that is not our fault, of course—but, then again, one well-known political opponent of his sits in jail, and a new election law seems to damage any chance Vice-President Ky might have to qualify for the general election.

These doubts are reflected in the mail I receive every week from my District; and I am sure that I am not unique in this respect. I am sure that this Subcommittee agrees that our major consideration should be how to resolve these public doubts. This is no time for aggrieved swipes at the present Administration—our overinvolvement in Southeast Asia has been very much a bipartisan affair. It may have occurred under a Democratic Administration but it had widespread Republican support. In the same vein, some of the strongest proponents of the present Administration's strategy in winding down the war have been Democrats.

No, flaying out against someone or some political party is not at all needed. What is needed is good sound Congressional advice to the President. There is no governmental body more sensitive to the people than the House of Representatives—we are on the firing line every two years and that fact teaches us to listen to the people. They are telling us now that they want our policy defined; they want to see our goals from this point forward set forth in clear and unequivocal language; and they want us to expedite our withdrawal as much as possible.

I know the Constitution is, at best, fuzzy in defining our responsibilities in the field of foreign affairs. We cannot here settle that long-standing debate. Nevertheless, nearly every Constitutional scholar has claimed that what was intended by the framers of that document—and that what has evolved over the years—is a *sharing of responsibility*.

It is time—way past time—we accepted our sharing of that responsibility; not by invading the clear prerogatives of the President as Commander-in-Chief; and not by attempting to dictate to him—through, in this instance, mandated withdrawal deadlines or whatever—in such a way as to tie the hand of the only person who, under present circumstances, can negotiate for us as satisfactorily as possible a conclusion of this war; but rather, instead, by searching among ourselves for a *consensus*—difficult and painstaking task though that might be—as to what our national policy with respect to Vietnam, and former Indochina, ought to be in the months and years immediately ahead.

Perhaps such a consensus would have been impossible two or three years ago. At that time, there were many who still believed that with a few more bombs, a few more troops, and a few more billions of dollars, we could score a "victory"—a victory made, produced, and directed in the United States. There are few such visions today; either in Congress or in the Administration. What we *all* seek now is the most responsible way to end our involvement in this war. What the Administration apparently seeks is the continuation of a strong non-communist South Vietnamese government, and the withdrawal of all, or almost all of our troops. What the more outspoken Congressional critics of the war apparently seek is the end of our support for what they term an inherently unrepresentative government, and the immediate withdrawal of all our troops. What many "moderate" Congressional leaders seek is a ceasefire, an atmosphere conducive to serious negotiating efforts in Paris, an exchange of POWs, *and* the withdrawal of all our troops.

Lest we forget, this is a far narrower range of options than that which existed three short years ago. Then, as you will recall, the choice of options still included a heavy expansion of our ground troop commitment. Some still talked of a million-man American army in Vietnam. Some still talked of mining Haiphong harbor and carrying out a land invasion of the North. Some still whispered about introducing tactical nuclear weapons. We do not continue to consider such options now; and it is very much to the credit of this Administration that—no matter what differences remain among the American people—the range of divergent viewpoints has thus narrowed so considerably.

Some months ago, I introduced a Joint Resolution, H.J. Res. 462, which calls for United States troop withdrawals from Indochina to be continued, on an irreversible basis, until *all* United States armed forces

were withdrawn from Indochina. The resolution also states that it is the "sense of Congress" that all United States servicemen in Indochina be withdrawn from ground combat activities on or before June 1, 1971, and that all troops should be withdrawn as soon after that date as practicable.

This resolution, although differently phrased, is similar to the one I introduced last year, H. Con. Res. 756. The purpose of both efforts was to encourage an "end-the-war" consensus in the Congress. Obviously the passage of time since the introduction of H.J. Res. 462 requires that its present wording be re-worked; and there are several other resolutions pending before your Subcommittee which present other interesting possibilities. The exact wording of the resolution is not paramount, nor is it at all important who receives credit for initiating the successful effort. What *is* important is that this Subcommittee, and subseqeuntly the full Committee on Foreign Affairs, carefully weigh all the proposals before it, and then report to the House a resolution which would codify that policy which a majority of the Congress feel should be followed by the current Administration.

