ate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m., Tuesday, October 26, 1971.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, 1971, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 21, 1971:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

James R. Thompson, Jr., of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice William J. Bauer.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 21, 1971:

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

Carl R. Berman, Jr., and John W. DeCoste for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, subject to the qualifications provided by law.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Richard T. Burress, of Maryland, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Richard J. Grunewald, of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Richard Schubert, of Pennsylvania, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

FEDERAL METAL AND NONMETALLIC MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

W. W. Little, of Arizona, to be a member of the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Board of Review for the term expiring September 15, 1976.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE NATION

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial that appeared in the October 13 issue of the Arkansas Gazette dealing with the national health insurance proposals pending before the Congress. As the House Ways and Means Committee is now delving into this complex issue, I thought that this editorial, which analyzes the several legislative measures relating to national health insurance, would be of interest to my colleagues. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE NATION

One of the large unresolved issues still before the Congress this fall is whether a national health insurance system of some type should be adopted. The arena for really substantive examination of the question will shift later this month to the House Ways and Means Committee, headed by Representative Wilbur Mills of Kensett.

It can be stated with reasonable assurance and fairness, we believe, that the present system of delivering an acceptable level of medical care at a reasonable cost to all Americans is essentially inadequate. It is often said, and agreed to by many in the health field, that at its best American medicine is the best there is and can be delivered to the patient if he can pay for it. The rich can pay for the best but in varying degrees the rest of those in our society cannot.

A need for change, at least, in the system is widely recognized. Evidence of that is the proliferation of bills before the Congress dealing with the national health insurance concept. At last count there were about 20 in the hoppers, with five of them to be considered serious contenders. What happens is going to depend in large measure on the handling given to the issue by Mr. Mills and his colleagues on Ways and Means.

Consequently, it was encouraging to read last week of Mills' criticism of the version of national health insurance offered in the Nixon administration bill. The administration's proposal, he says, would "only add to the problems we now have," a point on which Mr. Mills is precisely correct. Perhaps it will be argued that such an evaluation is a part of the Mills non-candidacy for the Democratic presidential nomination. It may be, but if this means that Wilbur Mills is ready to fashion a truly comprehensive program of national health insurance, then let the credit fall where it will.

The administration's program would largely preserve the present system of financing health insurance for a limited segment of the population through private insurance. Features include a provision requiring all employers to purchase a minimum-benefit private insurance package for their employes.

A second serious measure before Ways and Means is similar in several respects to the administration plan. It is the "Healthcare" bill supported by the Health Insurance Association of America, and introduced by Representative Omar Burleson of Texas. Unlike the Nixon proposal, the purchase of insurance policies would remain voluntary. There are other provisions as well, but what this "health insurance industry" bill does essentially is build upon the present system. That is essentially what the administration bill does, too. Basic change simply would not be accomplished.

Even less attractive are the "Medicredit" plan supported by the American Medical Association, and the "Catastrophic Health Insurance" program, written by Senator Russell Long of Louisiana and backed by his Senate Finance Committee. Medicredit would provide a system of tax credits toward the purchase of private health insurance. The Long program would be something of an extension of Medicare to the under 65s, covering only those persons presently covered under the Social Security system. As the name implies, the principal advantage would be to pay most medical costs after those insured had been hospitalized for 60 days and had paid $2,000 more for other medical services.

Our own preference among the proposals before the Congress is the "Health Security" plan introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy. It has its flaws but it is the only proposal that would reform the whole system of health care—from delivery to method of payment—and it would cover *all* Americans. Traditional relationships between patient and private physicians would be preserved. Financing would come 50 per cent from general tax revenues and the rest from taxes on employers and employees through the Social Security system. Preventive medicine—perhaps the best kind there is—would be encouraged.

Total costs are really not the principal issue. Authoritative estimates—some of them from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—indicate that total health costs in the coming years are going to be about the same regardless of what system of health care payment and delivery is used. Indeed, the chances are that under a system such as that advanced in the Kennedy bill total costs would even be reduced.

Virtually all the industrialized nations of the world already have national health care systems. Adequate health care should be available to all Americans regardless of their economic circumstances as a matter of national policy. It is time that fact was recognized and acted upon in the Congress.

COMMONWEALTH EDISON PRAISED FOR $11 MILLION RESEARCH PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, on earlier occasions, I have expressed myself in support of the responsible management of Commonwealth Edison Co. which serves the electric power needs of Lake County, Ill., and most of the 12th District which I have the privilege to represent in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the development of a nuclear powerplant at Zion, Ill., questions have been raised regarding the threat of thermal pollution resulting from the use of Lake Michigan water for cooling the condensers of the nuclear generating plant.

While alternate methods of reducing the thermal effect have been suggested, there seems to be no existing satisfactory answer. Indeed, there is some question as to whether the limited thermal change which will occur in a small segment of Lake Michigan will indeed have any deleterious effects on the environment.

Mr. Speaker, it has been shown that substitution of a liquid metal-cooled fast breeder would eliminate the threat of pollution to the environment, either through thermal change or dispersal of heat into the atmosphere.

I am encouraged to note that Commonwealth Edison Co. has pledged the total sum of $11,414,000 toward a joint Government-industry research effort aimed at building several demonstration fast breeder nuclear powerplants.

This announcement made recently by my constituent, J. Harris Ward, chairman of Commonwealth Edison Co., evidences the determination of this responsible electric utility company to supply the needed energy for residential and industrial needs of the area—at reasonable cost and with a minimal adverse effect on the environment. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note this significant contribution by Commonwealth Edison Co. which is further tangible evidence that American industry is vitally interested in improving the *quality of life* in our Nation and in protecting the human environment for the benefit of all mankind.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

A TRIBUTE TO CASIMIR PULASKI

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the chorus of praise accorded the exploits of Casimir Pulaski, a mighty son of Poland and champion of liberty.

Born to royalty, Pulaski had every opportunity of making the most of status quo conditions in 18th century Europe. Without struggle, without difficulty he could have lived in keeping with his family traditions, a life of splendor and magnificence as a member of the Polish Royal Court.

Pulaski, however, was a man of great imagination, conscience and democratic spirit; so much so, that he could not tolerate the outrage of tyranny. Joining with others, he was successful, for a time, in establishing effective resistence to foreign encroachment on Polish soil and foreign domination of Polish governmental affairs. Pulaski and his kind were, however, overwhelmed by an alliance of foreign adventurers and less principled Polish noblemen. Following the 1772 overthrow of the Polish Republican Government, Pulaski and other Polish patriots were driven from the land to seek sanctuary. The cause of Polish independence apparently was dead.

Advised of the impending American Revolution, Pulaski became the advocate of American democracy and liberty. He offered his services to American officials in France. A cavalry officer of high degree, experienced in battle, he was of course gratefully received. By the summer of 1777 he was in America, ready for service in the democratic cause.

At Brandywine, Germantown, and Valley Forge, the courage of Pulaski inspired American troops, and following every bold performance he was promoted, until at last he was directed to lead the Colonial cavalry against the British forces in the South. A dashing figure on the battlefield, a man of fearless determination, he had become by 1779, a spectacular symbol of the Colonial cause.

At the height of his fame, recognized for valor and ability, he organized and led a cavalry charge against the enemy at Savannah in October 1779. The British resistence was intense and Pulaski was severely wounded in the battle. Several days later, he was dead.

To every American Patriot, the loss of Pulaski appeared in the nature of catastrophe. His dauntless spirit and numerous accomplishments rendered him a hero of unprecedented proportions, and his loss was mourned on a national scale.

On this day, marking the anniversary of his demise, we hail the memory of Pulaski—a man of principle, of courage and high attainments, and a man to whom the struggle for democracy was the most important motivation in the world.

THE NATURAL GAS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1971

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a consumer problem of critical importance is posed by the present natural gas supply shortage. This problem is not confined to any single section of the United States, but it is particularly threatening in the New York metropolitan area where my own district is located.

I have undertaken to determine just what the situation is in New York, and I am forced to report that the picture which emerges is far from reassuring.

The New York metropolitan area is supplied by three major pipelines, one of which provides more than 75 percent of the total supply. Not one of these pipelines has been able to obtain any additional new supply for this year and none expects to have any new supply available next year.

In fact, two of the New York suppliers, including the major one, are having difficulties in meeting their commitments under present contracts. Both have informed the Federal Power Commission that they will have to impose 3-percent or 4-percent curtailments on deliveries for the coming winter. Indications are that these curtailments may become still more severe for the winter of 1972–73.

If the coming winter should be extremely cold, the proposed curtailments could result in an emergency situation for gas consumers in New York. At best, they might be called upon to reduce their gas consumption by turning down their thermostats. If this step failed to cut requirements to the point where they could be met, it would become necessary for the gas company to suspend service to certain customers or in certain areas.

Already, increasing numbers of would-be new consumers are unable to obtain natural gas service in the New York metropolitan areas. Requests by a growing number of families and business concerns for service have necessarily been refused. Restrictions have been imposed on the addition of large volume loads. These restrictions now prevent the use of gas for heating in city housing projects and private apartment projects and by industrial or commercial consumers who need a substantial volume of fuel.

The shortage of gas for industrial consumers will inevitably have a damaging effect on the economy of the metropolitan area. Some industrial plants already have been forced to cancel [redacted] for expansion of improvements in operations because of the unavailability of gas. The result has been a double loss of the economic benefits of the investments that would have been made and of the potential for new jobs.

Further public injury results from the increased pollution of the air when oil or coal has to be used for fuel because of the natural gas shortage. The air pollution problem of New York has been widely publicized and is certainly known to everyone who lives there or who visits our city. Anticipated curtailments of gas service for this winter will further exacerbate the pollution problem.

Mr. Speaker, all of these ill effects of the gas supply shortage strike directly at the people of New York City, and, in greater or less degree, at most of the people of the entire Nation as 150 million Americans depend on natural gas for domestic, commercial and industrial fuel. This one source accounts for approximately one-third of all energy consumed in the United States.

I would emphasize that the supply shortage of this essential fuel is not a threat looming over us at some time in the future. It is a condition that exists right now, and it grows out of the fact that even as the demand for natural gas has been steadily growing, the discovery of new supplies has lagged behind. During the last 3 years, more gas was consumed in the 48 contiguous States than was found. Known reserves supplies have gone down, and virtually all of these reserves are already committted.

I am speaking of known reserves. The National Petroleum Council estimates that 60 percent of the Nation's gas reserves are still to be discovered. These potential supplies would meet the demand for many years to come—but until they are discovered and developed, their value to the consumer is only potential, not actual.

It is a matter of record that the effort to find and develop new gas fields has undergone a drastic slowdown in recent years. We do not have to look far to find the reason. The incentive for gas producers to engage in costly and uncertain explorations for additional gas supplies have been alarmingly weakened by Federal law and regulatory policies.

The urgent need the Nation faces is to restore and strengthen this incentive. And one step toward doing so is to bring about price stabilization by making sales contracts between gas producers and interstate pipeline companies valid and binding on all parties concerned.

As matters now stand, these contracts, even after they have received the Federal Power Commission's stamp of approval, leave the producer without any assurance as to what price he will receive for his gas or how long he will continue to receive the agreed-upon price. He does not know what volume of gas he will be called upon to deliver to the pipeline. Nor does he know how long he will be required to continue to make deliveries.

The trouble is that every provision of the contract can be changed by order of the Federal Power Commission. Even after contract prices have been approved by the Commission, they can be revised—and often have been revised—by a subsequent order of the Commission. So can other contract provisions regarding the amount of gas to be delivered and the period of time over which it must continue to be delivered.

These uncertainties naturally discourage investment in exploration for and development of new gas fields.

The uncertainties would be removed by enactment of H.R. 2513, which I introduced early in this session and which last month was the subject of hearings

before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Power. Essential provisions of H.R. 2513 were supported by testimony at these hearings by representatives of all segments of the industry; by labor, by the coal industry, and by the financial community.

H.R. 2513 does not propose to remove Federal control of the gas industry. Under its provisions, the Federal Power Commission maintains control over producer-pipeline contracts. Interstate gas prices and other contract provisions will still have to be approved by the Commission.

What H.R. 2513 proposes to do is to make sales contracts, once they are approved by the Commission, valid and binding. The resulting price stability would go a long way toward restoring the incentive for producers to search for and develop new gas fields. Enactment of the bill would also encourage the movement of additional gas in interstate commerce, benefiting consumers in areas where there is a little or no gas production.

The gas supply shortage has been years in the making. It is a problem that obviously cannot be solved overnight. But we should make a start toward its solution. Enactment by Congress of H.R. 2513, in my earnest opinion, would represent a significant initial step toward relieving a situation which is pressing hard on millions of Americans.

STUDENT LOAN MARKETING ASSOCIATION

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed a survey of the State of Texas with respect to the participation of national and State chartered banks and other lending institutions which deal in Government-guaranteed loans.

An examination of the figures shown indicate the poor record of participation of lending institutions in Government-guaranteed student loans. Over one-third of the counties which have banks, have no banks which issue Government-guaranteed student loans. In my own home county, Harris, which is the most populous county in the State, only 13 national banks and six State banks have made any loans whatsoever. Even those which have made loans may have made only a few to the children of preferred customers. My information is that a bank will not give serious consideration to making a loan to a student unless the parents of that student have done considerable business with that bank in the past.

The interest rate on these loans is fixed by law and stands at 7 percent per annum. There is an additional "incentive" amount paid directly to the banks and is not charged to the student. The rate of this incentive can be as high as 3 percent and is determined by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in concert with advisory committees. That rate now stands at 1¼ percent, to bring the total interest on these loans to 8¼ percent. This is not a bad interest rate for a no-risk loan, and one wonders why lending institutions do not make more of these loans.

However, the main objection of lending institutions to making these loans is the problem of "liquidity." A loan to a student who does not have to pay it back until after graduation can remain on a bank's books for many years—thus tying up that part of the bank's operating capital. Military service and graduate education can defer payment on the loan even longer. What is needed is a secondary mortgage facility to which lending institutions can discount these loans and continue to "turn over" their capital.

I am happy to see that both the bill before the House, H.R. 7248, and the bill that was passed in the other House of Congress, S. 659, contain a provision for the establishment of a Student Loan Marketing Association, even though S. 659 provides for the termination of the SLMA after 5 years. It will be started with Government funds, but will then become a semiprivate corporation which may purchase up to 80 percent of the face value of a Government-guaranteed student loan. It would, therefore, provide for the same type of service to encourage loans to students that the Government National Mortgage Association now provides to stimulate the construction of low-cost housing.

Few would say that GNMA has been a bad business proposition, and I expect that SLMA will meet with the same success.

Dr. John C. Stevens, the president of Abilene Christian College in Abilene, Tex., visited with me in my office to discuss this problem. His college is among seven in Texas which have undertaken to become lending institutions themselves because of the number of students who wished to attend but found it impossible to obtain a loan from a lending institution. I asked Dr. Stevens to write me an account of the successes and difficulties he has had with the program.

Dr. Stevens has eloquently pointed to the need for a secondary mortgage facility for Government-guaranteed student loans. I wholeheartedly support section F of H.R. 7248.

The survey and Dr. Stevens' letter follows:

Texas statistics—type of institution making loans

	Number of institutions
National banks	256
State banks	187
Federal savings and loans	9
State savings and loans	7
Federal credit unions	55
State credit unions	21
National savings bank	1
Schools	7
Direct state loans	1
Other	4
Total	548

TOTAL NUMBER OF LOANS AND AMOUNTS UNDER VARIOUS PROGRAMS

Program	Total number of loans	Total amount of loans
United student aid fund	15,329	$11,190,198
Texas opportunity program	233,853	80,427,035
Federally insured loans [1]	67,184	68,410,429
Total	316,366	160,027,662

[1] This program has more or less coopted the State program now. It was begun in December 1969. The State program was begun in 1964.

BREAKDOWN ON GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS FOR HARRIS, GALVESTON, BRAZORIA, AND MATAGORDA COUNTIES

County	Total number of lending institutions involved	Number of loans	Amount of loans	Average amount per loan
Harris	28	5,159	$5,005,025	$970
Galveston	4	459	423,346	922
Brazoria	6	558	437,094	783
Matagorda	2	96	97,482	1,015
Total	40	6,272	5,962,947	

County	Number of national banks	Number of national banks making guaranteed student loans	Number of State banks	Number of State banks making guaranteed student loans
Anderson	3	1	[illegible]	1
Andrews	1	1	[illegible]	0
Angelina	2	1	3	1
Aransas	1	0	0	0
Archer	0	0	1	0
Armstrong	1	0	0	0
Atascosa	1	1	4	1
Austin	1	0	5	1
Bailey	1	0	1	1
Bandera	1	0	1	0
Bastrop	2	0	2	1
Baylor	2	2	0	0
Bee	2	0	1	0
Bell	7	3	3	3
Bexar	17	11	13	7
Blanco	1	0	1	1
Borden	0	0	0	0
Bosque	1	1	4	3
Bowie	2	2	4	1
Brazoria	5	2	10	3
Brazos	3	3	2	2
Brewster	1	0	0	0
Briscoe	1	0	1	1
Brooks	1	0	0	0
Brown	2	1	2	1
Buchanan	0	0	0	0
Buchel	0	0	0	0
Burleson	1	0	3	1
Burnet	0	0	3	0
Caldwell	2	1	2	2
Calhoun	1	1	2	0
Callahan	1	1	2	1
Cameron	5	4	4	3
Camp	1	0	1	0
Carson	2	0	1	1
Cass	4	3	2	0
Castro	0	0	2	0
Chambers	0	0	3	0
Cherokee	1	0	5	2
Childress	1	1	1	0
Clay	2	1	0	0
Cochran	0	0	1	0
Coke	1	1	1	0
Coleman	2	2	1	0

County	Number of national banks	Number of national banks making guaranteed student loans	Number of State banks	Number of State banks making guaranteed student loans
Collin	5	1	8	1
Collingsworth	0	0	2	1
Colorado	1	1	4	2
Comal	1	1	1	0
Comanche	2	0	2	0
Concho	0	0	2	1
Cooke	2	1	2	2
Coryell	2	1	3	0
Cottle	1	0	0	0
Crane	0	0	1	0
Crockett	1	0	0	0
Crosby	1	1	2	2
Culberson	0	0	0	1
Dallam	1	0	1	0
Dallas	27	13	46	19
Dawson	2	1	0	0
Davis	0	0	0	0
Deaf Smith	1	1	1	0
Delta	2	1	1	0
Denton	5	1	5	2
Dewitt	3	0	5	2
Dickens	0	0	1	0
Dimmit	0	0	2	1
Donley	0	0	3	1
Dunn	0	0	0	0
Duval	0	0	2	0
Eastland	3	2	2	2
Ector	2	0	3	0
Edwards	0	0	3	0
Ellis	3	2	8	1
El Paso	6	3	7	0
Encinal	0	0	0	0
Erath	2	1	1	1
Falls	3	1	3	1
Fannin	4	2	3	1
Fayette	2	1	6	0
Fisher	1	0	1	0
Floyd	2	1	0	0
Foard	0	0	1	0
Foley	0	0	0	0
Fort Bend	4	0	5	0
Franklin	1	1	0	0
Freestone	3	0	2	0
Frio	0	0	2	0
Gaines	0	0	2	0
Galveston	6	0	7	4
Garza	1	1	0	0
Gillespie	1	1	2	1
Glasscock	0	0	0	0
Goliad	1	1	0	0
Gonzales	1	1	3	1
Gray	2	1	1	0
Grayson	9	5	4	1
Greer	0	0	0	0
Gregg	3	2	5	1
Grimes	2	0	4	0
Guadalupe	2	1	4	1
Hale	3	3	3	1
Hall	1	1	2	0
Hamilton	3	2	0	0
Hansford	0	0	2	1
Hardeman	1	1	3	0
Hardin	1	0	3	0
Harris	31	13	81	6
Harrison	2	2	4	2
Hartley	0	0	0	0
Haskell	2	1	1	1
Hays	1	1	2	0
Hemphill	1	1	1	0
Henderson	1	1	6	0
Hidalgo	5	2	11	6
Hill	5	2	2	0
Hockley	2	2	1	1
Hood	2	0	1	0
Hopkins	2	1	1	1
Houston	1	2	4	0
Howard	2	1	2	0
Hudspeth	0	0	0	0
Hunt	5	2	4	1
Hutchinson	2	1	2	0
Irion	1	0	0	0
Jack	0	0	3	0
Jackson	1	1	2	0
Jasper	1	0	3	0
Jeff Davis	0	0	1	0
Jefferson	8	5	5	1
Jim Hogg	1	1	0	0
Jim Wells	2	2	4	2
Johnson	2	1	5	0
Jones	3	1	1	0
Karnes	3	1	1	0
Kaufman	4	2	3	1
Kendall	4	2	3	1
Kenedy	0	0	2	0
Kent	0	0	1	0
Kerr	1	0	1	1
Kimble	1	0	1	0
King	0	0	0	0
Kinney	0	0	1	0
Kleberg	2	1	1	1
Knox	1	0	1	1
Lamar	4	2	1	1
Lamb	3	1	3	0
Lampassas	2	1	1	1
Lasalle	1	0	0	0
Lavaca	2	1	2	2
Lee	1	1	3	0
Leon	0	0	5	0
Liberty	1	1	5	1
Limestone	1	1	5	2
Lipscomb	3	2	1	1
Live Oak	1	1	1	1
Llano	1	0	1	0
Loving	0	0	0	0
Lubbock	5	1	5	3
Lynn	2	0	1	0
McCullock	3	3	0	2
McLennan	10	6	4	0
McMullen	0	0	0	0
Madison	1	1	1	0
Marion	1	1	0	0
Martin	1	0	0	0
Mason	1	0	1	1
Matagorda	1	1	2	1
Maverick	1	0	1	1
Medina	2	1	3	1
Menard	1	0	1	0
Midland	2	2	1	0
Milam	2	1	3	1
Mills	0	0	1	1
Mitchell	1	0	1	0
Montague	5	3	0	0
Montgomery	1	1	4	0
Moore	1	0	2	0
Morris	3	1	1	0
Mortley	0	0	1	0
Nacogdoches	3	2	3	0
Navarro	4	2	5	1
Newton	1	0	0	0
Nolan	1	1	2	1
Nueces	8	4	9	0
Ocilltree	1	1	0	0
Oldham	0	0	1	1
Orange	3	3	2	0
Palo Pinto	5	2	1	0
Panola	1	1	1	0
Parker	2	2	1	1
Parmer	0	0	3	1
Pecos	1	0	2	0
Polk	1	1	2	1
Potter	5	1	2	0
Presidio	1	1	0	0
Rains	1	0	1	0
Randall	1	1	1	1
Reagan	0	0	1	1
Real	0	0	0	0
Red River	3	1	0	0
Reeves	1	1	1	0
Refugio	2	2	0	0
Roberts	0	0	2	2
Robertson	1	0	4	0
Rockwall	0	0	2	0
Runnels	2	1	4	0
Rusk	2	1	2	0
Sabine	0	0	2	0
San Augustine	1	1	1	0
San Jacinto	0	0	2	0
San Patricio	2	1	7	2
San Saba	2	0	0	0
Schleicher	1	1	0	0
Scurry	1	1	1	1
Shackelford	2	0	0	0
Shelby	1	0	4	1
Sherman	0	0	1	1
Smith	3	3	5	3
Somerville	1	0	0	0
Starr	0	0	1	1
Stephens	2	0	0	0
Sterling	1	0	0	0
Stonewall	1	1	0	0
Sutton	1	1	0	0
Swisher	2	1	2	1
Tarrant	15	3	22	8
Taylor	4	2	4	1
Terrell	0	0	1	0
Terry	1	1	1	1
Throckmorton	1	0	1	0
Titus	1	1	2	2
Tom Green	4	3	1	1
Travis	6	5	7	4
Trinity	2	0	0	0
Tyler	0	0	3	0
Upshur	2	1	2	0
Upton	0	0	2	2
Uvalde	1	1	2	0
Val Verde	1	0	1	1
Van Zandt	4	0	2	0
Victoria	1	1	3	1
Walker	2	1	1	0
Waller	0	0	3	0
Ward	1	1	1	1
Washington	2	2	3	1
Webb	2	2	1	1
Wharton	1	1	6	1
Wheeler	2	0	2	0
Wichita	5	3	4	1
Wilbarger	2	1	1	1
Willacy	1	1	1	1
Williamson	6	1	7	2
Wilson	2	0	2	1
Winkler	1	1	2	1
Wise	4	0	2	0
Wood	3	2	1	0
Yoakum	0	0	2	1
Young	4	2	0	0
Zapata	1	1	0	0
Zavala	0	0	2	0
Total	522	257	675	187

ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE,
Abilene, Texas, October 11, 1971.

Hon. BOB ECKHARDT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ECKHARDT: I appreciate the diligent study you have made of the extent to which banks in Texas have been participating in the Federally Insured Student Loan Program. It seems to me that the material you have collected demonstrates that we need to do something that we have not yet done to make the program really viable.

Let me tell you something of our experience at Abilene Christian College: Inasmuch as we became convinced that not enough banks were participating in the program to serve the needs of our students, we qualified the College itself as a lending agency in connection with the program. Then, during this past summer, I mailed a letter to every student who was enrolled in the College during the past year (with the exception, of course, of seniors who had graduated) and to all prospective students whose names were in our files notifying them of the availability of the deferred tuition plan known as the Federally Insured Student Loan Program. I suggested that, if they were interested, they should first go to their bank or savings and loan association, but that if they could not secure the loan from one of these firms they should write to the financial aid office at Abilene Christian College and we would take care of their application.

As a result of this communication, the College currently has advanced loans to this year's student body under the Federally Insured Student Loan Program totaling $385,000. These loans have benefitted 271 students. In addition to these direct loans from the College, we have arranged for financing for 146 students who are Texas residents through the Hinson-Hazelwood Program of Texas, which is now a part of the Federally Insured Student Loan Program. These loans amount to $187,150

Furthermore, on the basis of information we have supplied to the students to take to their bankers, we estimate that an additional 204 students have received loans totaling $262,000 from their banks or savings and loans associations.

Therefore, it appears that of our present student body of 3,307 621 are participating in the Federally Insured Student Loan Program with loans totaling $834,150. Without this help, I believe our enrollment would be significantly lower than it is, but with this help we are at an all-time high with a modest increase over last year's student body, including a significant 16 percent increase in the size of the freshman class.

If there can be established a secondary market for the FISL paper, I am convinced that the program will expand and be available to all students who want it. Of course the loan programs will never completely meet the needs of the students who want to go to college. We need more grant money; but until such funds are available, the long-term loan possibilities make it possible for every student who deserves to go to college and desires to go to college to avail himself of the opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. STEVENS,
President.

COOPERATIVE ANIMAL DISEASE CONTROL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, still fresh on the memory of Congressmen from the Southwest is the recent double disaster of drought and disease which swept through that area.

And every Congressman here knows that it is only a matter of time before some sort of natural disaster strikes his own area—perhaps disasters of the same sort we so recently had to deal with.

Well, my part of Texas is slowly pulling out of the drought. And the dreaded Venezuelan equine encephalomyelitis which, killed over 1,300 horses in rapid order, has been abated somewhat.

But the disease is not eradicated. It will take a long time to eradicate—if we are ever successful at all. And lying just off our coast in Cuba is the deadly African swine fever.

Clearly we need every tool we can muster to stop these dread diseases from entering and entrenching themselves in our country. And one of the most important tools we have is cooperation with our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere to stop and contain these diseases when and where they crop up.

That is what H.R. 10458 seeks to do. We have established patterns for cooperation in many areas, such as hoof and mouth, rinderpest, and so on. But the painful lesson of this year is that we need to broaden that field to include any such threat that may arise.

I am most pleased that the House sought a speedy passage of this resolution which seeks to further much needed international cooperation in the field of animal diseases.

A GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED ECONOMY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's statement October 8, announcing a continuing system of price and wage controls after the present 90-day freeze ends—this time, without a termination date—could well signalize the end of the free market in America and the permament imposition of a Government-controlled economy.

It was a display of naked power by a single man over the life and work of his fellow citizens, without parallel at least since the early days of President Franklin Roosevelt, by the leader of the party which is supposed to be dedicated to fighting the kind of big government which Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal established.

The legislative authority under which President Nixon is acting to impose his system of price and wage controls is a bill first passed by Congress on July 31, 1970, which makes one of the most enormous delegations of power to the Chief Executive in the history of our Nation's elected lawmaking body. This bill was passed, and extended early this year, in the face of the President's assurance that he neither wanted nor would use the powers it gave him. It was widely regarded as simply a Democrat attempt to embarrass the Republican President. Most Republicans voted for it in what has proved to be the mistaken belief that the President meant what he said about it.

I voted against this bill. And it is tragic to find now that on a matter of this importance, the word of the White House, given to Members of the President's own party in Congress, cannot be trusted.

No matter what pleasant-sounding words are used to describe it, the hard fact remains that the phase II economic program announced October 8 is a program for mandatory and, for all practical intents and purposes, permanent price and wage controls, differing in no essential respect from the Office of Price Administration set up during the Second World War. The executive branch of the Federal Government, without any requirement even to consult with the elected representatives of the people, will have the power to tell every employer how much he may pay his employees, how much and how often he may raise their pay, and how much every businessman, small or large, may charge for his goods and services. To call such a system in any respect "voluntary," as the President repeatedly did, is frighteningly Orwellian. We might as well say that the Soviet laws against private ownership of capital are voluntary because people may obey them of their own free will.

The many citizens who still applaud the President's action because they are thinking only of not having to pay higher prices, will soon begin to realize that these controls mean that in many cases they will not be allowed to receive pay raises—even when fully earned and agreed to by their employer—because their particular raise does not fit into the Government's categories. Then they will also begin to learn that price control does not mean that the same goods at the same quality will be available at the same price. As all history proves, price controls mean fewer goods, of lower quality, less readily available at the Government-dictated price.

Permanent mandatory price and wage controls abridge the fundamental liberties of every citizen to earn money and to do business. There is still a way to block this immense seizure of economic power by the White House. The controls cannot be continued unless Congress passes the bill extending the President's authority to impose them, as he has now requested. That bill can and should be defeated. Every American who does not want to live the rest of his life in a Government-controlled economy, with the free market fading into distant memory like the memory of the days when Americans could still own and trade in gold, should take his stand against permanent mandatory price and wage controls and let his representatives in Congress know it.

KEEPING LOW-INCOME HOUSING LIVABLE—SPEECH AT NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I have had numerous inquiries about a speech

which I made yesterday morning, which was apparently widely quoted, dealing with the problems of keeping housing built for low-income families habitable. My remarks were addressed to the National Conference on Low- and Moderate-Income Housing, sponsored by the Nonprofit Housing Center. It contains what are perhaps some "old fashioned" ideas about the responsibilities of the occupants to take care of the housing and also the responsibilities of those who provide the housing to make sure the people they select to live in them are educated to the responsible use of the housing.

The speech referred to is as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF MISSOURI

(Ranking member, Subcommittee on Housing, House Committee on Banking and Currency, at National Conference on Low- and Moderate-Income Housing, sponsored by the Nonprofit Housing Center, at Hotel Sonesta, Washington, D.C., Monday, October 18, 1971, at 9:30 a.m.)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to participate in this conference because I believe wholeheartedly in the concept of nonprofit housing sponsorship and I want to do everything I can to assist you in your efforts to expand your contribution toward solving our housing dilemmas. The problems are many, the successes limited, and the pitfalls worrisome; and there is far too little public understanding of the importance of your work. Official attitudes have been somewhat frosty, to say the least, and the red tape endless. Everyone gives lip-service to the objectives of nonprofit sponsorship but when the financing headaches become acute, and speed in solving the problems is essential, you are often likely to encounter delay instead, so problems become emergencies and emergencies become crises.

As documented in one of the comprehensive analyses prepared for the panel on housing production which I chaired for the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, nonprofit sponsors have usually overextended themselves by taking on all of the hardest jobs in housing, have had numerous failures, have been stretched too thin, have had many of their people lured away into private enterprise with higher pay, have often been victimized by professional consultants or builders, have tried to solve almost unsolvable social problems, have sometimes been saddled with projects in which they lost interest, and are by no means the major instrument available to us in achieving the goal of building 2 million units a year. Panaceas they are not.

Fair enough. I don't think any of us who helped to establish a role for nonprofit organizations in the housing field more than a dozen years were under any illusion that by this stroke of legislative genius we had solved the housing problem. I remember writing to every church and fraternal organization and union in St. Louis calling their attention to the opportunity under the 1959 act to sponsor housing for the elderly, and not being able then to enlist a single one which felt it could take on such a great challenge or heavy responsibility. It took some time thereafter to have interest develop, and eventually, as many of you know, we had some extremely successful elderly housing projects constructed in the St. Louis area under the program. I am always pleased and warmed inside when I hear from residents of those projects about their pure joy in living in them—the comfort, yes, but more important, the spirit—the atmosphere.

Of course these were projects undertaken with limited objectives—not to try to solve the housing shortage or rescue a neighborhood or take care of all of the elderly or do anything more than provide X number of apartments at reasonable rentals to elderly people, affording good shelter in a pleasant living environment.

PIONEER WORK OF ST. LOUIS BICENTENNIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

When I later initiated the legislation for subsidized home ownership for the poor, which became Section 221 (h), I had no illusions that this, either, was the ultimate solution for the housing problems of America. We had a small scale working model in existence of the kind of program which could work, in the rehabilitation work being done by the St. Louis Bicentennial Development Corporation.

But when this concept was seized upon as a prototype for a vast national program I had deep misgivings. Where would the necessary nonprofit sponsors come from? How many community leaders could be brought into active—rather than "letterhead"—participation?

The theory doesn't necessary hold up that if a subsidy to a low-income family to reduce the mortgage interest rate to 3% is a good idea, then a program of reducing it down to 1% would be even better. True, housing under the Section 235 program, which grew out of 221 (h), was for many months during the most recent mortgage famine, about the only kind of private housing being constructed. But as the investigation made by the Banking and Currency Committee clearly revealed, and as HUD later confirmed, much of this housing was very badly built and much of the rehabilitation housing under this program was criminally defective and fraudulent.

So far as I can determine—and HUD says it has no evidence to the contrary—none of the abuses spotlighted in our investigation of the 235 program occurred in the 221 (h) program under nonprofit sponsorship.

It's not that profit is automatically bad and nonprofit automatically good, and I certainly don't want to give that impression. As I said earlier, we cannot possibly depend upon nonprofit sponsorship to solve the housing problem by itself, or even to account for a *majority* role. But it *can* provide a *major* role, and, despite all of the shortcomings and hardships and red tape and aggravations and headaches and setbacks, the effort must be pursued and expanded.

CONSTRUCTION OF ROOMS IN BUILDINGS ONLY PART OF SOLUTION

And that is why I was happy to come here this morning and meet with you—not to tell you the details of your own business but to encourage you to continue to believe in what you are doing, and to express my gratitude for what you are trying to do.

As I think we all know, construction of rooms in buildings is only a part of the solution of the "housing" crisis in this country. I do not want to depreciate the dedicated effort and imagination which have been expended over the past four decades by public officials—Federal, state and local—and by private enterprise in constructing millions of rooms in buildings for people to live in. Public programs and private enterprise together performed miracles in housing supply and in home financing. But the fact is that during most of that long period of nearly 40 years, both public and private builders concentrated on the bricks and mortar and mortgages, and this was not enough—not nearly enough. There was little or no attention paid during most of that time to the urgent need for attending to the problems of the people occupying the housing which was being built.

Consequently, because buildings came first and people second, many of the solidly built housing complexes constructed under one government program or another, or by one or another visionary—or mercenary—in the private enterprise field have turned into economic disasters and social nightmares. They are unfit for human habitation at a time when we cannot afford the loss of housing capacity they originally represented.

A TRAGEDY FOR SOCIAL BANKRUPTCY

At the risk of being repetitious to a group whose members already know my general views on this subject. I want to say that I think it is a tragedy of social bankruptcy that in my own city of St. Louis we are being urged to tear down a housing project built only 16 years ago to accommodate thousands of families, because no decent family wants to live in the units and few of the units are even habitable. They have been literally torn apart—destroyed—and turned into a jungle of crime, vandalism, and trespass, by drug addicts and others exercising squatters' rights.

Those who built the project with such high hopes only 16 years ago made many mistakes in planning and in format—they built wrong for the wrong size families, for one thing; and for another, they made the by-now universally understood mistake of cramming thousands of children into huge high-rise buildings. Under the very best of environments, large numbers of young children usually are not compatible with high-rise buildings. Of course it can be accomplished without disaster if the children are under rigid discipline and control at all times. For instance, if you go into a high-rise apartment project in Singapore or in Hong Kong, full of people and especially full of young children, you hear a constant twittering of bird-like sounds composed of a multitude of quiet voices talking in Chinese sing-song, but there is order and control; the places are spotless; the people who live in them are buoyed in spirit and absolutely delighted with their step up the housing ladder to their very own private homes—even a single room for a family. These were families which previously lived in shacks or packing boxes, on boats, or out in the open.

AMERICAN PATTERNS OF LIFE COMPARED TO THOSE OF ASIAN REFUGEES

Perhaps one day those huge Asian projects, too, will become uninhabitable slums, but I doubt it. They can be kept livable. But it requires a life style or life philosophy which is not generally characteristic of the way American families with children live—neither the rich, the moderate income, nor the poor. I mean, among other things, the absolute control over the children's activities, so that whether they are playing many floors below on an open playground or in the fields nearby or on the streets, they are respectful of the neighbors and the neighborhood. The children in the Asian projects I mentioned are multitudinous, but orderly—even when playing actively in groups, with or without constant adult supervision.

If 1,000 or more families from Singapore or Hong Kong were moved into one of our problem housing projects in a metropolitan area of the United States, I suspect they would carry this life style with them. Perhaps not. It would probably depend upon how many American families were also living there, and which group instructed, or "corrupted", the other.

Since American families as a rule exercise a certain degree of "social anarchy" in the mass, we cannot expect them to act like Chinese families living in Singapore or Hong Kong, or Japanese families in Tokyo. Yet our large high-rise housing projects were all built with the idea that the clean and sturdy surroundings would automatically instill in the tenants the same life-style characteristics of a refugee family in an Oriental metropolis, a family which had fled famine and regimentation in China and had come to another country where there was food and perhaps employment, too, but absolutely no place to live except what you created for yourself out of a few boards and a sheet of tin, until the authorities could move you into something better.

I talked to many such families in the Far East and walked through many projects—it was hot and there were far pleasanter ways of participating in what the newspapers usually refer to as a Congressional "junket"—but I learned how a high-rise full of children can be made to work, if that is the only way in which large numbers of unhoused families can be provided with a roof over their heads.

But with the vast amount of land still available for human habitation in this country, I hope we have stopped trying to solve our housing problem in the only way the British of Hong Kong could possibly have proceeded to try to solve theirs.

DEALING WITH THE DISRUPTIVE FAMILY

It is not necessary in our cities, I believe, to tear down all of the public housing high-rises. They can be utilized for many suitable purposes. In some of our largest and most crowded metropolitan areas, they probably are inevitable for housing families with young children, too. But recognizing that this is not the best possible solution, we must use them under those special circumstances in a manner which maintains discipline and control over the youngsters, and which faces up realistically to the fact that some families—or many families are not philosophically attuned to acceptable living styles in crowded conditions.

I asked both tenants and management people in the jam-packed housing projects I visited in Asia whether they had any "problem families" which would not or could not conform to rules and regulations intended to keep the projects livable. Yes, I was told by both groups, there have been such families in the projects. What was done about them? "They were kicked out."

When you inquire of some of our management people in problem housing projects in the United States what they do in such situations, they often shrug and say "How can we put them out? Where would they go?"

Hence, out of an excess of compassion—or for whatever reason—we permit the problem family to destroy a crowded environment for *everyone else.*

Perhaps public officials cannot deal with this problem toughly. But individual citizens, banded together in a voluntary organization where their contributions are of their own precious time and effort and a desire to make their community a better one, can insist that those who benefit from these contributions must provide some self-help, too—must contribute *something,* if only a willingness to conduct themselves in a manner which makes the housing environment livable for everyone.

EDUCATION IN THE USE OF HOUSING

I don't know how much of that your member organizations can accomplish. But it seems to me that education in the *use* of housing is equally as important to the disadvantaged family entering a new home as the provision of the home itself.

And education in the use of housing entails education in the rights of one's neighbors. It entails respect for the property itself—knowing that some one else had to make a sacrifice or a contribution of money or of time and effort to bring that housing into existence.

You have a full program ahead of you today and I don't want to intrude on your schedule by talking old fashioned morality and deportment. But I am old-fashioned enough, I am afraid, to cringe at litter in the streets and on the sidewalks, at neglected broken windows and trampled grass and shrubs and endless junk and all of the other aspects of "slum" in an area where the housing is solid, built to last, but gruesomely being torn apart. Can we solve this social problem or not?

OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF PROFESSIONALS BY HOMER FERGUSON

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, over 28 years ago, in 1943, a gentleman who had already distinguished himself in Michigan as an outstanding attorney and judge of the Circuit Court of Wayne County, came to Washington to represent his State in the U.S. Senate. I speak of the Honorable Homer Ferguson, who during the next 12 years became well known nationally as a serious, hardworking, fair-minded, Member of that body, serving on the important Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees.

In March of 1955, Senator Ferguson became Ambassador Ferguson when he was asked to represent our country in the Philippines. Later, President Eisenhower appointed him as a judge of the U.S. Court of Military Appeals. He was unanimously confirmed by the Senate, took the oath of office administered by Chief Justice Warren on April 9, 1956, and has served with great honor through the years. Although Judge Ferguson's term expired on May 1, 1971, in his usual zeal to give more than is required of him, he is delaying his well-earned retirement until his successor is sworn in on November 15. Knowing Judge Ferguson as I do, I am not surprised to learn that he has plans to continue working for our Government in a semiretired status and will be on call to serve the Court of Military Appeals when he is needed.

Last July 27, Judge Ferguson spoke at the 12th annual Congress of the Professions of the Michigan Association of the Professions, an organization formed on December 2, 1958, which has been duplicated successfully in Virginia, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Illinois, and other States, and is now seeking to enlist the professions against crime.

Judge Ferguson's remarks to this organization are the essence of the thoughts regarding our citizenry and the law of a man who has made, administered, and adjudicated these laws during a lifetime of distinguished service. I include his comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so they may be given the attention they deserve.

THE OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF PROFESSIONALS

I offer greetings to the Michigan Association of the Professions and to the Probate Judges of Michigan, and express my appreciation for the invitation to come to this meeting, as well as making me an honorary member of MPA several years ago. I have watched with interest, and participated when possible, in the yearly visits you have made to Washington to confer with Congress.

The concern of professional people for the operation of our state and federal governments is noteworthy. Your present intent and desire to "enlist the professions against crime" is most commendable. Some Americans have lost faith in the courts, the legislatures, and the executives in the state houses and the White House as well as their ability to deal with the problems which confront us. I am concerned for my country, because some American citizens have fallen to a new low in their obedience to law and their adherence to responsible standards of morality. I doubt that this statement will attract a large amount of attention in the press. Indeed, it is the other variety of comment—the calling for revolution against today's "institutions" and the bombing of buildings that receive their rapt attention. Nonetheless, you have still maintained your interest in problems of our national life, and certainly a very important one today is to determine whether we, as professional leaders, can change the attitude of our citizens toward law and order in America.

I do not desire to discuss those legal doctrines or cases which are of interest only to judges and lawyers. Rather, I wish to discuss with you what you can accomplish in making a change in the attitude of our citizens. A change is necessary not only in the national attitude of our citizens toward the police, the judges, and political leaders, but also, in some instances, in the attitude of those officials toward the people. We should be concerned because what is done by us now determines the lives of the future generations.

In the past, our trust in the law was not always justified nor was our trust in public officials always justified. I learned about this as far back as 1939 when as a Circuit Judge I was a one-man Grand Jury in Wayne County, Michigan.

At that time, the people who did not agree with the law as it existed went to the legislatures or to the office holders and asked for a change in the law. Or, at the ballot box, they changed the elected officials. Or, as in Wayne County, the citizens and prosecuting attorney alike petitioned for a grand jury so that proceedings could be instituted under the law to punish those who had violated the law. The citizens at that time were dedicated to enforcement of the law for the good of our country.

In the past twenty years or more, that dedication has disappeared in the whirlwind of revolution which has swept this land with the alien concept of resistance to government. That concept is now with us, and while it is held only by a militant minority, it has its weakening effect.

Examples of this abound. Bombing has become a method of political protest or dissent. Even ministers of the gospel have been found guilty and sentenced for breaking into Selective Service offices and destroying records. FBI offices have been broken into, their records stolen, and even received as stolen goods, and used by the press to discredit law enforcement. Under the guise of enforcement of law, some of our private citizens even attempted to make a citizen's arrest of the director of the Selective Service in his office in Washington.

And, while we cannot fairly comment on an untried case (for there is always the presumption of innocence and the right to a fair trial) there is a federal case now pending where, under the guise of citizen's arrest, it is alleged another group conspired to kidnap a high public official.

There are, and have been, injustices in our social order, in employment, living conditions, and other facets of daily life. But they cannot be cured by polarizing groups of our people into minorities dedicated to the overthrow of the government. We are all Americans under the law, and change must be accomplished in the American way, rather than by riots, marches in streets, bombing of public buildings and murder. Rather than being of any particular color or religion, a liberal or conservative, let us all join together as united Americans and cure our ills by action under the law.

The great enemy of freedom is apathy of

our people. Thomas Jefferson was right when he said "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," as was Benjamin Franklin when he said at the time of the framing of our Constitution: "We have given you a republic if you can keep it." Can we keep it? A glaring example is the bombing of the Capitol of the United States. This was a well-planned attempt to destroy the whole Capitol building and stop the government by paralyzing operations. I made a personal visit to examine the damage. It was apparent that the perpetrators had in mind taking advantage of the much publicized weakness of the front wall of the Capitol building. If it had been so weak, the great dome itself might have been destroyed by that bomb, for it was powerful; powerful enough to break the door of the Vandenberg Room 50 yards away and, in the Senate restaurant, to destroy a great stained glass portrait of Washington.