I would like to outline the elements which might well be present in any such effort, and will leave the exact wording to the experts who sit on this Subcommittee. What should we say to this Administration that would be helpful and purposeful, both to it and to the American pepole?

Well, first, I think we should re-affirm that our withdrawal program is an irreversible one. No matter what happens in South Vietnam, I do not believe the American people will again support any increase in American ground troop support for the South Vietnamese government. A reversal of Administration policy in this respect is unacceptable, and Congress should say so.

Second, we should define as the end goal of our present policy the *total* withdrawal of American troops. There are strong arguments that can be advanced for various levels of logistical support after we withdraw—and perhaps it is best if these questions are left unanswered in the present effort, since consensus would be terribly difficult to find on such an issue. But I think we *can* find consensus around the proposition that a large residual force—of say, 50,000 troops—is unacceptable. The situation in Vietnam is not amenable to a Korea-type solution, for a number of reasons that I will go into if you wish.

There is also considerable controversy about whether we should provide air support for the South Vietnamese troops after our withdrawal—perhaps from bases in Thailand. Personally, I feel that some such support may be in order; although I would like to see an end to the saturation bombing raids we continue to conduct. Widespread bombing is of only marginal value in cutting the enemy's supplies; and in the process, hundreds of thousands of civilians have been killed, injured, or uprooted from their homes. Close support missions, however, might still be required by the South Vietnamese government for at least the next two or three years. However, it might also be well if this consideration was left for another day, if no consensus is possible. What we should instead concentrate on now are those elements upon which we *can* agree.

Third, we should make it clear that our withdrawal is not dependent upon the continued success of the Thieu-Ky regime. Our troops are surely not positioned in South Vietnam for President Thieu's convenience; and their presence should not be prolonged merely to assist him in either his re-election or the administration of his nation's government.

Fourth, during these last stages of our withdrawal, we must leave the President some negotiating room and encourage him to use it. At the very least, a cease-fire and an agreement for the release of prisoners-of-war should be negotiated. I made this same point last week when I offered an amendment to the Nedzi-Whalen amendment to the Military Procurement Bill, which would have conditioned an April 20, 1972, withdrawal date on the establishment of both a cease-fire and a release of prisoners before that date.

Some have criticized such an approach by charging that it only "muddies-the-water" and leaves the President so much discretion that the Congressional action becomes relatively meaningless. But they ignore the fact that our mere withdrawal—without any negotiated agreement on anything—would do precious little to set the forces in motion for an end to the bloodshed and strife. If other long-time critics of the war do not understand this, former Senator Eugene McCarthy does; for he has noted that our mere unilateral withdrawal would invite chaos in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. It was his point, as well, that Congressional action mandating a date certain for withdrawal without any conditions whatsoever would be an abdication of our responsibility for the combined military, political and economic problems we have helped to create in Southeast Asia.

So *negotiate we must.* But we must also do so quickly, since it is also the case—unfortunately enough—that our bargaining power dwindles away with each passing month, as our troops continue to come out. It is time, in other words, for the President to do some serious negotiating with Hanoi, and it is our responsibility here in Congress to help guide the President in that direction. Setting a date certain for United States withdrawal, with certain conditions to be negotiated, is probably the way to move things off dead center, and I would hope that any resolution would convey that rather clearly to the President.

I know it takes two to negotiate, even as it "takes two to tango"—yet, in either exercise, one participant has to *lead.* And if, up to now, the President has been reluctant to so lead by virtue of his uncertainty over the Congressional, and public, reaction to any such forward movement on his part, it seems to me that this Subcommittee has an excellent chance to reassure him.

One final point. We have no time to spare in taking some sort of action. The hour is already late for a Congressional statement on the longest war in our Nation's history. It is, in my opinion, imperative that we take action as soon as possible for at least two reasons. First, I have the impression that the Administration has an open mind on some of the policies I have referred to here today, and that officials in the Administration might welcome a cogent statement of Congressional sentiment. Second, the American people will be relieved if we can clearly establish our policy in Southeast Asia before the onset of the next Presidential election. I say this because I think we all recognize that it is not in our Nation's best interests that there be another acrimonious, partisan exchange between Presidential candidates about the war in Indochina. We *ought* to settle our national policy *now.* The level of dialogue about Southeast Asia in the final months of the 1968 campaign was, as you will recall, uninspiring—to say the least. The war has been too costly, both in terms of human lives and in domestic unity, for anyone to take advantage of the sad situation for parochial political advantage—I refer to Republicans, Democrats, and third parties as well. If we wait until 1972 to hammer out the final, tough decisions relating to our withdrawal, we invite further disunity.

Therefore, I wish this Subcommittee well in its work. It has an important and urgent task; but if you report a cogent, sensible resolution to the House, you will have performed a significant service to the American people.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 5, I placed in the RECORD a letter from a Canadian citizen who formerly lived in my congressional district. He is concerned about the international impact of the President's new economic policy, especially its impact on United States-Canadian relations.

On Thursday, October 7, the Christian Science Monitor featured a story on the same subject. Bruce Hutchison, Canada special correspondent of the CSM, writes that: "A note of desperation has emerged in the debate agitating the United States largest customer, Canada."

The Washington Sunday Star on October 10 published an interpretive article by Robert L. Miller on the same subject.

Clearly our neighbors to the North are concerned by our recent economic moves. We must not ignore their concerns.

The two stories follow:

[The Christian Science Monitor, Oct. 7, 1971]

A NOTE OF DESPERATION

(By Bruce Hutchison)

A note of desperation has emerged in the debate agitating the United States largest customer, Canada.

The nonpartisan Canadian Press, serving all newspapers with strictly factual news, reports from Ottawa that "Canada and the United States appear to be heading toward a political collision of crisis proportions. Unless somebody swerves or steps on the brakes soon the crash would drastically transform Canada as nothing has since the North American War of 1812."

If the United States does not relent, the national news service says, "the Canadian Government soon will have the choice either of bowing to U.S. wishes or of fighting back."

Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau has used no such alarming language. He has said only that he does not think the United States "is deliberately trying to beggar its neighbors," but if it is, then "We'll have to have a fundamental reassessment of our whole economy."

Providing the latest twist to the debate over the effect of U.S. economic policies is Ottawa's sudden cancellation of discussions with Washington on the joint use of North America's energy resources.

Mr. Trudeau has assured Parliament that this move should not be construed as retaliation against the American tariff surcharge. The government, Mr. Trudeau said, was busy with important economic problems and "unable to find the time" for the energy talks scheduled to open this autumn.

But his statement was received skeptically by the opposition. Conservative Party Leader Robert Stanfield said he found it hard to interpret the government's policy as anything but retaliation.

The times called for continued dialogue between the neighboring countries rather than a break in their conversations, Mr. Stanfield added.

Outside Parliament, External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp insisted that "we just haven't got time" for the energy negotiations. "Everybody's all tired out." The United States Government, he said, had not indicated that it regarded Canada's decision as retaliatory.

These cryptic parliamentary exchanges left the Canadian people confused and concerned.

From coast to coast they are asking what the government really intends to do if, as it has told, the American surcharge threatens a body blow at the national economy.

PROTECTIONISM WORRY

While saying publicly that it has "contingency plans," the government privately is haunted by the old specter of an increasingly protectionist United States which now buys almost 70 percent of Canada's huge exports.

This fear persists despite President Nixon's repeated assurances that his government favors the expansion of world trade once its immediate balance-of-payments problem is solved.

Meanwhile, though the energy talks are postponed indefinitely, Ottawa and Washington continue to discuss their controversial free-trade deal in automotive products.

The United States is seeking modification of those clauses that safeguard Canadian producers and Ottawa has not refused to consider Washington's demands.

Mr. Trudeau told Parliament, however, that revision of the existing arrangements was not a condition to the removal of the American surcharge. The two issues, he said, were not linked in his government's mind.