There are other examples: In some cities, firemen are afraid to answer alarms for fear of bullets. In Washington, D.C., the police have been forbidden to go with the firemen to protect them, because their presence in certain wards might start a riot, and some of our college presidents thought they had the right to give amnesty to students who destroyed university buildings. We have all read of the insulting and killing of a judge in his own courtroom by organized militants. We must do something quickly and seriously.

A recent television poll of adults who claimed to be intellectuals and college professors, not just teenagers, showed them to have grave misgivings about our constitutional bill of rights. Those great amendments calling for presumption of innocence, for proof of guilt beyond reasonable doubt, for trial by jury, due process of law, and other rights of the citizen, were put in the Constitution so we could not have a dictator, as some nations have, with a government of men, but rather a government of law. Unfortunately, too often, we hear of these amendments being traduced, with license being demanded for everyone rather than liberty, with intellectuals demanding freedom from all restraint on their conduct. On May Day, when the mob and rioters attempted to take over Washington, what did they have as a substitute if they had succeeded in their attempt to paralyze the government?

The Bill of Rights applies today as a means of guarding justice. The purpose of criminal procedure, and the Bill of Rights which provides for criminal procedure, is important not only to the citizen-defendant but also to the lawyers and the judges in the trial of criminal cases. Our difficulty is that too many lawyers and even some judges do not believe that criminal procedure is an essential to the enforcement of criminal law.

The whole purpose of the Bill of Rights was to lay down sound rules of procedure for the courts to follow in the prosecution of every accused for the commission of a crime, without regard to his race, color, or creed. Without criminal procedure, you cannot have "Equal Justice Under Law," which words are carved in the stone above the entrance to the Supreme Court.

That is the essential concept. Democracy is justice under the rule of law. Communism and anarchy are justice under men. The people today are having difficulty with that word "justice" as to its meaning. I find many people who speak of it as if it were ethics or a moral code. If we talk of justice in courts it is entirely different than what many people think of—they think of justice as mercy.

It appears to me that we must start to educate not only the students in the law schools but the students in the grade and high schools and our colleges in the meaning of "Equal Justice Under Law" that we may have our citizens support in the enforcement of criminal law.

The law aims at treating all people alike under law and not under men. The symbol of your organization is the figure of a man reaching for the stars. The emblem of justice is a woman blindfolded, holding a sword in one hand and scales in the other. Some judges are unmindful of this. They want to follow their own ideas eliminating the rules of procedure. This is not justice under law, but a personal equation. The blindfold is in the symbol to represent equal justice under law. It represents the law—as a judge, my ears should tell me what has been done, but I should not see what the person before me looks like to determine guilt. Justice is not always mercy, nor is mercy always justice.

And this is significant. There is a place for mercy in the law. It is the right of the jury to pass upon the evidence and apply what they find to be the facts to the law, as given by the judge. Juries can administer mercy because they are the judges of the innocence or guilt of the accused.

In a case in my court in Detroit, for example, a young man was tried and the jury came in with a verdict of not guilty. The prisoner was duly released and the court adjourned. I was walking down the hall when I saw the foreman of the jury shaking a finger at the former prisoner, whom he had backed into a corner, and saying to him: "We let you off this time but don't you ever do that again!" That could be classed as society's mercy, for they had the right to acquit him, as his peers. A judge also can give mercy in his sentence, unless the legislative body has made a certain mandatory sentence applicable to the case on trial.

My teaching of criminal law at the Detroit College of Law demonstrated to me how difficult it was for law students to see the necessity for following procedures as given by the Constitution in the Bill of Rights. I have discovered in my practice at the bar, and my service on the bench, that there is some cowardice in the legal profession, the juries, and even the judiciary itself in the enforcement of criminal law and the administration of equal justice under law. It is not always an easy task. I recall one of the most prominent citizens of Detroit—a friend—who asked me not to become a Grand Jury because I had only one of two choices. One was to find indictment for crime by our public officers and, in so doing, to ruin the city, and other to find no guilt and no indictment and to ruin myself.

I could not have made my investigation if I had not received the cooperation of the Press of Detroit not to print the names of persons appearing before me as witnesses until after I had completed my work. Times have changed. I have a feeling that the press would not give me the leeway today that they did then. I could not have done that work today.

We need skilled prosecutors as well as skilled defense lawyers learned in law. There is a tendency today to barter and sell justice—to change a felony to a misdemeanor to obtain conviction by a plea of guilty. Our people and some of the press have changed our language to call felonies "Civil Disobedience." The Constitution allows the people "peaceably to assemble" but not illegally to assemble. A mob has no right to assemble. I fail to find the word "peaceable" when they describe these riotous assemblies as "civil disobedience."

Our big job today is to make those who desire to dissent to return to our traditional methods of dissent and change, and this applies not only to laymen but to the police, the courts, the legislatures and officials in the executive offices. We must all abide by and be governed by law.

I applaud the Michigan Association of the Profession in dedicating itself to better enforcement of law in the great State of Michigan and to getting involved in this great crusade of helping to keep our country free as a Republic.

CANCEL CANNIKIN

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Sunday's edition of the Washington Post contained an editorial regarding the proposed nuclear test on Amchitka Island.

The circumstances surrounding this blast are most mysterious. In the name of national security, the Government has denied citizens and Congress access to information that would put the proposed nuclear explosion into some kind of reasonable perspective.

I have written to the President on numerous occasions, and I have sent several telegrams urging him to reevaluate the U.S. position regarding nuclear testing. Although my letters and telegrams were written more than 4 months ago, I have yet to receive a reply from the President.

In May of this year, I went to Anchorage and Juneau to offer testimony before the Atomic Energy Commission. At that time, I raised several questions regarding the safety, necessity, and feasibility of such a test. I believe that each question merited an answer. Yet to this date, the Atomic Energy Commission has failed to respond to my questions.

As the time approaches for the detonation of this underground nuclear test, more and more people have expressed their opposition to project Cannikin.

The Washington Post editorial is just another voice that asks for rationality during a time when we need it most:

CANCEL CANNIKIN

Mr. Nixon would be well advised to cancel Cannikin, the mile-deep test of a five-megaton warhead scheduled at Amchitka in the Aleutians late in October. Environmentalists and conservationists, no small constituency, have warned of possible radioactive leakage, earthquakes and submarine tidal waves. Arms control experts have noted that Cannikin's technical purpose is to test part of a militarily dubious anti-missile defense which, because of progress at SALT, may not even be deployed. Canada, Japan and other Pacific neighbors are alarmed that the United States, acting alone, should endanger their near environment. If the advance political "fallout" of Cannikin is this poisonous, how much worse will be the fallout after the fact.

Why, then, does the President insist on plunging ahead? In so far as political analysis affords an answer, it may be this: Mr. Nixon believes that if public opinion overrules what he regards as strategic necessity and Moscow sees it happen, then a fateful precedent will have been established and Moscow will be sorely tempted to exploit it. In these terms, Cannikin is not so much a test of a missile as a test of American will.

What is lacking in that otherwise seductive argument is a sense of perspective. Clearly, it would be dangerous for Moscow to get the idea that the United States is a pushover. What is less clear is how such an idea could be conveyed by cancelling the test of a particular missile which may or may not be de-

ployed, which may or may not work, and which if deployed will surely provoke additional counter-measures by the other side—all this at a level of armaments on both sides which is well above what has come to be called *sufficiency*. That the Russians, untroubled by public opinion, have conducted their own large megaton tests does not mean they have a military or psychological advantage; it means they have not figured out how to get off the arms treadmill. It is precisely the uncritical tendency to regard each and every stride in the arms race as a do-or-die test of national resolve that has strung out the contest and made it the tragedy that it is.

By cancelling Cannikin Mr. Nixon can serve arms control and the environment alike, to his own and the country's advantage.

JAMES G. FULTON

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as secretary of the Pennsylvania Republican delegation, I feel it is appropriate to include in the RECORD the following letters of sympathy and tributes to my late colleague and friend, the Honorable James G. Fulton:

The letters follow:

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C. October 8, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT G. FULTON,
Dormont, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Your brother's many years of service to his State and to the Nation were a credit to him and to the people of his district who elected him to represent them for twenty-seven years. Jim will be very much missed by all of us who had the privilege of knowing him.

May I extend my deepest sympathy to you and to the other members of your family.

Sincerely,

SPIRO T. AGNEW.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: Mrs. Rogers and I were saddened to learn of your loss.

Your brother was admired for his knowledge of foreign affairs and his service to our country. He will be greatly missed by his friends in the Department of State.

We extend our deepest sympathy to you and the other members of your family.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. ROGERS.

DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY,
Pittsburgh, Pa., October 11, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT FULTON,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I was very sorry to hear of your brother's death. I regarded Jim very highly and regret very much that I was unable to pay my respects personally. Please accept my sympathy and the sympathies of all the Holy Ghost Fathers and Brothers with me here at the University. May he rest in peace!

I pray that the Good Lord dispatch him swiftly to his true home in heaven and that He console and sustain all Jim's loved ones in this time of bereavement.

With every best wish and prayer, I am

Sincerely,

HENRY J. MCANULTY, C.S.Sp.

TOWNSHIP OF MOUNT LEBANON,
October 12, 1971.

Mr. ROBERT D. FULTON,
Pittsburgh, Pa.

DEAR BOB: Words are so futile it seems in expressing innermost feelings, particularly on an occasion such as this as Mount Lebanon joins the many other communities in the 27th Congressional District in bidding farewell to your brother and our friend, Jim. A very exceptional human being has departed from us and I doubt if the unique role he played in the life of the South Hills will ever again be filled.

I am enclosing a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Mt. Lebanon Township at the meeting held on October 11, 1971 which all too inadequately expresses the feeling of the Commissioners on Jim's death. I am sure the 40,000 residents of Mt. Lebanon would like to share in this tribute to the one who served us so very, very well, in so many ways, for such a long time.

I am enclosing extra copies of the resolution as well as this covering letter in case you may wish to pass them along to your sisters. To each of you we would like to express our personal note of sympathy on the death of your distinguished brother.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. FINLEY,
Township Manager.

A RESOLUTION PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES G. FULTON

Whereas, Congressman James G. Fulton died on October 6, 1971, and

Whereas, Congressman Fulton served with distinction in the House of Representatives of the United States of America representing the 27th Congressional District from February 2, 1945, until October 6, 1971, and for two years prior to that in the State Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania from 1939 to 1941, and

Whereas, Congressman Fulton rendered outstanding service which will long be remembered by his constituents as well as all citizens of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and his associates in the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the Township Board of Commissioners on behalf of the citizens of Mount Lebanon wishes to pay special tribute to the memory of Congressman Fulton for his distinctive public service, now therefore be it

Resolved, that the Board of Township Commissioners of the Township of Mount Lebanon hereby expresses sincere sympathy to the family of Congressman James G. Fulton on their loss and further wishes to formally recognize the long and outstanding service rendered by Congressman Fulton to the citizens of Mt. Lebanon, the Pittsburgh area, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

A REMINISCENCE AND A TRIBUTE TO JAMES G. FULTON

(By Richard E. Beeman)

"There are two things you're not allowed to say in this office"—"The first is 'I can't'; the second is 'I don't know' ". So went the warning Jim Fulton gave to each new student who came to work in his Congressional office, and such was the student's first glimpse into politics and the style of the man whom the office knew as 'JF'.

A Navy Veteran, Jim Fulton was the kind of boss that if he said 'jump', you asked 'how high?' on the way up. And for over 27 years, he was personally responsible for giving the young people of Pittsburgh an opportunity to learn first hand about the realities of public service. When public funds were not available, he frequently went into his own pocket to keep the student intern program going.

For the young people in his office, being around Jim Fulton meant that every experience was magnified times five. If it was work, it meant exhaustion; if it was fun, it meant you had something to tell your grandchildren about. There was no middle ground for JF because he approached every day at full throttle, loving every minute of the excitement he created. "I *like* being your Congressman!" he'd exclaim, and "Count me on the team!" was his trademark.

His sense of adventure was legion, and Jim was never bashful. "Gee Whillikers!" he telegraphed the President, "Surveyor sure did go kerplunk right on the moon. If you ever have need for a Congressman/Astronaut, I know a good volunteer". Jim Fulton would have done it with glee.

He had short tolerance for hesitation. "Go on," he commanded a summer intern, "go represent me at the White House this evening. You can't lose . . . If they let you in, you'll have the time of your life. If they turn you away . . . well, you'll never be turned away from a better place."

Everybody in Pittsburgh knew about Jim Fulton being in the newspaper business, but sometimes he had to tell the people in Washington himself. "I know how to pose the best pictures for newspapers because I own seven of them," he announced one night at an embassy reception, "Now, Mr. Khrushchev, if you'll just stand right over here . . ."

Such encounters made Jim Fulton delight in public life and put him always a step ahead. The sparkle of his personality and imagination kept him there. Long before fashionable women's liberation, Jim Fulton called for a woman astronaut. While others struggled to see the dawn of the space age. Jim Fulton had visions of nuclear rockets and landings on Mars.

He was an avid reader, and his knowledge of science, unsurpassed in the House, could be devastating in debate. Once, when challenged to defend the reasonableness of the metric system, he delivered himself of a fifteen minute lecture to the Congress on the subtitles of using light waves as a measuring standard. "He was the consummate politician," a House colleague remarked, "In the leadership fights, when Jim Fulton would stop nominating Bob Corbett and finally vote for one of the contenders, you knew the election was over."

Jim was careful to separate himself from his public office and never fell victim to the mistake of believing that he was what in fact he represented. On Sundays he would never shake hands at church. Standing with his hands conspicuously in his pockets, he'd explain, "Hand shaking is politics, and I don't come to the Lord's house to do business." Jim Fulton worshipped at the Presbyterian Church, but he had so many friends in the Catholic Diocese that he used to quip, "I'm either the best Presbyterian the Catholics ever had, or the best Catholic the Presbyterians ever had, and sometimes even I'm not sure which!"

Beyond the figure in public office, Jim Fulton was a warmhearted person whose intuition for human nature could be matched only by his compassion for the human condition. En route to Washington one summer morning, JF suddenly pulled off the highway and stopped. An old drifter whose coat was held together by an oversized safety pin trudged along the other side of the road. "Here," Jim said, "Run catch up with that old man and give him half our lunch. Don't tell him anything, but that he reminded the fellow in the black car of his dear sainted father." Jim Fulton's concern ranged from roadside to White House. "Tell the President you think he's doin' a good job when you shake his hand . . . Dear God, he looks just awful this morning."

Few men have had such an intense feeling for the fun, the foibles and the ironies of public life. When a constituent wrote in to ask Jim how it was that Congress could re-

quire working men to retire at age 65 while its own elderly leadership touted the virtues of a Seniority System, Jim was stymied for a second. He tried one reply of explanation, then another, then telegraphed back this message: "Congratulations on your perspicacity. You have uncovered one of the basic contradictions of American politics."

He worked hard for us all. He enriched our public life and he fought for our country's well-being. He left a heritage of honesty, friendship, and personal sacrifice in public life. When times were hard, he'd serve warning to his friends, "Don't ever run for Congress." Then he'd smile and his eyes would twinkle as he'd add "Cause they might elect you."

His passing marks the end of an era, and Congressman Jim Fulton will be long remembered in the heart of Pittsburghers as "The Best Congressman we ever had."

HEARINGS ON S. 2087

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, September 29, 1971, the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures held hearings on S. 2087, the administration-backed proposal to pay a $50,000 gratuity to the survivors of police officers killed in the line of duty. Testifying in support of this legislation that day was Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst, among others. Although I was unable to testify personally on this one day of hearings, I did submit written testimony, opposing the administration-backed measure.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will be considering this important issue, hopefully in the near future. So that my colleagues may better appreciate the full context of the administration-backed legislation and legislation which I have introduced, H.R. 714, I insert here my testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ANDREW JACOBS, JR., BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES, SENATE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, on August 1, 1968, Senator Bayh and I introduced legislation to extend Federal survivors' benefits to the families of police and firemen killed in the line of duty. The legislation which extends coverage under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to all public safety officers would provide up to 75% of the deceased officer's base pay to the widow and children until her remarriage and until the children's 18th birthday.

In April of 1968, President Johnson signed Public Law 90-291, which extended coverage under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to all State and local law enforcement officers who are killed while enforcing a Federal law or while maintaining custody over a Federal prisoner.

It was late in the 90th Congress when Senator Bayh and I introduced our bill; too late, in fact, to solicit Administration support with an eye toward passage in that Congress. So in March, 1969, Senator Bayh and I introduced identical legislation in the 91st Congress. The reaction to our legislation was rapid and gratifying. By mid-summer of 1969 there were 135 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives as well as endorsements from the National Fraternal Order of Police, the International Firefighters' Association [AFL-CIO] and the American Trial Lawyers' Association.

After several phone calls, some prodding, and six months delay, the Administration voiced its opposition to the principle of Federal benefits to the families of slain local public safety officers in an October 8, 1969 letter from Deputy Attorney General Richard Kleindienst to Chairman Celler:

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, D.C., October 8, 1969.

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,

Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on H.R. 7989, a bill "To extend benefits under section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled in the line of duty."

Public Law 90-291 (5 U.S.C. 8191-8193) extended the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (5 U.S.C. 8101 *et seq.*) to eligible State and local law enforcement officers and their survivors. That law defines eligible officers to include a State or local law enforcement officer killed or injured while seeking or attempting to apprehend a person for the commission of a crime against the United States or as a material witness in a criminal proceeding instituted by the United States. Also eligible are law officers protecting a person held for the commission of a crime against the United States or held as a material witness in connection with such a crime. A final category of eligible law enforcement officer is one who, when injured or killed, was attempting to prevent the commission of crime against the United States. In all instances, eligibility for compensation pursuant to Public Law 91-291 is dependent upon some connection between the death or injury of the law enforcement officer and the enforcement of Federal law.

H.R. 7989, recognizing the valuable service of law enforcement officers and firemen throughout the United States, would amend section 8191 of title 5, United States Code, to extend its benefits to professional and volunteer State and local police and firemen; as well as to all other members of legally organized law enforcement agencies. Eligibility for compensation would not be dependent upon any nexus between the injury or death and the performance of a federally connected activity.

The Department of Justice is unable to recommend enactment of this legislation, despite its high regard for those who risk their lives in law enforcement or fire fighting. If the principle of this legislation is sound, it could apply with equal force to retirement benefits and even salaries of public safety officers. In our judgment it is incumbent upon the States and local communities adequately to compensate such personnel when employed, when injured or killed, and when retired. Further, it would appear to be an unreasonable intrusion into State and local government activities for the Federal Government to underwrite the proposed compensation benefits.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

RICHARD G. KLEINDIENST,
Deputy Attorney General.

The administration persisted in its opposition to this principle for 20 months, until June 3, 1971:

[From the Washington Post, May 27, 1971]

NIXON, HOOVER DISCUSS POLICE DEATHS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

President Nixon summoned Attorney General John N. Mitchell and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover to his office yesterday to discuss ways in which the federal government can help prevent the slaying of policemen.

White House press secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said after the unexpected meeting that the President feels the recent slayings in New York and Washington were "tragic" and "reprehensible."

"Mr. Nixon will write letters of sympathy to the families of two New York policemen who were shot in the backs last week and of two Washington policemen who died following gunshot wounds suffered in the line of duty, Ziegler said.

The New York policemen killed last week were Waverly M. Jones and Joseph A. Piagnitini. They were shot after having responded to a call for help in a Harlem apartment.

In Washington, William L. Sigmon was killed Tuesday when he attempted to apprehend two robbers of the National Permanent Federal Savings and Loan Assn. office on MacArthur Boulevard NW.

Another policeman, Jerard F. Young, was buried yesterday. He was shot in the head while attempting to make an arrest April 21.

Last November, the President directed the Justice Department "to make available all appropriate investigative resources" to local and state police "when requested in any case involving an assault upon a police officer."

The President said at the time that he had discussed his directive with Hoover and D.C. Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson.

The President "primarily wanted to discuss the scope of the problem and to see what assistance is being provided," Ziegler said yesterday of the late afternoon meeting.

The FBI's main help is in providing laboratory tests and assisting in out-of-state leads on those involved in attacks on police, Ziegler reported.

"The President asked me to express his hope that these tragedies will remind people of the debt we owe policemen for many services, of the protection they so selflessly provide and of the respect and support we owe them for what they do," the press secretary said.

Also attending the meeting in the President's office were John D. Ehrlichman, assistant to the President for domestic affairs, and Egil Krogh, deputy assistant.

Zeigler said that narcotics control also was discussed at the meeting.

THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WAS DELIVERED TODAY BY CONGRESSMAN ANDY JACOBS (D-IND.) AT A NEWS CONFERENCE IN THE CAPITOL

In response to the recent tragedies of policemen killed in the line of duty, President Nixon on Wednesday expressed his hope that "these tragedies will remind people of the debt we owe policemen for many services, of the protection they so selflessly provide, and of the respect and support we owe them for what they do."

I share that hope. And I am encouraged to think that the President's concern might indicate that this administration will reconsider its opposition to my three-year effort to enact legislation to compensate the widows and children of police officers and firemen killed in the line of duty.

If it does not reconsider, if it does not withdraw its opposition then one must interpret the true White House message on Wednesday as being, "I can't give you anything but love. . . ."

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1971]

FOR SLAIN POLICEMEN'S KIN

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—President Nixon called today for Federal legislation to provide $50,000 to the family of any policeman slain in the line of duty.

At the same time, his Attorney General reiterated the Nixon Administration's opposition to new controls on the sale of handguns.

The new proposal was announced by Attorney General John N. Mitchell at a White House briefing following a morning meeting between the President, nearly two dozen chiefs of police and sheriffs from around the country, Mr. Mitchell, J. Edgar Hoover and several Senators and Congressmen.

The meeting had been called to discuss recent police slayings, to demonstrate the Administration's concern and to unveil the new proposal. By the end of the day, however, the Administration had found itself caught up in new controversies over the motives behind its concern, its stand on gun control legislation and even the composition of the meeting.

Among the prominent absentees were two critics of some aspects of the Administration's policy—Police Commissioner Patrick V. Murphy of New York and Quinn Tamm, executive director of the International Association of Chiefs of Police.

Without going into detail, Mr. Mitchell said that legislation providing a lump sum of $50,000 to the survivors of slain policemen would be forwarded to Congress soon "in further indication" of the Administration's support of law enforcement officers across the country. He said that benefit levels for slain policemen varied widely from state to state and were in some cases insufficient.

The proposal was denounced by Representative Andrew Jacobs, Jr., Democrat of Indiana. He submitted legislation in 1968 that would amend the Federal Employe Compensation Act to provide the widow of a policeman slain in the line of duty 40 per cent of her husband's salary plus 15 per cent per child up to a total of 75 per cent of the total salary.

Asserting that his version would provide larger annuities, Mr. Jacobs said that the Administration submitted an opinion in October, 1969, opposing his measure as "an unreasonable intrusion into state and local government activities." The fact that the Administration had reversed itself on the question of "intrusion," Mr. Jacobs said, suggested that it wished to gain political profit from the concern generated by the recent shootings.

Mr. Chairman, nearly 200 police officers lost their lives in the line of duty and over 50,000 assaults were made against police officers while the Administration opposed this legislation.

There are several salient features which distinguish and favor the Bayh-Jacobs legislation over that of the Administration.

(A) S. 1081/H.R. 714 will grant benefits more closely related to need by basing the annuity in part upon the number of dependents.

(B) The Administration machinery for the implementation of S. 1081/H.R. 714 is extant. In moving the consideration of the Conference Report of what became Public Law 90-291, the Chairman of this subcommittee commended placing the Administrative function of that similar legislation in the Department of Labor, to insure that a disparity did not exist between benefits received by a Federal officer and a non-Federal officer killed enforcing a Federal law. I suggest we should not allow a difference between two non-Federal officers, one of whom dies enforcing a Federal law while the other dies enforcing a State law, but both protecting American lives and property.

(C) S. 1081/H.R. 714 include benefits for permanently disabled public safety officers. The Administration proposal does not. Once more, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with a potential disparity. If a local law enforcement officer is disabled by a car thief from across the State line, he will receive Federal benefits. If the automobile was stolen in the State, the benefits will not accrue to him. It would be shameful if a totally disabled policeman under such circumstances were to wish for the sake of his family that he were dead.

It is well to note that of the 105 claims made to date under Public Law 90-291, nearly one-half [47] have been for disability. 100 police officers are assaulted everyday. Some of these assaults result in no more than a bruise, others in total paralysis. Equity requires benefits for disability as well as death.

(D) S. 1081/H.R. 714 provide for the inclusion of firemen in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. The Administration-backed proposal does not.

In 1970, 115 paid firefighters lost their lives in the line of duty and 38,683 were injured, 195 in civil disorders and an additional 113 as a result of individual acts of violence. 208 firefighters were injured answering and returning from false alarms. 320 firefighters were injured in the line of duty in 1970 to the extent that they had to leave firefighting. 224 left because of occupational disease disability, while another 235 died of occupational disease. Mr. Chairman, according to the F.B.I. statistics for 1970, nearly 10,000 arrests were made for the crime of arson. Though precise figures are not available, all indications point to the probability that deaths and injuries in the line of duty are as high, if not higher, for volunteer firemen. For the purposes of this legislation, amendment should be made to consider volunteer firemen as having a certain GS rating, as is currently mandated for volunteers in VISTA and the Peace Corps who are killed under certain circumstances.

(E) Comparison of the financial benefits which would be paid under the two major proposals for Federal benefits indicate that the annuity method is preferable to the gratuity method. The International Firefighters Association and the National Fraternal Order of Police have indicated that they would rather see their families receive a monthly annuity check than a lump sum which might well have a tendency to evaporate rather quickly. Even if the $50,000 gratuity were invested in 6% bonds, the yield would be only $3,000 a year, a figure which does not approach 75% of the base salary of most public safety officers—nor, for that matter, does it even reach the poverty level of $3,944 a year.

Senator Bayh and I—and, I trust, this Committee and the rest of Congress and most of the country—think the families of those who fall in the fight to make us safe deserve better than that.

ONLY TRULY NEEDY SHOULD GET FREE MEDICAL ATTENTION

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, as the Committee on Ways and Means begins hearings on the subject of a national health insurance program, my attention has been called to a most interesting article which appeared in the March 22, 1971, edition of the Baltimore Sun. As I believe it is most pertinent to those concerned with this matter, I insert the article in full at this point in the RECORD:

ONLY TRULY NEEDY SHOULD GET FREE MEDICAL ATTENTION

(By Russell Kirk)

Plenty of people are all against socialism—except such socialistic measures as benefit themselves. When, not long ago, I wrote something about the overloading of military hospitals by veterans (and all their dependents) who get even aspirin free there, a good many beneficiaries of this variety of socialism spoke up in wrath.

From Florida, a retired major wrote to me, proclaiming himself an "anti-Socialist." But he stoutly defended his right, and the right of all his fellow pensioners (whom he prefers to call "retirees") to total medical treatment at public expense.

"With HEW giving free care to unwed mothers, prostitutes, alcoholics, drug addicts and other types of social scum," this retiree informed me, "why do you downgrade it for people who have earned it honorably with their own sweat and blood?"

Well, as a matter of fact, I think the Medicare and Medicaid programs ill-designed and inordinately costly. My general principle is that no one should be offered free medical attention, or anything else free, who is quite able to pay his own way. Charitable benefits—whether from governmental or private sources—should be reserved for those truly in need.

On this principle, there exists a good case for free or low-cost medical treatment for military veterans who have incurred serious service-connected disabilities, and whose income is low. But it does not follow that every man who has served some years in the Army (as I did) ought to be equally entitled, of right, to claim medical benefits free of charge, just because he happens to live within driving distance of a military post with a hospital.

The typical retired "career" veteran is not in want. After 20 years in service, he has been able to retire on full pension. He is in his forties or fifties, healthy enough, and holding a decent job, in addition to his pension. On the average, he does not have little children who need medical care. In short, the average man of this description is better able to pay his own medical bills than is the average American citizen.

Besides, making medical services free at base hospitals discriminates in favor of those pensioners fortunate enough to live within reasonable distance of such installations. If free medical attention for life is supposed to be an important inducement for young people to enlist in Army, Navy, or Air Force—why limit this benefit to that minority of veterans dwelling next door to a military hospital?

"If Mr. Kirk's employer offers retirement benefits for his years as a senior citizen," another reader—in Puyallup, Washington—writes, "I would be surprised if he refused them." Well, I do not have an employer; but I would not take advantage of what was originally intended to be a charitable service to those who had suffered seriously in the service of their country, if I could pay my own way.

When I left the Army, I could have filed a claim, successful, for cash benefits, as well as limitless free medical attention for a service-connected disability. I declined to do so, not being incapacitated, really, and believing that such benefits should be reserved for those really in need.

But some think differently. There is the general, for instance, on active duty—a pleasant man, capable and well-liked by his subordinates—who weekly is driven more than a hundred miles to the nearest military hospital to collect 400 free aspirin tablets for himself. An inconsistent world, my masters.

ARE WE SPENDING MONEY FOR THE WRONG CARE?

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, as our House Ways and Means Committee this week begins hearings on health care proposals, I would ask that the following article be inserted in the RECORD for consideration by my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 28, 1971]

NATIONAL HEALTH: ARE WE SPENDING MONEY FOR THE WRONG CARE?

(By Earl Ubell)

(NOTE.—Mr. Ubell is science editor of WCBS–TV News.)

In the Congress, last week, the debate sharpened over the ways and means of spending new billions of dollars for the nation's medical care. Yet for a small but increasingly vocal group of economists, sociologists and even physicians, the whole argument seemed somewhat beside the point. More doctors and hospital beds for the millions, they believe, will do little to reduce serious illness or prevent premature deaths.

Health leaders testifying before the Senate Health Subcommittee were arguing the merits of four plans. President Nixon wants a national insurance program that will be paid for by the individual, his employer and—in small part—by Government. The American Medical Association has submitted a similiar plan. Senator Edward Kennedy wants the Government to pay the bill. Senator Jacob Javits seeks to extend the present health insurance for the aged to everyone.

Under such programs, the disease-care industry is likely to grow from its present $60-billion a year to $75-billion or even $100-billion, making it the biggest business in America. So far the major argument has been over the means of financing—government or private—and, peripherally, over ways of restructuring our medical panoply to provide care that is "better," less expensive and more evenly distributed.

But there is increasing evidence that the medical complex, no matter how restructured or paid for, may be irrelevant to the central health issue. Thus, for example, Dr. Eli Ginzberg, Columbia University economist, points out that, "Despite the substantial increases in expenditures for medical care, there has been no significant increase in male longevity during the past decade." And Dr. Victor Fuchs, another economist, comments: "My reading of the health literature leaves me with the impression that the greatest potential for improving the health of the American people is not to be found in increasing the number of physicians, or forcing them into groups or even in increasing hospital productivity, but is to be found in what people do for themselves."

Both views depend on two self-evident axioms. First, the doctor is helpless before ailments that account for most of the sickness and death in America—heart, kidney and blood vessel ailments, cancer, alcohol and drug abuse, accidents and the general debilitations of age. Even though he can cite individual instances of spectacular cure or life saving, in general he palliates. He reaches the patient wth too much medical care too late.

As a corollary, even when doctors get there early, the statistics show little change. At least four studies have indicated that annual physical check-ups do not decrease mortality or morbidity.

A second axiom states that in the modern world, housing, nutrition, accident prevention, sanitation—clean water, food, streets and homes—have produced more health than all the doctors and hospitals combined. Recognizing this, the Community Medicine Department of Mount Sinai Hospital is developing a corps of "super" superintendents to repair toilets, clean out rat and vermin infested basements and maintain deteriorated housing in the slums. These men, it is felt, will produce more health than an equivalent number of doctors and nurses.

Dr. Nathan Glazer, the sociologist, argues further in the current issue of The Public Interest that our personal, psychological and cultural milieu—i.e., the way we have learned to take care of ourselves—may be as important as better environmental conditions and certainly more important than doctors and doctoring.

He points to a curious set of statistics: Sweden has 83 doctors per 100,000 population but it has half the death rate among middle-aged men as the United States, with 140 doctors per 100,000. Furthermore, Americans go to their doctors twice as often as Swedes do. Even within the United States, the wide variations of doctor availability do not seem to have any correlation with health. Rather, health indexes seem more related to poverty levels within states than to numbers of doctors.

Many blame the current financial medical crisis on the inefficient system and they want to improve its efficiency so it delivers more medical care for the dollar. The Kaiser-Permanente Plan and the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York (HIP), both pre-paid insurance plans with doctors working in groups, are one approach to increased efficiency. President Nixon is pushing for establishment of such "health maintenance organizations." But though they can cite statistical evidence showing lower death rates among their members than among users of other kinds of insurance plans, they have been unable to untangle those figures from social and economic patterns of their patients. Thus, maternal mortality rates among blacks in the two plans are lower than those for blacks outside the plans—but higher than those for whites within the plans.

If the critics are right, the new insurance programs, if passed, will serve mainly to drive up demand for health care—which will in turn drive up costs, thereby consuming a substantial portion of our national talent and treasure—and there will be little improvement in the mortality and morbidity statistics to show for it. The alternative: Put more effort into traditional areas of nutrition, housing and sanitation, especially among the poor. And break new ground with non-medical preventive measures—campaigns for auto and home safety, massive anti-cigarette, anti-alcohol, anti-drug programs, and high-powered educational schemes to teach us to take care of ourselves.

TROUBLE IN THE MOJAVE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the senseless folly of aiding the destruction of one environment to contribute to the ultimate deterioration of another environmental system is being manifested even today as the California water project continues to be built.

Water is to be diverted from northern California in mammoth amounts to be sent southward to cool powerplants and to "turn the desert green" so that land speculators can make a substantial profit from unwitting citizens tempted with talk of "land booms" and "bonanzas in the desert."

Mr. Speaker, the October issue of the Reader's Digest includes an excellent article on the perils facing the great desert lands of California.

The article, entitled "Trouble in the Mojave," demonstrates the awful fate that will befall this great resource if we continue to allow reason to be secondary to the quick profits sought by land developers and speculators.

The article follows:

TROUBLE IN THE MOJAVE

(By Earl and Miriam Selby)

The mystique of California's great Mojave Desert is that of a land bitterly hostile to life, barren, a place where, as some geologists once wrote, they were "20 miles from water, 20 miles from wood, and 40 feet from hell."

Like millions of other Americans, we shared that idea—until we spent time in the Mojave. Then we came to see it as a national treasure unlike anything else in this country. But it is a treasure in trouble. As things are going, it may soon become one vast sandy slum.

The problem is people: some 11 million people who live in the cities of southern California just two hours away; people who want to escape, even for a little time; people who want to collect rocks, or hunt, or ride their motorcycles; people who want to build a jetport, or speculate in land, or prospect for mineral riches. The temptation is to believe the Mojave can absorb anything man does to it. To understand why this is not so, you need to see the desert as it really is.

Nature has spread a table of richness in the Mojave. Last spring we walked in fields so fertile they sprout seven cuttings of alfalfa in a single year. We saw lilies 40 feet tall, as well as micro-dot flowers visible only when we were flat on our stomachs. We fished for rainbow trout, fed wild berries to robins.

As many as 25,000 cattle and 140,000 sheep graze on the Mojave. One of every four fryer-chickens in California is desert-bred. The annual worth of minerals taken from the ground is $170 million.

Even the topography has become an asset. In the last 20 years, dozens of prototypes of military planes have been flight-tested at Edwards Air Force Base, where 45 square miles of dry lake bed make an ideal runway for emergency landings.

But the Mojave is more. William Pitt once called public parks the "lungs of London," and that is what the desert is for America. It offers city residents a chance to breathe, to escape their tensions, to look on land undisturbed by man.

Like a giant scoop, the Mojave stretches westward from the Colorado River to the Sierra Nevada, from the transverse mountains bordering the Los Angeles basin northward into Death Valley. In this vastness—three times as big as Connecticut—the Mojave has an endless panorama of life and moods. The kangaroo rat, for instance, has learned to live here without much water by developing kidneys four times as efficent as man's. Some desert plants have seeds with a coating that washes off only when rains are heavy enough to assure moist soil for the entire life cycle. Cactus wrens have some inner sense that tells them not to lay eggs in years when there would not be enough spring flowers to support the insects the birds need for their young.

It can be an inhospitable land. A few years ago, hundreds of robins scouring the Mojave for water during a particularly

virulent hot spell finally found it, but died on the edge of it, too exhausted to drink. Mojave's sands have been measured at 170 degrees in July. But with an average elevation of 2100 feet above sea level, it also has winter snows. Spring sandstorms can denude cars with a 75-mile-per-hour sandblasting. Vicious thunderstorms set off canyon mud flows that shove giant boulders 600 feet a minute.

None of this keeps people out. In 1940 the Mojave had a population of about 30,000. Today there are ten times that number. The biggest concentration is in the western end's Antelope Valley, but the swelling is also keenly felt in such eastern Mojave communities as Barstow, Needles and Twenty-nine Palms. With more people come more cars, more homes, more industry, more pollution, more trash.

Smog is beginning to ravage desert vegetation. In Antelope Valley the underground water is being used up twice as fast as mountain runoffs can replenish it. Even the new supplies anticipated from the $3-billion project bringing water from northern California's Feather River may not meet all the demands. Still, talk of boom abounds. Several years ago, Lockheed invested $50 million in a new plant for its L–1011 TriStar jets at Palmdale. And the city of Los Angeles has already begun acquiring land for the $900-million airport it is planning in the same area.

Precisely because the Mojave is so big there has never been any unified plan for controlling developments. Real-estate promotions unacceptable in one county find haven in another. While some subdividers plan conscientiously, with paved streets, deed restrictions and open-space provisions, others use only a bulldozer blade to denote roads to come, someday; and in staking out the smallest possible plots they invite the worst of suburbia's ticky-tack.

There is ample evidence of the results of poor planning. About 80 percent of the Mojave, more than seven million acres, is federal land. In the 1950s, when the pressure was to get public lands onto tax rolls as private property and damn the consequences, the Federal Bureau of Land Management (BLM) auctioned off tens of thousands of the acres under its jurisdiction. Much of it wound up as the pawn in land speculation. People met the "residence" requirements by putting up small shacks, then abandoning them. And they will remain until torn down, because hardly anything rots in the hot, dry air. We saw one canyon road, known locally as "tin-can alley," littered with thousands of cans. They had been used to feed silver miners—90 years ago.

J. Russell Penny, a plain-talking man, took over as the BLM director in California five years ago. He has brought a fresh breath to the agency. But BLM at present is hopelessly outmatched in the desert. Although it still controls nearly three fourths of the Mojave and is charged with maintaining it in public trust for all of us, it has never been given enough men or money to do its job. Visitor-days—a technical term in which the number of visitors is multiplied by their days in the desert—now run about five million a year on BLM lands. Yet, BLM has only enough men to assign one to every *million* acres. The results are shocking:

Under the best of care, it takes from 25 to 35 years to nurse fragile desert vegetation from poor to good condition Yet hundreds of thousands of desert acres have been wantonly chewed up by ORVs—"offroad vehicles" such as motorcycles, dune buggies and jeeps. When cycles roar across BLM lands, they scar the desert for decades. Tank trails left from World War II maneuvers are still clear after 30 years of weathering.

Petroglyphs and pictographs, priceless rock carvings, drawings and paintings made by Indians up to 3000 years ago, have literally been quarried out or, in some cases, shot into shambles by gun addicts using them for target practice.

In Penny's view, it is futile to think that the desert is not going to be used by people; to him, the only question is how they will do it. He has spearheaded action to channel ORVs into certain parts of the desert which have already been ruined. Penny also got federal, state and local officials to join in the first comprehensive studies of the desert's recreational uses, which showed that with proper management up to 50 million visitor-days a year could be accommodated. Management would include such things as giving BLM staffers the status of rangers with powers to enforce regulations; federal protection of the desert's irreplaceable resources; and initiation of a conservation and education program. BLM estimates that this work, plus needed long-range data collection and planning, could be done for $28 million over a five-year period in both the Mojave and its smaller sister desert to the south, the Colorado. Without such procedures, the enormous potential will be lost.

The plan has been submitted to the U.S. Interior Department and Congress. On their decision rests the future of the Mojave. And there is no time to wait.

YET ANOTHER PRESCRIPTION FOR CANCER

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, October 18, I joined with Chairman PAUL G. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS to introduce the "Cancer Attack Act of 1971." This bill was unanimously reported to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment on October 14, 1971.

In an effort to acquaint my colleagues with the subcommittee's bill and the reasons for its differences with the Senate version, I am submitting for insertion in the RECORD an article titled "Yet Another Prescription For Cancer" from the September 24 issue of Nature, and an article from the October 8, 1971, issue of Science titled "Cancer Politics: NIH Backers Mount Late Defense In House."

The articles follow:

YET ANOTHER PRESCRIPTION FOR CANCER

(By Nicholas Wade)

The National Institutes of Health may yet be rescued from dismemberment by the setting up of an independent cancer research authority. The proposals, which have so far achieved the dubious distinction of almost uniting the Senate in support and the biomedical community in opposition, last week entered a critical stage in their passage through Congress when they became the subject of hearings before the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment. But just as it seemed that members of the House of Representatives, like their colleagues in the Senate, would be placed in the unfortunate position of either voting for a measure likely to break up the National Institutes of Health or of recording their dissent and being accused of refusing to support cancer research, Mr. Paul G. Rogers, chairman of the Health Subcommittee, offered a solution that may preserve both the structure of NIH and the integrity of Congressmen.

With the support of five members of his subcommittee, Mr. Rogers last week introduced a bill designed to give the National Cancer Institute authority for coordinating all the activities of the NIH related to cancer research, and a budget of $400 million for 1972, rising to $600 million in 1974. The bill, which was written with the help of cancer researchers, also keeps the National Cancer Institute firmly within the NIH.

Before Rogers had introduced his bill, it seemed likely that the House would follow in the footsteps of the Senate by voting through a bill which in effect would take the National Cancer Institute outside the NIH umbrella and place it in an agency operating under the unfortunate and misleading name of the Cancer Cure Program. The Senate gave its blessing to the creation of the agency by a vote of seventy-nine to one, and since the bill also bore the sponsorship of the Administration, it looked set fair to sail through the House and into law with the opposing voices of the biomedical community drowned in the political rhetoric.

As passed by the Senate, the bill would set up the Cancer Cure Agency as an "independent agency within the National Institutes of Health" and would endow it with "such sums as may be necessary". The agency would have its own budget, a director at the same executive level as the director of the National Institutes of Health and its own bureaucracy. To call it an integral part of the NIH on the basis of its geographical location in Bethesda would therefore clearly be a misnomer, and any doubts about the subsequent bad health of the national institutes if the bill were to become law should have been swiftly cast aside when the National Heart and Lung Institute asked for similar treatment. There is little doubt in Bethesda that the Senate version of the bill would signal the break-up of NIH if it were passed unchanged by the House.

In contrast, the bill introduced last week by Congressman Rogers and his colleagues is designed to represent as closely as possible the views of the biomedical community, but at the same time it makes a few obvious concessions to the thinking that lay behind the Senate's adoption of the Cancer Cure Program. If adopted, the bill would give the National Cancer Institute more independence and considerably more dollars than at present, and make it better known, but its standing in the National Institutes of Health's bureaucracy would not be greatly different from that of other institutes.

The key strategem in Rogers's defense of the NIH is to seek to buy off other proposals with the promise of $400 million to the National Cancer Institute for the present year—more than $60 million above the amount appropriated by Congress last month, which itself included an extra $100 million requested by President Nixon in May. The Rogers bill would therefore distribute Congressional largesse to the National Cancer Institute at almost double the rate for 1971, and by 1974, the NCI would have nearly three times as much money as it is now accustomed to spend each year. Even this bid may, however, be too low to succeed in tempting the supporters of a separate agency to abandon their ideas, for the original proponents of a cancer cure agency were asking for funding to reach $1,000 million by 1976.

As for the bureaucratic arrangements for cancer research within the National Institutes of Health, the Rogers bill would promote the director of the NCI to the level of Associate Director of NIH. And before other agencies have a chance to complain that they would be relegated to the status of poor relations, the bill similarly promotes the directors of the National Heart and Lung Institute and of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke and makes all three positions political appointments directly from the White House. The grouping together of these three institutes is suggested on the

basis that, between them, cardiovascular diseases, stroke and cancer account for about 75 per cent of deaths in the United States, and it firmly underlines Rogers's belief that the political dust kicked up during the debate about cancer research should not be allowed to obscure the legitimate claims of other areas of biomedical research. Ironically, however, previous suggestions that the director of the NCI should be a political appointment have come under fire for placing unnecessary political ties on biomedical research, and the move to extend this provision to other institutes will do little to head off those criticisms.

Perhaps the most important provision in the Rogers bill is that the budget of the National Cancer Institute should be submitted directly to the President for review and referral to Congress. Although the Director of NIH, the Secretary for Health, Education and Welfare, and the National Cancer Advisory Council would have a chance to look at and make comments on the NCI budget, they would be constitutionally powerless to alter it. This proposal in effect may help to turn the cancer budget into a political football, to be debated separately in Congress each year, but it will also keep public attention focused on the efforts of Congressmen to help find a cure for cancer—a sure way of ensuring that funding for cancer research is maintained at a high level.

This proposed budget mechanism, although generally regarded as a lesser evil in comparison with setting up an entirely separate agency, will present a few difficulties for the National Institutes of Health. For one thing, the flexibility built into the present system, whereby budgets for the separate institutes are channelled through the director of the NIH, would be lost if the Rogers bill were put into effect. At present, revisions are made in each institute's budget right up to the time that the Administration's budget goes to press. But if the NCI's budget is to be reviewed by the Director of NIH, the Secretary of HEW and the National Cancer Advisory Council, not only must it be drawn up a good deal earlier but it would also not be open to last minute change. One official of the NIH described this arrangement last week as a "formula for chaos", but Roger's supporters defend it on the basis that it will assist the NCI in its planning if it can be sure that its budget request is transmitted to the President without arbitrary alterations designed to make the NIH's budget request fit the global sum allowed by the Office of Management and Budget.

Another provision in the Rogers proposals that has been billed as a means of speeding up grant applications, and therefore, by implication, the development of a cure for cancer, is the suggestion that all the directors of the research institutes should be able to distribute grants of less than $20,000 without first seeking approval from the National Cancer Advisory Council. In the past, the advisory council has met only three times a year, and this has led to accusations of unnecessary delays in the processing of grant applications. But the force of the new proposal is probably more rhetorical than actual, for it will only speed up grant applications by at the most one or two months in a process that now takes between six and eight months, and there are no suggestions that researchers and equipment are standing idle during the application process.

The proposed arrangements are, nevertheless, being welcomed for two reasons. First, they will take some of the burden of reviewing straightforward and minor grant applications from the shoulders of the National Cancer Advisory Council, and make it less of a rubber stamping body. For another, if the proposal is accepted, it would do little damage to the established review processes of the NIH. NIH officials are naturally suspicious of any change in the grant review process and they are particularly concerned to preserve the scientific peer review, but they accept that the force for change has probably gained irresistible momentum. The Rogers bill is regarded as doing the least damage since it applies to about 26 per cent of the NCI's grants, and in any case to the grants which usually generate the least controversy.

What chance has the new bill of succeeding where previous attempts to inject some rationality into the debate about cancer research have failed? One of the chief obstacles in the path of the bill is clearly the fact that an independent NASA-style agency dedicated to finding a cure for cancer makes an ideal subject for political hyperbole—the Senate debate on the proposal provides a good example—while a proposal in effect to give more money to existing institutions lacks the same lustre. Another difficulty facing Rogers and his supporters is the fact that the Senate has already passed the Administration's bill designed to give the National Cancer Institute independent status, and whatever the House passes must be amalgamated with the Senate bill in a conference committee. Although members of the biomedical community can find many acceptable elements in the new bill, it is already undoubtedly a compromise with the Senate position, and may become badly emasculated in the conference committee.

Whatever compromise is finally worked out by the committee and by the House, the new bill has placed the Administration in an embarrassing position, for when the Administration's bill was first introduced, it advocated elevating the National Cancer Institute to a bureau, but keeping it firmly within the bureaucracy of the NIH. The Administration's original proposal was designed to head off attempts to create a separate cancer agency that were embodied in a bill introduced into the Senate by Edward M. Kennedy. The Administration found it politically expedient, however, to compromise with Kennedy's supporters by agreeing to a compromise bill that retained the essence of Kennedy's proposals, but which bore the Administration's name. The introduction of Rogers' bill has therefore put the Administration in the situation of defending a position which it had previously attacked, against proposals which it once supported.

GUIDE TO THE BILL

The bill introduced into the House last week by Congressman Paul G. Rogers and five members of his Subcommittee on Public Health included the following major provisions:

The National Cancer Institute would be preserved as an integral part of the National Institutes of Health, and it would be charged with the task of coordinating all the cancer research in NIH.

The National Cancer Institute's budget would be transmitted separately to the President, but the Director of NIH, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare and the National Cancer Advisory Council would have the chance to comment on, but not alter it. The NCI would be authorized to spend $400 million in 1972, rising to $600 million in 1974.

Directors of the Heart and Lung Institute, the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke and the National Cancer Institute would all be promoted to the level of Associate Director of the NIH, and all would be direct appointments by the White House.

All the institutes would be able to approve grants of less than $20,000 without having to seek approval from the advisory councils, although scientific peer review for all grants must be maintained. It is hoped that this would help prevent the National Cancer Advisory Council from being bogged down with minor decisions.

Finally, so that Congress can keep a check on the way the provisions are working, the director of the National Cancer Institute is required to present an annual report to the President for transmittal to Congress.

CANCER POLITICS: NIH BACKERS MOUNT LATE DEFENSE IN HOUSE

The tussle to wrest control of cancer research away from the National Institutes of Health has moved from the Senate to the lobbies and committee rooms of the House. In July, a bill to set up the National Cancer Institute as an agency virtually independent of the NIH swept through the Senate by a 79 to 1 vote, and seemed assured of an equally decisive victory in the House.

The tide was abruptly stemmed last month when Representative Paul G. Rogers (D-Fla.), chairman of the House Subcommittee on Public Health and the Environment, introduced a counterbill cosponsored by a majority of his subcommittee. Whatever compromise emerges in the next few weeks between the Rogers bill and that passed by the Senate may radically affect the long-term future of biomedical research, insofar as the progress of science is subject to administrative influences.

Few issues have so united the biomedical community as the proposal to remove the National Cancer Institute from NIH and establish a NASA-like agency charged with conquering cancer in the same way the moon with conquered. No major scientific body, apart from the American Cancer Society, supports the proposal, and numerous organizations from the National Academy of Sciences downward have spoken out against it. Opening hearings on cancer legislation last month, Rogers displayed a 3-inch stack of letters he had received from scientists and scientific organizations protesting the bill passed by the Senate. The mobilization of scientific opinion came too late to influence the course of events in the Senate, and it may be too small to prevail in the House against the ill-assorted but powerful alliance backing the Senate-passed bill.

The first public surfacing of the proposal for a separate cancer agency was a report produced last November by the National Panel of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer, a group appointed by the then chairman of the Senate health subcommittee, Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.). Stimulus for setting up the panel came from the New York millionairess and philanthropist Mary Lasker, the surviving, fully active member of the remarkable quartet that orchestrated the growth of the NIH's budget from $2.5 million in 1945 to nearly $1.5 billion by the late 1960's. Her chief partners in this enterprise were the late Representative John E. Fogarty of Rhode Island and former Senator Lister Hill of Alabama, chairmen of the appropriations subcommittees in the House and Senate that deal with the NIH budget. The fourth member of the team was James Shannon, director of the NIH from 1955 until his retirement in 1968.

Although Mrs. Lasker and Shannon worked in concert to increase congressional appropriations for health research each year, they frequently disagreed over the direction of research, Mrs. Lasker and her allies tending to emphasize applied over basic research and the need to translate research results into methods of treating patients. In particular, as a member of the National Advisory Cancer Council, which reviews the grant programs of the National Cancer Institute (NCI), Mrs. Lasker used to argue for larger budgets for cancer research than Shannon thought could usefully be spent.

The report of the Senate Panel of Consultants represents a continuation of these arguments outside the forum of the NIH. The panel was cochaired by a long-time colleague of Mrs. Lasker, Sidney Farber of the Boston Children's Cancer Research Foundation, and Mrs. Lasker helped Senators Yarborough and

Jacob K. Javits (R-N.Y.) pick the panel members. A former staff member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has been quoted as saying that members were chosen on the basis of their national reputation in cancer research or philanthropy, since "this was a PR operation as much as anything." Although the scientific portion of the panel's report—by far its major component—won general praise, its chief recommendation, in favor of an independent cancer agency outside NIH, was to some extent blunted in impact by having been predicted. In asking the Senate for funds to set the panel up in March 1970, Senator Yarborough said the panel should direct particular attention "toward the creation of a new administrative agency which would guarantee that the conquest of cancer becomes a highly visible national goal."

The panel's recommendation was the basis of the Senate bill introduced in January this year and passed essentially unchanged in July. An important, maybe crucial, factor in the Laskerites' victory was the defeat of Senator Yarborough last year and his replacement as chairman of the health subcommittee by Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), regarded in the White House as a serious contender for next year's presidential election. The Administration at first firmly opposed the Kennedy-Lasker bill (known as S. 34). By way of countermeasure, President Nixon in his State of the Union message in January asked for an additional $100 million to be appropriated for the NCI (even though last year the Administration asked the Senate appropriations subcommittee to cut the NCI budget by $20 million). The President's science adviser, Edward E. David, urged in a speech in February that the cancer effort remain within the NIH, adducing the argument—since repeated by a train of scientific spokesmen—that it would be a mistake to isolate cancer research from the mainstream of the life sciences.

After these initiatives, the Administration rested its lance in the belief that the threat from the Kennedy bill had been headed off. Kennedy held 2 days of hearings in March, at which the members of the Senate panel and the American Cancer Society testified in favor of S. 34 and a preponderance of witnesses from the biomedical company testified against it, including representatives of the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Hospital Association, the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology, and the American Medical Association. In a letter to Kennedy, Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, wrote that those responsible for the proposed National Cancer Authority "will find it necessary to reinvest virtually all of the National Institutes of Health within the Authority," if it is to succeed in its mission.

Until April, there were too few votes in the Senate health subcommittee to report the Kennedy-Lasker bill out, a situation that seems to have changed abruptly early in May. On May 11, the morning that the subcommittee was to meet in executive session to mark up the bill, the White House belatedly launched a second counteroffensive, with the unappealing name of Cancer-Cure Program (*Science*, 28 May 1971). A statement made by the President indicated a substantial shift which seemed to bring the Administration's position almost into line with the Kennedy proposal. But the Administration bill (S. 1828) that embodied the new position contained, among other features displeasing to the Lasker forces, a provision that the President could redelegate his authority for the proposed cancer agency back to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, which would leave everything much as before.

For reasons that are not wholly clear, the White House tacticians agreed to an abject compromise, which consisted of the substance of the Kennedy-Lasker bill (S. 34) topped with the number of the Administration's bill (S. 1828), plus a face-saving and otherwise unsupported phrase stipulating that the proposed cancer agency should be an independent agency "within the National Institutes of Health." The outlines of this compromise once agreed, two Senate aides set about fashioning a revised version of S. 1828 with the aid of a pair of scissors and a copy of S. 34.

This compromise, by which the Administration traded the integrity of the NIH in return for Kennedy's dropping his sponsorship of the bill, met the approval of all but one of the 80 senators who voted on the measure. The basic tenet of the Lasker strategy for a separate cancer agency—that Congressmen do not dare vote against more funds for cancer—seemed vindicated by the outcome of the Senate debate. But Senator Gaylord Nelson (D–Wis.), who cast the lone dissenting vote, believes he has not been harmed politically by his stand, "I haven't received any bad reaction, and the newspaper editorials in my state were in favor of my position," he told *Science*.

Nelson's opposition to the Kennedy-Lasker bill may have been aided by an old friend of his, Philip P. Cohen, professor of physiological chemistry at the University of Wisconsin, Cohen, who was a member of the National Advisory Cancer Council at the same time as Mrs. Lasker and Farber, seems to have been one of the first members of the scientific community to start lobbying against the Lasker proposals. In March 1971, he presented to Nelson's office a petition signed by more than 450 biomedical scientists in Wisconsin, including almost the entire faculty of the McArdle Laboratory for Cancer Research in Madison, protesting the establishment of a separate cancer agency. Nelson not only opposed the Kennedy bill in committee, producing an alternative bill that would have made the NIH as a whole independent, but also took his fight to the House in an appearance last month before the Rogers subcommittee.

Rogers, like Kennedy, has been chairman of his subcommittee only since January. Both are eager to establish their authority in health matters, a pursuit which has already led them into conflict on several issues, notably health manpower legislation. Rogers spoke out against the idea of an independent cancer agency as early as February. He opened his hearings on cancer by introducing on September 15 a bill designed to counter the Senate-passed bill in almost every particular. The chief thrust of the Rogers bill is to retain the National Cancer Institute within the NIH, but to transfer to the director of the NIH the czar-like powers designed by the Lasker group to be wielded by the director of an independent cancer authority. The Rogers bill raises the director of the NCI to the rank of associate director of the NIH (similar elevation is accorded to the directors of two other major institutes—the heart and lung, and the neurological diseases and stroke). Under the bill, the director of the NCI is allowed to prepare an independent budget, but the director of NIH can see and comment on it before it goes to the President. The director of NIH must also give his approval to any new peer-review system set up by the director of the NCI (in the Senate version of the bill, this approval is not required).

An important feature of the Rogers bill is a provision authorizing the directors of all NIH institutes to award grants of less than $20,000 without approval by their national advisory councils. This measure is designed to counter a principal criticism leveled by the Lasker forces against the NCI, and corroborated by a General Accounting Office study, that grant proposals are subject to average delays of up to 8 months.

Rogers and his aides claim that their bill embodies the three specific recommendations made by the Senate Panel of Consultants better than does the Senate bill. Thus the Rogers bill adopts the funding levels recommended by the Panel (a budget rising to $600 million by fiscal 1974—the Senate bill asks only for such funds as are necessary), * * * for the development of a cancer research program (the Senate bill does not mention a plan), and makes specific proposals for streamlining the administration of cancer research.

The Rogers bill was drawn up with advice from the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the president of the newly created Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, John R. Hogness, was present at one drafting session with Rogers and AAMC president John A. D. Cooper. The fate of the Rogers bill depends on several factors, foremost of which is whether Rogers can retain a majority of his subcommittee in the face of blandishments from both the Administration, which is supporting the Senate-passed bill, and the skillful lobbyists associated with Mary Lasker. Several features in the Rogers bill seem designed as bargaining counters, but the failure of the Lasker lobbyists by last week to gain the compromise they had expected suggests that Rogers feels in a strong enough position with his subcommittee to drive a hard bargain.

In whatever form the bill leaves the subcommittee—and Rogers intends that his bill, not the Administration's, will be reported out—its next hurdle is in the full committee, the House Interstate Commerce Committee, chaired by Harley O. Staggers (D-W.Va.). Both sides are claiming Staggers' support, although Staggers has not indicated where his opinion lies (he sponsored the House version of the Administration's cancer bill but only as a courtesy). The Lasker forces claim that their pull with the Democratic members of the full committee, together with the Administration's pressure on the Republican members, will ensure a majority for the Senate-passed measure. Should the Rogers bill be reported out with the blessing of the full committee, it is almost certain to pass the House. Once in conference with the Senate, the House backers of a Rogers-type bill would be in a strong position, since in the event of deadlock authority over cancer research will stay where it is, under the control of the NIH.

The hearings held by Rogers' subcommittee, now in their fourth week, have produced some new faces, but few arguments that have not already surfaced at the Kennedy hearings. One reason, perhaps, is that the basic rationale for an independent cancer agency, that the NIH is incompetent to handle a major attack on cancer, has never been presented for serious argument. "There's a great myth about the omnipotence of the NIH, just as there used to be about the Pentagon, but in fact the place needs the same kind of going over as the Pentagon is getting from people like Proxmire," says one lobbyist associated with the Lasker cause. But the Lasker forces have not tried to prove this case except by assertion and, rightly or wrongly the bulk of the biomedical community seems to favor the contrary view, as expressed by Senator Nelson before the Rogers subcommittee, that the NIH is "a unique arrangement, probably the finest institution of its kind in the world, and certainly . . . the undisputed leader in the field of biomedical research."

ALASKAN SKETCHES

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in Alaska and those who have

had the opportunity to visit our great State are enriched because of its beauty and charm.

The desolation of the North Slope, rich in oil deposits, is a stunning contrast to the vigor and vitality of Southeast Alaska. Our two largest cities, Anchorage and Fairbanks, possess the modern conveniences of any other large American city but it is free from the pollution that plagues the cities of the "lower 48."

Alaska is a State of vivid contrast that can best be described only after one has had the opportunity to see the majestic mountains, colorful landscape, and the rugged interior.

As I was reading today's edition of the Christian Science Monitor, I was delighted to find several poems that describe and explain the charm and beauty of the 49th State:

ALASKAN SKETCHES

A DOG TEAM AT LAST

Driving a dog team at last—only three,
But still a team! Skimming along they go,
The runners' soft susurrous on the snow,
The constant whisper of the dogs' feet, free
And swift and steady—that you hear. You see
A dog look back, grinning, and you know
He, too, rejoices, running, running so—
A gay thing running, a gay thing just to be!
Little flecks of snow fly from their paws,
Ticking a driver's cheeks. Over the humps
In the trail, and down; forget the brake, and the jumps
Of the driver grow gigantic. There are flaws
In an amateur's performance! Around a bend
The sled goes, sleek and smooth. The driver's slide,
Head and shoulders plowing a furrow wide
And deep in the snowbank, comes to a sudden end.
Meet them cross field—they look as if they knew,
Those dogs, but ask, "Cheechako, what happened to you?"

—*Lianne Dinwiddie and Eijah L. Jacobs.*

ALASKAN CHARM

A strange new beauty nacred by the dawn!
Unlimited dimension linked with raw
And rugged contours in an expertise
Of landscape—mystical Alaskan charm!
Aloof, white-turbaned peaks when on tiptoe
Can almost glimpse a crater on the moon;
Cold shadow fingers grope to touch the fur
Of pines which call the lower slopes their home.
Majestic Taku Glacier steals the scene
As blue skyscrapers walled with ice can do.
Our ship, discreetly distant, bluntly shouts
To wield vibration like a carving knife.
Enormous icebergs promptly break away
In slices large as half a city block;
These roar and rumble, tumbling far below,
Dive-bombing startled fishes as they drop.
Green inlets seem to be Midwestern plains
Where rippling wheat flows deep on fertile soil
And sea gull scavengers that trail the boat
Are one in aim with killdeers by a plow.
My mind collects enchanting souvenirs:
Carved totem poles, a Husky pup half grown,
Streams arched with salmon, islands in a chain,
And summer midnight bright with Arctic sun.

—*Maybelle Taylor.*

ALASKAN NIGHT

This night is a night for stars, all luminescent,
Cold, glinting as they cross the sky
In inconceivable effulgence. The crescent
Coldness of the winter moon slips by
Low in the south, as fended off, perhaps,
By this deep, frigid night, these glittering swarms,
This astral host. Such a sky entraps
The sight in wonder. But let the auroral forms
Stream up across the north, those columns, tall,
Shifting their hues, incredible interlacing
Of streamers and ribbons, and now a monstrous ball,
Yellow and violet, through the whole weft racing,
Traversing the heavens, touching those luminous bars—
Here is a glory to dim out the stars.

—*L. D. and E. L. J.*

A MAD POSTURE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, said:

I think there are good reasons why we should address the accuracy of our nuclear weapons. This issue sometimes becomes obscured in discussion of first strike versus retaliation. I personally believe this is a misunderstanding—and a terrible one.

A curious event took place in the Senate of the United States 2 weeks ago. A Senator actually took it upon himself to attempt to increase the effectiveness of our strategic forces rather than calling for further unilateral disarmament.

Senator JAMES BUCKLEY made a valiant effort to amend the Military Procurement Act with measures which would have given our strategic missile forces a damage limiting capability by increasing their accuracy to the point of being able to effectively neutralize Soviet nuclear missiles in their hardened silos.

Although the United States has for years had the technological know-how necessary to increase the accuracy of both our land- and sea-based missiles so that they would be able to destroy Soviet ICBM's on Soviet soil, we decided to make our missile forces less accurate than they might be. If this seems incredible to you, it seems no less incredible to me and to a growing number of other Members of Congress.

The theory behind purposely lowering the effectiveness of the forces on which our survival depends goes like this: If we were able to knock out the Soviet missile force they might be tempted to strike us first to prevent this from happening. Thus we should not deploy weapons capable of damaging the Soviet rocket force but instead target less effective missiles on Soviet urban and industrial targets which are easy to destroy. We will hold the Soviet people hostage while at the same time hoping that the Soviets will follow our example and not develop weapons capable of destroying our missile force. This would supposedly result in a condition known as "Mutual Assured Destruction," abbreviated as "MAD" and obviously tending in that direction.

If you ever wondered why the Department of Defense seemed more concerned with dead Russians than live Americans, this is the reason. This strategy of attacking civilians only was not conceived and set up as defense policy by military men but by former Secretary of Defense McNamara's intellectuals. If you suspect that the Soviets might not be unthinking enough to emulate our example, which assures that if war breaks out there will be total unlimited disaster for both sides, you would be correct.

The Soviet strategic missile force is being specifically designed to destroy, not our cities and industry, but our strategic weapons which could inflict retaliatory damage on them. As Senator Buckley correctly pointed out in arguing for his amendments—

It is now generally conceded that within another two or three years, if present trends are allowed to continue, the Soviet Union will have achieved the capacity to destroy virtually all our land-based strategic forces in a preemptive strike.

This is one of several reasons it is absolutely necessary that we improve the accuracy of our missile forces with all speed. Suppose the Soviet Union strikes with their SS–9—a huge ICBM capable of carrying one 25-megaton warhead or three 5-megaton warheads—in comparison, our Minuteman carries only one ½-megaton warhead or three 200 kiloton warheads—in combination with their submarine launched ballistic missiles, thereby destroying not only our Minuteman force but also our strategic bomber force before it can get off the ground. It is true that we would still have our Polaris-Poseidon submarines with which to retaliate. But the Soviets would have over 900 SS–11 and SS–13 ICBM's (similar to our Minuteman) still unlaunched. The President, if still alive, would then have the choice only of launching our Polaris-Poseidon missiles at Soviet cities, thus bringing unimaginable devastation on the United States, or surrendering. He would not be able to order the submarines to destroy the Soviet SS–11 and SS–13 counter-city reserve forces before they are launched because we have deliberately made our missiles inaccurate enough so that they will not be able to critically damage the Soviet hardened missile force. He would not have much of a choice.

By failing to make our missiles hard-silo accurate—a relatively inexpensive modification—in the hopes of not provoking a Soviet attack, we are actually encouraging just such an attack by increasing the prospects for the enemy's success. Not only is this "MAD" posture strategically indefensible, but it is also profoundly immoral to purposely lock oneself into a position where the only possible strategy is to annihilate millions of non-combatants.

Far from assuring the survival of our Nation should war break out, the "MAD" posture assures that we will either lose unilaterally or have a small comfort of knowing that we took millions of Russians with us. Although Senator BUCKLEY's amendments did not pass this time, they are a sign of a return to reason and reality in the congressional debate over defense.

CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR SULLIVAN STRESSES NEED FOR CREDIT CONTROLS AT NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER COUNCIL'S NATIONAL PRIORITIES MEETING

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 19, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has finally sent to the Congress today his draft of proposed changes in the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to provide additional legislative authority for the steps he told us on October 7 that he intends to follow after November 13 in phase II of his economic program. One of the major provisions of the proposed bill would amend the Economic Stabilization Act to authorize the President to regulate interest rates. But President Nixon already has more power than any President in our history ever had before to regulate interest rates and control the availability of credit.

He did not attempt to use that power when he imposed the 90-day freeze on prices, wages, salaries and rents on August 15, 1971, and those of us who were instrumental in providing him with both the Credit Control Act of 1969 and the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970—bills which were passed over his objections, in both instances—have been puzzled as to why he did not take any action on August 15 on interest rates and credit availability.

In the material sent to us today, the administration states that the 1969 Credit Control Act "is not satisfactory as a statutory basis for regulating interest rates" because it requires a Presidential determination which, we are told today, "would not appear justified under present conditions."

PUBLIC LAW 91–151 APPLIES TO "ANY OR ALL EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT"

Under the 1969 Credit Control Act, Public Law 91–151, the determination the President would have to make in order to impose credit controls is that he finds "that such action is necessary or appropriate for the purpose of preventing or controlling inflation generated by the extension of credit in an excessive volume." If he so finds, he can then authorize the Federal Reserve Board to "regulate and control any or all extensions of credit."

His existing powers, as I said, are extremely broad—greater than any President ever had over credit in this country, even in time of war.

Today, however, the President asked for "a more flexible tool than the Credit Control Act" to regulate interest rates, and I am sure the Banking and Currency Committee, in our forthcoming hearings, will want to examine very deeply into the issues presented by the President's position on this matter.

The draft legislation sent to us today would authorize the President merely "to stabilize interest rates * * * at levels consonant with orderly economic growth."

The Credit Control Act, on the other hand, includes, among other things, such powers as to:

(6) prescribe the maximum amount of credit which may be extended on, or in connection with, any loan, purchase, or other extension of credit.

(7) prescribe the maximum rate of interest, maximum maturity, minimum periodic payment, maximum period between payments, and any other specification or limitation of the terms and conditions of any extension of credit.

(8) prescribe the methods of determining purchase prices or market values or other bases for computing permissible extensions of credit or required downpayment.

(9) prescribe special or different terms, conditions, or exemptions with respect to new or used goods, minimum original cash payments, temporary credits which are merely incidental to cash purchases, payment or deposits usable to liquidate credits, and other adjustments or special situations.

(10) prescribe maximum ratios, applicable to any class of either creditors or borrowers or both, or loans of one or more types or of all types—

(A) to deposits of one or more types or of all types.

(B) to assets of one or more types or of all types.

(11) prohibit or limit any extensions of credit under any circumstances the Board deems appropriate.

DETERMINATION OF INTEREST CHARGE

Public Law 91–151, in section 204, defines the method of determining interest charges as "the sum of all charges payable directly or indirectly to the person by whom the credit is extended in consideration of the extension of credit."

Unless and until the administration witnesses can convince me to the contrary, I think the interest control powers we have already given the President are broader, better, more comprehensive, and more effective than the substitute credit control powers he asked for today.

SPEECH TO NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER COUNCIL

In a recent talk I made in San Juan, Puerto Rico, over the Columbus Day holiday weekend, I went into the background of the Credit Control Act in some detail, Mr. Speaker, and in view of the President's request for different language, my San Juan talk may be of interest to the Members.

It was made to the members of the National Housing Center Council of the National Association of Home Builders, at one of a series of national priorities conferences held in various parts of the country. The National Housing Center Council consists primarily of the manufacturers and distributors of housing materials, supplies, and equipment.

The speech was made just a few days after the President had revealed his general plans for phase II but before we had been given any of the specifics.

As I explained to the top officials of the National Association of Home Builders who were present, and to the members of the National Housing Center Council, the desperate plight of the housing industry during the tight money period of 1969–70 was a major factor in the enactment of the Credit Control Act of 1969, a bill I had originally introduced primarily to find a means of getting more funds into home mortgages at a time when commercial paper and commercial loans and speculation were swallowing up most of the investment money available in the economy.

Following our success in enacting the Credit Control Act of 1969, many of us on the Banking and Currency Committee then joined to initiate the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970. This is discussed in my speech to the homebuilders' group, which follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, AT NATIONAL PRIORITIES SERIES LUNCHEON, SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL HOUSING CENTER COUNCIL OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOME BUILDERS, AMERICANA HOTEL, SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 10, 1971

Coming to the Caribbean on a Columbus Day weekend, almost exactly 479 years after the Discoverer, to report on what the 92nd Congress will or might do places me somewhat in the position of Columbus himself when he returned to Spain from his first voyage to report to Ferdinand and Isabella on how he had been spending his time and their money. According to all of the legends, he really had no idea where he'd been when he got back. In my case, fresh from numerous roll call votes and Committee meetings in Washington, I know where I've been, but I'm not at all sure where we're heading in this Congress economically, housing-wise, or any other way. There is a lot of "half-baked" legislation pending—in the sense, of course, that it is only partially finished—and much can happen to any of the major measures in that stage, including a tax bill that the Senate may festoon, as it often does, with all sorts of additional sugar plums and candied apples.

So I shall not try to forecast Congressional actions in *any* area. Forecasting would be, at best, only an exercise in careful double-talk, and I don't think any of us came this distance for vague generalities and conjecture. The only certain prediction I can make about the 92nd Congress is that it will go out of business at noon on January 3, 1973, finished or not.

Even that flat prediction could turn out to be chancy, however, because, at the rate we have recently been adopting Constitutional amendments and considering others, from school prayers to equal rights for men and women, someone may slip through a change in the Twentieth Amendment and my one solid prediction to you about this Congress would be wrong after all. Let me say then that, at this moment, under the terms of the Constitution as now existing, we will go out of business at noon on January 3, 1973. Between now and then, you will be no more surprised than I will be about some of the things we do in the interval. Events shape a Congress and its actions with remarkable unpredictability, and not knowing the events we will encounter domestically and abroad over the next 14 months or so makes every day in Washington Discovery Day.

But not having all of the facts on which to base a judgment has never prevented a Member of Congress from talking about what he or she *fears* or *hopes* might happen, or proposes to try to *cause* to happen or *not happen*. Since the Spanish Court did not place Columbus in chains until after a number of voyages, and Ferdinand and Isabella apparently accepted in good faith the unbelievable stories he brought back from his first trip, I'll take a chance on your forebearance today in bringing you only the *tentative* word from Washington on what we're up to.

Right now, the initiative—as it often is on national policy—is very definitely in the White House, chiefly as a result of the startling changes in direction in our national and international economic policies taken by the President on *August 15 while* the Congress was enjoying a long vacation.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S UNMATCHED ECONOMIC POWERS

One of my last statements in the House before we started on vacation on August 5 was a reminder to the President—and to the American people—of the vast powers the Congress had given Mr. Nixon in 1969, 1970, and 1971—more power than any President ever had even in wartime—to regulate or control any price, wage, rent, salary or form of credit. In my remarks I urged that the President use some of this great power to do something affirmative about the continuing spiral of inflation in a period of growing unemployment and economic stagnation. On the evening of August 15, I suddenly got the feeling that *somebody* reads the Congressional Record after all.

The newspapers in St. Louis, which had printed extensive news stories about my speech in the House outlining the scope of the President's vast but little known powers, and urging that they be used, indicated after August 15 that Mr. Nixon had taken my advice. It is nice to know that my hometown papers believe I have so much power and influence over national policy, but I am inclined to think that Mr. Nixon was more likely to have read the Gallup and Harris and other polls, and listened to some of his Republican "polls"—politicians—than to have been galvanized to action by a speech in the House by a Congresswoman from Missouri. For his previous economic "game plan," so-called, had certainly been working very badly indeed, either in stemming inflation or in solving the cruel dilemmas of joblessness, lowered profits, sickly security markets, and rapidly waning international confidence in the U.S. dollar.

Obviously, he *had* to act when he did—and boldly—in order to avoid what to any politician President would be a personal disaster in public credibility.

When his aides looked with him at Camp David for a handy peg on which to hang a sharply reversed course of action, the standby stabilization law we enacted in 1970 over his vigorous opposition and contemptuous criticism provided him with his major tool.

The freeze was instantly popular, even with all of its distortions and inequities, because it represented not just action of any kind but a complete break with policies which had manifestly not worked. The freeze was sudden and vigorous and decisive, as contrasted with the previous policy of drift and hope and unfulfilled promises. Furthermore, the freeze presumably put everybody in the same boat—the tycoon who couldn't have a new stock option plan, the grocer who couldn't raise food prices, the automobile company which couldn't up the price of 1972 cars, as well as the workers who could no longer catch up with other unions in a race to match or exceed the past, or anticipated, increases in the cost of living.

But then, as the Cost of Living Council began its day-to-day deliberations on specific problem cases, the public mood began to vary, from one of complete acceptance by everyone who was presumably in the same boat, to one of protest over individual decisions which exempted unprocessed foods, stock market quotations, interest rates and corporate profits—including increased profits stemming from the nonpayment of wage increases previously agreed to in union contracts but not permitted to go into effect as scheduled.

Now everyone seems to have his own magic formula for solving the inequities of the price-wage freeze. Most of the proposals deal with the sensitive and potentially explosive area of wage restraints, when failure to work out mutually acceptable machinery—and I underscore the words *mutually acceptable*—could precipitate industrial chaos.

CONTROL OF CREDIT AVAILABILITY A BASIC KEY

When Congress reconvenes on Tuesday after the Columbus Day holiday, the Banking and Currency Committee will resume the hearings we have been conducting on the price-wage freeze and its aftermath. And now that the President has revealed his plans for Phase II, as he did last Thursday night, we should be able to get finally from Administration officials some answers to many of the questions we have been asking in the hearing—and which we have been asked by witnesses.

Over and over again, the question has arisen in our hearings whether the Congress had given Mr. Nixon *too broad* a grant of powers in the 1970 Stabilization Act. Having had a great deal to do with the enactment of that legislation, I do not think we did make it too broad. In passing it, we envisioned the eventual need for an across-the-board freeze, such as the President finally did impose exactly 365 days later, but we regarded such a freeze only as a *temporary* means to stop the price-and-wage spiral while other measures could be devised to deal primarily with those areas of the economy where the pressures were most severe. A permanent or semi-permanent freeze was never contemplated. This economy rests, and must continue to rest, primarily on independent judgments by millions of businessmen as to what they can or will charge for any given goods or service, and by nearly 200 million consumers on what they are willing to pay and under what terms.

But before August 15, more and more businessmen were finding it difficult if not impossible to make price determinations, based on rising costs, which consumers were willing to pay. If the drift had continued much longer, business collapses would have multiplied, joblessness would have increased accordingly, and we undoubtedly would have been in a real mess. That could still happen, but the likelihood is far less today than it was two months ago.

I think the control of credit availability is one of the basic keys to the solution of our economic dilemmas. The powers the President has in this respect, through the Federal Reserve System, under the Credit Control Act of 1969 are unprecedented in their scope. Like the power to control prices, wages, salaries and rents, the power to control any or all credit terms was given to the President over his strenuous objections. He didn't want the power and said he would not use it. Hence, we were accused, at the time we passed the bill, of what the Committee minority report called "devious Democratic demagoguery" in providing to a President who did not ask for them powers he did not want and promised he would never use; our purpose in doing so, it was charged in the minority report, was merely to be able to *attack* the President *politically* for not using those powers.

Well, let me say in self-defense that, in initiating the legislation which became the Credit Control Act of December 23, 1969, it was certainly not my intention to try to embarrass President Nixon or provide a stick with which to beat him politically.

As far back as 1953, in my first term in Congress, I supported the move of the then Republican Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senator Homer Capehart of Indiana, to place the expiring Korean War economic controls—prices, wages, rents and salaries—plus the consumer credit control powers which had been repealed in 1951—on a *permanent*, standby basis, to be available for use when and if needed. When President Eisenhower rejected the idea out of hand, Senator Capehart let it drop. I never did. I have *always* felt a President should have in his economic arsenal a variety of weapons to use when the circumstances impose on a President the need to use them.

CREDIT CONTROLS APPROVED BY BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE IN 1966

Just think of the powers we have given to every President since Harry Truman in the use of atomic weapons. We trust our very lives to the sanity and integrity of whoever is in the White House, regardless of party. I think we can also trust his sanity and integrity in the use of economic powers which may become essential to the maintenance of our economic health.

Hence, in 1966, when the time seemed propitious, I proposed an amendment to the Defense Production Act to provide standby authority to regulate consumer and real estate credit. Similar to powers in existence in World War II and the first year of the Korean war. It was approved on a straight party-line vote in the Banking and Currency Committee. However, we lost that amendment in the House in 1966 on the charge that we had not held hearings on the proposal. So, in 1967, I included standby credit controls as a provision of the Consumer Credit Protection bill, primarily as a basis for holding hearings in our Subcommittee on that issue. And, in fact, those *were* virtually our only hearings on what became the 1969 Credit Control Act, although I did pursue the issue in general terms in subsequent hearings of the Committee on other legislation. So what I'm saying is that *partisanship* was *absent* from my sponsorship of this legislation. I was as willing to put the responsibility on Democratic as on Republican Presidential shoulders, because I feel that the shoulders of *any* President must be strong enough to bear the burden of wide discretionary powers to protect all of us in times of either military or social or economic danger.

But the fact that I had consistently introduced and pushed for enactment of standby legislation authorizing the allocation of our credit resources and the regulation of the rates and terms of credit was not sufficient, of course, to get it through.

NEEDS OF HOUSING INDUSTRY LED TO PASSAGE OF 1969 ACT

The legislation was enacted, I might point out, largely because the *housing* industry in 1969 was in such desperate straits because of lack of funds for mortgages that this industry recognized the urgent need for better tools than we then had available to assure an adequate supply of home mortgages. And there was widespread support, therefore, for a credit control law such as we passed, one which, I repeat, gives the President the power to control *any or all* credit terms.

If our economy is so sick that we must place it on a three-month rest cure, insulated from the daily flow of price and wage and rent decisions which contribute to the dynamics of normal economic life in this country, and if we must take the drastic measures on imports which the President has placed in effect, and search for tax gimmicks to breathe more activity into automobile production, and make huge concessions to other businesses through the investment credit, then I think the *people* have a right to ask for help in restoring their opportunity to buy a home at a reasonable rate of interest on a long-term mortgage. And as we know, home mortgages cannot compete with other forms of credit on *even* terms in a high-interest-rate era.

Subsidizing the interest rates, as we have done for low-income home purchasers, is an extremely expensive way to solve the problem; every mortgage which was subsidized at 8½% last year helped to support even higher rates for uninsured mortgages and for business loans generally. Obviously, we are not going to be able to subsidize enough mortgages, even at 7%, to solve our housing shortage. The cost would be astronomical. Interest rates *must* come down. Yet this is one segment of the cost picture which the President has not touched at all up to now in his assault on inflation, and implies he needs some new legislation to enable him to deal with interest rates. This, I do not understand. What is lacking in the authority on interest rates we already gave him?

True, he has warned the credit industry not to raise rates, but that is not enough. Since we are short of sufficient credit resources to cover all of the things in this economy that every businessman would like to do, including taking advantage of the pending investment tax credit, credit must be subject to some reasonable rationing based on social need and economic necessity, not merely on ability to pay. And housing stands at the top of the priorities.

They say that money, although expressed in terms of national currencies, has no nationality and no patriotism and seeks out its opportunities wherever in the world they are to be found. Yet we have taken steps to curb international dollar speculation when it adversely affects our own economy. We have, in fact, taken some pretty drastic steps in that direction. Can't we show some of that courage here at home, in our domestic economy, if the soundness of that economy urgently depends upon such action? I think so. I hope you do, too.

We have turned ourselves around economically on other occasions in our past, and it has always entailed some sacrifices.

I think most Americans—even those who took a pocketbook beating by some aspects of the price-wage-rent-salary freeze—would consider the sacrifices of the past eight weeks, and the sacrifices of the remaining five weeks of the freeze, to be well worth their toll if—and I underscore the if—if they result in a halt to inflation, which robs all of us, and if they result in a revival of economic dynamism which stimulates jobs and expanded business opportunities, and if they result in a decent prospect for solving our housing needs, our urban financial problems, our mounting educational costs, and recovering the equilibrium this economy desperately needs.

It isn't that we lack any of the financial or material or economic resources to do this job. We have those in abundance, once we have developed again the political will to make these resources work fairly for the entire economy.

PROPOSED DIRECT MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAM FOR AVERAGE INCOME FAMILIES

Many of you, I am sure, are familiar with the bill I first introduced in the last Congress and reintroduced in this one, with Chairman Barrett of the Housing Subcommittee as co-sponsor, to establish a new type of direct housing loan institution known as the Home Owners Mortgage Loan Corporation. The Home Builders supported that bill when I introduced it the first time, and I hope they still believe in it. But there hasn't been much push behind it. The mortgage industry has no use for it, for that industry recognizes in the bill an effective control measure for holding residential mortgage rates within reasonably moderate ranges.

This program would become operative *only*—and this is fundamental—only when the private mortgage market cannot provide the *average* income American family with a home purchase loan at a reasonable rate. Under my bill, the rate could be no higher than 6½%. It could be less. The money would have to come from appropriated funds—which is a stringent check on indiscriminate use.

But, according to my information, such a program would not cost the Federal Government a cent over the life of a long-term mortgage. The program might even make money for the Government. But that is not its purpose. Its purpose is to fill a gaping need—a hole in our financing resources—through which the average income family drops helplessly when mortgage funds become tight and interest rates skyrocket.

This is not an emergency measure to meet a temporary problem; it is a long-range solution to a recurring crunch.

If you feel it is a reasonable solution to the periodic nightmares in the home financing picture, let me know of your support—but more important, let your own Congressman and your Senators know, too. Have your corporate experts study it. Have them let me know what changes, if any, they think should be made in it. It is H.R. 4176. I think it's a good bill. The National Association of Home Builders, as I said, thought so too, and I hope still thinks so.

The bill is aimed *primarily* at meeting the needs of the mailman, the truck driver, the policeman, the teacher, the steelworker, your own workers—the families earning up to $12,000 or so a year and who *pay their own way*, and are willing to do so 100 cents on the dollar, families that pay their taxes and ask for no subsidies or special preferment—just a chance to buy a decent home which can stand in a pleasant and safe and healthy environment.

Families of substantially *lower* income than those I refer to are now eligible for all kinds of assistance, and many of them have been receiving it—at a cost to the Government of hundreds of millions of dollars a year, long into the future.

SELF-RELIANT MIDDLE INCOME FAMILY HAS BIGGEST FINANCING PROBLEM

Higher income families are also able to find housing and the financing to buy it. But the middle income, self-sufficient, self-reliant, hard-working fellow is the one with the biggest financing problem. Check in your own manufacturing plants and in your personnel files: see how many of *your own workers*, who manufacture the appliances and the materials which go into other people's houses, have been stymied and frustrated in their efforts to improve their own housing situations. Then multiply that by the problem nationally, among the average income families of this country, who are truly a vast and still unrealized market for your products.

Unless we develop machinery, such as H.R. 4176 proposes, to bring those families back into the housing market and keep them in the market year in and year out through an assured supply of mortgages at reasonable rates, the housing industry is going to continue to go through these recurring valleys of despair and stagnation. The moderate income families are not going to riot or drop out or demonstrate or do anything dramatic if we don't solve this problem—they will just quietly apply their combined political muscle to stop the use of their tax funds to help those now eligible for home ownership subsidies. So it seems to me we face a choice ultimately of deciding either to subsidize just about everyone or to devise a system of assuring mortgages to those who can pay reasonable interest rates without subsidy. And this problem is so big that only the resources of government—the borrowing power of government and some credit rationing by government—can solve it.

Looking at the statistics this year on housing starts, one can easily be persuaded that the crunch is over and the future of the housing industry is rosy. We are working on an omnibus housing bill, as I think you all know, which entails a redirection of our efforts to save our cities and metropolitan areas from further deterioration and strangulation. We are encouraging establishment of new cities and more metropolitan area planning. We are struggling with mass transit improvements. We have established new secondary markets for conventional mortgages, leading hopefully to a smoother flow of money into housing. But if the economy revives in other directions, and business takes wide advantage of the proposed new tax incentives for plant expansion and modernization, the competition for investment funds is going to heat up again, and housing once again will be begging for funds in a market where this industry is frequently unable to compete.

We know what the problems will be. Do we have the courage to apply the solutions in time to head off another round of home-building boom and bust? I hope so. For, each bust seems to get worse and last longer than the one before it. Thank you.

TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE WATERWAY

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the preliminary injunction handed down last month by U.S. District Judge John Lewis Smith, barring the start of construction on the long-awaited Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway pending the outcome of an ecology suit, was a bitter disappointment to me.

As I stated earlier, it is most unfortunate that the hopes and dreams of a great section of this country can be thwarted by a few extremists.

While the furor created by Judge Smith's ruling may have been dimmed somewhat by the passage of a month's time, it is heartening to me that the distinguished members of the State of Alabama's House of Representatives have seen fit not to let this section fall by the wayside.

In response to the court's ruling, they have drafted and adopted a most important resolution which I commend to the attention of all Members of the House:

STATE OF ALABAMA,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

H.R. 252

By: Messrs. Grainger and Roberts

Whereas, The long-sought Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Project has been imperiled by the ruling of a United States District Court judge in Washington, D.C., on the basis of a complaint from the Environmental Defense Fund; and

Whereas, Extensive, responsible studies of the environmental impact of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway have been made by the executive branch of the United States government and by the Corps of Engineers. The requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act of 1969 have been met by the filing of an environmental impact statement in conformity with the Act.

The planning for this project has been underway for a sufficient length of time to give consideration to every conceivable aspect of environment impact. The Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway is the first major waterway authorized by Congress to have environmental considerations built into its plans.

The injunction issued by the court on the complaint of the Environmental Defense Fund is a clear warning to all people of our region to beware of those environmentalists who can only see a single phase of the requirement to protect the ecology.

The competitive desire by the Environmental Defense Fund to halt projects is a cynical use of the desire of our people to control the environment.

Any valid environmental consideration must incorporate man's needs to engage in productive work so that he may provide himself and his family with food, clothing, and shelter.

The halt of the Waterway will restrain proper economic development of the region.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House

of Representatives, That we express our continuing strong endorsement of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway Project and condemn and reject the ruling by the Federal District Court in Washington imposing a temporary halt in construction of this vitally needed and long awaited opportunity for economic growth for our region.

Be it further resolved That copies of this resolution be sent to members of the Alabama Congressional Delegation, the President of the United States, and the Director of the United States Environmental Agency.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives September 22, 1971.

JOHN W. PEMBERTON, *Clerk.*

LEAD POISONING: PERIL IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, childhood lead poisoning is a devastating disease ravaging the inner cities of this country. And the Nation's Capital is no exception.

A recent study made for the District's government by Dr. Selma J. Mushkin and Dr. Ralph Friedlin of the public services laboratory at Georgetown University indicates that as many as half the children under the age of 6 who live in Washington's inner city may have excessive levels of lead in their bodies.

As staggering as this is, the real tragedy is that childhood lead poisoning is a totally preventable disease. We know how to identify it. We know how to treat those afflicted with it. We know how to stop it from recurring. Yet, in an unconscionable disregard for the health of the children of this Nation, the necessary Federal action to meet this silent epidemic has not been forthcoming.

For the past 3 years, I have attempted to get the Congress and the appropriate Federal agencies to live up to their responsibility to the young who reside in our Nation's ghettos, by mounting a comprehensive program to combat lead poisoning. The Congress recognized this need by the passage of my Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act in December 1970. And it finally took a stride toward the eradication of this dread disease by appropriating $7.5 million for fiscal year 1972 for its implementation.