He also denied press reports that the Cabinet was split on the question of revising the automobile pact.

[From the Sunday Star, Oct. 10, 1971]

FRIENDSHIP FADING: UNITED STATES-CANADA GULF WIDENS

(By Robert L. Miller)

TORONTO.—Canadian-U.S. relations are deteriorating at an accelerating pace, a breathtaking descent on a roller-coaster that already may be out of control.

As suspicion yields to distrust and in some cases is replaced by naked contempt at the inter-government level, it becomes apparent that a real tragedy looms.

The politics of confrontation, being practiced with great vigor both in Ottawa and Washington, has led the two countries into a collision along so broad a front that the damage to bilateral friendship may prove irreparable.

"Things can't get much worse," mutters a Canadian official in Washington, who even as he speaks is on his way to deliver another Ottawa-ordered snub to Uncle Sam: A sarcastic declaration that the U.S.-Canadian energy talks must be suspended indefinitely, because the Canadian negotiators are all "too busy" wrestling with the problems posed by President Nixon's 10-percent surcharge.

INTENSE DISLIKE

Canadian newspapers report without comment that in the Washington corridors outside the International Monetary Fund meeting one of the choice topics of gossip was Nixon's "intense personal dislike" of Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau.

In Ottawa, the president himself is the subject of scores of jokes that, although they may lack the polished delivery of U.S. comedians who say much the same thing on American television, are savage and often quite unfair.

Gov. George Wallace of Alabama tells a New York audience that Trudeau is a "crypto-Communist" whose background is even worse than Castro's, and instead of laughing this off, Canadians become infuriated.

But insults are not the cause of the deterioration of relations; they are the result of it. The two governments are reaping the harvest of bitterness they have sown themselves.

LIST OF DISAGREEMENTS

The list of disagreements is depressingly long.

On the Canadian side there is the harboring of U.S. draft-dodgers and deserters; there is Ottawa's peremptory extension of its offshore sovereignty claims; there is the studied rejection of such U.S. policy cornerstones as NATO and the Organization of American States; there is the holier-than-thou, our-hands-are-clean attitude toward Indochina.

On the U.S. side, there is economic imperialism practiced by multinational corporations which threaten to bleed Canada white; there is a history of taking Canada for granted (an Ohio schoolteacher recently assigned an essay on Canada as part of a series her pupils were doing on "state of the union"); there is a tradition of deafness to protest (the nuclear test still scheduled for Amchitka is a classic instance); and, of course, there is the surcharge.

ONE BRIEF MEETING

What is most disturbing about this litany of international squabbling is that the leaders of neither country seem prepared to do anything about it.

Since 1968, when Trudeau and Nixon won their national elections, they have held one brief meeting and the chief question of interest at that one, both in Ottawa and Washington, was whether Trudeau would slide down a White House bannister or do a headstand at the state dinner Nixon tendered.

Nixon has agreed to visit Ottawa next spring, but it is doubtful that a presidential visit could be brought off under the present circumstances. Furthermore, there is little to suggest that matters will improve during the winter.

For his part, Trudeau has shrugged off all suggestions that he deal directly with Nixon in an effort to iron out some of the most pressing points at issue—notably, the trade problem.

Certainly, the current hostility in North America is unmatched almost since the days of the War of 1812—some 55 years before Canada became a country.

Fortunately, countries today rarely settle squabbles as they once did. Now, they talk instead of shoot. The trouble with talking, however, is that somebody has to listen before it can do any good.

CORNELIUS J. HAGGERTY

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, one of America's great labor leaders has passed from the scene. Cornelius J. Haggerty, a prominent trade unionist and president of the Building and Construction Trades Department of the AFL–CIO for 11 years, died last Sunday. C. J. Haggerty was well known in both labor and Government circles as an innovator and tireless advocate of the rights of the workingman; he epitomized the American ideal of hard work and determination.