But the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has not spent one cent of that appropriation, for the Office of Management and Budget has refused to release the money. This refusal is unconscionable.

Despite the severity of this problem, despite the tremendous number of youngsters in need of help, despite the congressional mandate that a meaningful effort be mounted, the children are still waiting.

At this point, I include in the RECORD an article by Alma Robinson which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of October 19 detailing the results of the study of lead poisoning in the Nation's Capital.

I commend it to my colleagues' attention.

HIGH LEAD LEVEL PREVALENT AMONG INNER-CITY TOTS

(By Alma Robinson)

As many as half the children under six who live in the District's inner city may have excessive levels of lead in their bodies, a study by two Georgetown University researchers indicates.

Lead poisoning, which can cause irreversible brain damage, mental retardation and eventually death without any observable symptoms, most often occurs when children chew flaking lead-based paint.

In the study made for the District government, Dr. Selma J. Mushkin and Dr. Ralph Friedlin of the public services laboratory at Georgetown concluded that the disease is probably twice as prevalent as was previously thought.

Dr. Mushkin, director of the laboratory, disclosed the findings yesterday to a D.C. Medical Society symposium on lead poisoning, marking the beginning of Community Health Week.

ONLY ONE DEATH

The researchers found that 30 to 50 percent of the babies born in the inner city, who live under "lead-hazard" conditions, may be expected to have an undue body burden of lead sometime before reaching school age, the study said.

In the last five years the death of only one child has been recorded as a result of lead poisoning in the District. But the symptoms, such as loss of appetite, stomach cramps and constipation, are easily interpreted as other ailments, the researchers said.

About 115,000, or 40 percent of all housing units in the District, are lead risks, the study said. Therefore, the report said, "A total cleanup of the housing environment is unlikely." At a minimal estimate of $300 a unit, the cleanup would cost $34.5 million.

On the other hand, institutional care for mentally retarded persons damaged from lead poisoning costs the city $250,000 for the duration of their lives, the researchers said.

CLINICS CRITICIZED

Under the 1970 city housing codes the D.C. Department of Economic Development was authorized to inspect buildings for lead content after the discovery of a child with an undue body burden of lead. The department can order the owner of a building to remove the lead hazard.

Dr. Mushkin said her research showed that only 15 percent of the children between 24 and 36 months of age may have been repeatedly screened for lead poisoning clinics operated by the Community Health Services Administration. She criticized the health clinics for a poor follow-up record on the cases of the children who were discovered to have an undue burden of lead.

Leaded paints, generally regarded the most durable, were the most widely used before World War II. They are now outlawed for interior use but are on sale for exterior purposes.

Covering old paint with the new non-lead paints does not remove the hazard.

NATIONAL DISABLED LAW OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of concern expressed for the policemen killed in the line of duty. This officer has been stopped while in the prime of his life and forced to live on a lesser income than he needs for his family and his future.

Peter Frazza of Nutley, N.J., himself a policeman forced to retire on a disability pension, has been trying to do something about the plight of people like himself.

Recently the Italian Tribune News editorially described his work and his efforts to expand the National Disabled Law Officers Association. I commend the article to my colleagues:

[From the Italian Tribune News, Jan. 8, 1971]

HIS GOAL IS TO AID POLICEMEN IN NEED

Peter A. Frazza of Nutley knows what it is to be hurt.

He also knows the cost of hospitalization, and the long recuperation period.

Frazza is also aware that there are those long periods of lonesomeness when a man has nothing today.

He also knows how a man can need a friend.

Peter Frazza, who spent eight years in the Nutley Police Department, was disabled in a car crash while on duty in August, 1963.

His injuries forced him to retire and he walks with a cane today.

"During the last 10 years, the law and order profession has had a great number of men disabled in the line of duty," Frazza said. He added:

"These men have become forgotten ones. They and their families must be adequately taken care of."

In order to help disabled policemen, Frazza has sponsored the National Disabled Law Officers Association in Nutley. It is designed to provide aid to the families of policemen injured in the line of duty, as well as the policemen.

"We're still trying to work out the details and to get the organization rolling in high gear soon," Frazza said.

He explained that the organization will operate similarly to the Disabled War Veterans and will seek financial aid for the families of the injured men. Such aid can come in the form of scholarships for their children.

Although the organization is on a local level in Nutley, Frazza hopes it will eventually spread across the nation.

"We will get the list of all disabled police in other states and ask them to begin operations in their area," Frazza explained.

He said the organization while still in its infancy has been given good support although without any official endorsements.

In order to get the organization established, Frazza said, "donations are necessary and may be sent to N.D.L.O.A., c-o 75 New Street, Nutley, N.J. 67110.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER, 1971

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again the President has proclaimed a National Day of Prayer, following the precedent established in 1952, some 19 years ago. Since that time, the National Day of Prayer has won a special place in the hearts of our people, symbolizing—as it does—the deepest aspirations of American idealism and representing—as it also does—the sources of our common life. America was conceived as a Nation under God, and to that faith she has ever borne witness. There has seldom been a time in our history when the recognition of God's

sovereignty was more needful than today.

We are set in the midst of troubled and difficult days, fraught with challenge and with opportunity, days marked by disruption and transition. The proclamation of a Day of Prayer recalls us to ourselves and to the ultimate source of wisdom, without whose guiding power we cannot survive.

In observing a Day of Prayer, we as a people are reaffirming the ethical, moral, and spiritual foundations of American democracy as these find expression in the Judaeo-Christian tradition. In his Circular to the States (1783), George Washington wrote these words, words which are as eloquent and apt today as they were at the birth of this Republic:

I now make it my earnest prayer, that God would have you, and the State over which you preside, in his holy protection, that he would incline the hearts of the Citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to Government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow Citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served in the Field, and finally, that he would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all, to do Justice, to love mercy, and to demean ourselves with that Charity, humility and pacific temper of mind, which were the Characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed Religion, and without an humble imitation of whose example in these things, we can never hope to be a happy Nation.

May we on this Day of Prayer in 1971 dedicate ourselves as individuals and as a Nation to that kingdom of righteousness, justice, and peace for which Washington prayed. This is a day for our churches and synagogues throughout the land to share in prayer—for our Nation, for our fellow men, and for the world, for justice and for peace.

Especially do we pray for our servicemen missing and held captive in Southeast Asia. We urge every American to unite in the prayer for their safety and for their speedy return to their homes and loved ones. Prayer which did not give special place to these victims of war and to their well-being would be, indeed, a mockery. May our heartfelt concern for them be joined with our hopes for a just and lasting peace, and may the keeping of this Day of Prayer truly be for the healing of the nations.

REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM IN COMMUNIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Internal Security has started upon its investigation of the organized efforts to subvert the fighting forces of our Nation.

While this investigation will concentrate on the campaign to destroy the effectiveness of our general purpose forces it is important to remember that Bolshevik antimilitarism has a much wider scope. In fact, if we wish to utilize one of the prevailing cliches, we might say that antimilitarism in the nuclear age is directed against the entire military-industrial-scientific-educational complex.

The Communist organization acts upon the historical present and therefore takes into account all the characteristics of the contemporary historical situation.

The history of Communist advance over the last 50 or so years is the history of the destruction of the forces standing in opposition to that advance. This destruction takes place before war breaks out, during the war if it breaks out, and after the war if there is any remaining opposition.

The House Committee on Internal Security is primarily concerned with destruction of the effectiveness of our Armed Forces in the present period of quasi-war. Soviet theorists view our society and the military as interacting parts of a single whole. The Armed Forces is an extension of the society insofar as the attitudes of the society find their way into the military forces and influence military preparedness. The society is in turn an extension of the military, since its survival depends on the military forces.

An invaluable contribution to understanding the Communist antimilitary campaign has been made by Dr. Robert Beerstecher. His as yet unpublished thesis, entitled "Revolutionary Antimilitarism in Communist Theory and Practice," is the only thorough and complete treatment of Communist operations aimed at destroying the military capability of those marked for conquest. With meticulous detail Dr. Beerstecher traces Communist antimilitary operations, both in theory and practice, from the period before the Bolshevik coup d'etat in November 1917 through the Korean war. I think my colleagues will be as astounded as I was to read of the successes achieved by the Communists. I hope that by making this treatise widely available through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many people will come to understand the critical danger posed to our Nation by those who are seeking to collapse our defenses by destroying the morale and undermining the loyalty of the men who defend our freedom.

The following portion of Dr. Beerstecher's thesis deals with the Communists' use of antimilitary tactics up to the time when the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia:

REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM IN COMMUNIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

(By Robert E. Beerstecher, Ph. D.)

PREFACE

The ancient Russian saga of the simple peasant possessed of tremendous strength who believed that he could lift the world if only he could find a pulley large enough is a perennial favorite in communist circles. Unlike the tragic hero of the tale who never found his pulley, the communists are convinced that they have found theirs: mass revolutionary antimilitarism. This work requires penetration of the armed forces.

How the strategy and tactics of revolutionary antimilitarism evolved, and how they were developed further by the soviets under the aegis of the Communist International is described in detail in the following study. Mass demobilization and the rapid dissolution of western military strengths after World War II, the Greek civil war, the rise of communist China, the Korean war, the fall of Indo-China, and the recurring Middle East crises—all testify to the fact that revolutionary antimilitarism is not a thing of the past.

For more than half a century, revolutionary antimilitarism has been, and continues to be, the foundation of soviet strategy for achieving world domination. No country has been exempt from the application of this communist doctrine; yet few people are cognizant of the implications of the antimilitarist activities being carried on daily around them. The fault is not entirely their own. Although considerable information concerning communist antimilitarist activities and tactics has been amassed by various military, civilian and governmental internal security organizations in non-communist countries, often its highly sensitive and classified nature has prevented its wide dissemination among the very people most frequently affected by it, i.e., the men and women in the armed forces, in government, and the public at large.

In the United States, congressional committees have rendered an important public service by their investigations of communist activities, but the facts which they develop frequently are obscured by the mass of relatively unimportant detail which clutter the published hearings. Moreover, congressional hearings receive only limited distribution, and, at best, make difficult reading. This may account for the fact that the contemporary literature on communism, while exhaustively treating other aspects of Soviet doctrine, seemingly ignores the question of revolutionary antimilitarism. Three general exceptions should be noted. Angelo Rossi, the foremost authority on the French communist movement has contributed important documentation on defeatism and the tactics of military disintegration in France.[1] Another contemporary expert on modern communism, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, has made an invaluable contribution to current knowledge through his authoritative analysis of the communist techniques of conflict management.[2] The communists themselves are the third exception. Communism itself has provided the primary source material on which my historical analysis of revolutionary antimilitarism is based. To an even greater degree than Hitler detailed his grandiose scheme for world domination in *Mein Kampf*, the disciples of Leninism have revealed through their activities and writings which extend over half a century the pattern of communist conquest, and the predominant role assigned in it to revolutionary antimilitarism work in the organized military forces of all non-communist states.

I hope that this study will contribute to a better understanding of communist intent and the manner in which communist intent is translated into action through mass revolutionary antimilitarism. Communist successes have been greatest in those areas where their machinations were least understood. This has been especially true where antimilitarist activities were concerned. Armed with the knowledge of Soviet antimilitarist tactics, the future need not be a repetition of the past.

I. FOUNDATIONS OF REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM. . . .

Revolutionary antimilitarism is a fundamental tenet of Soviet strategy. Although the doctrine of antimilitarism was well founded in socialist tradition, it remained for Lenin, the precursor of modern communism, to impart the mass revolutionary character which makes it peculiarly a twentieth century phenomenon. According to the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, antimilitarism is "a mass

---

Footnotes at end of article.

international movement of struggle against the politics of militarism and imperialist wars . . . closely connected with the fight against capitalism as a cause giving rise to war and militarism." [3] For Lenin, however, antimilitarism meant more than merely the struggle against militarism and war; it was the warfare of peace. Clausewitz's dictum that war was the continuation of politics by other means found its parallel in Lenin's recognition that antimilitarism was the means by which peace was waged. In the lexicon of Lenin, war and peace were synonyms. "Peace," he wrote in March, 1918, "is a respite for another war, war is a method of obtaining a somewhat better or somewhat worse peace." [4]

For Lenin, revolutionary antimilitarism meant the creation of a militant mass organization, the revolutionary army. "The revolutionary army," he stated in July, 1903, "is needed because great historical questions can be solved only by violence, and the organization of violence in the modern struggle is a military organization." [5] Much earlier in 1901, Lenin had emphasized the part played by organization in the revolutionary army. "Because the crowd may overwhelm and crush the regular troops," he said, "We must without fail manage to keep up with the spontaneous rise of the masses in our work of introducing extremely systematic organization among the regular troops, for the more we manage to introduce organization the more probable will it be that the regular troops will not be overwhelmed by the crowd, but will take their place at the head of the crowd." [6]

In his writings, Lenin repeatedly emphasized the tremendous importance of military knowledge, military technique and military organization as "an instrument in the hands of the masses" for determining the outcome of revolution.[7] He also emphasized the necessity for penetrating and organizing from within the military forces of the state, for he held that revolution, to be successful, required the army, or at least a part of it, to be on the side of the masses.[8]

The concept of the state played an important role in Lenin's theory of revolutionary antimilitarism. "The state, in the true sense of the term," Lenin declared, "is the power exercised over the masses by detachments of armed men separated from the people." [9] It was, he asserted, a special organization of force for the suppression of some class.[10] The chief instruments of state power, Lenin held, were the standing army and the police.[11] It was necessary, he stated, for the revolution *"to concentrate all its forces of destruction* against the state power, and to regard the problem, not as one of perfecting the state machine, but one *of smashing and destroying it."* [12]

Revolutionary antimilitarism inside the armed forces dates from 1901 when Lenin concluded that the scope of revolutionary work in Russia was too narrow because it failed to encompass the army. "As soon as our available forces permit," Lenin wrote in his pamphlet, *What Is To Be Done?* "we must without fail devote serious attention to propaganda and agitation among soldiers and officers, and to the creation of 'military organizations' affiliated to our party." [13] Lenin further noted that the frequent street fights which occurred between the workers and the government troops had caused a "revival of the democratic spirit" in Russian military circles. To exploit this rising spirit, the Russian social-democratic party popularized among the soldiers the slogans "Do not fire against the workers! Do not fire against the people!" in connection with the May day celebrations of 1902. The soldiers were called upon to pass to the side of the revolutionary workers, bringing their weapons with them.[14]

In January, 1902, Lenin drafted an action program for the Social-Democratic Party of Russia. In it, he set forth the party's immediate political task of overthrowing tsarism, and the goal of establishing a republic which would guarantee to the people their sovereignty. In addition, the program that Lenin drafted provided for universal suffrage, unrestricted liberty, complete equality, the separation of church and state, free education, and "the abolition of the standing army and the substitution for it of the universal arming of the people." [15]

Lenin explained why social-democrats considered it necessary to abolish the standing army in his pamphlet, *To the Rural Poor:*

"The standing army is an army that is divorced from the people and trained to shoot down the people. If the soldier were not locked up for years in barracks and inhumanly drilled there, would he ever agree to shoot his brothers, the workers and the peasants? Would he go against the starving peasants? A standing army is not in the least necessary to protect the country from an attack of the enemy; a people's militia is sufficient. If every citizen is armed, Russia need fear no enemy." [16]

Another reason given by Lenin was that the people would be delivered from the burden of militarism:

"Militarism costs hundreds of millions of rubles a year, and all this money is collected from the people; that is why the taxes are so heavy and why it becomes increasingly difficult to live. Militarism further increases the power of the officials and of the police over the people. Militarism is required to plunder foreign peoples, as for instance, to take the land from the Chinese. The people gain nothing by this, and their burden only increases because of the increased taxes. The substitution of the armed nation for a standing army would enormously lighten the burden of all the workers and all the peasants." [17]

War and the Revolution of 1905

The revolutionary movement which had been developing in Russia in the last decade of the nineteenth century began to assume serious proportions in the first years of the new century. In some government circles, the revolutionary trend was looked upon with growing apprehension. Vyacheslav Plehve, the Russian Minister of the Interior, was one of those who sought a solution to the revolutionary problem. "We need," he is alleged to have stated, "a small victorious war to stem the tide of revolution." [18] In February, 1904, the war came, but it brought with it a series of crushing military defeats rather than the victory for which Plehve had hoped.

Conditions between Russia and Japan had been strained for many months. Russia refused to acknowledge Japanese demands that she relinquish control of Korea and Manchuria. The Russo-Japanese war began on February 10, 1904, when the Japanese navy shelled Russian warships at Port Arthur. In the months which followed, Russia's military forces suffered numerous defeats. Japanese troops landed in northern Korea without opposition, and in April, 1904, crossed the Yalu River where they won a major victory over the Russian army. In July, 1904, the Russian Pacific fleet was destroyed in a naval engagement near Port Arthur. In August, another major battle occurred between the Russian and Japanese field armies at Lito-yang; again the Japanese emerged victorious. Port Arthur became the scene of a siege.

While the war was being pursued in the Far East, the Second International convened an international socialist congress in Amsterdam. The war was unpopular with the middle class, the workers and the peasants in Russia, demanding of them ever-increasing sacrifices. It was equally unpopular among the soldiers and sailors who were forced to fight it. A strong defeatist attitude had developed in Russian socialist circles and was clearly evident in the proceedings of the congress. Georgi Plakhanov, acting for the bolshevik, menshevik and social-democratic factions of Russian socialism, publicly shook hands at the congress with Sen Katayama, the Japanese socialist leader. There the agreement ended. Although the mensheviks proclaimed a slogan of *"peace at any price."* Lenin and his newly formed bolshevik party were not prepared to support them. Lenin recognized that each new defeat of the armed forces increased popular discontent in Russia. "The cause of Russia's freedom depends upon the military defeats of the autocracy," he stated, adding, "The Russian people have gained by the defeats." [19]

Leon Trotsky, in his pamphlet, *The Proletariat and the Revolution,* written in 1904, at the height of the Russo-Japanese war, joined Lenin in calling for bolshevik work in the armed forces. "We ought to do all at our command," he wrote, "to make the army detach itself from absolutism at the time of a decisive onslaught of the masses.[20] The first prerequisite for revolution, Trotsky declared, was to turn the political strike of the proletariat into a demonstration. The second prerequisite, he stated, was the mood of the army:

"A dissatisfaction among the soldiers, a vague sympathy for the 'revoluters,' is an established fact. Only part of this sympathy may rightly be attributed to our direct propaganda among the soldiers. The major part is done by the practical clashes between the army units and protesting masses." [21]

Trotsky counted heavily on the disintegration of morale resulting from the war. He noted that rumor played an important part in the process:

"Our ships are slow, our guns have short range, our soldiers are uneducated, our sergeants have neither compass nor map, our soldiers are bare-footed, hungry, and freezing, our Red Cross is stealing, our commissariat is stealing—rumors and facts of this kind leak down to the army and are being eagerly absorbed. Each rumor, as strong acid, dissolves the rust of mental drill. Years of peaceful propaganda could hardly equal in their resuts one day of warfare." [22]

Trotsky outlined the steps which he believed necessary in order to achieve maximum benefit from the disintegrative process:

"The mere mechanism of discipline remains, the faith, however, the conviction that it is right to carry out orders, the belief that the present conditions can be continued, are rapidly dwindling. The less faith the army has in absolutism, the more faith it has in its foes. We ought to make use of this situation. We ought to explain to the soldiers the meaning of the workingmen's action which is being prepared by the party. We ought to make use of the slogan which is bound to unite the army with the revolutionary people, Away with the War!" [23]

Trotsky added:

"We ought to create a situation where the officers would not be able to trust their soldiers at the crucial moment. This would reflect in the attitude of the officers themselves. The rest will be done by the street. It will dissolve the remnants of the barrack-hypnosis in the revolutionary enthusiasm of the people." [24]

Trotsky stressed the importance of antimilitarist propaganda:

"We ought to carry on the most intensive propaganda in the army in order that on the day of the strike each soldier, sent to curb the 'rebels,' should know he is facing the people who are demanding a national constitutional assembly." [25]

Proletarian rule, he concluded, meant dissolution of the army.[26]

Footnotes at end of article.

On January 1, 1905, the Russian military garrison at Port Arthur capitulated to the Japanese. Several days later, and hundreds of miles away, another event occurred in St. Petersburg which touched off an unparalleled wave of civil disorder, strikes and armed uprisings. This event has been recorded in soviet histories as the opening battle of the revolution of 1905. Under the leadership of a priest, Georgi Gapon, a large procession of workers marched on the Winter Palace to present a petition to the tsar. When the procession attempted to force its way forward against a military cordon, the guards fired on the crowd. In the panic which followed, the crowd dispersed, leaving behind several hundred dead and injured.

News of what had happened in St. Petersburg spread rapidly throughout Russia; internal dissension followed in its wake. Conditions within Russia were already acute, accentuated by the steadily rising cost of living. Discontent among the people increased from day to day. News of each new military defeat further complicated the situation, and had a marked effect on both the civil and military population. The situation was exploited by the bolsheviks who, through their propaganda and agitation, created a revolutionary movement among the troops and the sailors. In February, 1905, the Russian army was defeated in a major engagement near Mukden. Russia's hopes for victory thereafter were pinned to the single possibility offered by its European fleet. Although it had been ordered to the Far East after the defeat of the Pacific fleet at Port Arthur in July, 1904, the European fleet did not arrive in the Far East until May, 1905. It arrived in time to keep its rendezvous with disaster and annihilation at the battle of Tmishima.[27]

Mass organizational work in the army and navy by the bolsheviks began later in 1905.[28] In spite of the numerous proclamations issued by the bolsheviks to the soldiers, few sections of the party had actually undertaken organizational work inside the armed forces prior to the St. Petersburg massacre. Only then did work in the army become recognized as one of the basic tasks of the party. The object of the bolshevik military organizations in the armed forces was to carry on propaganda among the troops and prepare them for armed insurrection. Soldiers and sailors belonging to the party were assigned to one of the military organizations which in turn was part of the over-all social-democratic organizational structure.[29]

A series of military revolts broke out in the army and navy. The best known of these was the mutiny of the Russian cruiser *"Potemkin"* in the Black Sea.[30]

The immediate cause of the *"Potemkin"* mutiny was the putrid condition of the soup meat which was delivered aboard on June 13, 1905. The meat was hung on hooks on the spar deck for the night. The following morning, one of the ship's crew noticed that there were maggots crawling over the meat. When the sailors complained to the watch officer, the ship's medical officer was sent to examine it. According to one eye-witness account, the ship's doctor "approached the meat, put on his pince-nez so as to see the maggots better, twisted it round in front of his face, sniffed and said that the meat was very good, that the crew was merely faddy and therefore did not want to eat it. All that was necessary was to wash off the maggots with water, and the meat would be excellent." [31]

When it came time for dinner, the crew of the *"Potemkin"* ate their ration of bread. However, they refused to touch any of the soup which had been prepared for the evening meal. When word of their refusal was brought to the attention of the captain, he ordered all hands to assemble on desk. The captain reminded the men that insubordination was inadvisable on a warship and could result in hanging from the yardarm. Then he ordered the assembled crew to step forward if they had changed their minds about eating the soup. The majority of the crew remained fast in their places, signifying their continued refusal. The captain ordered the guard turned out. At the appearance of the armed squad, the crew broke ranks in disorder. Some of the sailors ran to the gun deck where they seized rifles and ammunition. In the fighting which followed, several of the ship's officers were killed. A few jumped overboard, and swam to the safety of a nearby boat. However, the captain was taken prisoner. Later he was killed by the crew who disposed of his body by throwing it overboard.

Having taken command, the crew proceeded to elect a twelve man ship's committee to direct the operation of the *"Potemkin."* One of the first decisions made by the revolutionary ship's committee was to sail for Odessa where a general strike was in progress.[32] The sudden appearance of the *"Potemkin"* in Odessa temporarily threw the balance of power in favor of the strikers. Clashes between the workers and the government forces caused the general strike to turn into a spontaneous armed uprising. "The passage of the *'Potemkin'* to the side of the rebellion," Lenin later observed, "was the first step in converting the Russian revolution into an international force." [33]

He also noted that bolshevik propaganda had met with remarkable success in the army. Even the military patrols "guarding" St. Petersburg, he pointed out, were given leaflets calling on them to come over to the side of the people.[34]

During the revolution of 1905, Lenin became convinced that the army was the "key" to successful revolution.[35] Evaluating the revolutionary potential of the army, Lenin wrote: "The army cannot and must not be neutral." [36] The proletariat, he declared, must succeed in winning the army over to the side of the masses.[37] Lenin again called for the disintegration of the standing army. "Everywhere, in all countries," he declared:

"The standing army is used, not so much against the external enemy as against the internal enemy. Everywhere the standing army has become the weapon of reaction, the servant of capital in its struggle against labor, the executioner of the people's liberty. . . . Let us entirely destroy the standing army. Let the army merge with the armed people, let the soldiers bring to the people their knowledge of military affairs, let the barracks disappear and their place be taken by a free military school." [38]

Lenin recognized that penetration of the armed forces was not in itself a revolutionary panacea. "We have carried on work in the army," he wrote, "and we will redouble our efforts in the future to 'convert' the army ideologically. But we shall prove miserable pedants if we forgot that at the moment of the uprising a physical fight for the army is also necessary." [39]

In January, 1906, the bolsheviks celebrated the first anniversary of the St. Petersburg massacre. Joseph Stalin, then a young Georgian bolshevik, wrote a special pamphlet commemorating the occasion. In it, he set forth his analysis of the tasks facing the party in the spreading revolutionary situation. A united party, an uprising organized by the party, and a policy of offensive, Stalin declared, were the three things needed to achieve victory for the revoltion.[40] He stated:

"Our task is to help the party organize the armed uprising, actively to intervene in this sacred cause and to work tirelessly for it. Our task is to multiply the red detachments, to train and weld them together; our task is to procure arms by force of arms, to reconnoitre the disposition of government institutions, calculate the enemy's forces, study his strong and weak aides and draw up a plan for the uprising accordingly. Our task is to conduct systematic agitation in favor of an uprising in the army and in the villages." [41]

Later, when the bolsheviks attended the annual workers' party congress, Stalin defined their main task as the development of the revolution "by expanding and intensifying agitation activities among broad sections of the proletariat, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and among the armed forces." [42] Stalin, however, argued that agitation alone was not enough. The situation, he said, demanded more than propaganda and agitation, although these would always be among the party's chief weapons. Stalin called for arming and augmenting the number of red fighting squads.

In March, 1906, the bolsheviks held a conference in Moscow of the military organizations for the purpose of discussing the work by the propagandists among the soldiers and officers. The agenda outlined for the conference covered a wide area of activity, including the party aims, the objectives of the revolution, the demonstration of the army, the disintegration of military forces, the immediate concrete demands for military personnel, and the selection of the decisive moment for revolution. The conference also discussed the role of the army in European and American revolution. Before the conference could conclude its work, however, its members were arrested.[44] Unrest in the army and navy continued. In July, 1906, mutinies broke out in Sveaborg and Kronstadt. Although the antimilitarist work of the bolsheviks contributed to these mutinies, the much larger and extremely active social-revolutionary party was the real motivating force behind them.

In November, 1906, another conference of bolshevik military organizations was held in Tammerfors, Finland. At the Tammerfors conference, a resolution was adopted stating that the objective of the military organizations was "to create in each body of troops a solid cell of the party; through the cells to organize the revolutionary elements of the army; to sustain their popular demands; and to make them pass to the side of the insurrection." [45]

The bolsheviks created military organizations in many of the major cities. By 1907, their party had contacts in most of the important military units and camps.[46] Part of their success was the early recognition that successful work against the armed forces required that agitators, propagandists and organizers actually join the services.[47] Particular attention was devoted to young men about to be conscripted into the army. These recruits were trained to carry on revolutionary propaganda.

Although the bolsheviks worked under conditions of severe illegality, they managed to publish some twenty illegal papers devoted to revolutionary propaganda in the army and navy between 1905 and 1907. Every big garrison town, i.e., Revel, Riga, Dvinak, Betuni, Odessa, Warsaw, Sveaborg, Kronstadt, St. Petersburg, and Moscow had its soldiers' newspaper, e.g., *The Soldier* (Sevastopol), *The Army Messenger* (Finland), *The Soldier's Life* (Moscow and Voronos), etc. The papers enjoyed short lives and relatively limited distribution. For example, *The Soldier's Voice* which began publication at Riga in December, 1905, survived 20 issues for a total of 52,000 copies. Distribution of these papers was accomplished by the members of the illegal bolshevik organizations in the cities where the papers were published through their contacts inside the army and navy.[48] The papers represented important vehicles for propaganda and agitation.

The Stuttgart Congress

Militarism was an important item on the agenda of the Stuttgart congress of the Second International which was held in August, 1907. Lenin was the sparkplug of the bolshevik delegation. Contemporary militarism, he

Footnotes at end of article.

declared, was the result of capitalism. Like the German socialists of his day, Lenin was careful to distinguish between external militarism, i.e., *Militarisms nach aussen*, and internal militarism, i.e., *Militarisms nach innen*. Both forms, he stated, were "living manifestations" of capitalism: military force employed in international conflicts, the external manifestation; militarism as a weapon for the suppression by the ruling class of all proletarian movements, the internal manifestation.[49] The Stuttgart congress, Lenin noted, was more concerned with *militarisms nach aussen*. Therefore, the bolsheviks attempted to focus attention on the problems of internal militarism. A major controversy over the proper antimilitarist tactics ensued.

"The principles of the premises for the correct solution of this problem," Lenin later declared in commenting on the controversy, "were laid down quite firmly long ago and they do not give rise to differences of opinion."[50] But, he recognized, although the connection between the principles of militarism and capitalism were firmly established in socialist doctrine, the proper tactics of antimilitarism remained undefined. Socialists, Lenin asserted, had solved neither the "practical problem of how the struggle against the burden of militarism" was to be carried out nor "how wars were to be prevented."[51]

Two extreme positions on militarism were evident at the Stuttgart congress. German social-democrats led by Vollmar argued that there was no need for any special antimilitarist activity. Militarism, they reasoned, was the child of capitalism; wars were a "necessary concomitant" of capitalist development. In case of war, Vollmer's followers maintained, German social-democrats were duty bound to defend their fatherland from attacks and to participate in a "defensive" war. "All our love for humanity," Vollmer declared, "cannot prevent us from being good Germans."[52] The other extreme at the congress was represented by the French socialists of the Hervé school. The Hervéists argued that the proletariat had no fatherland, thus denying the possibility of a "defensive" war. All wars, they maintained, were fought in the interests of capitalism, thus making it essential that the proletariat resist every kind of war. The followers or Hervé further asserted that the only correct antimilitarist tactic was to reply to every declaration of war by creating a military strike and insurrection. This, they stated, was the end which antimilitarist propaganda must serve.[53] Neither position, Lenin held, was sound. From the polemics of the Stuttgart congress, Lenin evolved much of the basic doctrine of revolutionary antimilitarism which guides the communist movement.

Lenin asserted that Vollmar's position on the necessity to defend the fatherland ignored the fundamental truth stated in *The Communist Manifesto* that the proletarians had no fatherland. "The fatherland, i.e., the given political, cultural and social environment," Lenin explained, "is the most powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat."[54] Hervé also had been wrong, he continued, when he asserted that it was immaterial in which fatherland the proletariat lived. "The proletariat cannot remain indifferent to the destiny of its country," Lenin declared, "but it is interested in the destiny of its country only insofar as it affects its class struggle, and not by virtue of some bourgeois patriotism."[55] Lenin attacked the position held by Hervé that the proletariat were obligated to retaliate to every war with a military strike or an armed uprising. Such a policy, he pointed out, deprived the proletariat of the choice of the decisive moment for battle. This choice should not be left to the enemies of the proletariat. Hervé's position, Lenin noted, failed "to connect war with the capitalist regime in general, and antimilitarist agitation with the entire work of socialism."[56]

Further, he said, it "revealed an utter lack of understanding of the fact that the application of one or other of the means of struggle depends not on any decision revolutionaries may have made previously, but on the objective conditions of the particular crisis, both economic and political, caused by the war."[57]

But Lenin did not close the door entirely against the use of the military strike or armed uprising at the outbreak of war. He said:

"The proletariat may reply to the declaration of war by a military strike if it finds it expedient and appropriate; it may, among other methods of achieving the social revolution resort also to a military strike . . . but it is not in the interests of the proletariat to bind itself down to this "tactical recipe."[58]

Lenin emphasized the need for special antimilitarist work. Such activity, he stated, was "not only particularly necessary, but practically expedient and useful."[59] This, he pointed out, was especially true in the case of antimilitarist propaganda:

"Special antimilitarist propaganda must be conducted all the more energetically because cases of the intervention of military forces in the struggle between labor and capital become increasing frequent, and the importance of militarism not only during the present struggle of the proletariat, but also in the future, at the moment of the social revolution, becomes increasingly obvious."[60]

Lenin was successful in getting the Stuttgart congress to amend its final resolution on antimilitarism. Lenin defined militarism in his amendment as the primary weapon of class oppression. He emphasized the necessity for agitating among the youth.[61] The amendment highlighted three fundamental tasks for social-democrats and bolsheviks alike. "If a war threatens to break out," Lenin wrote, "it is the duty of the working class and their parliamentary representative in the countries involved to exert every effort to prevent the outbreak of war by the means they consider most effective."[62] Should war still break out, Lenin asserted, it was the duty of the working class to intervene in favor of its speedy termination. It was also their duty "with all their power to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to rouse the masses and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule."[63]

In December, 1908, Lenin drafted a special resolution in which he evaluated the existing situation in Russia and redefined the fundamental tasks of the bolshevik party. He wrote:

"First on the order of the day is the prolonged task of training, organizing and welding together the class conscious masses of the proletariat. Then, as a task subordinated to this, it is necessary to extend the work of organization to the peasantry and the army, especially in the form of literary propaganda and agitation, and in this our main attention must be given to the socialist education of the proletarian and the semi-proletarian elements among the peasantry and in the army."[64]

Revolutionary sentiment grew steadily in the Russian armed forces. In 1912, a rash of military revolts and attempted mutinies broke out. In July, 1912, two battalions mutinied at a military camp at Troitsk near Tashkent. Military discipline, poor food and severe conditions of Siberian camp life were contributory causes. The mutiny had been preceded by several months of revolutionary agitation and propaganda activities in the camp. The bolsheviks had held secret meetings at which leaflets were distributed calling on the soldiers to refuse to salute their officers. Discussions were held at which it was suggested that the soldiers should do "what they did in China," that is, overthrow the government and establish a republic as had been done during the Chinese revolution of 1910–1911. Although the mutineers had been in contact with the military revolutionary organization at Tashkent, they lacked a clear and distinct plan of action. Mutinies were attempted in the Baltic and Black Sea fleets during the spring and summer of 1912. Unsuccessful attempts at mutiny occurred aboard the cruiser *Rurik*, the battleship *Tsarovich* and other vessels of the Baltic fleet. In the Black Sea area, an attempt was carried out on the cruiser *Joan Zlateust*. The premature disclosure of the mutineer's plans resulted in suppression of the attempts by the military authorities. Thereafter, the bolshevik press urged that those involved in the preparation of rebellion exercise greater care.[65]

Lenin and the World War

In August, 1914, a conflagration swept across Europe. Lenin was living in Austria when the war broke out, but he made his way to Switzerland where, in the early days of September, 1914, he drafted his famous theses on the war. The war, he asserted, was an imperialist conflict; the workers had been betrayed by the leaders of the Second International who had confined themselves in the struggle against militarism "to a sentimental philistine point of view instead of recognizing the necessity for a revolutionary war."[66] Lenin raised the banner of revolutionary antimilitarism.

It was the duty of real social-democrats, Lenin stated, to bring on a social revolution by turning the weapons which they had been given to slaughter each other against the bourgeois. The slogans of social-democracy, he concluded, should be based on "an all-embracing propaganda of the socialist revolution, to be extended also to the army and the area of military activities; emphasis to be placed on the necessity of turning the weapons, not against the brother wage slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the bourgeois governments and parties in each country; recognition of the urgent necessity of organizing illegal nuclei and groups in the armies of all nations to conduct such propaganda in all languages."[67]

Although the central committee of the Russian bolshevik party had laid down the main line on the attitude to be taken towards war in a special manifesto of 1914, there existed widespread confusion and wavering in the ranks, specially among bolshevik abroad as well as among the social-democrats in other countries. In March, 1915, the bolsheviks held a special conference in Berne, Switzerland, for the purpose of establishing ideological unity on tactics. The conference which was convened by Lenin, was attended by representatives of bolshevik sections from England, France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland. After the reports by the local bolshevik sections, the conference discussed the war and the tasks of the party, the need for a central organ and a new newspaper, the tasks of organizations abroad, and the attitude toward colonial affairs.[68] The report on the war question was made by Lenin.

"The present war," Lenin stated, "is of an imperialist character."[69] Its real essence, he continued, was the struggle between Germany, England and France for the division of colonies. Which group dealt the first blow, or which first declared war, Lenin asserted, was unimportant insofar as social tactics were concerned. Slogans about a war of defense, of resistance to enemy invasion, or of defense of the fatherland were used by both sides, he pointed out, adding that they were "nothing but a means for the wholesale deception of the people."[70] The only correct proletarian slogan, Lenin reiterated, was "Transform the present imperialist war into civil war."[71]

Lenin outlined five initial steps which he

Footnotes at end of article.

believed were necessary in transforming the war into a civil war. The first step was "absolute refusal to vote for war credits and resignation from bourgeois cabinets." [72] Next, he said, it was necessary for a "complete rupture with the policy of 'national peace.'" [73] On this point Lenin was opposed by Hukharin, Krylenko and others. Lenin's opposition accepted the slogan of civil war, but rejected the slogan of defeat on the basis that favorable agitation among the masses who were "intoxicated with patriotism" would alienate them from the bolshevik party. They recommended that the slogan of defeatism be replaced with the slogan of "fight for peace." However, Lenin's position prevailed at the conference, and the proposal was rejected. Behind its rejection was the rationale that a fight for peace which did not involve a call for revolutionary mass action against "one's own bourgeoisie" was tantamount to the "abandonment of the class struggle." [74] Propaganda in favor of the slogan "fight for peace" was, Lenin held, incompatible with the slogan of civil war.

"It, in fact," Lenin wrote, "would imply petty-bourgeois snivelling. And we, even in time of war, must remain revolutionaries. We must preach *class war* also among the troops." [75] Lenin's third step for transforming the imperialist war into civil war was the creation of an illegal organization. The fourth step, he stated, required "support of fraternization among the soldiers of the belligerent nations in the trenches and in the theatre of war in general." [76] In addition, as his fifth step, Lenin postulated the necessity for supporting "every kind of revolutionary proletarian mass action in general." [77]

Without a series of revolutions, Lenin stated, there could be no such thing as a "democratic" peace. Without a call for revolutionary mass action, the propaganda of peace was an illusion. Pacificism and what he termed as "the abstract preaching of peace" were identified by Lenin as only a means of deceiving the working class, for, he asserted, wars were inevitable under capitalism.[78]

"In every country," Lenin stated, the struggle against the government waging this imperialist war must not stop at the possibility of that country's defeat as a consequence of revolutionary agitation. The defeat of the government's army weakens this government, aids the liberation of the nationalities oppressed by it and facilitates civil war against the ruling classes.[79]

This, Lenin noted, was the case in Russia.

The question of the slogan "defeat of one's own government" in imperialist war was developed at length by Lenin at the Berne conference. Afterwards, he published a defense of the slogan in which he asserted that it was axiomatic that "a revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but desire the defeat of its government." [80] There was no meaning to a revolutionary struggle against war, he continued, unless it meant revolutionary action against "one's own government." In wartime, Lenin explained, this meant "not only desiring its defeat, but really facilitating such defeat." It did not mean, he emphasized, organizing unsuccessful military strikes, blowing up bridges, or helping the government defeat revolutionaries.[81]

Revolution in wartime, Lenin wrote, was civil war. The transformation of war between governments, he noted, was facilitated by military reverses or "defeats" experienced by the governments. It was impossible, he continued, to strive for such a transformation without at the same time facilitating defeat. Without revolutionary action, revolutionary slogans were meaningless.[82] "The transformation of the imperialist war into civil war," Lenin stated, cannot be made, anymore than it is possible to make a revolution—it *grows* out of a multiplicity of diverse phenomena, phases, traits, characteristics, consequences of the imperialist war. Such a growth is *impossible* without a series of military reverses and defeats of those governments which receive blows from *their own* oppressed classes.[83]

Prior to the outbreak of war, the Social-Democratic Party of Germany had declared that it would not allow the government "to send German proletarians to be butchered." However, when the war finally came in 1914, it reversed its position, declaring that "in the moment of danger we shall not leave our fatherland to its fate." In the Reichstag, all the social-democratic representatives supported the war effort except Karld Liebknecht. By his speeches in the Reichstag and his work in the German socialist youth movement, Liebknecht, who later was one of the principal leaders of the Spartacus League, earned for himself a reputation as a determined antimilitarist. In May, 1915, Liebknecht issued a manifesto entitled "The Chief Enemy Is In Your Own Country" in which he called upon the German workers and soldiers to fight against German imperialism with revolutionary determination. His manifesto concluded with the following words:

The chief enemy is in your own country! The chief enemy of Germany is in Germany: it is German imperialism, the German war party, German secret diplomacy. It is against this enemy in our own country that the German people must fight, must fight in the political struggle in alliance with proletarians of other countries who are fighting against their imperialists.[84]

This fundamental theme of defeatism, the enemy within, was later adapted as a standard bolshevik recipe for disintegration of military and civilian morale.[85]

In September, 1915, an international socialist conference was held at Zimmerwald, Switzerland. Lenin formulated the position taken by the bolsheviks at the conference, declaring the necessity for a common ideological declaration condemning social-chauvinists and opportunists, opposing the slogan "defense of the fatherland," and supporting a program of revolutionary mass action. A draft manifesto addressed to the workers of all countries was presented to the conference by the bolsheviks in which the war was characterized as predatory. The manifesto named certain social-democratic leaders and accused them of treachery. It called upon the masses to compel their representatives to vote against war credits, to withdraw from the cabinets, to conduct propaganda, to fraternize in the trenches, and to fight for the overthrow of the government. The manifesto was rejected by the majority at the conference, for the bolsheviks under Lenin's leadership were still only a minority faction.[86] The primary opposition to Lenin and the bolsheviks at the conference came from the German, French and Italian socialists. It was against the Germans that Lenin directed his criticism. They admitted, he stated, "that we were heading for revolutionary battles, but they said, we must not shout to the whole world about such things as fraternisation in the trenches, political strikes, street demonstrations and civil war. Such things are done, they said, but not talked about. Others added: this is childishness, putechism." [87]

The French position was that Europe was not ripe for revolution, while the Italians at Zimmerwald argued that the task of the conference was not to create civil war but to end the World War.

The compromise manifesto finally adopted by the Zimmerwald conference was somewhat more restrained in its language than the one originally drafted by the bolsheviks. It declared that the war was the outgrowth of imperialism; that responsibility for it rested on the "ruling powers of capitalist society." [88] The manifesto contained an indictment of the socialist leadership, but the sharpness of its criticism was tempered by the omission of any direct reference to particular individuals. The manifesto called for an "irreconcilable proletarian class struggle." [89] Unlike the bolshevik proposal, however, the Zimmerwald manifesto failed to specify how the class struggle was to be carried out.

Although it offered no program, and lacked a "clear pronouncement as to the methods of fighting against the war," Lenin and the "left" signed the Zimmerwald manifesto. Explaining their willingness to compromise, Lenin declared: "A struggle for peace without revolutionary struggle is an empty and false phrase . . . the only way to put an end to the horrors of war is a revolutionary struggle for socialism," but it would have been "bad military tactics," he added, "to refuse to move together with a growing international protest movement." [90]

Defeatism accelerated the revolutionary crisis in Russia. In October, 1915, Lenin wrote that the lessons of war compelled even the opponents of bolshevism to recognize both the necessity for "defeatism" and "the necessity of issuing—at first as a slashing phrase in a manifesto, but later more seriously and thoughtfully—the slogan of a revolt in the rear of the German militarists, in other words, the slogan of civil war." [91] "In the conditions of an imperialist war," he continued, "a revolutionary crisis in Russia could not but lead people's thoughts to the only salvation of the people, to the idea of 'a revolt in the rear' of the German army, i.e., to the idea of civil war in all the belligerent countries." [92] Socialists, Lenin asserted, were duty bound "to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, to call for it, to create the necessary organizations, to speak fearlessly and in the most concrete manner of the various methods of violent struggle and of its 'technique.'" [93]

After the Zimmerwald conference, Lenin proposed several theses to guide social-democratic, i.e., bolshevik, work. "We consider," Lenin wrote in October, 1915, "that the immediate and most urgent tasks are to consolidate and extend social-democratic work among the proletariat, and to extend it to the rural proletariat, to the rural poor and to the army." [94] Lenin explained that the most important task of revolutionary social-democracy in Russia, as he saw it, was the development of "the incipient strike movement" under the slogan of the "three pillars," i.e., democratic republic, confiscation of the land of the landlords, and the eight-hour day. Lenin also emphasized the requirement for agitation demanding the immediate end of the war. Another of the theses proposed by Lenin was that "soviets of workers' deputies and similar institutions must be regarded as organs of insurrection, as organs of revolutionary power." [95]

In February, 1916, the Zimmerwald adherents held a preliminary meeting at Berne, Switzerland, to make arrangements for a second international socialist congress. The bolsheviks proposed that the Berne conference dispense with its original purpose, and constitute itself as the congress. This congress, the bolsheviks contended, should then issue a manifesto proclaiming to the proletariat that the time had arrived for revolutionary action. The bolshevik proposal was rejected, but a compromise measure was later accepted by the Berne meeting which reflected the growing trend towards the "Left." The compromise resolution sharply criticized the inactivity of the Bureau of the Second International, and the "social-patriot" policies of the Germans and French. This criticism did not completely satisfy the bolsheviks who wanted a complete break with the Second International and the establishment of a new International, but it represented an important

Footnotes at end of article.

departure from the position previously held by the majority at Zimmerwald.

The compromise called for the "voluntary" intervention of the working class in the class struggle. At the same time, it condemned voluntary participation by the working class in any national defense organization or movement. The measure approved the use of strikes and mass demonstrations, fraternization by the man in the trenches, and votes against war credits. The Berne conference completed arrangements for holding of a new congress. The site selected for the congress was Kienthal, Switzerland.[96]

The Kienthal congress was held in April, 1916. The Zimmerwald "left" entered the congress with a concrete program which generally followed the revolutionary proposals it had made at Zimmerwald and Berne. The program advanced by the "left" under Lenin's leadership called for a complete break with the "social-chauvinists," the establishment of a new International, and the initiation of revolutionary mass activity aimed at transforming the war into a class struggle.[97]

In the theses formulated by Lenin at Kienthal, it was asserted that revolutionary action during the war was impossible without working for the defeat of the government. This, in turn, Lenin pointed out, facilitated the revolution. "It is necessary to tell the masses," he argued, "that unless they themselves create underground organizations and a press that is free from military censorship, i.e., an underground press, it will be utterly impossible to render serious support to the incipient revolutionary struggle, to develop it, to criticize each step it takes, to correct its errors, and systematically broaden and sharpen it."[98]

"Every 'peace program,'" Lenin stated, "was a deception unless its principal object was to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, and to support, aid and develop the revolutionary struggle of the masses that is starting everywhere (ferment among the masses, protests, fraternization in the trenches, strikes, demonstrations, letters from the front to relatives—for example in France—urging them not to subscribe to war loans, etc.)."[99]

"It was the duty of every socialist," Lenin continued, "to support, extend and intensify every popular movement for the termination of the war. But this duty is really being fulfilled only by those socialists who, like Liebknecht, appeal from the parliamentary tribune to the soldiers to lay down their arms, who preach revolution and the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war for socialism." [100]

The resolutions finally adopted by the Kienthal congress emphasized the need for mass action and class war. This represented a definite victory for the Zimmerwald "left". The Kienthal resolution declared that peace could be attained only through revolutionary mass action. Condemning the "social-chauvinists" and "social-pacifists," the resolution asserted that those who placed their hopes for peace on disarmament or arbitration were visionary Utopians. The resolution called upon all socialists to repudiate the acts of their governments involving annexations or oppression against weak nations and minority groups. It emphasized the demands of the Zimmerwald "left" for defense of the right of self-determination for all peoples. The burden of the war, the Kienthal resolution concluded, should be shifted from the backs of the workers to the possessing classes.[101]

After the success of the Kienthal congress, Lenin continued his revolutionary activities with renewed vigor. There are those, Lenin wrote in October, 1916, "who imagine that in one place an army will line up and say, 'We are for socialism,' and in another place another army will say, 'We are for imperialism,' and that this will be the social revolution."[102] Whoever expected a "pure" social revolution, he continued, would never live to see it. They merely paid lip service to revolution without understanding what it was.[103] What was required, Lenin said, was mass struggle, and revolts by small nations, like the Dublin rebellion of 1916. Lenin counted the Irish rebellion as an event a hundred times more significant politically than a similar revolt in Asia or Africa. "The struggle of the oppressed nations in *Europe*," he pointed out, "a struggle capable of going to the lengths of insurrection and street fighting, of breaking down the iron discipline in the army and martial law, will 'sharpen the revolutionary crisis in Europe' infinitely more than a much more developed rebellion in a remote colony.[104]

Lenin attributed the failure of the Irish revolt to the fact that it was premature; but even in premature, unsuccessful revolutionary movements, he said, the masses "gain experience, acquire knowledge, gather strength, get to know their real leaders . . . and in this way prepare for the general onslaught" just as mutinies in the army, strikes, and demonstrations prepared the way for the revolution of 1905.[105]

"Moments occur in history," Lenin stated in January, 1917, "when a socialist is called upon to throw off all legality." [106] Moreover, he said, "one must tell one's own bourgeois that they are hypocrites when they talk about national liberation, one must say that this war cannot result in a democratic peace unless the proletariat "turns its guns" against its own governments.[107]

Lenin emphasized the necessity for taking a firm stand against pacifism. "Such and only such," he said, "could be the position of a genuine Marxist, a genuine socialist and not a bourgeois reformist. It is not he who repeats the general, meaningless, non-committal, goody-goody desires of pacifism who really works for a democratic peace but it is he who exposes the imperialist character of the present war and of the imperialist peace that is being prepared, he who calls upon the people to rise in revolt against the criminal governments." [108]

By the end of January, 1917, Lenin was in open rebellion against the social-democrats who formed the Zimmerwald center and right. Speaking of their slogan of pacifism, Lenin said:

"This reformism is absolutely irreconcilable with revolutionary Marxism, the duty of which is to take the utmost possible advantage of the present revolutionary situation in Europe in order to openly preach revolution, the overthrow of the bourgeois governments, the conquest of power by the armed proletariat." [109]

Lenin called for revolution. "If the bourgeois governments are not overthrown by revolution, peace now can only be an imperialist peace, a continuation of the imperialist war," he said.[110] Peace, he reminded, was only the continuation of the politics of war. The time for decisive action approached.

Revolution and the Red October

The revolutionary ferment in Russia matured in March 1917. Lenin's reaction to the news that the tsar had been overthrown and a provisional government established was to begin preparation for an immediate return to Russia. The events which had occurred in Russia, Lenin stated, represented only the first stage of the revolution. It would not, he predicted, be the last. The new government, Lenin asserted, could not provide the *"peace, bread and freedom"* for which the proletariat strived:

"It cannot give peace because it is a war government, a government for the continuation of the imperialist slaughter, a government of conquest. . . . It cannot give bread because it is a bourgeois government. *At best*, it can give the people a "brilliantly organized starvation," as Germany did. . . . It cannot give freedom because it is a government of landlords and capitalists." [111]

From his analysis of the situation, Lenin concluded that it was necessary to "take advantage of the freedom given by the new regime and the existence of the Soviets" to organize the masses. Organization became Lenin's "order of the day." [112]

The circumstances surrounding Lenin's trip from Switzerland to Russia through Germany in a sealed railroad car constitute an interesting chapter in the history of international intrigue, but this story needs no retelling, for it has been fully documented elsewhere.[113] Before leaving Switzerland, Lenin issued a farewell message in which he outlined what the bolshevik party would do if the revolution placed it in power. "We would forthwith propose peace to *all* the belligerent peoples," he stated. As part of the conditions of peace, the bolsheviks demanded the "liberation of *all* colonies and *all* oppressed and nonsovereign peoples." [114] Power for the bolsheviks, Lenin stated, would mean waging war. "We are not pacifists," he said, adding:

"We are opposed to imperialist wars for the division of spoils among the capitalists, but we have always declared it to be absurd for the revolutionary proletariat to renounce revolutionary wars that *may prove necessary in the interests of socialism.*" [115]

There had been a time, he continued, when the slogan "Turn the imperialist war into a civil war" had been ridiculed as a "dreamfarce" and as a "straight line drawn in empty space." [116] What had transpired in Russia, he concluded, demonstrated that the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war was rapidly becoming a fact.[117]

In his April theses written immediately after his arrival in Petrograd in 1917, Lenin emphasized the necessity for fostering a spirit of defeatism in the army. Pointing out the connection between capitalism and the imperialist war, he stated, "It is impossible to end the war by a truly democratic, noncoercive peace without the overthrow of capital. The widespread propaganda of this view among the troops on active service must be organized." [118] Later, in discussing how the war might be ended, Lenin reiterated the view that it was impossible to achieve peace without overthrowing the power of capital but he added a second condition: "the transfer of the power of state to another class, the proletariat." [119] The mechanism for accomplishing this, and for transferring the allegiance of the army from the provisional government to the indirect control of the bolshevik party, was the soviet of workers' and soldiers' deputies.[120]

During the revolution of 1905, the workers had set up strike committees called "soviets." One soviet had been established for each industrial enterprise. After the March revolution, the institution of the soviet was revived, embracing within it both civilian and military alike. Companies of soldiers and groups of factory workers formed local soviets which were entitled to their own representation in the regional soviet. The regional soviets were represented in district soviets which, in turn, elected deputies to the next higher soviet.

In the army, the soviets pyramided from company to army group level.[121] Existing as they did side by side with the provisional government, the soviets functioned as a supplementary or "supervisory" government. Thus, during 1917, a "dual power" system of government evolved in Russia. Lenin recognized the dual power as a transitional phase in the development of the revolution. "Two powers *cannot* exist in a state," he said, "one of them is bound to give way." [122] In the struggle between the soviets and the provisional government which followed, the bolsheviks maneuvered to gain control of the

Footnotes at end of article.

soviets, all the while working to undermine the stability of the government.

Lenin's famous April theses called for fraternization.[123] In a separate pamphlet written in the middle of April, 1917, Lenin stated the bolshevik "position" on the question of whether fraternization between soldiers across the front lines should be encouraged. "It is desirable and essential," he wrote, explaining that "It is absolutely essential to encourage immediately attempts at fraternization between the soldiers of both warring groups in all the belligerent countries.[124]

Lenin advanced the thesis that officers in the army should be elected by the soldiers. In addition, he stated that "every step of every officer and general must be supervised by persons specially elected for the purpose by the soldiers." [125] In this lay the germ of the institution of the political commissar. "Soldiers will obey and respect only elected authorities," Lenin concluded.[126]

By the end of April, 1917, the central committee of the bolshevik party had regrouped its forces and extended its influence into the army. The bolsheviks began publication of a series of special propaganda newspapers like *Okoppaya Pravda* (*Trench Truth*) and *Soldatskava Pravda* (*Soldier's Truth*) for free distribution among the soldiers.[127] In the Volga area bolshevik organizational work in the army was concentrated against the large military garrisons at Saratov, Kasan and Samara. This work was carried out by veteran revolutionaries like V. V. Kuibyshev, L. M. Kaganovich and K. E. Voroshilov.[128] The center of the revolutionary movement in the Transcaucases was Balm where Stalin long before had been active in the leadership of the bolshevik organization. Work among the soldiers of the Caucasian troops was directed by Alyosha Djaparidze, another old bolshevik whose long revolutionary career, like Stalin's, included numerous arrests and Siberian exile.[129] The bolsheviks were also active in building up their organization in the army in Byelorussia, fronting the war zone. The first bolshevik organization formed in the region made its appearance in April, 1917, at Gomal. This committee, called the Poleesye committee, carried on intensive revolutionary propaganda work within the headquarters of the Supreme Army Command located at Mogilev.[130]

Bolshevik work was not limited to the army. In the Ukraine and the Crimea, the bolsheviks carried on extensive organizational work setting up clandestine groups among the troops, but their most important activity was directed at the naval bases.[131] Their work among the Black Sea sailors in Odessa and Sevastopol, and among the men of the Baltic fleet, was instrumental in winning the navy to the support of the bolsheviks when the revolution finally came. By June, 1917, the bolshevik organization among the sailors at the naval base of Reval claimed a membership of slightly more than two thousand members.[132] Similar growth was reported elsewhere throughout Russia by the bolshevik military organizations.

In June, 1917, the provisional government decided to launch a new major offensive against the Central Powers on the Eastern front. News of the government's decision to resume active fighting lowered military morale and sparked a series of mass civil disorders. On July 1, 1917, a mass demonstration held in Petrograd protesting the renewal of the war exploded into an uprising, but the situation was quickly brought under control by the provisional government. Within two weeks, however, the offensive on the Eastern front had collapsed. Meanwhile, Kerensky had been named the new prime minister of the provisional government. One of his first acts was to issue orders for the mass arrests of the bolsheviks for their complicity in the July first uprising. Whether the uprising was spontaneous, or an improvision of the bolsheviks, is unknown; but the provisional government was provided with all the justification it needed to move against the bolsheviks through the publication of various documents alleging Lenin's participation in a German conspiracy to undermine Russian military operations. Although many of the bolshevik hierarchy were arrested, Lenin escaped to Finland from where he continued his revolutionary activities.[133]

In an effort to reestablish discipline in the armed forces, Kerensky appointed General Lavr Kornilov as commander-in-chief of the Russian army. From the very beginning, Kornilov proved a source of irritation for Korensky, for he insisted on an independence of action which Kerensky could not or would not permit. Kerensky precipitated a major crisis by dismissing Kornilov, alleging that he had attempted to overthrow the government. Lenin, in hiding in Finland, recognized that the situation brought the bolsheviks a step closer to power. "We must conduct our agitation against Kerensky," Lenin wrote, "not so much directly as indirectly." [134] Lenin proposed that the bolsheviks demand "a most active energetic and truly revolutionary war" against Kornilov.[135] "The development of that war alone," he said, "may put us in power, but of this we must speak as little as possible in our agitation all the time remembering that events may any day put the power into our hands, and then we shall not relinquish it." [136] Lenin called for a change in tactics. He directed that the bolsheviks intensify their agitation in favor of "partial demands," namely, the arming of the Petrograd workers, the dispersing of the Dumn, the calling of the Kronstadt, Wiborg and Helsingfore troops to Petrograd, and the transfer of the large estates to the peasants. The soldiers, Lenin said, were to be encouraged "to beat up the generals and officers" who supported Kornilov.[137] The masses, Lenin concluded, had to be drawn into the struggle against Kornilov: "They must be aroused, inflamed." [138]

Lenin used the Kornilov crisis as an argument for insisting on peace with the Central Powers. "An *immediate and unequivocal peace must be proposed on precisely formulated terms*," Lenin declared. "If we do that," he continued, "we may secure either a speedy peace or the transformation of the war into a revolutionary war." [139]

Kerensky granted the bolsheviks amnesty in an effort to gain their support against the steadily growing influence in the Russian army of the officer clique represented by Kornilov. He also permitted the bolsheviks to form civilian red guard detachments during the crisis; but when Kornilov no longer threatened, the red guards refused to turn over their weapons to the provisional government. Thus, in effect, the Kornilov crisis permitted the bolsheviks to arm themselves. It also contributed to the alienation of the soldiers and sailors from the provisional government. This was further accelerated by the antimilitarist propaganda and agitation circulated by the bolsheviks.

After the Kornilov affair, the bolsheviks transferred L. M. Kaganovich to Gomel to take charge of the work of the Paleszyo committee. Under Kaganovich's direction, a secret bolshevik group was formed within the battalion of the Chevaliers of St. George which guarded the General Staff Headquarters. A similar bolshevik committee was activated in Minsk under the leadership of Mikhail V. Frunze, whose revolutionary career had begun during the 1905 revolution. The nature of the work carried out by the Minsk committee of the bolshevik party was influenced by its proximity to the fighting front. Under Frunse's guidance, the committee organized special training courses for propagandists working among the soldiers. Frunse himself is reported to have made frequent trips into the frontline trenches to distribute bolshevik propaganda and organize the soldiers.[140] To distribute its newspaper, *Zveda* (*The Star*), the Minsk committee formed a special propaganda distribution system which utilized teams of five men.[141] Each group was composed of men who were acquainted with the firing line, and knew how to contact the men in the trenches. Organizational work in the army was also carried on by local bolshevik groups in Orsha, Bobruisk, Slutsk, Borisov and Vitebak. By September, 1917, the bolshevik party in Byelorussia had a total membership of over 9,000 members and sympathizers, a considerable number of whom were in the army.[142] The central committee of the bolshevik party attached special importance to the work in Byelorussia. They reasoned that in the event the Supreme Army Command withdrew troops from the front to crush a bolshevik insurrection in Petrograd or Moscow, the troop trains would be routed through the major rail centers at Minsk, Gomel, Vitebak and Orsha where bolshevik forces could prevent their passage.

In the Don and North Caucasus regions, bolshevik work was carried out among the Cossack troops, with extensive propaganda calling for the fraternization of the Cossacks with the proletarist. Focal point for the work was the 39th Cossack Regiment deployed at Belaya Kalitm.[143] Unlike propaganda work elsewhere in Russia which was conducted in one of the Slavic tongues, some of the work among the Cossacks was conducted in Arabic.[144]

Bolshevik influence in military units throughout the Urale and Siberia increased after August, 1917, when exemptions from military service previously granted to former political exilee expired. Local bolshevik committees ordered all party members and sympathizers to join the army. Even bolsheviks who, as members of the local soviets, were still exempt from military service, went into the army for the purpose of organizing illegal revolutionary groups and carrying on antimilitarist propaganda work.[145]

By the autumn of 1917, conditions inside Russia had deteriorated to the point that Lenin became convinced the decisive moment for the seizure of political power by the bolshevik had arrived. His conviction was reinforced by events which had transpired in Germany. Lenin interpreted the mutinies in the German fleet and the wave of strikes which occurred in 1917 as indicators of a coming revolutionary tide which would engulf Europe. The revolutionary tide began in Petrograd.

In October, 1917, the provisional government ordered one-third of the Petrograd garrison to the front. The bolsheviks interpreted the order as an attempt to weaken their position by removing the more revolutionary troops from the capital. Leon Trotsky, as president of the Petrograd soviet, suggested that the soviet refuse to concur in the order unless it could be shown that the removal of the troops from the capital was a military necessity.[146] The military revolutionary committee established by the Petrograd soviet on October 22, 1917, was an outgrowth of the bolshevik's maneuver to utilize the situation to create an armed uprising A "collegium of representatives" which was "to function alongside the commander of troops of the Petrograd military district" was formed from the ranks of the Petrograd soviet and other organizations.[147] The soviet insisted that none of the troops of the Petrograd garrison be moved without prior notification of this "collegium," the military revolutionary committee. It also directed the committee to prepare a plan for the defense of Petrograd

Failure of the moderate parties in the Petrograd soviet to participate in it permitted the bolsheviks to control the military revolutionary committee. The committee thus became the legal front for the revolutionary preparations being made by the bolsheviks. Similar military committees were established by the soviets throughout Russia. Lenin, who had returned from Finland,

Footnotes at end of article.

provided the political leadership for the Petrograd committee. Events moved rapidly during the last week of October, 1917. The committee established itself as the command authority for the Petrograd garrison. It further consolidated its position by appointing new commissars who were under bolshevik discipline to replace the political commissars previously appointed by the soviet to the various military units and establishments in the Petrograd region.[148]

On November 3, a special meeting of the Petrograd soviet was held at which delegates of the local garrison pledged their support to the military revolutionary committee. The time for words, the resolution of the Petrograd garrison declared, had passed. The resolution called on the soviets to "take the power into its own hands in order to give the people peace, land and bread.[149] The resolution contained four slogans which were to become the passwords of the October revolution: "All power to the soviets; an immediate armistice on all fronts; the land to the peasants; an honest and prompt convocation of the constituent assembly."[150] These were potent weapons at a time when a German army was steadily moving towards the gates of Petrograd, and the war-weary Russian people were faced with the prospect of another winter of hunger and fighting.

When the military revolutionary committee asserted that it would henceforth exercise control of all military decisions, the commander of the Petrograd military district, Colonel Polkovnikov, refused to acknowledge its authority. The committee accused the military command of having become a tool of the counterrevolution, and appealed to the soldiers of the Petrograd military district to refuse to obey any orders which did not carry the sanction of the committee. Using the committee to cover their activities, the bolsheviks continued their preparations for an armed uprising. Mass demonstrations carried out on November 4, 1917, provided the bolsheviks with a front for their last dress rehearsal prior to the outbreak of the actual fighting.[151]

On November 6, 1917, the government began its counteraction against the bolshevik-dominated military revolutionary committee, for knowledge of the planned uprising had leaked out. One of Polkovnikov's first steps was to issue orders for the removal of all commissars appointed by the committee. He also ordered tactical redeployment of loyal military units throughout the city. Hours later, the military revolutionary committee, acting in the name of the Petrograd soviet, declared that it was forced to adopt measures of self-defense. The call for the uprising followed.[152] In the fighting which followed, the reign of the provisional government collapsed. News of the bolshevik seizure of power in Petrograd swept Russia, providing the signal for a series of similar uprisings in major cities and military installations throughout the country. By mid-November, the fighting was over.[153] Under Lenin, bolshevism had come to power in Russia.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Les communistes francais pendant la drole de guerre* (Paris: Les Iles d'Or, 1951).

[2] *A Century of Conflict* (Chicago: Henry Hagnery Co., 1953).

[3] B. I. Vavilov (ed.), *Bolshava Sovyetgkaya Entsiklopediya*, Vol. II (2d ed.; Moscow: March 18, 1950), 506.

[4] V. I. Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII (New York: International Publishers Co., Inc., 1943), 303.

[5] "The Revolutionary Army and the Revolutionary Army," *ibid.*, III, 313.

[6] What Is To Be Done?", *ibid.*, II, 184–85.

[7] *Ibid.*, III, 315.

[8] Except in those instances where the context specifically rules out naval or air forces, the term *army* in this study refers to the organized military forces in general. This is consistent with communist usage and practice.

[9] *Ibid.*, VI, 74.

[10] "The State and Revolution," *ibid.*, VI, 24.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[12] *Ibid.*, p. 30. Italics in original.

[13] *Ibid.*, II, 143.

[14] Emilyan Yaroslavsky, *El trabajo de los bolcheviques en el ejercito antes de la revolucion de octubre* (Barcelona: Publicaciones Edeya, n.d.), p. 6. This work will be discussed in detail in chapter vii.

[15] Lenin, "Draft Programme for S.D.P. of Russia," *loc. cit.*, II, 227.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Plehve was later killed by a terrorist's bomb, a victim of the revolutionary tide he had hoped to stem (David J. Dallin, *The Rise of Russia in Asia* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1949), p. 79).

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 80.

[20] M. J. Olgin (ed.), *Our Revolution* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1918), p. 31.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 36.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 37.

[24] *Ibid.*

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 99.

[27] Dallin, *op. cit.*, pp. 77–78.

[28] Tarosisvaky, *loc. cit.*

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

[30] Although the bolsheviks later asserted that their party had been in contact with the sailors of the Black Sea fleet, and had made preparations for a general mutiny in the navy, there is little direct evidence to substantiate their claim (A. Karatchikov, *The Revolt on the Armoured Cruiser "Potemkin"* (New York: Workers Library Publishers, n.d.) pp. 3–5. This pamphlet will be discussed in detail in chapter xi).

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[34] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, III, 333–34.

[35] Later, when Lenin read Clausewitz's conclusion that the one key to *every* country was the army, he recorded his observation in a marginal notation: "clever and intelligent." (Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 21).

[36] Lenin, "The Army and the Revolution," *loc. cit.*, III, 338.

[37] *Ibid.*, p. 583.

[38] *Ibid.*, p. 339.

[39] *Ibid.*, pp. 349–50.

[40] Joseph Stalin, *Works*, Vol. I: 1901–1907 (Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1954), 206.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 205.

[42] *Ibid.*, p. 277.

[43] *Yaroslavsky, op. cit.*, p. 20.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[45] *Ibid.*

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] *Ibid.*, pp. 23–24.

[48] Lenin, "Militant Militarism and the Anti-militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy," *loc. cit.*, IV, 325.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 326.

[52] *Ibid.*

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 327.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 328.

[55] *Ibid.*, p. 321.

[56] *Ibid.*

[57] *Ibid.*, p. 329.

[58] *Ibid.*, p. 331.

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 330.

[60] Vavilov, *loc. cit.*, p. 507.

[61] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, IV, 442.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 443.

[63] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[64] "Editor's Notes," *ibid.*, pp. 395–97.

[65] U.S., Congress, House, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States*, Appendix—Part I, 76th Cong., 1st Sess., 1940, p. 600.

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, V, 335.

[68] "Conference of the Sections of the R.S.D.L.P. Abroad," *ibid.*, p. 131.

[69] *Ibid.*, p. 132.

[70] *Ibid.*, p. 133.

[71] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

[72] *Ibid.*

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 336.

[74] *Ibid.*

[75] *Ibid.*, p. 134.

[76] *Ibid.*

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 135.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 136.

[79] "Defeat of One's Own Government in the Imperialist War," *ibid.*, p. 142.

[80] *Ibid.*

[81] *Ibid.*, p. 143.

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 145. Italics in original.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 363.

[84] For a discussion of the contribution of defeatism to the fall of France in June, 1940, see chapter xvi.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 367.

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 227. Italics in original.

[87] Merle Fainood, *International Socialism and the World War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935), p. 70.

[88] *Ibid.*, p. 71.

[89] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[90] Lenin, "The Defeat of Russia and the Revolutionary Crisis," *loc. cit.*, V, 153.

[91] *Ibid.*

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 228.

[93] "A Few Theses," *ibid.*, p. 155.

[94] *Ibid.*

[95] Fainsod, *op. cit.*, pp. 85–87.

[96] *Ibid.*, p. 91.

[97] Lenin, "Proposals Submitted by the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party to the Second Socialist Conference," *loc. cit.*, V, 238.

[98] *Ibid.*, p. 237.

[99] *Ibid.*

[100] Fainsed, *op. cit.*, pp. 95–97.

[101] Lenin, "Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up," *loc. cit.*, v, 303.

[102] *Ibid.*

[103] *Ibid.*, p. 304. Italics in original.

[104] *Ibid.*, p. 306.

[105] "Bourgeois Pacifism and Socialist Pacifism," *ibid.*, p. 253.

[106] *Ibid.* Italics in original.

[107] *Ibid.*

[108] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[109] *Ibid.*, p. 262.

[110] "Letters From Afar," *ibid.*, VI, 11. Italics in original.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[112] Possony, *op. cit.*, pp. 42–52.

[113] Lenin, "Farewell Letter to Swiss Workers," *loc. cit.*, VI, 16.

[114] *Ibid.* Italics in original.

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[116] *Ibid.*, p. 20.

[117] "The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution," *ibid.*, p. 22.

[118] "Tasks of Proletariat in Our Revolution," *ibid.*, p. 55.

[119] "The guarantee of the final victory of the Russian revolution lies in consolidating the alliance between the revolutionary workers and the revolutionary soldiers. The organs of this alliance are the soviets of workers' and soldiers' deputies." (Stalin, "The Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies," *loc. cit.*, III, 2).

[120] Possony, *op. cit.*, pp. 30–32.

[121] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, p. 49. Italics in original.

[122] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

[123] "Political Parties and Tasks of Proletariat," *ibid.*, pp. 86–87.

[124] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

[125] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

[126] These papers were suppressed in July, 1917. *Okoppaya Pravda* soon reappeared under the name of *Okoppaya Habat* (*Trench Alarm*).

[127] G. F. Alexandrov *et al.*, *The History of the Civil War in the U.S.S.R.*, Vol. II: *The Great Proletarian Revolution* (London: Lawrence and Wishart Limited, 1947), pp. 88–91.

[129] *Ibid.*, p. 162.
[130] *Ibid.*, p. 143.
[131] *Ibid.*, p. 135.
[132] *Ibid.*, p. 159.
[133] Possony, *op. cit.*, pp. 55–56.
[134] Lenin, "To the Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party," *loc. cit.*, VI, 207.
[135] *Ibid.*
[136] *Ibid.*
[137] *Ibid.*, p. 206.
[138] *Ibid.*, p. 207.
[139] *Ibid.* Italics in original.
[140] Alexandrov *et al.*, *loc cit.*, pp. 143–45.
[141] *Zvasda* was edited by A. F. Myaerdkov, a veteran bolshevik who commanded a company for the training of non-commissioned officers. Circulation of this newspaper, which was financed by a grant of 2,000 rubles from the central committee in Petrograd, doubled from 3,000 copies to 6,000 copies between July and August, 1917. (*Ibid.*, pp. 146–47).
[142] *Ibid.*, p. 150.
[143] *Ibid.*, p. 98.
[144] An example of bolshevik propaganda material in Arabic is reproduced by John Reed in his "How Soviet Russia Conquered Imperial Germany," *The Liberator*, I, No. 11 (January, 1919), p. 22.
[145] Alexandrov *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
[146] Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
[147] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
[148] *Ibid.*, pp. 64–65.
[149] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[150] *Ibid.*
[151] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[152] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[153] October according to the old-style calendar.

HAND IN HAND WITH THE PEOPLE

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, this week 33 of my constituents proved that citizens can effectively work with Government officials in helping solve some of the problems that confront us in this country today.

Organized as the Fourth District Environmental Control Committee, the constituents I speak of have been working for the past year and a half on problems of pollution. Meeting monthly as a full committee, with many interim subcommittee meetings, these dedicated people have sent to me recommendations which they think would be helpful in solving some of our pollution problems.

Today, I have introduced seven bills which result directly from their studies—and these studies will be continuing. Both they and I recognize that we will have to persist in our efforts to bring pollution under control. With their help—and the help of others—great strides are being made that are cutting into the predicament in which we find ourselves.

The citizens who worked on this committee deserve a special salute from Congress. They were helping not only me as their Congressman, but you and all the people across this land. They are not idle people, but people who work and who took many full days from their work to help us. Nor are they, for the most part, in positions relating to ecology. Their widely varying backgrounds range from attorney, minister, and wildlife biologist to sportsman, engineer and civic leader. Their one universal similarity was a desire to actively participate in a manner that could prove helpful to their communities, State, and Nation. Almost to a man, when volunteering to serve on the committee, they noted that while they had no previous experience in most areas of pollution control, they were ready and willing to study and learn all facts of pollution possible—and study they did, Mr. Speaker. Armed with mounds of books, pamphlets, studies, and surveys which I received in my congressional office; along with great lists of additional studies which the Library of Congress furnished, the enthusiastic members of the Environmental Control Committee delved into three phases of pollution—water, land, and air. Their trips to the committee meetings often required traveling more than 100 miles, but I never heard one complaint about this.

The chairman of the committee—during the organizational period and for several months thereafter—was Earl Harris of Tavares. Archie Gordon later assumed responsibility as chairman and still serves in this capacity. Other members are: Gordon Beeson, Titusville; Phil Searcy, Rockledge; Mrs. Bobbye Bowman, Jacksonville; Curtis Lovelace, Jacksonville; John Barton, Flagler Beach; Don Jordan, Bunnell; Steve Fickett, Jr., Brooksville; Frank Springstead, Brooksville; Ben S. Burton, Leesburg; Phil Edwards, Eustis; Talmadge Etheredge, Leesburg; Neal B. Huebsch, Eustis; Samuel N. Pearce, Tavares; Donald Crace, Ocala; James Cunningham, Ocala; E. Ross Allen, Silver Springs; Dwight Hart, Oklawaha; Whitie Hurlbut, Ocala; Gene Price, Ocala; David M. Thornton, Ocala; Mrs. Dorothy Crossan, St. Augustine; Barry Crim, DeLand; William Leffler, Jr., Sanford; James Veal, Lake Panasoffkee; Robert Hartman, Jr., Ormond Beach; James Huger, Daytona Beach; George Russell, Daytona Beach; Reverend R. Grady Snowden, DeLand; Theodore Halmos, Daytona Beach; and Lloyd Stone, Daytona Beach.

While most of the committee's work has been toward studying and recommending possible legislation that the Congress could enact to more effectively combat pollution, the subcommittee on land pollution control became particularly interested in the effect that trees have on the environment and how many trees are being destroyed—some 3,000 acres each day—and recommended to me that we start a tree-planting project in the Fourth District of Florida. Our object is to get as many people as possible to plant 12 trees—12 because the committee found that this number of trees could produce oxygen needs for one person, while additionally providing food, aiding water control and acting as sound barriers. Although the tree planting season has just begun in Florida some 40 individuals and 10 organizations—such as scouts, garden clubs and schools—have participated. As each person plants 12 trees, I send him or her a certificate of award in recognition of his or her contribution to a better ecology. One committee member volunteered to order 5,000 trees and he is distributing them free of charge to every individual who will plant 12.

Mr. Speaker, in a time when many sit on the sidelines of action in America, wailing that they cannot participate in Government nor have any part in the decisions that are made, it is refreshing to honor 33 citizens who chose to volunteer and work for a better country. At a time when too many refuse to help at anything unless they are put on a salary, 33 citizens chose to volunteer their time—with not one penny in payment; not one cent in repayment for their travels—and not even a free meal during their many day-long conferences and meetings.

My heartfelt thanks goes out to each of them, Mr. Speaker. I know I speak for you and all Members of Congress when I add your appreciation to each member of this Committee.

THE NATIVES MAY WIN ONE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the most important issue facing Alaska today is the rapid and just settlement of the Native land claims. For the past 2 days the House of Representatives has considered a historic measure. Never before has a Native land claims bill been reported out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and considered by the full House of Representatives.

The people of Alaska are very concerned about this issue. Because the issue is so great the independent-thinking people of Alaska have wide and varied opinions as to what kind of settlement would be in the best interests of the State. I believe sincerely that the difference of opinion on important issues is what makes our system of government best. At this point I include in the RECORD several communications from my constituents back home.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Oct. 17, 1971]

THE NATIVES MAY WIN ONE: THE GREAT ALASKAN REAL-ESTATE DEAL

(By Thomas M. Brown)

KOTZEBUE, ALASKA.—The jet flight from Anchorage to Kotzebue is a two-hour trip in a time machine. Shiny Boeings whisk the traveler from the sprawling subdivisions and shabby trailer courts, the countless used-car lots and the budding patch of skyscrapers that mark Middle America's firmest toehold in the far north. They plunk him down amid the litter and ramshackle dwellings of a weather beaten village perched precariously on a sand spit jutting into frigid Kotzebue Sound. The trip spans the chasm between a quintessentially American city in the making, where the inhabitants live much like Americans elsewhere, and a community about twice as old as New York (having been continuously inhabited for at least 600 years), where the people still live on the animals of land and sea and only gradually are shedding traditions rooted in the Stone Age.

This wind-blasted huddle of shacks, situated 26 miles north of the Arctic Circle and 200 miles east of Siberia's Cape Dezhnev on the remotest rim of North America, home to 1,976 persons at last count, would seem

an unlikely setting for high drama. Yet the drama is here, and it is compelling.

There is the daily drama of survival in an uncompromising environment where the people still subsist by the hunt and hunger is a frequent companion, where nature still bends man to the rhythm of its seasons and the perpetual sea wind seems the breath of infinity.

And there is the larger drama—common to some 200 other Eskimo, Indian and Aleut villages sprinkled across Alaska—of the nation's most grating clash of cultures: the collision of technological America with the last remnant of primitive America. As usual, primitive America is losing:

On Front Street, the gravel track that meanders between Kotzebue Sound and the disorderly jumble of jerry-built houses, stands a shiny aluminum pole topped with a revolving, red-and-white-striped bucket bearing the familiar, smiling, spade-bearded visage. Colonel Sanders has arrived in Kotzebue, and an Eskimo who is lucky indeed if he has a job can sample three pieces of that famous chicken for $2.50 or five pieces for $3.85.

Just down Front Street from the Colonel's stronghold one warm day while it is still summer, four Eskimos are preparing their food in a more traditional manner. They have shot a beluga whale in the Sound and have moved the 10-foot carcass in to the tide line. They work quickly with long knives, cutting longitudinally around the white whale, then pulling off the foot-wide strips of skin and blubber—the Eskimos' prized *muktuk*—as if peeling an orange. Soon the water where they work is red blood. As the slabs of blubber come free, one of the Eskimos rinses them in the water, then set them out on a layer of weeds on the rocky beach in the thin, high Arctic sun.

All along the beach, with its incredible litter of tin cans, oil drums, Day-Glo fishing-net floats and discarded outboard motors, the driftwood drying racks are laden with ropy lengths of beluga meat blackening in the sun and the wind, and with split fish drying a deep red. There is a constant coming and going of small boats as men set out to fish or hunt the small whales. Across the street, behind the curtained windows at Tony's, others sip Rainier beer at $1.25 a can or, if they can afford it, Heineken at $1.75.

At Hansen's store, Eskimo women in atigis, knee-length summer cloth parkas trimmed with fur, crowd the aisles to buy eggs at 98 cents a dozen, peaches, cherries, grapes or apricots for $1.19 a pound; wieners at $1.15 a package (10 buns cost 95 cents); ground beef for $1.25 a pound; or Screaming Yellow Zonkers for 65 cents a box.

Their husbands pay 56 cents a gallon for gasoline for their outboard motors and snowmobiles, and 41 cents a gallon for stove oil.

When the breeze holds steady it keeps the bugs down; when it slackens, the air is alive with the buzz and sting of mosquitoes and the Eskimos haul out aerosol cans of bug repellent.

In the evenings, water skiers skim across the chill smooth waters of the Sound behind boats used earlier in the day for subsistence fishing. And at 2 A.M. the summer sun reaches its nadir, dipping low in the north, swinging redly along the horizon, but never below it, then rising again, having never set, while the kids play in the dirt streets in the warped time peculiar to the Arctic summer.

At the Jade Shop, a tidy little establishment specializing in selling jade bookends, jewelry and some Eskimo ivory carvings to tourists, an airline tour bus arrives. In the visitors flock, mostly middle-aged and elderly people on their first trip to Alaska. They ooh and ahh at the prices (even generally low-quality Alaskan jade isn't cheap). One man who looks very much the archetypal Angeleno, paunchy and flower-shirted and armed with camera, picks up a $35 ivory carving of a walrus and, after a cursory examination, announces: "I think I'll take this little Alaskan novelty." The owner carefully wraps the carving in a box, hands it to the man—and stares in disbelief at the quarter and dime he is handed.

"What's this?" he wants to know.

"It was 35 cents, wasn't it?" the Angeleno asks.

"Thirty-five cents! Do you know what this is? It's part of a walrus tusk. Someone has to go out and shoot a walrus, then spend eight hours carving this, and you want it for 35 cents. You've gotta be kidding."

"Well, take it back; $35 is too expensive."

Another day, another village: I fly to Deering with State Representative Frank Ferguson, a 28-year-old Eskimo from Kotzebue, and his brother, Ray. With a third brother, Don, they operate Don's Safair, a bush flying service, and own an office and apartment building where the post office is located. Deering is perhaps 30 houses, some empty, a Bureau of Indian Affairs school, a Society of Friends church, a small general store with a battered red Jeep pickup bearing a 1967 license, all strung out along a gracefully curving stretch of sandy beach on the south shore of the Sound.

Walking down the dusty street in the clean sea wind, we encounter an Eskimo boy perhaps 4 years old grimly clutching a Hershey bar (with almonds).

"Can I have some of that?" Ferguson asks.

"No way," is the emphatic reply.

Flying out, I see the village cemetery, a huddle of crosses on a high bluff with a sheer drop of 200 feet to the sea and a view that goes on forever.

On the way back to Kotzebue in the fast twin-engine Cessna 402 we listen to the Red Sox and Cleveland, piped in by the American Forces Radio Network for the men who serve at the DEW Line radar sites that dot the Alaska coast.

The big question in this land of affecting paradoxes—the issue around which revolve the twin themes of poverty and cultural change and, ultimately the fate of Alaska's 55,000 Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts (another 5,000 live outside the state)—is this: Who owns Alaska? The natives say they own most of it and they've got a good argument.

When William Henry Seward persuaded the first Johnson Administration to pay Czarist Russia $7.2-million for Alaska in 1867, what the United States Government purchased, according to one analysis the natives like, was not title to Alaska's 586,412 square miles, but administrative sovereignty over them. This, the argument goes, was recognized by Congress in the Organic Act of 1884, which said: "That the Indians or other persons in said district shall not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or now claimed by them but the terms under which such persons may acquire title to such lands is reserved for future legislation by Congress."

Now—104 years after the United States acquired Alaska—Congress is finally moving toward a decision on how much land the natives should be allowed to retain and how much they should be paid for surrendering the rest. In September, the House Interior Committee approved a bill which would grant the natives title to 40 million acres of land. In addition, it would pay them $425-million over 10 years from the Federal Treasury, and another $500-million from royalties on oil, gas and mineral leases in Alaska, in compensation for land taken by the Federal and state governments.

The House bill would entrust management of the cash settlement to 12 native regional corporations. The corporations could (1) invest the money, (2) distribute it on a per capita basis to qualified natives within their respective regions, or (3) use it for other purposes, such as education or housing, provided 40 per cent of the money first was distributed on a per capita basis to villages in the region. It is widely anticipated that most regional corporations would want to invest in community improvement and economic development projects.

Over in the Senate, Interior Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson, who previously had opposed a large land settlement, startled everyone by guiding through committee a bill with a land provision potentially even more generous than the one suggested by the House.

The 40-million-acre settlement proposed by the House bill equals 62,500 square miles—an area larger than 30 states of the union. The $925-million spread among 60,000 persons (5,000 nonresident natives would be eligible to share in the settlement under the House bill) comes to $15,416 each.

Thus it may appear that Congress is being extravagantly generous to one of the nation's most obscure minority groups, a circumstance which would be cause for wonder, if not outright disbelief. But the natives were asking for 60 million acres, $500-million from the Federal Government and unlimited income from a perpetual 2 per cent oil, gas and mineral royalty.

The question is, do the natives need or deserve as much as the land bills provide—let alone what they themselves are asking? The answers vary.

One old man I met on the beach at Kotzebue seemed baffled by the legal complexities of the land claims and how they happened to arise in the first place—a condition not uncommon among elderly natives, many of whose access to information is hampered by poor English and the isolation of their villages. But about one thing he was quite clear: "Take our land? How could we live if they take our land?" he asked incredulously.

That feeling was amplified by Willie Goodwin Jr., a crewcut 26-year-old electronics and computer technician who worked at Cape Kennedy and helped install the instrumentation in an Apollo tracking ship at Boston before returning home to his dirt-poor village in hope of helping his people. He is perhaps typical of a rising group of young native leaders who are better educated than their elders, more familiar with the way politics operates and impatient for what they consider justice. If the land settlement is not satisfactory, "We may have an Eskimo war." Goodwin says it in jest, but there is an edge to his voice. "If they take our land they can do what they want with it. If they build on it, do you think the caribou are still going to come by?"

The generation gap is highly visible in native society, and the activism of the younger natives, who have been in the forefront of the fight for a claims settlement, contrasts vividly with the relative stoicism of the older members of the community, so much so that there is an undercurrent of feeling that the younger natives are trying to secure their own vision of what the settlement should be without due consideration of the wishes of the older generation.

"The old-timers have not been approached and listened to," says Mrs. June Nelson, a bright young member of the seven-member City Council and president of the school board.

"When the white man first came," Goodwin replies, "they just sat back and watched. They're still sitting back and watching."

The views of the 20 per cent of Kotzebue's population that is white are mixed. Some, like Bill Pender, the easy-going foreman of a Public Health Service sewer-construction project, who has lived in the Arctic since 1948, have a definite view: "I think we should give them what they've got coming and let them decide for themselves what to do with it without trying to tell them how to use

it." Others, like Mabel Walsh, who runs a curio shop and dry-goods store, are more ambivalent. If a large claims settlement is legislated, "Will they feel they're rich now and won't have to work any more?" she wonders. Mrs. Walsh, a former Mayor and currently a member of the City Council, also questions the need for a large land settlement in view of the declining dependence on subsistence hunting. Still, she says: "This huge cash settlement—if it is used to insure that health needs are looked after and to insure the possibility of a good education for those who want it, and if funds were available for housing loans or grants—that I would like to see."

Significantly, both natives and whites generally stress the primary importance of land in the settlement. The outright opponents of a large claims settlement—and there are many in the urban areas of the state—generally object most to the prospect of the natives receiving title to large tracts of land. One has the feeling they would be willing to pay the natives any amount of money rather than grant them title to 40 million or 60 million acres of land. The unarticulated argument: In the long run, in Alaska as elsewhere, land equals wealth. In the short run, for many natives the land still means life itself. "The land is more important than the money," says Bobby Schaeffer, the 22-year-old regional director of the Rural Alaska Community Action Program (RurALCAP), the state antipoverty program funded by the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity. "Ninety to 100 per cent of most villages' living comes off the land."

The contrast between the two Alaskas—urban and rural—could scarcely be greater. The 80 per cent of Alaska's population that is mostly white lives primarily in the cities—places like Anchorage, Fairbanks, Kenai, Juneau, Ketchikan and Sitka. Despite the exotic setting of Alaska, for the most part the life-style of this majority would be easily interchangeable with that of Americans elsewhere. Most are regularly employed (though even in the cities unemployment is double the national average). The educational level is high. And per capita income is among the highest in the nation ($4,200), though some of that apparent advantage is illusory because of the much higher cost of living.

About 70 per cent of the native population still lives in what Alaskans call the bush, in 200 villages ranging in population from a few people to regional centers of 2,000 or more like Barrow, Nome, Bethel and Kotzebue (pronounced KOTS-a-byu). These people live, substantially, by subsistance hunting and fishing, just as they have for centuries. Few are employed full time, though many hold part-time or seasonal jobs. One new report prepared by the Alaska State Housing Authority (ASHA) shows median family income at about $6,430 in Kotzebue, compared with a national average of $7,974. Not bad, it would appear, until one considers that:

Living costs in Kotzebue are 85 per cent higher than those in Seattle, reducing real purchasing power to less than $3,500.

The average family in Kotzebue is about 5.25 persons, compared with 3.66 persons nationally. So median per capita income was $1,065 which, adjusted for the cost of living, was worth about $575. Per capita income nationally that year (1968) was $3,412.

But dollar income figures alone are misleading because they do not take into account the value of subsistence hunting and fishing activities. "A rough measure of the importance of food-gathering efforts is that half the households reported that they depended on hunting and fishing for most of their meat supply," the report said. Even so, "for the sake of a meaningful comparison, the average family in Kotzebue today is still much poorer than the average American family during the Great Depression."