Beginning his career as a lather's apprentice, he became a journeyman in 2 years and in a mere 6 months was president of the local. His accomplishments encompass the entire breadth of American labor history and it is with deep personal sadness and a sense of loss that I mark his death. The life of C. J. Haggerty is exemplary of American principles of fairness and equity of which the American labor movement can always be proud. Mrs. O'Neill and the entire O'Neill family join with me in mourning the death of the late C. J. Haggerty.

THE ROLE OF SWEDEN

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the role of Sweden in international affairs over the years has been a puzzle to many of us.

The role has been described as one of neutrality. But I believe it is fair to say that it raises the question: What is it neutral about?

Victor Riesel, the columnist, has taken an interesting look at Sweden and its relationships. I include his text with my remarks:

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Courier-Express, Oct. 5, 1971]

SWEDEN POURS MILLIONS OF U.S. DOLLARS INTO HANOI

WASHINGTON.—In a quiet restaurant just about a year ago, some of Sweden's most powerful parliamentary leaders pledged to several Americans that U.S. war prisoners would soon be freed by Hanoi.

The Swedish delegation asked only that the Americans be patient, and understanding, and refrain from urging a boycott of competitive Swedish products. Just "give our contacts a chance to work things out in Hanoi," the Swedish officials said. And they added, "Your countrymen will be free."

The Americans promised patience. And they kept their pledge. The Swedish leaders did not, or could not, keep theirs.

And on the streets of this up-tight capital, on the walks near the White House, on the Capital grounds a few days ago, grim women, sorrowing women, prayerful women chanted a litany of prayers for their men, sons, husbands, brothers, now known as PWs (Prisoners of War) and MIAs (Missing in Action).

As the PWs stultified in their cells, the industrialists of Sweden prospered. For there was no boycott. American longshoremen union chiefs unloaded Swedish exports. Dockwallopers chief Ted Gleason treated Swedish cargo as any other. Johnny Bowers, the Longshoremen's executive vice president, spent time, energy, devotion and heart, healing the women on whose own hearts are branded the letters PW and MIA.

Not the least of Swedish exports to the U.S. during this year of waterfront peace is the auto known as Volvo. The Swedish corporation sells more Volvos—though criticized technically here—in the U.S. than in its home country.

During the year's first eight months 37,579 Volvos were bought by Americans in the continental U.S. Specialists project the final 1971 sales figures at over 52,000. And by President Nixon's own rule of thumb, this will cost Americans at least 13,000 jobs. The President has said that the additional sale of every 100,000 new American cars would create 25,000 jobs desperately needed now that some auto facilities are being shut.

AID TO HANOI AND CUBA

There is no estimate available now of the net profit to Volvo Inc., or the tax peel-off to the Stockholm government. No doubt it is in the millions.

And the record will show that the Swedish International Development Authority already has given just Hanoi and Cuba alone almost $20 million. And has allocated another $15.5 million to North Vietnam and $3.5 million to Cuba in the next fiscal year. And there are other such heavy installments coming.

The enmity of Hanoi toward America is etched in blood. Some semantics may be possible in the definition of Cuba. But Fidel Castro isn't exactly a blood brother of our land.

There's no subtlety about Swedish policy. Its government wants its corporations to sell as much as possible in tolerant America, while it deals with nations seeking to destroy Americans physically and philosophically. Philanthropy now means profits later. After aid comes trade. Thus last May, Swedish trade delegations played ping-pong with Fidel Castro himself. It was a public exhibition.

Only the Americans failed to notice.

And when Marxist President Allende of Chile ordered the seizure of the Ford assembly plant there, he urged the Volvo corporation to come in and operate it.

As for mainland China, the Swedish industrialists have been dealing with Peking for years. There is much more, ideologically as well as financially. So much so that even the New York Times, which has denounced American longshoremen as "loutish," commented recently that "apparently the risks of offending Washington and Moscow are weighed on different scales in Stockholm."

The point being Swedish neutrality—when it comes to the U.S., Sweden's government is more neutral than ever; when it comes to the Marxist world, Sweden's neutrality is so much less neutral than it is against the U.S.