Even in the villages there is a dual economy, the ASHA report says: Most of the best jobs are with the Bureau of Indian Affairs (B.I.A.), the Public Health Service (P.H.S.), the Federal Aviation Administration and other Government agencies, and with the businesses which cater to the employes of these entities; and the bulk of these jobs are held by whites. "White unemployment is negligible," the ASHA report says. "As a rule, Eskimos who can find work hold lesser positions or temporary jobs and earn much less. Eskimo families bear the brunt of the work shortage. In effect, there are two separate job economies: a white economy of full employment and an Eskimo economy of massive unemployment and low-paying employment."

But an independent survey by Jane Pender, the editor of the weekly Kotzebue News, suggests that a simple shortage of jobs, rather than overt discrimination, is at the root of the problem. Mrs. Pender, a white who has lived in the Arctic for years and has a particularly keen insight into native culture, points out that all Government agencies have preferential native hire. In addition, her survey shows there are 19 year-round businesses in Kotzebue. Of these, 10 are white-owned and operated, while nine are owned by natives or by a white/native couple. "Where the business or agency is Eskimo-owned, or with Eskimo top management, no Caucasians are ever hired," Mrs. Pender says. "In the case of locally owned Caucasian or Caucasian-Eskimo businesses or agencies, preferential native hire is the rule. . . . The white who comes here comes because he has a job, usually a skill which is in short supply here. If his job folds up, he has to leave either because there isn't another in the area which calls for his skills or because, due to his race, he will immediately drop to the bottom of the list and be hired only after all eligible natives have gone to work, or been interviewed.

"Where this causes hardship is in the case of whites who are either committed to the area because they like it, or because they have married native women." In any event, the officially recognized level of unemployment has hovered at about 30 per cent in Kotzebue for a decade. That figure alone would qualify it as one of the most economically depressed areas in the country, but it understates that problem. Official figures show that in 1969, there were 585 workers among the 4,580 residents of the Kobuk region, which Kotzebue dominates, or one job for every 7.8 residents. In the nation as a whole, the average is one job for every 2.6 persons. Unemployment in Kotzebue is reliably estimated at about 60 per cent year-round; in smaller villages it is often more than 80 per cent.

Furthermore, things are getting worse. In the period from 1961 to 1969, for example, total employment increased by 8 per cent, while population grew by 31 per cent.

In addition to the gloomy economic situation, the educational level is low, and poor sanitation and diet, frequent lack of prompt medical attention and the many hazards of the hunting life combine to give Alaska's natives a life-span much shorter than that of non-native Alaskans. The statistics are appalling: the average age of death is about half that of other Americans, 35 years; the crude death rate is more than twice that of white Alaskans; the suicide rate is twice as high; deaths by homicide are three times as numerous; infant mortality is twice as high. While natives make up about 17 per cent of Alaska's population, they constitute a majority of its welfare cases in all categories of assistance. In Kotzebue, 80 per cent of the housing is substandard, and Kotzebue is better off than some other places.

Thus, the natives exhibit to a remarkable extent the classic poverty syndrome so familiar in the ghettos of urban America. Here the problem is further complicated by the environment and by the cultural collision which is so evident in village life. Yet Alaska's natives have provided one of the classic examples of the adaptability of man to his surroundings and, anthropologist Margaret Lantis has observed, "Eskimos are trying just as hard today to adapt as they did 500 or 900 years ago; the difficulty is that they are adapting not to the Arctic but to the Temperate Zone way of living. The new people with their new standards have nearly overwhelmed the Eskimos, not in numbers but in wishes and wants."

The first Eskimos crossed the land bridge from Asia perhaps 6,000 years ago, following the movement of game, or perhaps, because of population pressures. They were nomadic hunters, almost entirely dependent for food and clothing on the animals of land and sea, for little vegetation important to man can grow in this cold land of ice and snow. They pursued caribou, seal, walrus, polar bear, beluga and bowhead whale by dog sled and skin boat, armed with bow and arrow and harpoons and knives of bone and stone. Their technology was primitive, but superlatively adapted to the environment.

Still, the Eskimos were unable to alter their environment in any significant way. They were mortally bound to the inexorable cycle of the seasons and the migration of game, at the mercy of the harsh winter weather and periodic famines so severe that cannibalism sometimes resulted. Their society was successful and stable, based primarily on the family unit and unthreatened by either internal dissension or external forces. But it was a hard existence and the natives were understandably alert for ways of easing it. Thus, the arrival of the white man, with his modern and rapidly evolving technology, was revolutionary.

Russian adventurers flocked to Alaska in the wake of Vitus Bering, who "discovered" it in 1741, followed by American whalers in the eighteen-fifties, and a succession of traders, missionaries, miners, school teachers, doctors, nurses, construction workers, military men and bureaucrats. Their influence was so pervasive that today villages like Kotzebue bear little resemblance to the traditional Eskimo settlements of old. The rifle, outboard motor and wooden boat have displaced the bow and arrow and harpoon, the oar and the kayak and umiak. Western-style houses with oil-burning stoves have replaced the traditional semisubterranean sod houses with seal-oil lamps (the igloo, contrary to popular belief, was never common in Alaska). Most recently—and most startlingly—the snowmobile has almost completely replaced the sled dog and the villages are uncannily quiet without the yapping and howling of the huskies. The white man also brought diseases and exploitation which sent the native population plummeting. The population now is recovering rapidly, fueled by a high birth rate.

The arrival of the whites, with their gadgets and trade goods, disrupted traditional trading, and hunting patterns. Natives began to concentrate in permanent, year-round coastal villages, which previously had been rarities with the exception of a handful of places like Kotzebue which were particularly well situated geographically.

Thanks to its strategic location near the drainages of three major river systems, Kotzebue had long been an active trading center, linking the Eskimos of interior Alaska with those of Siberia. (Indeed, there are still elderly Eskimos who can recall the last visits of the Siberians about the time of the Bolshevik Revolution.) The population of Kotzebue grew from about 200 persons in 1900 to 372 in 1939. Then, during the last three decades, while the population of the Kobuk region about doubled, the population of Kotzebue exploded five-fold. By ordinary standards it is still quite a small

town, but in function it serves as a miniature metropolis for the region—a center of trade and communications. It also has attracted a constant stream of new residents from smaller villages in the area and in the process has become so much a melting pot that now only one-third of the native heads of household were born here.

Kotzebue sprawls, untidy and unplanned, over its spit. The land is full of hummocks and marshy low spots; people pick high ground to build on, with a casual disregard of lot lines. The streets meander nonchalantly around protruding corners of houses; some newly settled areas of town have no streets at all. The city budget is minuscule: $111,320 for fiscal 1971. The two biggest sources of revenue are a 3 per cent sales tax ($57,000) and shared revenue from the state government ($46,500). The largest expenditure ($40,500) is for the police department.

Natives hold six of the seven City Council seats, but local government is relatively powerless in determining the course of events in the community. Most of that responsibility lies with the Federal employes who run the B.I.A. schools, the P.H.S. hospital and the offices of other agencies.

In 1970, Kotzebue had 302 homes, 246 of which ASHA found substandard: poorly constructed, poorly ventilated and poorly insulated. In addition, there is serious overcrowding: three-fifths of all families live in homes that do not meet minimum accepted space requirements; sometimes eight or 10 people live in a small one- or two-room house. Community water and sewer projects are still under construction and many homes have neither running water nor flush toilets (indoor chemical toilets and "honey buckets" are commonly used). The water and sewer systems have been plagued by operational difficulties which many residents attribute to a design unsuited for an area with permanently frozen subsoil, and maintenance of the system is likely to be beyond the resources of the community when they are turned over to Kotzebue upon completion. The telephone system is erratic. Transportation is expensive (a round-trip airline ticket to Anchorage costs $146) and unreliable in winter. There is no television, no radio except A.F.R.N. broadcasts to the nearby DEW Line site. The Anchorage Daily News has limited circulation here, providing some news from the rest of the state; local affairs are covered by the newly established Kotzebue News, the mimeographed legal-size weekly published by Jane Pender.

Despite Kotzebue's urgent problems, many of its residents like it here very much and want to stay. This is particularly true of the older residents, many of whom came here from smaller villages and seem quite proud of their town, whatever its shortcomings.

The question is whether the community will be able to hold its talented youth until it has the resources to make living here more attractive to youngsters who generally are more acculturated than their parents and more impatient with prevailing conditions. (And it clearly is with youth that Kotzebue's future lies: the median age here is 15.9 years, compared with 23.3 for Alaska as a whole and 27.7 for the United States.) Anthropologist James Van Stone noted in a study of Point Hope that, "The Point Hopers, like most rural people everywhere, depend on their own small community for the satisfaction of their major wants. When the point is reached where residence in the village leaves too many wants unsatisfied, the community will begin to disintegrate." This process of disintegration is already well advanced in some of the smaller villages of Alaska and signs of it are appearing here.

"They send the younger people outside to school where they have their own beds with clean sheets, central heating, flush toilets," says Mabel Walsh. "Then you send them home for three months in the summer and they're supposed to be satisfied with conditions here?" The same point emerged differently in a discussion I had with three Kotzebue teenagers, Nelly Ward, 16, Pooky Tiepelman, 18, and Lenny Henry, 16. Miss Ward, who was graduated from the B.I.A. high school here this year, plans to attend the University of Alaska at Fairbanks with the help of a state loan. She said she planned to return to Kotzebue to work after graduation, prompting Henry to ask: "What are you going to do here?" Miss Ward shrugged.

"The way it is now, I don't think I'd want to live here," Tiepelman said. "It could be made a decent place to live, but first of all you have to get people thinking about what they want and need. . . . A lot of the young people would like to get out."

"A majority of them, anyway," Henry said.

And frequently they do get out. The ASHA report on Kotzebue notes that, "There are fewer residents in the age group 20–24 years than in the age groups immediately before and after that group. This discrepancy can only be explained as a result of heavy emigration from the community of members of that age group." And, of course, young and middle-aged adults "are the most productive members of a community. They are the breadwinners. They are the people who provide social and political leadership for a community. And they are the people who tend to leave Kotzebue. The poverty of opportunity for personal achievement and the poor living conditions induce many of the young adults to leave Kotzebue. Consequently, the city is drained of its best-trained, most productive members. As long as this situation prevails, the success of the community will be limited."

Yet despite all this—despite the appalling statistics which here take on the flesh of reality, despite the poverty and the cultural stress—one leaves Kotzebue with a feeling of cautious optimism, a sense that these people will yet prevail in the most unlikely circumstances—as they have in the past.

Among the hopeful indicators is the tremendous upsurge of native activism in the last few years, with the struggle for a land-claims settlement the catalyst. In last year's elections, natives won an unprecedented six seats in the 40-member State House of Representatives and came close to winning others. Natives also hold two of the 20 seats in the Senate, and Kotzebue's Willie Hensley is one of the most effective members of the upper chamber. Emil Notti, the personable former president of the Alaska Federation of Natives, the central native organization formed to seek a claims settlement in Congress, ran a respectable second in a three-man race for the Democratic nomination for Lieutenant Governor, though he spent only about $5,000, while the winner, H. A. Boucher, spent a reported $125,000. A heavy native vote, along with strong support in southeastern Alaska where he has long been a favorite son, guaranteed Gov. William A. Egan his victory over former Gov. Keith H. Miller. In response, Egan has given natives several important positions within his administration (though no cabinet appointments).

Furthermore, at the national level, the natives, despite serious rivalries and divergent interests among peoples of three ethnic stocks and cultural backgrounds, have maintained an impressive facade of unity and have been effective in convincing large numbers of Congressmen of the justness of their cause.

In addition, some of the young natives who leave their communities to go to school are coming back home to see if they can help. Bobby Schaeffer and Willie Goodwin of RurALCAP are two examples here. "I'm happier with my job now than I was when I was an electronics technician," Goodwin says. "I'm interested in my people. It's a good feeling to have something accomplished and to know your people were glad you could help."

While all this has been going on, the racial climate has remained reasonably good—though far from the perfect state many Alaskans like to believe they have achieved. The racial tension is there, as it inevitably is in relations between a well-to-do majority and a large, underprivileged minority. But so far the hatred and violence that have shattered relations between whites and blacks elsewhere is absent. One sociological study indicated that white prejudices against natives, though they exist, are less clearly defined than those against blacks and thus may prove easier to overcome. And most natives still favor racial cooperation in an attempt to work out an accommodation with white society. But it is a delicate balance which will not last without affirmative action by Congress.

Says Vince Scheurch, the articulate Mayor of Kiana: "We're waiting impatiently. I won't say patiently." The reasons are obvious: To Alaska's natives a land-claim settlement is not a massive welfare measure; it is a legal debt the United States Government has owed for more than a century. Payment of it could provide the large-scale infusion of cash the natives need to upgrade their villages. Mineral resources on lands granted to the natives could provide the long-term financial stability they need to evolve a political and social framework capable of resolving conflicts between the old culture and the new, and breaking the bonds of poverty which have made life here so difficult. And, most important to many natives, a large land settlement would guarantee the continued stability of the subsistence hunting and fishing upon which thousands of people will continue to depend for years to come.

"Money lasts a while," Schaeffer says. "The land lasts forever. We've lived without money all these years; I don't see why we can't do it for a while longer. The transition will take a long time anyway."

LAND HO!

The Alaskan land claims bill got a boost toward passage earlier this year when several of the major oil companies plus the consortium organized to build the proposed Prudhoe Bay-Valdez pipeline put their considerable lobbying muscle behind a claims settlement. The industry was concerned that unless the issue was decided, the natives might be able to get a court injunction halting construction of the line, which would cross land claimed by the natives. The prospect of lengthy litigation was enough to get an influential segment of the oil industry behind a settlement. The industry apparently has not urged any particular settlement formula, but instead has urged Congressmen to get on with the job of making that determination themselves.

The House legislation attempts to skirt one of the major previous roadblocks to a large land settlement: potentially divisive competition between the state government and the natives for the limited amount of valuable resource-bearing land. The Statehood Act, which admitted Alaska to the Union in 1959, gave the state government the right to select 104 million of Alaska's 365 million acres of land. The state had made only about 18 million acres of its selections—and only a small percentage of those had been confirmed by the Federal Government—when former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall slapped a "freeze" on all Federal lands, preventing their transfer to anyone, including the state, until the land claims were settled. As a result, about 93 million acres has been reserved by the Federal Government. Of that amount about 93 million acres has been reserved by Washington for national forests and the like—and thus is unavailable to either the state or the natives for selection. When Federal reserves and previous state selections are deducted, about 250 million acres of land are available to the state and the natives, and only about 40 million of those are considered likely to be commercially valuable. Those 40

million comprise land both the state and the natives want most.

As a way around this, the House bill would grant the roughly 200 native villages the right of first selection on about 18 million acres of land in the immediate vicinity of the villages. Then the state would be free to proceed with its statehood selections, which it would be required to complete by 1984. After that, the native regional corporations could select another 22 million acres.

The generous Senate bill, unique in land claims legislation, would allow the natives to choose between two alternative settlements:

(1)—Fee simple title to 40 million acres of land. Villages would be granted one township of land (23,040 acres), adjacent to the villages for each 400 persons. That would amount to 10 to 12 million acres. The rest would be selected by a native commission established by the bill.

(2)—Fee simple title to 24 million acres of land, surface title to another six million acres and surface use permits—but not title—to another 20 million acres, for a total of 50 million acres.

—T.M.B.

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS,
Sitka, Alaska, October 9, 1971.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: Enclosed you will find 3 resolutions that the Alaska Section of the Society of America Foresters recently passed. These 3 issues are of vital importance in our young State and as a professional society we want to make our position known to you.

We hope you will give these issues careful consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ALAN J. AITKEN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Society of American Foresters, Alaska Section

---

1971 ALASKA SECTION, SOCIETY OF AMERICAN FORESTERS, RESOLUTION NO. 5

Be it hereby resolved that the position statement of the Alaska Section of the Society of American Foresters concerning, "Native Land Claims in Alaska", shall be as follows:

The Alaska Section of the Society of American Foresters supports the settlement of aboriginal claims of the Alaska Natives.

Any settlement should recognize the overriding public needs of existing National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, Forests, and Monuments. Furthermore, any settlement should also recognize and provide for continued public ownership of other public lands in any land claim solution.

The Alaska Section of the Society of American Foresters recognizes the importance of public lands for all the people of the Nation, regardless of ethnic origin.

Therefore, be it further resolved that valid native land claims in Alaska be settled by monetary payment, in lieu of land grants, to quiet any clouded titles on these aforementioned public lands to preserve their dedicated National purpose; and that any land grants be confined to the area occupied by existing native villages and all bonafide Alaska native inhabitancy; all of the aforementioned to be as determined by the legal decisions of all applicable local, state, and federal executive, legislative, and judicial bodies.

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

The Greater Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce endorses without qualification position of Alaska State Chamber of Commerce with regards to Native land claims settlement.

In addition we feel the Kyle amendment as now contained in the House bill would be detrimental to the best interests of Alaska and therefore ask it be deleted.

C. W. BAER,
General Manager.

OCTOBER 13, 1971.

Mr. PHIL HOLDSWORTH,
President, State of Alaska Chamber of Commerce, Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR MR. HOLDSWORTH: We all realize that a settlement of the Alaska Native Land Claims will shape Alaska's future dramatically. Certainly on an issue with this economic importance the business community, through the Chamber of Commerce, must bring its views to the attention of the legislative leaders and the public. Alaska State Bank has supported the position taken by the State Chamber of Commerce and the Greater Anchorage Chamber of Commerce on the Native Land Claims. We do, however, wish to make two comments on the September 24, 1971 resolution.

First we feel that the resolution was introduced too late in the legislative process to have a positive effect on the settlement. Because of the eleventh-hour nature of the resolution, it exposes the Chamber and the business community to the charge of being obstructionistic. Secondly, we feel that a resolution of this importance should be endorsed by the membership at large, rather than the board of directors exclusively, so that the document truly reflects the sentiments of the total business community.

It is important to note that our comments on the September 24 resolution, which we submit for your consideration in the future, are not on content but rather pertain to the timing and lack of input from the membership at large.

Yours truly

KENNETH C. HUME,
President, Alaska State Bank.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,
Washington, D.C.

Alaskans finally aroused to danger of Kyl amendment by American Mining Congress statement. Anchorage and Fairbanks television carrying story and long program planned for early in week. Am also informed that petition against large land settlement circulating here. Your letter of October 4 overlooks fact that hard rock prospecting would be banded, destroying $10 million exploration industry, plus inestimable future economic and social benefits. I have been authorized to telegraph all Members of Congress, and am so doing. Asking for a no vote for Alaska on Kyl amendment Tuesday. Please do what you can. Believe me, we appreciate your past efforts and solicit your future ones.

ERNEST N. WOLFF,
President, Alaska Miners Assn.

PETERSBURG CONSERVATION SOCIETY,
Petersburg, Alaska.

Representative NICK BEGICH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BEGICH: The Petersburg Conservation Society is concerned about proposed bills regarding Indian Land Claims. We oppose any land settlement in excess of 10 million acres. We feel this is fair and sufficient for village expansion; larger amounts would have too great an impact on land use in Alaska. In Southeast Alaska the proposed village grants would cause complete chaos in resource-use planning. We do not oppose a monetary settlement of any reasonable amount but feel the land is for all peoples' use.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) EMILY V. MERRIAM,
Corresponding Secretary.

OCTOBER 15, 1971.

Hon. NICK BEGICH,
U.S. House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEGICH: As a geologist familiar with land use studies in Alaska and one formerly involved with the Department of Interior in Alaska, I believe that the land use studies are more complex than generally realized in terms of definitive work that would take much more than five years. I also do not believe that amendments for land use studies should be appended to the Alaska Native Claims Bill, but as necessary it all should be considered separately—perhaps in connection with the proposed revisions of the Public Land Laws.

Some of the opinions and reasons to justify this position are given in the enclosed letter submitted to the Anchorage Daily Times October 15, 1971.

Sincerely,

C. C. HAWLEY,
Consulting Economic Geologist.

Enclosure (1).

OCTOBER 14, 1971.

EDITOR,
Anchorage Daily Times,
Anchorage, Alaska.

DEAR SIR: Recent articles in your paper citing representatives of conservation groups—such as, Art Davidson, Friends of the Earth, and also Theodore G. Bingham, U.S.B.L.M.—deserve some comment, specifically on subjects of Land-Use Planning, Native Land Claims, and the Public Land Laws. All these items are intertwined because of legislation before Congress.

Both the Conservation groups and the U.S.B.L.M. have indicated that they believe that the Public Land Laws should be changed—one purpose being to protect our environment, admittedly a praiseworthy aim. It is also clear, however, that a real aim of extremists in both groups—private and government—is to accomplish this protection by complete withdrawal of public lands from entry for any private purpose, be it homesteading, grazing, mining, logging or recreational use. Alaskans and all other Americans should realize how dangerously close complete withdrawal of public lands is. They should decide if it is in the best interest of the United States to have complete collective ownership of the remaining public land in the United States. And if their decision is no, it's time to call, write or telegraph any person of influence that they know in order to stop it.

The new catchphrase in this assault on any development is apparently Land-Use Planning. At first glance hardly anything could appear more innocent and less dangerous to develop than this. But I believe it is worthwhile to ask what it means, how is it to be done, by whom, haven't we already done it, and are we all using the same ground rules? For example, it is apparent that to some vocal people the highest and best use of any wilderness is wilderness—never mind any tangible resources that might be present—it must be preserved. Land-Use Planning, if it has validity at all, must be based on study of land, its scenic value, watershed potential, as well as the more tangible items—such as, minerals and timber.

To those who ask five years for a study, it is possible to reply in either of two ways: First, why so such time? Second, that it is impossible to do an adequate job in any reasonable time. To justify this view, I would point out that Alaska has been studied more or less intensively for seventy years; we know in general what basins can contain oil or gas fields, what ranges are most likely to have mineral deposits, where the marketable timber is, where arable land is, what water power resources there are, and where the best fisheries are. There is also a con-

sensus on quite a number of the most scenic areas.

We are also aware of the areas of greatest social problems and population pressures. A great many of these things have been documented in voluminous reports. Has anyone read them? Would we read the next one or abide by its recommendations any more than those of "Alaska Natives and the Land" compiled by the U.S.B.L.M. from various authoritative sources?

Would the next edition of the Gruening report prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey and other agencies say a great deal more than the last? Based on the history of most government ventures, the answer has to be no. What of a real land-use study? To really appraise Alaska on a detailed field basis requires so much more work and time that it is seriously questioned whether the people who finally finished it would remember the object of this search. One example, several years ago the U.S. Geological Survey estimated that it would take 300 years to finish the one inch to the mile geological mapping of Alaska at the present mapping rate. This rate has not sped up, and even if it had by ninety percent, we are still talking about thirty years to complete a not-very-detailed analysis.

In remarks recently, Mr. Bingham of the U.S.B.L.M. implied that the days of the old-time prospector are over, and that it can all be done rapidly with electronic gadgetry. Unfortunately, this is not true. Many significant mineral discoveries are still being made in about the old way. True, transport by helicopter has revolutionized the ability of people to get around in the north, but when they are there on the ground, prospecting has not changed significantly. So-called modern geochemical prospecting is so basically similar to the search for gold by the gold pan that it's hard to see why it justifies a new name at all.

If people of this level of knowledge are going to do Land-Use Planning, I prefer the old way where a burro breaks his leg while slipping over a ledge of gold-bearing quartz.

These considerations and others bring me to the view that Land-Use Planning is a Red Herring and the people who propose it are either terribly naive (probably) or they figure that here is the way to stop development period.

These matters are particularly pressing currently because land withdrawals, pending use-planning, are part of at least two of the Native Claims Bills. The whole question of land laws is also under review, with hearings slated in Alaska in November.

It is generally agreed that deficiencies in the land laws are present, and that an entire new base is needed. But it is a matter of too much importance to change Alaska's land laws by means of an amendment on the Native Claims settlement, rather than specific legislation. These changes should be debated on their own merits.

Observations over the last few years indicate that the real land hogs in Alaska are not speculators or miners, but the extreme Conservation groups. Time after time these people have tried to get land tied up by administrative fiat, or by the amendment route, rather than by public debate. To give them credit, they undoubtedly feel that the end—Preservation—justifies the means. However, this argument is a dangerous one and is surely without democratic basis.

The Native Land Claims and the Public Land Laws can, respectively, be settled justly or revised as needed if all sides are heard and weighted as fairly as possible.

Yours for a greater Alaska,

Sincerely,

C. C. HAWLEY,

Consulting Economic Geologist.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF SITKA, ALASKA, URGING LEGISLATION TO RESOLVE THE NATIVE LAND CLAIMS

Whereas, legislation is presently before Congress to settle the Alaska native land claims, and

Whereas, the Alaska delegation to Congress has energetically pursued resolution of this matter, and

Whereas, the settlement of these land claims will benefit the people of rural Alaska and recognize the rights of our aboriginal citizens, and

Whereas, the present land freeze affects the orderly development of our State, and

Whereas, the lives of all Alaskans are affected by a lack of action resolving these unsettled matters,

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the City of Sitka, Alaska, as follows:

1. That all Alaskans unify to support legislation presently being considered by Congress for an equitable and fair resolution of the Native land claims problem.

2. That Congress be urged to pass the necessary legislation during this session.

3. That copies of this resolution be directed to the President of the United States, the Alaska delegation to Congress, Governor William A. Egan and members of the press.

HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, most of the presidents of public and private institutions of higher education have met and adopted a unified position on Federal aid to postsecondary educational institutions. I have discussed this matter at considerable length with a number of these leaders, and find their views most persuasive. The following is a statement of their position which I submit for the benefit of my colleagues:

The presidents of Oregon colleges and universities have devoted considerable time this fall to the study of Federal legislation having to do with funding of post-secondary education. We recognize that our society is struggling to implement a new relationship between government and citizen in the field of education and are deeply pleased with the progress which has occurred thus far. However, we still have some serious concerns and wish to express them in the following statement.

We hold primary belief in the proposition that national greatness results from individual greatness, and that individual greatness results from the unfettered pursuit of truth and knowledge. We are sure in our conviction that this pursuit must be effected chiefly through strong educational programs. We call for a broad Federal commitment to the general financial support of post-secondary educational institutions in order that these institutions may be so strengthened as to fully realize their potential.

An increasing number of colleges and universities are sorely threatened by rising costs. We believe it to be a national imperative to alleviate this situation. More subtle, but perhaps even more deleterious to the national interest, is the distortion of educational programs resulting from over reliance on the unstable and uncertain winds of categorical aid. We know this distortion is occurring in colleges across the land and decry it as counter productive to effective education.

We accept the necessity of continuing some forms of categorical aid, but deplore the present and growing reliance on such aid solely. This reliance emasculates and fragments the federal effort, while enhancing opportunities for federal guidance to become too specific at the expense of knowledgeable direction available only from state and local institutions.

From our own experience we are profoundly aware that options open to "Middle American" students in pursuit of post-secondary education are now limited. We are not willing to see all institutional aid linked to a formula distributing student aid almost entirely to economically disadvantaged individuals. We are firmly convinced that the best hope of providing equality of educational opportunity lies in making more general resources available to colleges and universities.

We are likewise convinced that continuing reform of the process of post-secondary education will result primarily as changes are developed in and by faculties and institutions. Improvement in the intensely personal relationship we call "teaching" cannot be imposed from without but must be created from within. This calls for financial aid not tied to someone else's priorities, projects or programs.

It is our unanimous belief that the principles underlying those parts of the Green Bill (H.R. 7248) concerned with general aid to institutions and to students competently express the best current approach to the problems of post-secondary education. We therefore urge your attention to those principles and ask your full support of them.

RESOLUTION DESIGNATING SQUARE DANCE AS NATIONAL FOLK DANCE

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to introduce a joint resolution designating the square dance as the national folk dance of the United States.

The square dance, like jazz music, is a uniquely American contribution to the world's entertainment culture. As stated in the resolution, the square dance has been a part of the Nation's folk history since 1651, more than 300 years ago.

Since that time, it has played a significant role in our national heritage. As the early pioneers set out from the Eastern Seaboard to fulfill our "manifest destiny" of inhabiting the continent from the Atlantic to the Pacific, they brought with them the square dance.

It was the standard form of entertainment for young and old alike, on the treks of wagon trains, in the small towns of the frontier, wherever people gathered for fellowship.

Thankfully, the art has been preserved and is still practiced in many areas of the country today by such outstanding and talented groups as the Dixie Swingers Square Dance Club. In practice if not by law, the square dance is already recognized by most people as the national folk dance.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to give well-deserved official recognition to the American square dance.

DISCHARGE PETITION AND THE PRAYER IN SCHOOL AMENDMENT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters about the proposed prayer in school amendment and probably there are a number of you who are interested in the issue but have not written to give me your views.

The current proposed amendment, sponsored by Congressman CHALMERS P. WYLIE is the latest in a long series of proposed constitutional amendments designed to reverse decisions beginning in 1962 in which the Supreme Court held that the first amendment barred the required use of official prayers or Bible reading in the public schools.

The first amendment provides that—

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

House Joint Resolution 191—the Wylie amendment—provides that—

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

The discharge petition to free the bill from the House Judiciary Committee received the requisite 218 signatures on September 21. The prayer amendment is similar to one which I cosponsored and introduced in the 91st and 92d Congresses. I also was one of the early signers of Congressman WYLIE'S discharge petition.

Of course, getting the bill out of committee is only one step in the long process of becoming a law. Any constitutional amendment must be passed by two-thirds of the House and the Senate and approved by three-fourths of the States. The movement to return prayers to schools started in 1962, and no school prayer amendment has reached the floor of either Chamber since 1966, although hundreds have been introduced.

Almost all major church groups and religious organizations oppose any change in the first amendment. Returning prayer to schools is the only amendment that has ever been proposed to the Bill of Rights. They fear that such an amendment might "open the doors for governmental intrusion into the religious affairs of the people." They allege that to authorize government, by a constitutional amendment, to intervene in the sacred privilege of prayer is to make of government a judge of theology and an administrator of religious practice."

Support for the constitutional change comes largely from individuals who particpatd in a large-scale mail campaign to make their representatives aware of their feelings on the issue.

The importance of the discharge petition to the Wylie amendment is that it gave it a second chance. The bill was bottled up in the Judiciary Committee, but thanks to the discharge petition it will now come to the House floor. Then, like any other bill it must be passed by the House and the Senate and since it is a constitutional amendment, it must also be approved by three-fourths of the States.

The discharge petition procedure requires that the petition remain on the Discharge Calendar, at least 7 legislative days. Any Member who signed the petition may move to have the House consider the motion on the second or fourth Mondays of the month. The 7-day requirement extended beyond September 27, the fourth Monday of September; both the second and fourth Mondays in October are holidays, delaying the first possible time for a vote until November 8.

The proposed prayer in school amendment has a chance of becoming the third bill in history enacted into law after being dislodged from House committees by use of a discharge petition. There have been 843 discharge petitions filed in Congress since the law creating discharge petitions was enacted in 1910. Of these only 25 have been brought to the House floor and only 20 have passed the House. Two bills survived the long process and ultimately became the law of the land. These were the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the 1960 Federal pay raise bill.

What is a discharge petition? How does it work? The normal procedure for a bill through the House of Representatives is: First, introduced, second, referred to a committee with jurisdiction over the subject matter, third, reported out of committee with findings and recommendations, and, fourth, considered on the House floor. If the bill is controversial it goes to the Rules Committee after it is reported out of committee. Before it can be considered on the House floor the Rules Committee must give the bill a rule. Sometimes, as in the case of the Wylie amendment to return prayer to schools, the committee to which the bill was referred or the Rules Committee, refuses to act on the bill thereby stopping its forward progress. The discharge petition enables a majority of the Members of Congress to do an end run around the committees and bring the legislation to the House floor for consideration.

The modern discharge rule was first adopted in 1910. The present form of the rule, adopted in 1935 permits a majority of the House—218 Members in the 92d Congress—by signing a motion to discharge a committee from consideration of a bill and thereby bring to the House floor: First, any public bill that has been before a standing committee of the House for 30 days; or, second, any committee-approved bill that has been before the House Rules Committee for 7 legislative days without receiving a special rule for floor debate.

In addition, the discharge rule permits dislodging of a special rule from the Rules Committee for debate on a bill that has been before a standing committee for 30 days—a combination of the first two procedures.

In summary, there is a possibility that the House will approve this constitutional amendment permitting prayer in public schools during the 92d Congress. The road ahead for final approval of a constitutional amendment is, however, long and arduous and only a few measures have survived the pitfalls and perils that have to be faced.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE PURCHASE OF RHODESIAN CHROME

HON. ROBERT PRICE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a favorite phrase among America's young these days is "Tell it like it is." While I do not agree with their grammar, I do agree with their sentiment. It is a time for realistic appraisals of our national policies, and if those policies are found wanting, to change the policy to fit the realism of the world in which we live. I am struck by two very unrealistic aspects of our current policy toward our national security and our relations with another nation, our need for chrome and our boycott of Rhodesia.

Chrome is a necessary ingredient in the building of America and in the maintenance of our national safety and security. To remain strong and free, we must have at our disposal, always ready, a mighty arm of defense. It is not enough to rely on our principles, our moral fiber, our sense of justice and freedom, we must rely on the military weapons that form the first line of defense in our fortress of liberty. Unfortunately, our enemies do not understand reason and logic and brotherly love, but they do understand and respect the steel of the sword. And our steel sword of defense must have chrome to give it the strength and the temper to withstand the onslaught of tyranny.

Does it sound reasonable, then, to seek chrome, not from our friends, but from our enemies? Does it appear logical to bend our knee before those who would destroy our freedom, and ask them for the weapons to forestall that destruction? And to add the final burden to this test of logic, does it reflect good judgment to pay a higher price for chrome from our adversaries than the price offered by our friends?

We have singled out the Rhodesian people from among the families of nations as the target of our wrath because we supposedly do not like something about their government. But we have not turned away from those nations that are run by dictators, those nations that deny religious freedom, those nations that forbid the printing of the truth, those nations that muzzle their citizens, those nations that imprison their dissenters, those nations that launch aggressive wars against their neighbors, those nations that assume postures of hostility toward the United States. Those nations, which epitomize all that America hates, remain our friends, while Rhodesia, a free, democratic, God fearing, independent nation, is a pariah.

We, in this House, can right two

wrongs. We can follow the lead of the Senate and support the Byrd amendment to the military procurement bill, H.R. 8687, an amendment which echoes legislation introduced in this House by Mr. COLLINS and myself. The amendment is easily understood. Section 503 would reestablish equity and good sense by making it the law of the land that so long as the importation of materials from Communist nations is not prohibited, the importation of those same materials from non-Communist nations shall not be prohibited. We will be placing our chrome priorities in proper perspective, buying good, high-grade chrome from a friendly nation, from American companies, at a fair price. We will be eliminating the discriminatory treatment of Rhodesia, a treatment which is the antithesis of the American principle against rendering moral judgments against our fellow man.

I urge your support of this important legislation. It is time to "tell it like it is" to take the realistic view, to let reason dictate our policy.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 630

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 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 No. 630, which I introduced on September 30, 1971:

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 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. That is the least we can negotiate for."

Whereas Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, chief delegate of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam stated on July 1, 1971, that the policy of her government is: "If the United States Government sets a terminal date for the withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1971 of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp, the parties will at the same time agree on the modalities:

"A. Of the withdrawal in safety from South Vietnam of the totality of United States forces and those of the other foreign countries in the United States camp;

"B. Of the release of the totality of military men of all parties and the civilians captured in the war (including American pilots captured in North Vietnam), so that they may all rapidly return to their homes.

"These two operations will begin on the same date.

"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.

RED'S CD PLAN PLAGUES UNITED STATES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago, I included as part of the Extensions of Remarks several portions of the Soviet Civil Defense Handbook in order to alert my House colleagues to the critical importance of improving our own civil defense preparedness. Ray Cromley has done an excellent analysis of the Soviet Union's plan of action and I include his commentary at the conclusion of my remarks:

IT COULD UPSET NUCLEAR BALANCE—REDS' CD PLAN PLAGUES U.S.

(By Ray Cromley)

The Russians may come up with a civil defense strategy which could upset the nuclear balance:

Systematic mass evacuation of major cities as tension mounts before the start of a nuclear war.

Establishment of the rural countryside as the population, medical and supply base for fighting the war and for post-war recovery.

A mass movement of selected factories (with workers and families) from big "target" cities to rural "safe" areas.

Relocation of workers in the remaining big-city factories to dispersal areas 37 to 50 miles outside the cities, from where they'd commute to work in daily 12-hour shifts.

Thus in theory only essential workers would be left in the urban centers when the first missiles landed. These would be protected by blast shelters.

Most essential workers, when not actually on the job, would sleep, study or play in 'safe" rural areas provided with fallout shelters.

Soviet planners estimate that without evacuation and dispersal, a nuclear attack on an unprotected large city could result in death for 90 per cent of the citizenry.

They believe early dispersal could reduce losses to less than 8 per cent.

If the Moscow strategists are correct and if indeed the Soviet Union were able to carry out such an evacuation-dispersal program in advance of a nuclear war, this ability would have a very unsettling effect on American planning.

For the keystone of U.S. defense is deterrence. U.S. strategy assumes Russia will not attack this country if Moscow knows that after absorbing a first strike the United States will have left sufficient nuclear missiles to destroy a number of Russian people so great as to be unacceptable to any war makers in the Kremlin.

But if the Russians can in fact cut their casualties by the percentages they now calculate, the U.S. deterrence would shrivel to ineffectivity.

This reporter has studied in translation, 334 pages of Soviet detail on this program, which is far more, of course, than merely a method of or evacuation and dispersal The concept seems well thought out and carefully planned.

But the Soviet evacuation depends on an ability to foretell well in advance precisely when a nuclear war will break.

This requires that Soviet planners be superbly expert in reading the signs of war. Or it means Moscow is certain it will make the first strike and Soviet civil defense men thus have advance knowledge of "N" day.

It is to be noted that in any event a pre-war massive evacuation of Russia's cities would tip off Washington.

Some theorists believe such massive evacuation is impossible. But the Russians do have some experience. In World War II they evacuated 10 million people and 1,300 basic industries from vulnerable areas.

Stalin had considerably more time than today's Russians would have in a nuclear war. But no one should underestimate the chaotic conditions extant in the first year of Russia's war with Germany.

Dispersal preparations now under way call for heavy rural development in the years just ahead to prepare for a mass influx of city residents and for daily mass commuting by workers.

Rural highway nets and feeder roads are to be expanded. Communications, water and food supply systems upgraded, rural housing improved—and farm houses, farm buildings and rural underground structures equipped as fallout shelters.

City evacuation assembly centers are to be set up for each 2,000 to 3,000 persons. They will alert and assemble workers and provide transportation to the evacuation zones.

The evacuees will be met by rural party committees, lodged, given fallout protection, food, other necessities. Those not commuting to jobs in the city be assigned work in relocated plants or set to tending or harvesting crops.

The dispersal areas are now being set up, stocked with emergency supplies. Local resettlement committees are being organized and procedures standardized.

NINE LESSONS IN LIVING

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I read some very good poetry and words of wisdom from Mrs. Novella Wininger, Barren County Extension Agent, of Glasgow, Ky.

I include some recent aphroisms from her pen:

NINE LESSONS IN LIVING

Learn to laugh—a laugh is better than medicine.

Learn to attend to your own business. Few men can handle their own well.

Learn to tell a story. A well-told story is like a sunbeam in a sick room.

Learn to say kind things—nobody ever resents them.

Learn to avoid nasty remarks—they give neither the hearer nor the speaker any satisfaction.

Learn to stop grumbling. If you can't see any good in the world, keep the bad to yourself.

Learn to hide aches with a smile—nobody is interested in them, anyway.

Learn to keep troubles to yourself—nobody wants to take them from you.

Above all, learn to smile. It always pays.

COMMITMENT AND LOVE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a magnificent tribute of love, compassion, dedication, and hard work was recently dedicated in my congressional district to our beloved former President, John F. Kennedy. The story of that unique enterprise by a small group of Mexican-American citizens was sensitively portrayed by Mr. Richard Davis, editor of the Contra Costa Times and I include his article as a part of my remarks:

COMMITMENT AND LOVE

With the bicentennial years near, celebrating this nation's 200th anniversary in 1976, Central Contra Costa County residents from Martinez to Dublin could look to the eastern part of the county for an example of what can be accomplished by a relatively small number of people.

Hopefully, the bicentennial will find our communities from north to south, ranging into the San Ramon Valley and Pleasanton, working with historical societies in both Contra Costa and Alameda counties to outdo one another with celebrations to salute America's birth. But preparations must be started now.

Over in the east county, Americans of Mexican descent, few but hardworking, culminated 5½ years of loving labor when the John F. Kennedy Memorial was unveiled at the Contra Costa County fairgrounds on the closing day of the Contra Costa County fair.

Appropriately, an eternal flame, along with small floodlights, will illuminate this work of love and commitment for years to come. President Kennedy, the Mexican community is saying, along with his ideals, humor and challenge to all Americans to do whatever possible for their country, was special to them.

Knowing and loving these people over the years of working with them in Escondido, San Diego County's "Hidden Valley," Borrego Springs in the desert county of San Diego County, and now here in the shadow of Mount Diablo, we have always thought it a shame to take so seriously the "Frito Bandido" and "Jose Jiminez", for the Mexicans, like our beloved Hawaiians, are an extremely happy-go-lucky people.

Mexicans we have come to know as true friends over the years never really objected to these Mexican symbols. They understand that the gringo is not laughing AT the Mexican, but with him, and enjoying his priceless sense of humor—which more often than not is aimed at himself.

This is perhaps why the Mexicans, who have been among those greatly oppressed in our society over the years, looked to President Kennedy and loved him with such zeal. For Kennedy and the Mexican understood one another—an Irishman who had been looked down upon in Massachusetts by the blue-bloods, and the Mexican who still finds it difficult to realize equality among his fellow Americans.

What motivated these people was not the desire for money and power, of even recognition. It was the senseless slaying of the first Roman Catholic ever elected to the U.S. presidency, and a president with whom they related.

Pure commitment and love can do much, for the cost of the memorial could not possibly have been borne by the Mexican communities on the eastern side of Contra Costa County. They required help from experts in the field in Mexico, financial support from literally hundreds of businesses and retail merchants.

The dedication perhaps says it best: The memorial is dedicated so that "each individual, whatever color, race or religion, will be guaranteed the opportunity to achieve his greatest potential in this, the United States of America."

It was back in early 1965, just a matter of a few weeks after the Kennedy assassination, that 25 young Americans of Mexican descent, men and women, united by the sorrow they shared at the slaying, made up their minds to build a lasting memorial to carry on his "inspiration of hope."

These were not monied people . . . not sophisticated in the ways of organized fundraising, and they were not seeking personal or material gain. But what they had going for them shoved all obstacles aside—love, respect and dedication.

On the face of the bronze, marble and concrete memorial, the Mexican community believes it has a message for the young—ALL children of ALL time, in the challenge laid down by the late President:

". . . ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country."

In congratulating the east county Mexican community, we would hope that Central Contra Costans will perhaps take this challenge seriously over the next five years leading up to the 200th birthday of the United States, and work together to make this an impressively successful event through not only celebrations up and down the county but perhaps merging talents within the communities to erect something lasting that will be standing when the 300th anniversary celebration takes place.

This is something we can all work on—with ideas, talent and just plain hard labor. At least, let's think about it and exchange some dialogue.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JAMES G. FULTON

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sad, and join with my many colleagues in the Congress, in mourning the death of our good friend and fellow Member, James G. Fulton.

Jim was a hard and conscientious worker whose expertise on foreign affairs was well recognized, when he was appointed a member of our congressional delegation to the United Nations.

Jim was a jovial and an affable man who will not soon be forgotten.

In Fort Lauderdale, where Jim had a home in my district, we knew Jim well and respected his generosity and benevolence. I remember at times when introducing me to his many friends either in Washington or in Florida, he would joshingly say, "Here, let me introduce you to my own Congressman." Following his confinement at the Holy Cross Hospital in Fort Lauderdale last year, Jim wanted to help others who were ailing and made a noteworthy donation to that hospital's good work.

An ardent and persevering legislator, Jim Fulton loved the Congress which provided the impetus for him to get things done, despite the ever present obstacles. The U.S. space program owes no small thanks to Jim Fulton's efforts. I am sure that when it was an American who first set foot on the moon's surface, James G. Fulton basked in part of the glory which he justly deserved. We shall miss Jim Fulton.

SAVE POINT REYES PENINSULA

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, as a Californian and a Member of Congress, I feel that I must add my voice to those of my fellow Californians in support of saving the Point Reyes peninsula. To fail to act to protect and save this area would be a crime against nature and a crime against future generations of Americans. The National Park Service's 5,150 acre wilderness proposal, while better than no plan at all, is really quite inadequate to the task that lies before us. Large areas have been excluded and the National Park Service plan, absurdly enough, includes no shoreline.

I support the alternative proposal for 36,000 acres of wilderness as recommended by a coalition of citizen conservation groups. This proposal would protect some 25 miles of ocean and bay shoreline and tidelands—a necessity as far as I am concerned. In addition to the Mt. Wittenberg area proposed by the Park Service, it includes the southern portion of the seashore from Bear Valley Trail to Pablo Point, Drakes and Limantour Esteros and Limantous Spit, Tomales Point, the full length of Point Reyes Beach and the shoreline of Point Reyes Headland.

Generous wilderness protection for the Point Reyes area is important, not only because of the amazing and gentle beauty of this area, but also because of its proximity to the millions of people who live in the San Francisco bay area—people who desperately need the peace and tranquility that wilderness areas can provide.

There are several drawbacks inherent in the National Park Service Plan. Although public meetings on the overall conceptual master plans are a step in the right direction, present National Park Service policies do not provide for any citizen involvement in the decisions following adoption of the generalized master plan. I feel that citizens must be able to have a chance to review the important action plans which touch upon such important questions as the specifics of proposed developments and the location and design of major roads. The master plan should recommend that a representative citizens advisory board be established for the Point Reyes wilderness refuge.

In addition, most of the National Seashore under the present Park Service Plan would be designated as class III. This means that this land could conceivably be exploited and developed for commercial profit. We could see this area logged, grazed and hot-dog standed out of its beauty. Except for those lands where we in the Congress have specifically permitted dairy cow or cattle ranching, this land should be protected more stringently than present plans provide. This area should remain wild and beautiful and should not be developed.

I am of the opinion that those in the Park Service who studied this area and wrote this master plan were trying to serve the best interests of the people of California and America. However, this conceptual plan omits details which absolutely must be open to public review. It omits specifics which are vital to the success of the effort to save this area. For example, the master plan states the principle that the automobile must be phased out of the proposed park area. However, no deadlines are given and no real procedural guarantees are provided. We in the Congress, perhaps even more than other Americans, know that this could well mean that this principle might never become reality—and that even if the principle becomes practice it may be too late. In my view, private automobiles should be excluded from this lovely area and for one reason only—to accommodate masses of private automobiles would mean the destruction of the area. Do we want to see miles of asphalt, parking lots, and traffic jams in the beautiful and primitive area? I don't think any of us wish that, and so we must act to prevent it. Naturally, when we exclude private automobiles from an area such as this, alternate, public, means of transportation must be provided. This aspect of the proposed park has not been given the attention it deserves in the master plan. We are not talking here about just another beach and just some trees. This area is unequaled anywhere in the world for its majestic seacoast, its lovely green and rolling hills and its exquisite forests.

This "island in time" provides us with a rare opportunity to save something that soon will be gone and that cannot be recreated. We have other areas where people can drive to the beach, stroll down a boardwalk, visit concessionary stands and spend a Saturday afternoon. This is all right, but we don't want all of our seashore and all of the few natural areas that remain to end up this way. We in the West, perhaps, have the good fortune to have more wild and untamed land surrounding us than in some other areas of our country. There really is no joy similar to that of hiking into the Sierra, into an area where there are no roads, no cars, no machines, no businesses and no crowds. We cannot preserve all of our land in this way. But, by some miracle, Point Reyes, just a few miles from San Francisco, has remained in this primitive state.

At present, wilderness areas are more accessible to those with middle class income than to lower-incomed families. Point Reyes could be a place where people of all incomes and all races could have easy access to lovely wilderness. I sincerely hope that the final plan for this park area will be expanded to include 36,000 acres, with provisions for cheap and rapid public transportation from the population centers in the Bay Area to the lovely hiking trails of Point Reyes. I will do all that I can here in Congress to assist in this effort.

Most of all, I hope to see some action on this question quickly—to insure the safety of the wilderness and the success of all our efforts to serve the people of California.

THREE MOVING POEMS

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's newest newspaper, the River Times in Fairbanks, is rapidly becoming one of Alaska's most respected newspapers.

The River Times, operated by Rural CAP, emphasizes news that is relevant to the Native community. The first edition of this newspaper, published just last month, contained a wide variety of news items as well as some fine literature.

One item in the River Times particularly caught my attention. On the editor's page of the September 27, 1971, edition, I read with great delight three moving poems. After reading these poems, I thought the sensitivity and perception of the poets was most unusual. I am sure my colleagues in the Congress would find them most enlightening and I commend them to their attention.

The poems follow:

THE SUN, THE MOON, THE NIGHT AND YESTERDAY

The sun, warm it was,
A friendly warmth . . .
Blind to aches that could
Come, a blindness one gets when looking
Straight into the sun . . .
The shadows, Cast when yet the sun was high,
Over valleys and hills of warm,
Soft winds . . .
Fresh of sticky,
Spring leaves being
Swept by . . .
Soft, at first,
Blending with the winds, the shadows,
A warning . . . wasted . . . on two
Small, lonely smiles still blinded
by the
sun . . .
Mountains,
Waiting in the haze were hiding
The night . . . pale, white mists in
The lowlands were first to
warn them . . .
of themselves,
Of nights cold
Union with the
World, making
Hands seek the
Warmth of each
Other against the
Chilled stillness that would bring
Out the perfume in her long,
Soft hair . . .
The moon, beginning
Her soft, white glow
Was second in warning
Them of night's
Cold blindness . . .
Far different from the blindness
Of the warm
Sun . . .
The blindness of the
Night, which hides the
World, and their
Shyness, had arrived
And then they were
Blind . . .
Together.

PHIL KELLY.

Like an immortal he had trod this land
From time immemorial
Standing tall and proud
He traversed forest, mountain
Prairie, plain
With football soft as cloud
He reverenced the living
Respect gave to the dead
Walking very close to God
This Man with skin called red
Invaded then his land
Men of skin called white
And named him animal!

MERCIA.

REBIRTH

We are walked on and pushed aside,
we are left with but a thread of pride,
But to this we hold stubbornly,
And now more and more begin to see,
That we, the natives will not die.
And when we rise again the white man will see his lie.
To himself he has said that we are easy to control,
But he could not see the fire that burns within every soul,
Soon the flame will kindle, and then begin to roar.
At first a few will rise and then many, many more.
Our battlecry will shake the heavens,
And from syllables now spoken they are running like so many frightened deer.
Then all is over, peace restored, one race is left,
Now something whiteman once refused to hear is ringing through the trees pure and clear
It is us whiteman, we are saying We, the natives
We are here.

AMY KALLOCH.

TRIBUTE TO ANGELOS CLONES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise with the sad task of paying final tribute to Angelos Clones, a Washington economist, a leader of the international resistance movement against the Greek military junta, and a fine man, who succumbed to lymphatic cancer yesterday morning at the age of 41.

His parting is a loss not only to his wonderful wife and children, but to all of us here and abroad who have been working for the return of democracy to Greece. Our efforts to end fascism in Greece, which are now showing some signs of success, are a living monument to Angelos Clones, who will be fondly remembered by all of us who worked by his side, and by the Greek people when they throw off their yoke of oppression.

UNITED NATIONS PURPOSE AS INTENDED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in these days of confusion and distortion as to what the United Nations represents or what it was intended to represent in the field of international cooperation, I feel that the intent of our country as one of the charter members might be best revealed by speeches of U.S. representatives in the formation of the United Nations in 1945.

I insert an address by Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, at the dedication of the CFR Headquarters and a press release of Cordell Hull, Senior Adviser to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations at this point.

[From U.S. Dept. of State Bulletin, Apr. 8, 1945]

UNITED NATIONS WILL WRITE CHARTER FOR A WORLD ORGANIZATION

(Address by the Secretary of State[1])

In speaking here in New York this afternoon at the dedication of the building which is henceforth to be the headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations, I come to bear witness, as has every Secretary of State during the past quarter of a century, to the great services and influence of this organization in spreading knowledge and understanding of the issues of United States foreign policy.

Certainly today—after two world wars in 25 years—there can be few Americans, whether they live in the East or the West or the South, who do not understand how directly and personally they are concerned in our relations with other nations.

Ever since Pearl Harbor the hopes and thoughts of the people of this country have been centered increasingly upon creating at last a world organization which would be endowed with the power and the will this time truly to maintain the peace.

And ever since Pearl Harbor intensive studies and preparatory discussions of such an organization have been carried on by this Government—and by other governments. There were many plans and a multitude of variations in viewpoint which had to be weighed and analyzed and adjusted. This process took two years and a half.

By last summer we were ready for discussions with our principal Allies—the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and China. Out of these discussions, and all the preliminary work that had gone before, evolved the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.

Since last October these Proposals have been before the peoples and the governments of all the United Nations for further discussion and analysis.

Now—seven months later—all the United Nations are about to meet in San Francisco to write the Charter of a world Organization on the basis of these Proposals.

I have briefly reviewed this bit of history for a reason.

It has taken three and a half years of the most prodigious and single-minded effort the world has ever seen to bring the fighting forces of the United Nations into the heart of Germany and close to the home islands of Japan.

We can be sure that winning the peace is going to take a good deal longer and that it will be just as difficult and challenging a task.

Early in the war, when the United States and the other United Nations were in mortal danger from our enemies, we were steady and resolute and we found the means to develop and strengthen that unity of action without which we could not win victory. This is, perhaps, more difficult, now that the immediate danger has passed.

But the danger has not really passed—the danger that we shall fail in rebuilding the world and in preventing what would be the greatest and perhaps the fatal disaster of our history—another world war.

What is required above everything else today is the same steadiness and fixed resolution and clear understanding of our national interest with which we met the tests of war in 1942 and 1943 and 1944. Certainly we shall never succeed if every road-block or every land-mine on the road to peace throws us into a panic and, conversely, if every hundred yards of clear going makes us think we have nothing more to worry about.

It is with this point in mind that I wish to talk briefly with you about the San Francisco conference and about some of the forebodings and difficulties that have arisen concerning it.

First of all, let us keep the San Francisco conference in its proper perspective. It is not a peace conference. It will not deal with boundaries or reparations or questions concerned with the disarmament and control of Germany and Japan. Its purpose is to prepare the Charter of a world Organization to preserve the peace in the future which can be submitted to the member nations for adoption.

It will be a difficult task, a task as difficult as the writing of our own Constitution in 1787, for the conference at San Francisco, like the Convention in Philadelphia, will be pioneering a new way. The Charter will inevitably be the product of a series of adjustments just as our own Constitution was the product of a series of compromises between the North and the South, large States and small, the merchant interests and the agrarian interests. Without these adjustments of interest and viewpoint our Constitution could not have been written. Nor could it have been ratified by the 13 original States.

Probably no charter that can be agreed upon at San Francisco will completely meet the wishes of any one of the United Nations. What we must do there is to create a framework for the world Organization that can command the support of the great majority of the peoples of the world, that will be soundly based, and that will be open to improvement as we gain experience in the functioning of the Organization after it is established.

I am reminded again of our own Constitutional Convention. The delegates to that Convention clearly foresaw the necessity for later adjustments and amendments and made provision for them. Indeed, the first ten amendments to our Constitution went into effect only four years after it was written.

I believe that it was a wise decision, indeed an essential one, that the establishment of the world Organization should be kept entirely separate and apart from the settlements that will follow this war. It has been said that by joining in the world Organization before the peace settlements are made the United States and other members would be committed in advance to maintaining all these settlements in perpetuity whether they are good or bad.

Just the contrary is true. By creating the world Organization first, and separating its functions from the peace settlements, we place it above and apart from these settlements and leave it just as free to deal with threats to the peace of the world that may later arise from these settlements as from any other causes. The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, through their provisions for dealing with any situation that might endanger the peace, provide for the exercise of this responsibility by the world Organization.

For this reason, as well as for others, the rapid approach of the end of the war in Europe, far from making postponement of the San Francisco conference advisable, makes it all the more important that the conference be held on schedule and that its work be completed at the earliest possible moment.

We have ahead of us many other tremendously difficult tasks with which the San Francisco conference will not be concerned. We shall not be able to accomplish these other tasks in a few weeks' or a few months' time. They will take years. We have to deal with the disarmament and control of Germany and Japan, after they have surrendered, with the tasks of repairing the disastrous damage done by the war to the world's economy of assisting the liberated peoples to regain freedom and security, and of reaching the agreements on many other matters, social and economic, that are necessary to lasting peace.

Concern is expressed over the prospects of the San Francisco conference because of the delays that have arisen over establishment of a new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, or because of the questions raised by the Soviet request for separate membership in the Assembly of the world Organization of two of the Soviet Republics, or because of any other of the difficulties with which we are inevitably surrounded as we approach the end of the war.

I can assure you that if we based our course of action on that line of reasoning we would never have a conference, or a world Organization. New problems of this nature will continue to arise. The coming months and years will be, in fact, a continuous challenge to our good sense and our will to master the difficulties of peace.

I hope that all Americans will keep such temporary difficulties as the delay over the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in perspective.

It is important that this new government be established in time to make it possible for Poland to be represented at San Francisco. The United States Government is doing all in its power to bring this about. Poland is a United Nation and should be there.

But I ask you to remember that the agreement made at the Crimea Conference about Poland is only seven weeks old and that it was reached after two years of divergent views among the principal Allies about the Government of Poland. The delay in carrying out the Crimea decision on Poland has been disappointing, but in this perspective it has not been long.

I ask you also to remember that the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and the United States have repeatedly reaffirmed and always agreed in their common determination to see established a strong, independent, and democratic Poland after this war.

Nothing has happened to shake my belief that the Crimea agreement on Poland will be carried out. That agreement, you will recall, provides that the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be formed by reorganizing the provisional government now functioning in Poland "on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad", and that this new government shall be pledged to holding free elections as soon as possible on the basis of

[1] Delivered before the Council on Foreign Relations at New York, N.Y., on Apr. 6, 1945 and broadcast over the network of the Columbia Broadcasting System.

universal suffrage and secret ballot, with all democratic and anti-Nazi parties having the right to take part.[2]

Our participation in that agreement reflects the steadfast determination of the United States Government to respect the legitimate rights of small nations. No nation in the world has shown greater interest than the United States in the independence of small countries and in their right to manage their own affairs. This principle is basic in our dealings with all nations. It is basic in our policy for the peace. It is basic in the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.

The freedom and independence of small nations cannot be maintained, however, unless the large countries unite their power to preserve a peace in which the democratic rights of all nations can be upheld.

The only hope of the small countries, as of the large countries, lies in a world so organized for peace that the industrial and military power of the large nations is used lawfully for the general welfare of all nations. The alternative is a world in anarchy in which lawless power runs riot and small nations are the first to be trampled underfoot.

The large nations, and all the United Nations, are firmly united in the purpose and in the necessity to create a new world organized for peace, because it is to the vital interest of each of them to do so. Let us never forget that this unity of purpose and this community of national interest is paramount to all the lesser differences among us in interests and in history, language, and customs. Because of that paramount unity of purpose and community of interest, these lesser differences can be and will be overcome, as they arise, through the hard and exacting day-to-day work of consultation, negotiation, and adjustment which are the essence of successful cooperation among free peoples.

Eight years ago my great predecessor, Cordell Hull, when speaking before the Council on Foreign Relations, called for "a world organized for peace and advancing civilization, rather than for war and degrading savagery."

Now, after the devastating war which he foresaw, the world has its chance. It has taken the sacrifice of millions of lives, the outpouring of our wealth, and untold destruction and suffering to bring us to this moment.

The San Francisco conference will be a decisive juncture in the history of America and of the world. But we are only at the beginning of the long road to lasting peace.

If we are to complete the journey, surely we will neither fail nor falter now, when we have hardly begun upon it.

American character and America's achievements have been fashioned by high vision and good common sense. With that power of vision to keep the goal we seek always before us, and that common sense to guide us, I know that America will not fail either the world or herself.

[From U.S. Dept. of State Bulletin, July 1, 1945]

STATEMENT BY CORDELL HULL[3]

The San Francisco conference will live in history as one of the great milestones in man's upward climb toward a truly civilized existence. The Charter of the United Nations adopted there provides an essential framework within which the peace-loving nations of the world can work together, more effectively than ever before, toward banishing war and toward providing wider opportunities and greater facilities for human progress.

That Charter draws together and brings to a focus the basic moral and political ideals which must underlie a workable system of organized relations among nations. Through such a system alone can mankind hope in the world of today to achieve peace and security, justice and fair-dealing, cultural and material advancement. It builds on the experience of ages, as well as on the realities of the modern world forged in the ordeal of two World Wars.

The delegations of the 50 nations represented at San Francisco have labored there in the spirit in which they have been fighting the latest and costliest war for human freedom. The Charter which they have produced stems from the great documents that, in the darkest hours of the war, served for humanity as beacon lights of hope and determination—the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration by United Nations, the Moscow Four-Nation Declaration, the Tehran Declaration, the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, the decisions of the Crimea Conference.[4]

The magnificent success of the San Francisco conference attests to the unshakeable resolve of the United Nations to work together in peace—as they have worked together in war—to preserve the ideals for which they have been and are making such tremendous sacrifices, to make the realization of these ideals a living monument to those who have given their lives that these ideals may endure.

We now have, at long last, a Charter of a world organization capable of fulfilling the hopes of mankind. It is a human rather than a perfect instrument. It has within it ample flexibility for growth and development, for dynamic adaptation to changing conditions.

The Charter will work, and grow, and improve, if our Nation and all nations devoted to peace maintain the spirit in which they have created it and remain eternally vigilant in support and defense of the great ideals on which it is founded.

There are many difficulties and complexities ahead of us. We must still bring the present war to a victorious conclusion. We must heal the wounds of the war and repair its ravages. We need build toward new horizons of enduring peace and of an increasing measure of social and economic well-being. In the performance of these vast tasks, our chances of success have been immeasurably strengthened because 50 nations—different in race, language, historic background, and attitude toward life—have found common ground at San Francisco and have agreed on a Charter for the United Nations.

The Charter now goes to the peoples and legislatures of the world for ratification.

Out of long experience—out of what I see ahead—I appeal with all my heart to our Nation and to all United Nations to ratify the Charter and to bring into existence, as soon as possible, the international Organization for which it provides. Upon the success of that Organization depends the fulfillment of humanity's highest aspirations and the very survival of our civilization.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE[5]

We have completed the United Nations Charter. We have just begun to make a United Nations peace. The next step is ratification of the Charter by the United States and a sufficient number of other countries to bring the world Organization into being and set it to work. That cannot come too soon if we are to realize the hope which the San Francisco Charter has given to the world.

The four members of Congress on the American Delegation have already made an inestimable contribution to the Charter by the leading part they played at San Francisco. Now it is the turn of the whole Senate to give force and effect to this work. I hope that the United States, after due consideration by the Senate, may be among the first, if not the first, to ratify the Charter. That would be fitting to the place of leadership our country holds in war and peace.

In Washington the war against Japan may seem far away. At San Francisco it is never possible to forget the magnitude of that struggle which must still be won.

Every day we were at work as delegates in San Francisco upon the Charter, American warships, transports, and planes carrying fighting men left the Golden Gate for the battle-fronts. And every day, by other planes and ships, the wounded came back from Okinawa. There was and is no pause for the men who fight and die. There can be no pause for us at home. The tasks of peace that lie ahead of us are urgent. The stakes could not be higher. Let us get on with all we have to do—to make victory and peace secure.

---

[2] BULLETIN of Feb. 18, 1945, p. 215.

[3] Mr. Hull is Senior Adviser to the United States Delegation.

[4] For texts of these documents, see *Toward the Peace—Documents* (Department of State Publication 2298).

[5] Made on his arrival in Washington from San Francisco after the close of the Conference.

L. CPL. EDWARD F. STARRETT AWARDED NAVY CROSS

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, L. Cpl. Edward F. Starrett, a fine young man from Maryland, was recently awarded the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in the Republic of Vietnam. I wish to honor him by including the following article in the RECORD.

CITATION:

For extraordinary heroism while serving as a Mortar Gunner with Company G, Second Battalion, Fifth Marines, First Marine Division in connection with combat operations against the enemy in the Republic of Vietnam. During the early morning hours of 9 December 1970, while occupying a position in defense of a hamlet in Que Son District of Quang Nam Province, a unit of Marines and Regional Forces soldiers came under ground attack by a large North Vietnamese Army force supported by intense mortar and rocket-propelled grenade fire. During the initial moments of the assault, Lance Corporal Starrett was wounded when an enemy mortar damaged the bunker in which he was located. Although momentarily stunned, he recovered quickly and ran across the fire-swept terrain to his mortar position. As he commenced firing illumination rounds, a grenade landed in the pit he occupied, but he escaped further injury by quickly diving out of the emplacement. Returning to his gun, he found it inoperable and also observed that some of the hostile soldiers had penetrated the defensive perimeter. Observing one of the enemy preparing to hurl a hand grenade at the communications center, he prevented this action with an accurate burst of fire. Lance Corporal Starrett then commenced firing at the advancing enemy soldiers and immediately became a target for enemy grenades. Although wounded again, he continued his vigorous defense of the position, accounting for two more hostile soldiers and preventing further penetration at that point. Later, he stood in full view of the enemy and, seemingly oblivious to the grenades detonating around him, fired round after round into the attacking unit. Sustaining numerous casualties, the enemy was forced to retreat. By his courage, aggressive fighting spirit, and unfaltering devotion to duty in the face of grave personal danger, Lance Corporal Star-

rett was greatly instrumental in repelling a determined enemy force and upheld the highest traditions of the Marine Corps and of the United States Naval Service.

LOWELLVILLE, OHIO, CELEBRATES SENIOR CITIZEN DAY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 17, 1971, I had the privilege of helping the village of Lowellville, Ohio celebrate "Lowellville Senior Citizen Day."

This celebration was a landmark for Lowellville Village, Mahoning County and the State of Ohio, in that all the senior citizens of an entire community were gathered together under one roof. The senior citizens were honored as "the very special residents" of the city, and so they are. Through their dedication and faithfulness, they helped to make Lowellville a great community just as senior citizens throughout our land helped to make America the great Nation it is.

I commend the initiative Lowellville has taken in proclaiming a day for its senior citizens. Communities throughout the country would do well to follow the excellent example set by Lowellville, Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of Lowellville's wonderful senior citizens as well as the community leaders, groups and organizations who made "Lowellville Senior Citizen Day" a most successful and enjoyable occasion.

PROGRAM

National Anthem, Linda Nock.

Invocation, Rev. Henry King, Lowellville Methodist Church.

Introduction of Toastmaster, Donald M. Nolfi.

Toastmaster, Dan W. Donatelli.

Welcome Address, Hon. Joseph J. Rossi, Mayor of Lowellville.

Introduction of Sponsors, Donald M. Nolfi.

Introduction of Senior Citizens, Dan W. Donatelli.

Special Awards, Hon. Joseph J. Rossi, Mayor.

Remarks, Ralph W. Skerratt, Jr., President Falcon Foundry.

Prizes, Councilman William Augustine, Sam Perrotta.

Main Address, Hon. Charles J. Carney, Congressman 19th District.

Benediction, Rev. Wm. J. Witt, Pastor Holy Rosary Church.

Dinner Music, Linda Nock–Anthony Rogers.

Guest Clergy: Rev. Steve Dimoff, Holy Rosary Church; Rev. Alan Pareis, First Presbyterian Church.

Mayor, Joseph J. Rossi.

Clerk-Treasurer, Donald M. Nolfi.

Solicitor, Ralph DelFraino.

Building Inspector, Steve Conti.

Engineer, Ted Dastoli.

Administrator, Nick Dalch.

Police Chief, Ormond J. Donatelli.

Fire Chief, Edward Primavera.

Plumbing & Heating Inspector, Carmen Conti.

Council President, William McCaughtry.

Members of Council, William Augustine, Tom Cadwallader, Anthony Pantana, Sam Perrotta, Nick Tanferno.

Police, Peter Argenziano, Ron Evans, Elmer Greco, Pat Iudiciani, Frank Lellio, James Noufer.

Ray Nero, Sewage Plant Operator.

LOWELLVILLE SENIOR CITIZENS

Arthur Agee, Mary Augustine, Ralph Argenziano, Angiolina Altiero, Catherine Alfano, Marie Brownlee, Louie Bongrazio, Domenic Boano, Donald Boland, Hazel Boland, Warren Book.

Helen Book, Sylvester Burke, Joseph Burke, Mary Brinsko, Clara Burns, Eunice Black, Sydney Burkey, Frank Curry, Maye Curry, Earl Cunningham, Marcia Cunningham, Venanzio Ciccone, Lucy Ciccone.

Mary Coss, Maria Carchedi, Angelo Crocetti, Caroline Crocetti, Carmela Cicuto, Joseph Casillo, Nick DeMarsh, Nick DeLetis, Margaret Drain, Felix DeLullo, Nettie DeLullo, Pasqualine DeLisio, Josephine DeLisio.

Guy DiMarino, Guido DePasquale, Anna DePasquale, Albert Delisio, Mary DePaul, Josephine D'Onofrio, Rachel Durbin, Vincenzo Dastoli, Cosmo DiCioccio, Mary DiCioccio, Sam DeOto, Carmel DeOto.

Kathryn Davies, Achille DiRusso, Leonard Esposito, Evangeline Esposito, Wallace Erskine, Ruth Erskine, Edward Erskine, Mary Eagan, Donato Ellenico, John Frech, Frances Frech.

Joseph Fisher, Nellie Fisher, Julia Flora, Frank Fire, Pauline Fire, Americ Faraglia, Jennie Fanto, Frances Greco, William Giovanello, Sr., Louie Gliemmo, Irene Gliemmo.

Anna Galazia, James Gray, Agnes Gray, Sarah Gray, John Hartman, Naomi Hartman, Agnes Hoffman, Ann Kerr, Olive Hines, Catherine Iudiciani, Paul V. Johnson, Peter Juric, Dorthy Juric.

Mabel Jones, Gertrude Lawrence, Elmer Liggett, Angelo Lucido, Nerina Lucido, Ralph Logozzo, Carmela Logozzo, Louis Leardi, John Lintner, Frank Mangine, Jennie Mangine, Andrew Masters.

Ann Masters, Blair Mills, Joseph Meehan, Irene McCarthy, Joseph Mariotti, Pearl Mentzer, Mike Mongine, Minnie Mongine, Marjorie McBride, Julianna Martin, Leland McBride.

Gertrude McBride, James Mullen, Olive Mullen, Florence McGinnis, Stella Mash, Louise Melillo, Joe Minno, Katherine Minno, John Martin, Freda Milligan, Edmund Merz, Lois Merz, Joe Musolino.

Patsy Melillo, Lucy Notoreschi, Fred Nolfi, Consiglia Nolfi, Mike Nero, Catherine Nero, Connie Nero, Andy Primavera, John Puharich, Joe Polito, Josephine Polito.

John Piskovich, Zoera Piskovich, Ben Pollice, Domenic Perrotta, Ben Polis, Nancy Quinn, Frank Reali, Ersilia Rozzi, Joe Ribarich, Mary Bibarich, James Rotz, Tom Reese, Sr., Florence Reese.

Maxie Reed, Annie Ripple, Domenic Rapone, Julia Rozzi, Vincent Spinosa, Filomena Spinosa, Zora Sontich, Tom Sherrick, Dorothy Smith, Isa Schraum, Ann Sylvester, Sam Simon.

Tillie Simon, Joe Schrader, Julia Schrader, Anna Shevetz, Sam Sorvillo, Wm. B. Sonnenlitter, Carl Schiffert, Gladys Shingledecker, Joe Stephenson, Dorothy Stephenson, James Tanferno.

Anna Tanferno, Concezio Tibero, Adeline Torella, Vincenzio Tamburino, Teresa Tamburino, Gabriel Tamburino, Mike Vuletich, Fred Wild, Pearl Wild, Jenny Wright, Marie Walters, Angelo Zarlengo, Rose Zarlengo.

A SINCERE TRIBUTE

Gathered here today are community leaders and representatives of professional, business, industrial, financial, educational, religious, political and other groups and organizations to pay tribute to the "Lowellville Senior Citizens" who have been faithful and dedicated to their community.

SPONSORS OF LOWELLVILLE SENIOR CITIZEN DAY

Aluminum Color Industries, Arnold Spinoza, President.

Butch & McCree Paving, Eugene Butch, Partner.

Conti Plumbing & Heating, Ralph Conti, President.

Cunningham's, Inc., George E. Cunningham, President.

C. D. Ambrosia, Carmen Ambrosia, President.

DeLullo Electric Company, William DeLullo, President.

Falcon Foundry, Ralph W. Skerratt, Jr., President.

Lowellville Allied Charities, Jean Mehler, Secretary.

Lowellville Savings & Banking, Albert Schreier, Sec'y-Treasurer.

Lowellville Superette, Frank Lucido, Partner.

Mount Carmel Society, Joseph Ferraro, President.

Ohio Water Service, Pierce Bailey, President.

Village Government, Lowellville Village Administration.

SPECIAL AWARDS AND PRIZES DONATED BY

Bessemer-Hillsville Bus Co.
Carchedi's Restaurant
Carbon Limestone
Coppola Painting
Dart Trucking
Debby's Beauty Salon
Kreock's Hardware
Lowellville Lions
Lowellville Drugs
McDonagh Insurance
Melillo's Tavern
Meehan's Fountain
Rex Machine
Saad Construction
Torella's Market

SENIOR CITIZENS HONORED GUESTS

Gus Arp, Minnie Arp, Homer Burns, Helen Burns, Richard Burns, Kenneth Baker, James Chutz.

Olga Crissinger, Mickilna Chutz, Julia DeLullo, Mary Jane Harris, Clingan Jackson, Freda Krall, Laura Lanz.

Kate McFarland, Irwin Gerlach, Mary McBride, Rose Mediate, D. L. Metzger, Ruth Metzger, Berneda Moore.

Ernest Norberg, Jim Polis, Andy Rotunno, Rose Rotunno, Jim Romeo, Mary Smith, Rickie Scholl, Jennie Torella.

BANQUET COMMITTEE

Joseph J. Rossi, Chairman; William Augustine, Co-Chairman; Irma Carchedi, Co-Chairman; Dan W. Donatelli, Co-Chairman; Donald M. Nolfi, Co-Chairman; Sam Perrotta, Co-Chairman.

Angie Balogh, Tom Cadwallader, Carmen Conti, Steve Conti, George Chornock, Nick Dalch, Orman Donatelli, Alfred Donatelli.

Claire Dovich, Joseph Ferraro, Theresa Logozzo, Novella Mamula, Joe Menichini, William McCaughtry, Ray Nero, Irma Nock.

Edward Primavera, Mary Perry, Anthony Pantana, Ernie Rogers, Helen Saad, Betty Shevetz, Nick Tanferno, Elizabeth Tomasino.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the talk I gave to the Lowellville Senior Citizens.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE SENIOR CITIZENS

(By Congressman CHARLES J. CARNEY)

I should like to talk to you today for a few minutes about Social Security. The broad term of Social Security includes such matters as the right to a job; to fair pay; to sufficient food and clothing; to adequate shelter and medical care; and to protection against poverty in old age or due to death or disability of the breadwinner. I will speak in detail about the last situation—the protection which must be afforded our senior citizens and those who suffer hardships due to death or disability of the breadwinner.

I am sure that most, if not all of us here, remember the battle that faced President Franklin D. Roosevelt when the first Social

Security Act was passed in 1935. President Roosevelt pointed out that a sound Social Security Insurance program applied the sound principle of pooling risks to reduce individual hardships; that such a program would insure steady purchasing power and promote full employment because it would help to maintain steady markets for business and agriculture. He talked too about the dignity of the individual—for prior to this time any aid to the senior citizens was make-shift aid coming from inadequate state and private welfare organizations or the family itself. Those who so vigorously opposed this program said it would have a serious effect on individual initiative.—*They called it a dole. Thank God that President Roosevelt had his way!*

Later, when National Health Insurance, or Medicare, was proposed—*again* the opponents spent millions lobbying against it. It was opposed on the grounds that it would be harmful to medical progress and the integrity of the doctors. None of the dire predictions of the opponents have come to pass.

Individual hardships have been reduced, the purchasing power of the senior citizens through Social Security has provided its share of a market for business and agriculture and has stimulated employment. The Medicare portion has not in any instance been harmful to medical progress. It *certainly* has not decreased the income to the medical profession and I can see *no* instance where it has put the doctors under political control.

I feel that the passage of the Social Security Act in 1935 was one of the greatest achievements in the history of our country. Yet from where I sit in Washington, there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that many portions of the Act as it now operates are inadequate and must be changed. It is true that Congress approved a 15% boost in Social Security benefits effective January 1, 1970. And when I became a member of Congress, I voted with the majority of Congress in enacting another 10% increase in 1971. I did so with some misgivings because I felt the increase should have been higher in view of the desperate position those on the fixed income of Social Security were facing because of inflation and the high cost of living.

However, these bills which were restricted solely to an increase in monthly payments, did not reach other major problems facing the senior citizens and others covered by the Social Security Act. *In March 1971* I introduced a Social Security Reform Bill which:

1. Provided an additional 5% across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits.
2. Provided automatic cost of living increases.
3. Increased the amount of money a retired person could earn without losing his Social Security benefits.
4. Extended Medicare coverage to disability recipients regardless of age.

In April 1971 I sponsored another Social Security Bill which:

1. Permitted increased Social Security benefits to a married couple based on the husband and wife's combined earnings; and
2. Entitled widows and widowers to a benefit equal to the amount their deceased spouse would have received if still alive.

I am happy to report that all six of these provisions were in essence incorporated in Chairman Mills' Welfare and Social Security Reform Bill which has passed the House and is now before the Senate. One of my provisions which was *not* incorporated was covering the cost of prescription drugs under Medicare. I shall continue to fight for this benefit.

In the meantime, I have not neglected other segments of Senior Citizens. I have introduced into the House of Representatives a bill which will enable railroad employees to retire at age 55 with 30 years of service and which will protect their annuity increases.

As many of you know, the Homestead Exemption Constitutional Amendment which I sponsored while I was a Senator in the Ohio State Senate was approved by the voters in 1970. I am hopeful that this session of the Ohio State Legislature will pass a bill implementing this Constitutional Amendment.

In conclusion, many people have said to me, "Why are you so *gung-ho* on Social Security and the Senior Citizens?" and I say to them: I will tell you why. Social Security and Medicare are not welfare. They are something the wage earner has earned.

I also say: *These* people have invested their sweat and labor to make this country great. They are leaving a better world for their children and grandchildren. *But most of all,* the most precious thing in life is the *dignity* of man. This our Senior Citizens have a right to—*and* I will fight for it as long as I am able.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert an account of the affair which was printed in the Youngstown Vindicator on Monday, October 18, 1971.

The article follows:

CARNEY URGES MORE REFORMS TO ASSIST SENIOR CITIZENS

LOWELLVILLE.—More rights for senior citizens under reformed Social Security were emphasized by U.S. Rep. Charles J. Carney, principal speaker at Lowellville Senior Citizen Day observance at the Sokol Center Restaurant Sunday afternoon.

"This celebration marks a landmark for Lowellville Village, Mahoning County and the state of Ohio, in that all the senior citizens of an entire community are gathered together," Congressman Carney told some 300 senior citizens, community leaders, representatives of professional, business, industrial, financial, educational, religious groups and organizations.

"Yours is not an isolated generation," Carney continued, "and I believe that under reformed Social Security, senior citizens should have the right to jobs, fair play, food, clothing, medicare, old-age disability and death benefits."

TELLS OF BILL

He added, "I believe that under Social Security reform there should be an automatic escalation clause to take care of cost-of-living increases, with added benefits for widows, It's a sad thing when the breadwinner, who gets 100 per cent benefit, dies and his widow gets only a two-thirds benefit. Such a bill is now before the Senate, having passed the House of Representatives."

Mayor Joseph J. Rossi was general chairman and sponsors were Lowellville businesses and the village administration. Cochairmen were Councilman William Augustine, Irma Carchedi, Dan W. Donatelli, Donald M. Nolfi, clerk-treasurer, and Councilman Sam Perrotta.

AWARDS PRESENTED

Special awards were presented to Sydney Burkey, 91; Consiglia Nolfi, 91, and Marie Walters, 92. The oldest senior citizen award went to Sylvester Burke, 96.

Mrs. Anna Shevetz received an award for the mother with the most living children (10), and the oldest resident award went to Jenny Wright, who has been a citizen of Lowellville for 83 years.

A duplicate prize was awarded to Mr. and Mrs. Gabriel Tamburino, and Mr. and Mrs. Sam DeOte, each married 58 years, as the oldest married couples.

Entertainment was provided by organists Linda Nock and Anthony Rogers; a drum and accordion combo, John DeLucia and Richard Tisone, and a medley of barbershop songs by the Youngstown Barbershop Chorus, Youngstown Chapter, SPEBSQA.

Invocation was led by the Rev. Henry King, pastor of Lowellville United Methodist Church. Benediction was by the Rev. William J. Witt, pastor of Holy Rosary Church, and Dan W. Donatelli was toastmaster.

YMCA AND SALVATION ARMY ENDORSE THE DANIELS YOUTH CAMP SAFETY ACT

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, within the week, the House of Representatives will have the opportunity to pass the Youth Camp Safety Act as part of the Higher Education Act. Since Mr. PEYSER of New York and I introduced this safety legislation to the education bill, it has been my purpose to call attention to the need for comprehensive youth camp safety legislation through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In the October 18 issue of the RECORD, I included the letter of support from the Boy Scouts of America. This national organization recognizes the inadequacy of present regulation and endorses our amendment as the most effective means to achieve national safety standards.

Today, my subcommittee received letters of support from two national philanthropic organizations which, like the Boy Scouts, are concerned about the welfare of young people. The Salvation Army and the YMCA have enthusiastically endorsed the Youth Camp Safety Act. The support of organizations such as the Salvation Army and the YMCA further indicates the need for the proposed legislation.

I would, therefore, urge my colleagues to give serious consideration to the following letter and telegram of support and arrive at the same conclusion:

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS,
New York, N.Y., *October 19, 1971.*

Mr. DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Education and Labor, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN DANIELS: This is to express genuine and enthusiastic support for the intent and substance of the "Youth Camp Safety Act"—Title 19, H.R. Bill 7248—sponsored by Representative Daniels (Democrat) of New Jersey and Representative Peyser (Republican) of New York. The protection of children and youth in the organized camps of America through sound safety standards is indeed important and a genuine concern of the National Board of YMCA's.

The utilization of the expertise of knowledgeable camping leaders to assist the Secretary in an advisory and consultative role regarding the promulgation of camp standards is wise at both the federal level and in the state programs. This is a distinct advantage.

I am deeply impressed with the remedial character of Title 19 as contrasted to a penal approach for seeking safety in camps. It is of particular importance to camping leaders that the law's intent is to upgrade safety practices by encouraging the elimination of safety hazards in consultation with the camp owner and director. The primary focus of this bill on "serious violations" is a genuine asset for effective implementation.

At the same time the application of the "General Duty" clause for each camp owner will strengthen and support the excellent standards and practices developed by the competent and concerned camp owners and directors over many years of very significant service to youth and families.

It is therefore a privilege to support Title 19, the "Youth Camp Safety Act."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES C. KUJAWA,
Director, Camping Services.

THE SALVATION ARMY,
October 19, 1971.

DOMINICK V. DANIELS,
Chairman, Select Subcommittee on Labor, Washington, D.C.

The Salavation Army is vitally concerned with camping legislation and strongly endorses Daniels-Peyser bill, H.R. 7248 without substitution of any other bill.

Mrs. BRIGADIER BARBARA WHEATLEY,
National Camping Consultant.

INTERNATIONAL CREDIT UNION DAY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note the designation of October 21 as International Credit Union Day.

Credit unions have played an important role in the financial security and independence of many Americans. Without them, many people would be unable to find an available source of credit in emergency situations. They have also helped to foster a sense of thrift and savings, thus benefitting the entire economy.

It should not be forgotten that credit unions were born in 1916 to help eliminate the unethical practices of loan sharks preying upon poor but hard-working people. At a time when truth-in-lending was rare, or even nonexistent, credit unions were taking action to improve the position of potential victims of such unethical practices. Nearly 50 years later, the credit unions were working hard to see that trust-in-lending was finally made a national policy.

In addition, America's credit unions have attempted to provide low-cost loans to small businessmen who would have been unable to obtain it through other institutions. Their chief concern has always been to help people, even though they may not always be able to make a profit. Credit unions often must rely on volunteers to serve on boards and committees, and thousands of people have freely given much of their time to further this movement.

For these reasons, I felt that credit unions have dedicated themselves to an important public service, and are, indeed, worthy of a day of national recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every American to join in the observance of International Credit Union Day on October 21.

SURVEY SAYS SCHOOL MORALE IS ERODING

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Steven of the New York Times has prepared an analysis of a recent school study in New York which should be of interest to educators throughout the nation.

I am placing the anlyses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order to give it widest exposure.

The analyses follows:

SURVEY SAYS SCHOOL MORALE IS ERODING

(By William K. Stevens)

Most students in a sampling of 15 New York State high schools, five of them in New York City, have said that their teachers do not respect, understand or help them, according to an independent study sponsored by the so-called Fleischmann Commission on the quality and financing of education.

The study indicates that "many students are finding their school experience painful and that most are finding it unenjoyable," says a report prepared jointly by Community Resources Limited, an independent research concern in Ann Arbor, Mich., and the Human Affairs Research Council, a similar concern in New York City.

Further, the study found teachers are generally unaware of the students' feelings, and seem confused and torn between their own rather progressive educational ideals and the everyday demands made on them to maintain order and control.

As a result, the study report asserts, that is a major breakdown of the traditional teacher-student relationship and a first-order crisis of morale that seriously undermines teaching itself.

This is said to be true even though students and teachers share many of the same basic values and educational ideas and describe each other generally as being "friendly."

STRUCTURES BLAMED

The report argues that the large size, monolithic structure, and authoritarian, hierarchial organizations of the schools are mostly to blame for the situation—that in such an environment, teachers and students are almost bound to feel and behave the way they do.

Among the report's recommendations is a proposal that school units be made much smaller, not exceeding 150 to 200 students. Such units could operate, separately and autonomously, inside present school buildings, the report points out. One New York City high school, Haaren, this year has divided itself into 16 such units.

Such units, the report contends, would allow a sense of community and shared purpose to develop, and teachers and students could know and understand one another in ways that are impossibe in present schools.

The 195-page report entitled "High Schools in Crisis," was submitted a few days ago to the New York State Commission on the Quality Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, headed by Manly Fleischmann, a Buffalo lawyer.

The commission, which is expected to issue its recommendations by December, was named by Governor Rockefeller and the State Board of Regents in 1969.

VIEWED AS "SIGNIFICANT"

Staff members of the commission said yesterday that the 18 members of the commission had not yet read the highschool study report, but that the staff viewed it as "significant" and expected it to be favorably received.

The chief author of the report was Dr. Alan E. Guskin of Community Resources Limited, which is associated informally with the University of Michigan. Over the last few years his organization has developed opinion-survey techniques and questionnaires and used them in other high schools in the country. The survey of the New York schools was made last April and May.

To determine teacher and student attitudes, detailed questionnaires were given to 2,488 students and 749 teachers in the 15 high schools—five in New York City, four in large upstate cities, and the rest in smaller localities. The schools varied in social and ethnic makeup and ranged in enrollment from 1,400 to 5,700. They were not otherwise identified in the study report.

Much of the situation in the schools, says the report, could be traced to their size. Hundreds or thousands of students in a single building require rigid measures of control so that outright chaos may be avoided, the report notes.

The study found that many students believed that the rules were applied unfairly and arbitrarily and wanted a lessening of discipline.

Teachers, on the other hand, were said to have favored more rigid measures of discipline and control, even while they espoused progressive educational ideals.

Further, the report says, "students and teachers do not view each other as individuals but simply as group members" in the impersonal atmosphere of the large high school.

"DON'T ENJOY RELATING"

The survey found that in such an atmosphere, students generally feel "that teachers do not understand their problems, do not help them do their best, do not help them improve their skills and are not concerned with their future."

"Students just do not enjoy relating to their teachers and don't like the experiences they were having in school," the report went on.

Students' views of administrators were found to be similar: "They are not accessible, they are not friendly, and there is great tension between students and administrators."

The questionnaires indicated that black students were acutely conscious of what they perceived as "overt racism" in the schools. For example, more than half the blacks felt they were being excluded from school activities because of race.

Only 11 per cent of the white students thought that was true, and a sizable proportion of white teachers seemed to feel that blacks had taken more than their share of influence. White teachers also commented frequently that blacks exhibited racism against them.

The study report recommends that in schools where there is only a small minority of black teachers and administrators, their numbers be drastically increased.

MOST DISLIKE SCHOOL

More than 66 per cent of all the students surveyed indicated that they did not enjoy school, but only about a quarter said that none of their teachers were friendly.

The study group found general agreement between teachers and students on some major questions of values. Both, for example, put a high priority on self-understanding and working for change in social institutions.

But for the most part, students and teachers did not agree on their perceptions of the school situation. "Teachers seem to be unaware of the negative feelings of their students," the report said. "They seem to be

denying the existence of the students' perceptions."

When asked to assign "positive," "average" or "negative" values to school morale, 52 per cent of students picked "negative," while 64 per cent of teachers picked "positive."

Asked to assign the same values to the "over-all educational process," 52 per cent of the teachers assigned "positive," compared with 28 per cent of the students.

MRS. ROSE OCHOTNY: LEGACY OF SERVICE

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I honor today the memory of a constituent of mine, Mrs. Rose Ochotny, of Upper Dublin Township, Pa., whose all too short life was an inspiration to her family, and to her friends and associates throughout Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Ochotny was only 43 years old when she died. But in those 43 years, she lived in full measure the life of a devoted wife, loving mother, and effective civic leader.

A member of the widely known and respected Pugliese family of Ambler, Mrs. Ochotny was born in that borough and lived her entire life in that area. She married Joseph J. Ochotny, a sergeant in the Upper Dublin Police Department, and was the mother of two sons.

Mrs. Ochotny shared more than the usual family life with her husband. She knew how important and challenging was his job as a policeman and she took an active interest in police affairs.

When she died, she was serving as State president of the Pennsylvania Ladies Auxiliary of the Fraternal Order of Police. That she contributed so significantly to her husband's chosen career through her statewide work was evidenced at her funeral. From all over Pennsylvania came police officers, their wives, and auxiliary members to pay their final respects.

Mrs. Ochotny was a member of the Supplee Memorial Presbyterian Church, Maple Glen; Ladies Auxiliary of Fort Washington Fire Company; Wissahickon Chapter No. 308, Order of Eastern Star; past president, Lodge No. 14, Montgomery County Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary, and national treasurer of Grand Lodge, Fraternal Order of Police Auxiliary.

She leaves her husband, their two sons, her parents, and a brother.

But she leaves also a legacy of concerned and loyal service to her neighbors and her community. Mrs. Ochotny proved again in this Nation of ours that an individual can—and does—make a difference. Despite obstacles that would have deterred the fainthearted, she pursued her family and civic duties with a zest for life and a devotion that we all admire and commend.