Thus at a time when American unemployment has hit our auto, aerospace and steel industries, America is buying the merchandise which helps kill more jobs, by the thousands, and which puts dollars in the hands of the military enemy, by the millions.

Competition from abroad is tough enough. The Japanese are selling some 600,000 cars annually in the U.S.—costing us about 150,000 jobs by President Nixon's measure. At least the Japanese are America's allies. Japan has been a powerful American military base.

NADER'S SLAPDASH REPORT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Ralph Nader has struck again with his usual measure of half-truth and distortion in his attack on water development in California. I know my House colleagues will find the following editorial by Henry J. Mills, general manager of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, of interest and wish to share his thoughts in the August issue of Aqueduct News with my House colleagues at this point:

NADER'S SLAPDASH REPORT

(By Henry J. Mills)

The recent report by Ralph Nader on water development in California was a great disappointment. I think my feelings are best stated by repeating here what I told the press at the time the report was released. . . .

Nader's people who prepared this report have no understanding or appreciation of what water development has meant to Southern California.

The fact is that this semi-arid region with a population now of more than ten million people could not survive without the water that has been brought from the Owens River and the Colorado River over the years. Moreover, it must have water from Northern California to make up for the inevitable loss to Arizona of half its current supply of Colorado River water as well as to meet the needs of a still growing population.

Unfortunately, the Nader report can only be termed a highly irresponsible and slapdash compilation of inaccuracies, untruths, malicious rumors, unsupported charges, distortions and headline-hunting generalizations.

In other investigations he has conducted, Mr. Nader has made significant contributions to the welfare of the American people. However, this report on water in California was done in haste and with blinding prejudice. It is a great disservice to the people of Southern California.

AMTRAK—NO

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, according to reports Congress will soon be hit with a request for an additional $160 million or more to finance operations of Amtrak, the Government-backed effort to preserve rail passenger service between "key" cities.

You will recall that the Congress originally gave Amtrak $40 million directly, and made a provision for an additional $100 million in Government loans.

At the beginning the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, later called Amtrak, predicted a rosy future. It was obvious from the beginning that political consideration was given in the selection of some routes served. This is not a way to run a railroad.

Amtrak started by cutting the number of daily trains almost in half—from 360 to fewer than 200; and things have grown worse.

At this point I do not plan to vote for additional funds for this organization, and I hope my colleagues will not either.

A LESSON IN LIFE

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention, the following letter that was received from one of my constituents, Mrs. Dorothy S. Jacobs, administrator, Maulsby Nursing Home, Clayton, N. Mex. I believe the letter speaks for itself:

A man with a large family to support, hard times, and an old father who was ill and required care as well as food, decided to take his father to the mountain to die. There no one would have to see if wild animals devoured him, or if he succumbed to the chill winds.

He loaded his father into the wheelbarrow, and with his eight year old son started the journey. About half-way up the mountain, the child said:

"Father, I'm glad you brought me along. Now, when you get old I'll know what to do with you."

Whereupon, the man turned around and re-traced his steps to his home, returning his father with him."

SENATE—*Friday, October 15, 1971*

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Ryan, major general, U.S. Army, retired, former Chief of Army Chaplains, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

O Almighty God, Father of all mankind and Judge over nations, we ask You to bless our Nation and all its citizens. We ask You especially to bless this august body of lawmakers as they convene today.

Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct their deliberations and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessing of equal liberty.

Give them the wisdom and the courage to continue to stand as free men ought to stand. Guide them in their deliberations, bless them with Your counsel that all their endeavors may begin with You and through You be happily ended. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 13, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

A message transmitting the nomination of Scott P. Crampton, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

A message withdrawing the nomination of Michael K. Lyons, of New York, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 8, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, which was sent to the Senate on July 28, 1971.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of October 13, 1971, the following bills were reported on October 14, 1971:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 748. A bill to authorize payment and appropriation of the second and third installments of the U.S. contributions to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank (Rept. No. 92-395); and

S. 2010. A bill to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association (Rept. No. 92-396).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 749. A bill to authorize U.S. contribu-