In their grief, her family and friends will find solace in this remarkable record of love, honor, and service.

NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH WEEK, 1971

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the week of October 10–16 has been designated as National School Lunch Week to call attention to the achievements of the school lunch and child nutrition programs and the fine example they have set for Federal, State, and local cooperation. This week is also set aside to emphasize recognition of the possibilities and need for continued expansion and improvement in our Government's child nutrition efforts. I have strongly and consistently supported the growth of these programs and it gives me great pleasure to salute them this year.

The national school lunch program has been working to bolster the diets of our children and eliminate hunger from this Nation's classrooms since 1946. Along with programs such as school breakfast and the lesser-known summer and nonschool food service programs, the school lunch program has provided tangible evidence that Congress is fully aware of the direct link between an adequate diet and a child's performance in school and hopes for a full life. Over the years, support for the child nutrition programs pioneered by the National School Lunch Act has grown consistently in Congress, matching the tremendous expansion in participation achieved by the citizens and local school officials who make these programs work in their communities.

Today, over 24 million schoolchildren are reached by the school lunch program. More than 7 million of these children are needy and receive free or reduced-price meals. States and local school districts across the Nation share in the cost of making sure that every child receives a lunch at school. And Congress provides a full measure of support: Over $600 million appropriated for this school year's child nutrition programs.

In Alaska, the work of the school lunch program means that over 34,000 children receive meals and nearly half of those children receive free or reduced-price meals, according to the most recent estimates. This level of support comes from over $500,000 of Federal funds supplemented by State and local contributions.

Unfortunately, this year's tribute to the school lunch program is marred by what threatens to be an end to the continued expansion and improvement of the school lunch and child nutrition programs. Congressional amendments to the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act last year mandated the expansion of the child nutrition programs. These changes committed this country to reaching a goal of assuring that every needy child receives a school lunch, free or at reduced cost, and that every schoolchild has access to a moderately priced meal. Earlier this year, full appropriations, above the administration request, were passed, the school breakfast program was continued, and the summer food programs were assured full support.

But Congress had to assert its commitment to a fully operating school lunch program again this last month when new regulations proposed by the administration sought to lower the Federal contribution toward the price of each meal and substantially reduce the amount of money available for the school breakfast program. On October 6, 1971, the administration accepted the Congressional call not to reduce Federal contributions. At the same time, however, the Department of Agriculture tightened the eligibility standards for free and reduced price meals to needy children and thus eliminated nearly 600,000 children from the program that Congress directed should be expanded.

While the thrust of the school lunch program was diminished by the administration's actions, the House of Representatives on October 18 passed House Joint Resolution 923 which I strongly supported and which attempted to strengthen the program.

House Joint Resolution 923 included provisions of the earlier-passed Senate resolution to assure funds for at least a 40-cent rate of Federal reimbursement per lunch for lunches for needy children. The resolution also added a provision calling for at least a 6-cent rate of Federal reimbursement per lunch for general assistance lunches. In effect this would be 46 cents per lunch for needy children. The entire resolution countered the effect of the tightened eligibility standards announced by the Department of Agriculture. The House resolution is now in conference with the Senate resolution.

I was especially pleased to learn that also on October 18 the Department of Agriculture announced that it was rescinding its order tightening eligibility standards and would provide the reimbursement rates supported in House Joint Resolution 923.

The issue before the Congress is very clear. Thirty-four thousand children in Alaska and 24 million children in other parts of the United States are hungry—Congress has no choice but to act now.

YOUTH APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Congress for the first time has designated November 8–14 as National Youth Appreciation Week. This is a deserving tribute to a program started 15 years ago by Optimist clubs throughout the United States and Canada.

In the past, these clubs of Optimist International which operate in nearly 3,000 communities have conducted their own Youth Appreciation Week observances during the second week in November.

But now Public Law 92–43 bestows na-

tional recognition upon the event. It officially designates the 7-day period as Youth Appreciation Week and requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people to observe the period with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The Optimist clubs, Mr. Speaker, describe the objectives of the week in this fashion: To recognize the accomplishments of youth; to encourage organizations to recognize the accomplishments of youth; to provide opportunities for youth to participate in society; and to encourage a greater interchange of ideas between youth and adults.

It is fitting and proper that the Nation should pause in its deliberations to pay tribute to the constructive contributions which many of our young people have made. In the past local events have recognized young people for taking part in such things as volunteer work in hospitals, acts of heroism, cooperative efforts with police, scouting, tutoring of retarded children, and church work.

I would like to pay tribute to the Optimist International for their efforts in this field over the years and to call upon all citizens to join in giving even more recognition to youth during the week of November 8–14.

SCHOOL LUNCH AND BREAKFAST PROGRAMS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the effort the Congress has made in House Joint Resolution 923 to further the intent of the law calling for free or reduced price lunches for our needy schoolchildren.

It is a simple fact that you cannot learn very much on an empty stomach. And it is a well-known fact that those who learn little in school soon fall behind—in society as well as in school, and usually for the rest of their lives.

Every child sitting in a classroom with a full stomach has at least a fighting chance of becoming a useful productive citizen. Every child sitting on a street corner, hungry, is already taking a dangerous step toward our welfare rolls.

Recent restrictive regulations by the Department of Agriculture served not only to retard the growth of this vital program but also to curtail it cruelly.

After an ensuing uproar a revision of the Agricultural Department regulations for this program put some States, including my own, fairly well in the clear—at least to continue the old program.

But many of our sister States are still left out in the cold. And the purpose of the School Lunch Act, as the bill clearly states, is not to hold the old program static but to see that every child who needs this vital nourishment gets it.

MARGARETTA CHAMBERLIN

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday afternoon, a luncheon was held at the Governor's Mansion in Harrisburg to honor five "Distinguished Daughters of Pennsylvania." One of these was Mrs. William Lawson Chamberlin, the former Margaretta Belin.

I have known Margaretta Chamberlin for many years. She is a most remarkable woman who, with five children of her own to raise, decided that she would have a much larger family than those five, and so has taken a vast number of people in need of help as her own, and has given so much of her life to help them.

The sheer recital of her accomplishments in a bare biographical sketch is stunning to read. She is the first woman elected to head the board of trustees of Keystone Junior College. She is the first woman elected to the vestry of St. Luke's Episcopal Church in Scranton. She is the first woman elected to the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Bethlehem. She is the first woman to speak on the floor of the Diocesan Convention.

She has served as president of Friendship House in Scranton; as president of the Junior League of Scranton; as president of the Waverly Woman's Club; as president of the Alumnae Association of Miss Hall's School; as chairman of the community development committee of the Lackawanna United Fund; as chairman of the education committee of the Scranton Central City Project; as chairman of the planning committee of the board of Keystone Junior College; as a director of the American Red Cross, of the community medical center, of the Scranton State General Hospital, of the Visiting Nurse Association of Scranton and Lackawanna County, of the Museum Association, of the Everhart Museum, of the Waverly Community House, of the Lackawanna United Fund, and of the United Neighborhood Service of Scranton.

It is almost beyond the imagination of any of us to conceive of any single individual holding all these responsible positions. Margaretta Chamberlin has held them all, and has given each distinguished service. And somehow, in the midst of this incredible schedule, Margaretta has managed to find time to be with her own children and grandchildren, and to keep close to her vast host of friends. I am fortunate to be counted as one of them, and doubly fortunate to have her oldest daughter, Margery, as a staff member in my congressional office.

I know I speak for every Member of this House, and in a very special way for every member of the Pennsylvania delegation, in joining the governor in saluting this "Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania."

Last week, I had the privilege of voting for the equal rights amendment for women. I did so with one lingering sense of regret. I could not help but think of such women as Margaretta Chamberlin, and I realized that we men are the ones who need a vote to declare us equal. Women are so often so superior.

I would wish that Margaretta's remarkable parents, Mr. and Mrs. G. d'Andelot Belin of Scranton and Waverly, were still among us to see their own daughter declared now a "Distinguished Daughter of Pennsylvania." They, too, served their community with unselfish hearts. I join Margaretta's husband, Lawson, her other children, Kathleen MacArthur, Bill, Alice, and Ann in the warmest congratulations to a distinguished lady for the recognition which she has received. It is a recognition she richly deserves. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append here the remarks of Governor Shapp on the occasion of the luncheon:

MARGARETTA BELIN CHAMBERLIN

Governor, SHAPP. I present Mrs. William Lawson Chamberlin of Lackawanna County, a citizen with a strong sense of civic responsibility who has devoted her time and energy to volunteer service in the fields of welfare, education and religion. In all her efforts Mrs. Chamberlin's wisdom, imagination and practical vision, added to compassion and concern for mankind, have made of lasting value her many contributions to her community and state.

As Board Member, then President, of Friendship House in Scranton, she was in the vanguard of those finding improved care for emotionally disturbed children. In Scranton's Central City Project, Mrs. Chamberlin's chairmanship of the Education Committee assured Funds, guidance and inspiration to young persons in the black community, spurring them to seek higher education. Her efforts in the United Neighborhood Services helped provide two neighborhood service centers in poverty and minority-group areas. And on the Community Development Committee of the Lackawanna United Fund, which she chaired, she directed the resources of her committee toward an innovative approach to urban problems, providing seed money for "Volunteers in Probation" to guide young people convicted of crimes and keep them out of prison.

During her eight years on the Board of Keystone Junior College, (enrollment 1200 students) Mrs. Chamberlin has served as chairman of the important Planning Committee and on the Executive Committee. She showed such alert and perceptive concern for the intellectual, physical and social welfare of students, faculty and administration that in 1970 she was elected the first woman to serve as chairman of this century-old institution.

Mrs. Chamberlain has other "firsts". She became the first woman elected to the vestry of St. Luke's Episcopal Church, Scranton. She was the first woman elected to the Diocesan Council of the Episcopal Diocese of Bethlehem and the first woman to speak on the floor of the diocesan convention.

It goes without saying that Mrs. Chamberlin has served many other organizations and agencies in her community and state, always rising to a position of leadership and responsibility. She has required of herself that no matter where her efforts be expended, they shall be given with intelligence, with constructive viewpoint, with progressive common sense and with complete dedication.

Mrs. Chamberlin is a woman whose many achievements are matched by a pioneering spirit, by innate humility.

CONGRESS NEEDS ADEQUATE INFORMATION ON ENVIRONMENTAL BILLS

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

MR. FISH. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I joined with my very able colleague from Delaware, Representative PIERRE S. DU PONT, in cosponsoring legislation which aims at improving the judgment-making capacity of Congress when acting on environmental legislation and when setting national environmental policy.

The first measure, H.R. 11288, would amend section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, to require that environmental impact statements be included in Agency reports on legislation having environmental implications. This would assure that, before a congressional committee begins hearings on such legislation, the committee members and staff would be apprised of the environmental issues raised. The second bill, House Resolution 647, would amend the rules of House of Representatives to require the committee reports, accompanying bills favorably acted upon to contain an environmental analysis of its content. Together, these measures would serve to clarify and further define the original intent of NEPA, that Congress should be provided with sufficient background information on any legislation which may affect the quality of our environment.

The need for this additional background information is blatantly demonstrated by our experience under NEPA to date. For example, in the 91st Congress, 4,000 environmentally oriented pieces of legislation were introduced. Yet, only seven impact statements were filed with the congressional committees. Earlier this year, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) and I joined together in an attempt to delay the final congressional decision on the controversial and complex Tocks Island Dam project. The real issue was not whether the dam should or should not be eventually built. Rather, it was whether it was a wise policy for the Congress to be approving construction funds prior to the completion of the environmental evaluation then being conducted by the responsible Federal agency. In February, the Corps of Engineers had filed an impact statement with the Council on Environmental Quality, which CEQ adjudged to be inadequate and unacceptable. The corps was in the process of undertaking a more thorough study of the environmental implications of the Tocks Island project in July, when the Congress was voting on its final approval. While we failed to delay congressional action, this experience convinced me that something must be done to prevent premature congressional action on matters of questionable environmental impact.

This is not to say, certainly, that this legislation will be any panacea. It does not guarantee wise congressional evaluation of environmental issues. Furthermore, it admittedly deals only with one small part of environmental policy formulation. There remain a number of other sections and elements of the NEPA that are still in need of further strengthening and clarification. Also, the existing mechanisms for environmental policy-making and enforcement, remain overlapping and fragmented. But, at the very least, passage of these measures would insure that the Congress will be provided with adequate background information and data, before it acts on legislation with potentially negative environmental consequences. It deserves the full support of the House.

Finally, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT) for his forward-looking and progressive attitude on environmental issues. Very early in his congressional career he has established himself as a concerned environmentalist, and has particularly distinguished himself in the deliberations of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which deals with so many key environmental problems. I am pleased to join with him in this effort.

PRISONERS OF WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, 1964, Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured in South Vietnam, becoming the first American prisoner of war in Southeast Asia. That was 7 years and 210 days ago.

At present, the Defense Department reports that we have 82 American servicemen in North Vietnamese prisons and 487 men listed as missing in action. In all this time, the Communists have released only 24 Americans in South Vietnam and nine in North Vietnam. Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese have flaunted the rules of the Geneva Convention regarding prisoners and have inflicted cruel and inhumane treatment on our servicemen. The families of known prisoners and MIA's have endured many anxious years waiting for word of their loved ones—word that does not come.

In the past few days, one prisoner, S. Sgt. John C. Sexton was released and the South Vietnamese reciprocated by releasing a North Vietnamese officer. Hopefully this may be a breakthrough—a change of attitude by the Communists. However, throughout the past 3 years of the Paris peace talks the Communists have exploited our prisoners at the bargaining table in efforts to make negotiations favorable to themselves.

Although we may differ on what courses of action we should take, we all agree the safety and welfare of these men are of paramount national concern. Let us not despair but all work to bring about a new breakthrough and hope that this will result in the safe return of our prisoners of war and missing in action in Southeast Asia. It is my fervent hope we can see more of these mutual releases.

TROTTERS SHOALS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the board of trustees of the South Carolina Electric Cooperative Association. There is no excuse for any further delay in this great worthwhile development:

RESOLUTION

On September 9, 1971, at a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees of the South Carolina Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., the following Resolution was unanimously adopted:

Whereas, there continues to arise from various sources vexatious opposition to the Trotters Shoals hydro-electric dam and reservoir, resulting in the possible threat of a delay in the prompt achievement of this worthwhile and much needed project, and,

Whereas, existing Federal activities in the usage area of the Trotters Shoals multiple purpose reservoir project now supply less than one-fourth of the requirements of the more than 140 rural electric and municipal and other public distribution systems desirous of obtaining this power source, with the percentage of Federal power to the total requirements being in a state of steady decline, and,

Whereas, a ready market exists for all Trotters Shoals power including that of private power companies who will receive sizable funds for transmitting power to others, and,

Whereas, the recreational and tourist value of this installation will be of pronounced significance in furthering the common good, particularly in view of the unusually low fluctuation of only two or three feet in water level, thus affording a marvelously stable shoreline, and,

Whereas, the creation of an abundant, pure and clean water supply by reason of this installation will insure adequate sources for municipal, rural and industrial use in the area, and,

Whereas, Trotters Shoals will provide a significant increment of increase in the general economy of the area because of new investments and new sources of income and accompanying taxes in all levels of activity within the area, and,

Whereas, the Trotters Shoals project is devoid of the objectionable emissions associated with fossil fuel plants and is without the burden of excessive fossil fuel costs, and,

Whereas, funds have been released by the United States Department of the Treasury for the inauguration of this laudable and greatly needed project,

Now be it resolved that the Board of Trustees of South Carolina Electric Cooperative Association, Inc., urge upon all in authority in all levels of government concerned with this undertaking to move forward firmly and without delay to achieve the completion of this project for the reasons hereinabove enumerated, and,

Be it further resolved that all persons associated with or likely to be the beneficiaries of this installation be asked, by the dissemination of this Resolution by appropriate means, to express, within their spheres of

influence, their desire for such early completion, and,

Be it also further resolved that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to appropriate Federal and State officials and to others, both individual and corporate, who might exert efforts to secure the expedition of the completion of this most worthy power and recreational complex to the end that the benefits so readily discernible will begin their flow at the first practicable moment.

THE NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Harrigan has long been one of my favorite writers.

He is a clear thinker and his writing goes straight to the heart of the issue at hand. His work has always been a great help to me and I feel that he has made a very real contribution to American political thought.

Tony's work in the all-important area of national defense has been particularly astute and valuable. I have done a great deal of research on our defense posture over recent months, and I know the worth of his efforts on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, the Southern States Industrial Council has recently issued Tony Harrigan's latest contribution to our understanding of the problems faced by this country in keeping her defenses strong. This booklet, entitled "The National Security Crisis: America's Deteriorated Defense Posture" is of such vital significance that it should be read by every member of this body. I include "The National Security Crisis," by Anthony Harrigan, in the RECORD at this point:

THE NATIONAL SECURITY CRISIS: AMERICA'S DETERIORATED DEFENSE POSTURE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

In the last decade, the American people have been witnesses to a shocking reduction in their national military power. Whereas in the 1950's the United States was the dominant country in the world, possessed of military might second to none, American strength in the 1960's and early 1970's has ebbed rapidly. The erosion of American's defense forces can be seen in terms of expenditures for defense purposes. The $71.8 billion proposed for defense in Fiscal Year 1971 was $9.8 billion below the Johnson administration budget for Fiscal Year 1970 and constituted the lowest percentage of the gross national product since 1951. In the judgment of U.S. Sen. Barry Goldwater, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the United States is fast on its way toward becoming a second-rate power in the world and "is no longer in a position of parity with the Soviets."

The total significance of the erosion of America's armed might is what thoughtful citizens must seek to understand. Warships, military aircraft and missiles are instrumentalities of national purpose. The history of the U.S. armed forces is the history of the American Republic—an index to the survival instinct and goals of the American people. If the American people are unwilling to provide adequately for their own defense, it is clear that their survival instinct has been impaired.

Historically, the armed forces of the United States have been the shield of the Republic. This has been especially the case in the cold war years. Though it is fashionable now to say that the cold war has ended, realists know strife with the Communist powers has simply entered a new phase. Today the communist states evidence both the capability and intention of new aggressive moves against the capitalist world.

For almost a generation, America's nuclear armaments have deterred the Soviet Union from starting a third world war—a massive strike against the free world nations. The conventional armed forces of the United States have been busily employed in the quarter-century past in fighting limited wars against communist aggression and in checking Soviet and Communist Chinese advances in many parts of the world. In the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, America's nuclear superiority and supremacy at sea prevented the Soviets from establishing domination over the West.

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

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

MISSILE FORCES

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

Today the Soviets possess approximately 1,500 ICBM's, whereas the U.S. has only 1,054.

The giant Soviet SS–9 missiles have a capability far exceeding anything in the U.S. arsenal. All in all, the Soviets have 50 per cent more land-based missiles than the United States.

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

Some recent policy decisions are nothing less than extraordinary. For example, Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, head of Strategic Air Command, told Congress that the United States has purposely passed up the opportunity to make its Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles more accurate. He blamed the situation on those who "fear" that the improved ICBMs might be used as a "first strike weapon."

If the nuclear balance situation is gloomy now, it will be even less cheering in the mid and late 1970's. Consider the situation with respect to missile-firing submarines. No U.S. missile-firing submarines have been built in more than two years. None are definitely scheduled for the future. The only significant change in the U.S. missile submarine force is in installation of advanced missiles in submarines conceived in the 1950's. There are studies of an ULMS (underwater long-range missile) submarine class, but no firm plans for construction. This advanced missile submarine is essential in view of the USSR's lead in land-based missiles.

The Soviets, meanwhile, are expanding their missile submarine force at a rapid rate. Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Operations, told the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers last fall that the Soviet strategic naval forces take the form of the modern "Yankee" class nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines similar to our Polaris boats. They currently have 15 of these submarines in operation and are building 12 a year, a clear indication of their desire to back up their land-based missile systems with a powerful strategic naval force.

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

MANNED BOMBERS

The situation with respect to manned bombers—another factor in strategic deterrence—is equally discouraging. In 1965, the United States had two and one-half times as many bombers as the Soviet Union, consisting of B–52's and B–58's. Today, the American bomber force has been reduced from about 750 to 450. All of the very fast B–58's have been retired from service. The proposed B–1 bomber, designed as a replacement, is receiving only limited development funding.

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

Tactical fighter forces still have an important role in air defense against bombers armed with nuclear weapons. Here again, the United States is at a marked disadvantage. The Soviets have 3,600 jet aircraft. The United States tactical fighter strength is

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

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

NAVAL FORCES

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

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

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

In the four years from June 30, 1968 to June 30, 1972, the U.S. Navy will have retired 463 ships from the active list. During that same period, 141 new ships will have been commissioned, leaving a net reduction of 322 ships—more than one-third of the entire American fleet.

Control of the seas depends on a complex of naval weapons systems: carriers, submarines, destroyers, intelligence-gathering ships, mine sweepers, and service ships. The United States has need of new ships in all of these categories. The current naval shipbuilding program is grossly inadequate to meet accumulated needs of many years. For example, under the fiscal year 1971 defense appropriations bill, only one new nuclear guided missile frigate was approved, only one fast combat support ship, only two general assault ships, and so forth. Great need exists for an entirely new class of fast surface-to-surface missile armed, small destroyers. Anti-defense elements in Congress oppose funds for such vessels. Yet, the Navy's manpower situation will become critical in the mid-1970's and small, heavily armed ships will be more important than at any time in decades.

SOVIET SEA POWER

Throughout the 1960's, U.S. naval forces went largely unchallenged. In the 1970's, there may be numerous direct and indirect challenges. The Soviets have powerful naval forces in the Mediterranean. They have used them in daring and dangerous ways, including collision-course tactics with U.S. warships. Soviet naval vessels frequently operate in the Caribbean. Indeed Sen. Strom Thurmond has asserted that "current intelligence reports also indicate the Soviet have broken their 1962 agreement with the U.S. by deploying nuclear missile launching submarines at Cuban bases." With the installation of a Marxist regime in Chile, it seems only a matter of time before the Soviet Navy has access to the port of Valparaiso. Then the Soviets will be in position to menace the Panama Canal from both the Pacific and Atlantic.

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

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

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

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

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

THE INDIAN OCEAN

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

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

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

While the Soviet Union is engaged in the same kind of naval buildup in the Indian Ocean that it carried out in the Mediterranean, the United States has not made any attempt to provide a counter-force—except for an occasional fleet visit by ships from the 7th Fleet in the Pacific. In the late 1950's Adm. Arleigh Burke, then Chief of Naval Operations, cited the strategic importance of the Indian Ocean. Adm. John McCain, Commander in Chief Pacific, also has stressed the U.S. security interest in the Indian Ocean in many speeches and writings. But the failure to modernize the U.S. Navy has resulted in inaction with respect to that vital global region.

TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

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

To augment U.S. defenses in any meaning-

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

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

ANTIDEFENSE MOOD

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

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

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

For America and its values to survive, it is imperative that Americans arrest the decline in U.S. military strength and acquire the arms essential to defense in the mid and late 1970's and 1980's. The American people can't afford to be outgunned by the enemies of Western civilization and freedom. Certainly, our people don't want to go the way of Carthage in the classical world. But if they want to avoid the fate of Carthage they must reject the counsels of those who are sounding the trumpets of retreat.

If the American people are awake, they will insist that the U.S. armed forces be provided with all the tools of defense—the nuclear navy, missiles and conventional forces—that spell the difference between national life and death.

HELPING THE PUBLIC

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I include for the perusal of the Members of this body a copy of an editorial from the American Medical News, which explains briefly the medicredit plan of the American Medical Association. It is my feeling that this plan has many excellent provisions:

HELPING THE PUBLIC

The American Hospital Assn. has pledged to introduce its Ameriplan proposal to Congress within the next few months. This will bring to nine the number of major legislative proposals for some type of national health insurance now pending before Congress.

While the number of proposals increases, so does Congressional support for the American Medical Association's Medicredit legislation. At present, 151 members of Congress are cosponsoring the AMA measure.

Basically, Medicredit is a three-part program aimed at removing financial barriers to good health care. Its features are:

A comprehensive health insurance policy for the poor and medically indigent paid for by the federal government. It would replace the present Medicaid program.

A program of catastrophic illness insurance designed to keep any family from losing all of its savings and its home because of medical and hospital bills.

A system of government payments to individuals and families for the cost of comprehensive insurance, with payments on a graduated scale based on income of the recipients.

Enactment of Medicredit would be the most effective way to eliminate one of the barriers between people who need care and those who are able to provide it. But this financial barrier is the easiest to overcome, because government can provide tax dollars when private dollars are unavailable. Medicare, to the extent that it has helped older people, has done so in this way. Because of inadequate financing, Medicaid has not done as well.

But the AMA—as well as many others—continues to warn against "over-promise" in health legislation. An accepted technique of proponents of compulsory insurance schemes is to compare America's death rates with other countries who have government-controlled health systems, citing such data as conclusive proof that other systems of health care delivery are superior.

However, the great advances in increasing life expectancy have been achieved by controlling epidemics and plagues and developing immunizations. More limited gains have been made in individual MD-patient encounters, including surgery, control of diabetes, and similar steps. There have been few gains through changing the role of the physician in regard to "well" patients who breathe polluted air, smoke cigarets, eat inadequate diets, and live in sub-standard housing.

While the hospital association's Ameriplan proposal disagrees markedly with the principles of Medicredit, AHA's leaders have demonstrated an acute awareness of the complexity of the problem. The words of Earl Perloff, who headed the committee that drafted Ameriplan, deserve careful consideration:

"We need to improve for those living in (inner cities) their economic status, their education, their housing, their sanitation, their nutrition. We just cannot continue to ignore the problems of such a large segment of our citizens and hope that the problem will just go away. It won't. It will only get worse—and not only for them but for all of us."

As the Nation debates the various national health insurance proposals, both Medicredit and Ameriplan are bound to receive considerable attention. It must not be forgotten by those in the health field, legislators, and the public that none of the legislative measures would have any effect on the way people live. Without major steps to improve the quality of life for many Americans, no system of financing or delivering care can promise to produce dramatic gains in the nation's health.

UAW LEADS FIGHT FOR HEALTH SECURITY BILL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this country faces a severe and potentially debilitating health care crisis, and yet the gravity of our problem seems to have gotten lost somewhere in the shuffle of bureaucratic machinery and political logrolling. But the signs remain clear and the evidence is overwhelming that most Americans are not so healthy as they were 20 years ago. Take for example these figures. In fiscal year 1970, we spent nearly $70 billion on health—more than any other national group—and yet 16 developed nations outrank us in infant mortality rates, nine surpass us in deaths linked to pregnancy and childbirth, and 24 can expect their male population to live longer than men in the world's richest Nation. These are certainly not, to say the least, achievements we can rank among our finest.

Perhaps the most telling confirmation of our deteriorating medical care system was a statement which President Richard Milhous Nixon was forced to make 2 years ago in which he called public and official attention to a massive

health care crisis which if not forcefully met within 2 years on the administrative and legislative levels would result in an overall breakdown of the system. According to this timetable, our entire health care system should have collapsed by now. As the Columbia Broadcasting System admonished in a recent documentary, if anyone should have the unlikely intention of seeking hospital care, then "Don't get sick in America."

Despite this 2-year-old indictment from official America, the late Walter Reuther gave serious and penetrating consideration to these same problems more than 10 years ago. Mr. Reuther, recognizing the hazardous direction in which we were heading, set about exploring various possibilities for a comprehensive health care program. His approach to health care was very much an American one, resting strongly on the belief that imitating other nations' health plans designed and instituted to meet their individual needs would not necessarily produce the best health care for our needs. Basic to his philosophy were the then relatively new twin concepts of group medical practice and preventive medical services. His objectives were to sustain the public health by anticipating medical problems which might develop, thereby keeping patients out of the hospitals as much as possible. Largely through Mr. Reuther's own initiative and the sponsorship of the UAW, practical reality was given these ideas through the birth of the Community Health Association—(CHA)—in Detroit. It was a straightforward approach to health care in which group members were obligated to pay a fixed fee for complete medical services. Since CHA hospital facilities were used by the participating physicians and medical support personnel as well as the working man and his family, members received a maximum medical return on their investment. The results were predictable—preventive medical treatment resulted in better health, less hospitalization, and lower costs for all.

The success of our Community Health Association generated the impetus necessary for Mr. Reuther to form in 1968 the Committee of One Hundred for the study of national health insurance. In outlining his expectations at the committee's founding, Reuther observed:

> I do not propose that we borrow a national health insurance system from any other nation. No nation has a system that will meet the peculiar needs of America. I am confident that we have in America the ingenuity and the social inventiveness needed to create a system of national health insurance that will be uniquely American—one that will harmonize and make compatible the best features of the present system. With maximum freedom of choice, within the economic framework and social structure of a national health insurance system.

He was, furthermore, convinced that financial reimbursement devices such as medicare and medicaid, or the extension of private health insurance, would not alone resolve the crisis of disorganization and prohibitive costs of America's health care. In fact, the more he explored this issue, the more convinced he became that somehow Congress had to initiate bold, new reforms to meet the health needs of its constituency. It had literally become a matter of "Do or die."

From these long and taxing deliberations of Reuther's Committee of One Hundred came the first dim outline of the program embodied in the national health security bill—H.R. 22—currently under examination in both the Senate and the House of Representatives. The concepts of group practice and preventive medicine contained in the legislation are direct outgrowths of Detroit's Community Health Association experiment. As was true of the Detroit experiment, the programs outlined in H.R. 22 emphasize the maintenance of health as well as the treatment of illness. Other measures in the bill would restrain mounting costs by increasing the use of health services and by implementing new professional and financial controls.

The UAW's involvement with comprehensive health programs has not stopped at the water's edge. It has embraced the health security bill as its primary legislative goal for 1971 and has launched a strategy geared to recruit millions of working people and numerous organizations in its battle to get H.R. 22 passed. Crucial to this effort has been the Reuther Family Study Center in Onaway, Mich. Often called the UAW think tank, the center has been used to analyze a broad spectrum of social problems varying from home economics to problems of collective bargaining, psychology, arbitration, and welfare.

Mr. Marcellius Ivory, director of Region 1A and one of labor's innovative problem-solvers, recently initiated a weekend conference hosted by the center on national health legislation. Over 300 leaders of the UAW and their wives participated. Their objective was to lay the groundwork for the UAW's political strategy to get H.R. 22 passed. Workshops and group discussions were held in a dynamic effort to give practical reality to their ideas. Emphasis was placed on thoroughly understanding the many aspects of the health care system and the legislative field on which the final battle would be fought.

Largely responsible for the success of the conference was the stimulus and imagination of the excellent keynote speakers who drew from their invaluable experience to get things going. Speakers included Mr. Jack Biedler from the UAW Washington office who was complemented by National CAP Director James Watts, and Lee Romano, educational director of Region 1A. Participants also heard from some of those more experienced in the struggle for justice for working men and women. Among these veterans were Mr. Walter Dorosh, president of Local 660—the world's largest local union; Vice President Robert Battle, head of the Trade Union Leadership Council; Mr. Harold Julian, legislative coordinator for Michigan; and Mr. John Luster, political action coordinator for Michigan's First and 13th Congressional Districts.

At conference end, the participants had planned the steps for achieving their legislative goal—passage of H.R. 22. They agreed to continue workshops in the congressional districts; to set up continuing contacts with Members of Congress, especially with those on the powerful Ways and Means Committee; and to organize a speakers bureau of well-informed members to spark enthusiasm for the bill among social, fraternal, and civic organizations.

The Region 1A conference recognized that all people, workers, the poor, city dwellers, and rural residents alike must be involved in national health care programs. Their strategy consequently seeks to reach out across the country to educate as many citizens as possible in the benefits of H.R. 22.

The UAW position and the activities of the Family Study Center in Onaway are largely responsible for convincing the Nation that a national health care program is imperative. Many members of the health and medical professions have begun to speak out for drastic changes in the attitudes of their colleagues, challenging them to match our superior technology with a health system which will genuinely serve everyone. We can no longer argue against the very fundamental premise that health care for all Americans will never be a reality unless we discard the piecemeal, entrapreneurial approach to health care which has become an unfortunate inviolable American tradition. Usually resistant to any innovations for improving our national health system is the American Medical Association. But that stalwart antagonist has begun to lose its clout for many new doctors are leaving the AMA for the greener pastures of reform and national health, concepts embraced by concerned citizens across the country.

When this bill is passed, and I predict that it will be, much of the credit for bringing about a national comprehensive health plan will go to conferences like the one held at Onaway. Those working men and women, black and white, who participated in the conference will be the unsung political heros who forced their Congress to do what should have been done long ago. Their initiative, their unwavering determination, and their firm belief that ours is a government for the people will in the final analysis help keep Americans healthy regardless of their ability to pay.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 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?

CHIEF JUSTICE OF ALABAMA SUPREME COURT URGES REFORM

HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Howell T. Heflin, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Alabama, addressed a joint luncheon of the American Judicature Society and the National Conference of Bar Presidents recently on the need for improvement in the administration of justice.

Chief Justice Heflin has distinguished himself through the years in his dedication to the highest ideals of the legal profession. He had served the profession with unusual ability as an attorney and as the president of the Alabama Bar Association before his election to the highest judicial office in our State.

He has devoted his considerable intellect and energies toward the improvement of justice, and for that reason his remarks should have the attention of the Members of Congress.

I ask include the text of his speech as a part of my remarks at this point:

THE TIME IS NOW

(By Howell T. Heflin)

Recently I was talking with a group of teen-agers pertaining to the generation gap. One asked me: "What has your generation accomplished?" This question caused me to ponder. I consider the productive years of my generation as beginning about 1935 when I became a teen-ager.

The scientific and inventive accomplishments since 1935 have been so numerous that it is impossible to comprehensibly list them. To consider just a few, we find space travel, computers, television, development of nuclear power, jet airplanes, automatic transmissions, antibiotic drugs and the Salk vaccine.

In the past 36 years, more has been accomplished through scientific and medical endeavors than in all of the generations of mankind beforehand combined.

What is the explanation for the multitude of such accomplishments during our generation? It would be difficult to list comprehensive classifications for such explanation. However, I have categorized in my mind five reasons. These are:

1. Research
2. Continuing education
3. Constant re-examination
4. A cooperative approach
5. Motivation caused by a sense of urgency.

We do not need to be reminded of the importance that research, continuing education and constant re-examination played in bringing these accomplishments into fruition. However, sometimes we fail to realize the essential contribution that a cooperative approach provided. A cooperative approach, coupled with a sense of urgency, called for an all-out effort on the part of interested scientists to work for common goals. The fear of destruction, regardless of whether it arose from competing military might, foreign ideologies, dreadful diseases or business competition, played a major role in creating a sense of urgency which demanded a cooperative effort.

THREE QUESTIONS

When I told this teen-ager what my generation had accomplished, he was impressed, but not for long. These achievements are now commonplace and unfortunately taken for granted. My answer revealed nothing new to him. Then he asked me three other questions:

1. What has your generation accomplished in ending wars and bringing peace on earth?

2. What has your generation done toward persuading neighbors to live by the Golden Rule?

3. What has your generation done to improve our system of justice?

Compelled by candor, I had to answer "very little." I began to think: would the application of the five reasons for scientific advancements aid in finding solutions to the problems of human affairs?

While I have ideas about peace and war and neighbors living together in harmony, I must direct my thoughts at this time toward a consideration of our system of justice.

There can be no doubt that research, continuing education and constant open-minded re-examination will play vital roles in improving the judicial process in the fifty states and in the federal system. Fortunately, over a period of a number of years the basic essential research for the modernization of our judicial system has been conducted by the American Judicature Society on a comprehensive basis; and also by other organizations, such as the Institute of Judicial Administration, the National College of State Trial Judges, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency and the American Bar Association, within their areas of concern. These organizations have carried on an effective educational program, which now must become more intensive and extensive.

MODERNIZING THE JUDICIARY

In March of this year, at Williamsburg, Virginia, President Nixon and Chief Justice Burger challenged the participants of the National Conference on the Judiciary to an all-out effort to reform our judicial systems with particular emphasis on state court systems. A National Center for State Courts, designed to improve the administration of justice in all of the state courts of the nation, received strong endorsements. Plans are under way for ten regional conferences on the judiciary in the near future. As a result of the Williamsburg conference, a blueprint for the modernization of the judicial branches was formulated in the consensus statement of the National Conference. The basic recommendations contained in this blueprint are patterned after the oft-voiced suggestions of the American Judicature Society, gained from its years of research and experience. Every individual interested in improving our system of justice not only should read this "consensus statement" but should thoroughly familiarize himself with each aspect thereof.

Never before in the history of this country has the time been so ripe to win the battle for a vastly improved administration of justice. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration money is available for state court improvement projects. The hour is at hand for a decided cooperative effort on the part of all interested individuals and groups.

Bar associations should be the prime movers to obtain a cooperative effort on the part of all vital and essential groups and individuals at the state and local level. The battle for the modernization of our state courts cannot be won unless bar associations are willing to make an all-out effort to win it. Dedication and diligence of a single bar president for the period of a year are not enough. There must be a continuing effort over a period of many months, perhaps years. Succeeding presidents, bar executives and members of the governing bodies of bar associations must realize the absolute truth of Chief Justice Vanderbilt's statement that judicial reform is not for the short winded. I would add that it is also not for the ill prepared. The bar presidents that are gathered here in New York should dedicate themselves to formulate a plan to bring judicial reform into fruition within their respective states. In some states, the plan of action possibly can be completed within two years; in others, it may take longer. Formulate a two-year plan or a three-year plan or a plan of whatever length is necessary. Such plan should be committed to writing as well as in the hearts and energies of the planners and executioners. Local bar associations, their executives and leaders, must play a vital role in such planning as well as in the execution. Plans may vary from state to state, but there are certain basic features that have proven successful which should be employed within the plans of each state. Let me suggest a few.

First, design your plan to obtain the cooperation and assistance of the governor of your state. In some states this may not be possible, but a group of prestigious judges, lawyers and citizens can at least achieve the neutrality of a governor.

Next, the cooperation and assistance of the legislative leaders of your state, particularly the members of the committees on the judiciary of both houses, are essential. Plans designed to achieve studies by interim permanent legislative groups or commissions can prove to be very fruitful. Never forget that at all times, involvement of legislative leadership is essential.

Endeavor to obtain the cooperation and assistance of the leadership of the judiciary of your state at all levels. While from this group will emerge foes who will resist any change, nevertheless this is the source of your staunchest supporters, when they understand the objectives. Do not neglect the educational process with this group. You will be surprised at the misunderstanding and lack of correct information among this group when new plans are first brought forth.

CITIZENS' SUPPORT NECESSARY

Citizens' support is essential. The citizens' conferences on the administration of justice sponsored by bar associations with the cooperation of the American Judicature Society have been the most successful single vehicle for court modernization in the past. Repeat or follow-up conferences should be planned if your state has already held a citizens' conference. Funds are available through LEAA to assist in connection with such conferences.

A coordinating committee of legislators, citizens, judges and lawyers is essential in order to provide leadership and the necessary follow-through. Such a coordinating group must have available drafting facilities for implementing legislation and constitutional articles to carry out the recommendations of citizens, judges and other groups. Such facilities are an absolute necessity, and early planning should arrange for such.

Obtain the advice and assistance of experts in the very beginning. Such experts are available from the American Judicature Society.

I could go on and make many other suggestions, but no universal and uniform plan will work in every state because it must be tailored to particular needs and different circumstances.

In the event allied efforts are underway to upgrade state governmental machinery, do not overlook the cooperation that can be obtained from such groups. If there is a constitutional revision study in progress in your state, do not miss the opportunity to discuss judicial reforms with such a committee or commission.

Many aspects of our court system involve, directly or indirectly, ethical considerations. Judicial selection, tenure, discipline, removal and salaries involve ethical problems. The removal of politics from the judiciary is a basic ethical goal. A number of states have studied or will be studying ethics in connection with the participants in state gov-

ernment. Do not overlook the opportunity to obtain support from such study groups.

It is essential that a cooperative approach be present on national and regional levels. The National Center for State Courts will be a great innovation in the battle, but success will be difficult unless the private organizations that possess the basic know-how are involved to the fullest. On a national level, the American Judicature Society, the Institute for Judicial Administration, the National College of State Trial Judges and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency have a history of successful accomplishments. The Institute for Court Management is being recognized for its recent contributions. All of these organizations, as well as the American Bar Association, must be involved and play vital cooperative roles in this campaign.

Legislation should be adopted by Congress to provide for a federal income tax deduction for contributions to state court improvement projects. This idea is not new. A temporary provision in 1962 allowed for such deduction for court reform projects and was most helpful in achieving reform in Illinois and other states that year. Such legislation would be a tremendous boost to the cause at this time.

COOPERATION IS SOUGHT

On the national and regional levels, cooperation should be obtained with groups like the Council of State Governments, the Citizens' Conference on State Legislatures, and other such groups. Court improvement programs should be on the agenda of the National Governors' Conference, as well as regional governors' conferences. Similar programs should be on the agenda of national and regional meetings of state legislative leaders. National magazines, as well as leading newspapers in the nation, should be directed to feature articles on improving the administration of justice. Documentaries on methods and ways to improve the system presented by television networks could prove to be most helpful if constructively presented. There is an urgent need for a coordinating group at the national level. Without such a coordinating body many efforts can be wasted or duplicated.

Today there is a sense of urgency about our court system which demands a cooperative approach. The problems of congestion and delay threaten to shatter the pillars of justice. Many complaints are voiced about the administration of criminal justice. The trial of the Chicago Seven and the trial of the "Charles Manson Family," as well as other publicized trials, revealed that there are those who are attempting to make a mockery of our system of criminal justice. Many believe that there are revoluntionaries seeking to destroy the orderly process of justice in order that the foundations of democracy will begin to crumble.

Never before in the history of this country have there been so many young people who refuse to take anything for granted. The youth of this country are extremely inquisitive and often cynical. However, just because our youth question established institutionalized procedures, including the judicial process, does not mean that their eyes and ears are closed to logic and reason. The vast majority of our youth today abhor the tactics of the violent militants of their age group and seek to find, peacefully but logically, solutions for their inquisitiveness. Because their styles, music and approaches are different, elders should not view their outward appearances as being so offensive as to refuse to listen to their thoughts and ideas. The greatness of this country in the past has been in its willingness to respect differences. The basic nature of the judicial process involves an unbiased hearing of differences. However, listening involves bilateral responsibilities. The young, as well as all who question our system which seeks to achieve justice, must consider the consequences and substitutes if our orderly system of trial by court and jury is destroyed.

YOUTH SHOULD BE INCLUDED

The youth of this country must firmly believe in our system of justice if it is to survive. It is essential that the young and those older maintain their lines of communication if this belief is to be solidly implanted among our young. Both the old and the young must listen to each other if established judicial institutions are to be maintained with stability but viable to change and improvement. Not only must we display a willingness to admit weaknesses in our system of justice but we must be observed at all times as sincerely endeavoring to correct its ills.

Our youth, both laity and law oriented, must be involved in this reform movement. Not only will their energy and enthusiasm be highly beneficial in this cause, but their involvement can produce lifetime advocates for constructive, evolutionary improvements rather than revolutionary pilots of pillage.

You have a great opportunity to render service at this time to our judicial system and to our profession. However, the opportunity for service extends beyond our particular fields of interest. By rendering service to our judicial system and our youth you will be strengthening basic American citizenship within your country, community and family.

On the chiseled epitaph of the tombstone of Thomas Jefferson appears the words that he wrote himself and which he gave to his daughter Martha Randolph. Following his death she saw that these words were inscribed:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson. Author of the Declaration of American Independence. Author of the Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom and Father of the University of Virginia.

That is all that appears. Thomas Jefferson was governor of Virginia. He served in the Congress of the United States, as ambassador to France, and as secretary of state. He was elected vice president of this country. A grateful republic twice elected him president of these United States. However, no mention whatsoever of any of these honors appear upon the inscription. His daughter asked him why he had omitted these honors, and he told her that he wanted to be remembered for the service that he had rendered rather than the honors he had achieved.

While none of us can stand in the shoes of Thomas Jefferson and accumulate his record of service and achievement, each of us in our own small way can endeavor to emulate his example of unselfish service to his country, community and family.

The opportunity for service to our system of justice is now. We must strengthen it, striving at all times to improve it. Otherwise, the great American dream of liberty and justice for all will never come true.

A MATTER OF POLICY

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in Tuesday's edition of the Boston Herald Traveler an editorial which I found to be most encouraging. It explained the Herald Traveler's recent decision not to accept advertising for, or to list in its entertainment section, films rated "X" by the Motion Picture Association of America. This decision was in my opinion both a wise and courageous action by the Herald Traveler. For it is only through individual efforts like this one that the American people will be able to stem the tide of obscenity and sex exploitation which has flooded American movie theaters in recent years. This demonstration of self-restraint on the part of the Traveler runs contrary to the attitude of majority of firms associated with the entertainment industries in America today. The newspaper was willing to sacrifice profit in the interest of good taste—a trend that I for one would like to see continued.

I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point for my colleagues' attention:

[From the Boston Herald Traveler, Oct. 8, 1971]

A MATTER OF POLICY

After long and thoughtful deliberation, and upon the recommendation of our professional film critics, the Herald Traveler has decided that it will no longer publish advertisements for X-rated motion pictures, nor will we list such films in our daily theater timetable.

It is our judgment that the vast majority of films rated "X" by the Motion Picture Association of America are purely voyeuristic, sex-ploitation movies which pander to every conceivable perversion. With very rare exceptions—possibly one or two films a year—they have proved, in our opinion, to be without any genuinely redeeming artistic merit or social value; they are crudely and hastily produced to make a fast buck. In short, they are not motion pictures by any reasonable connotation. They belong in the category of stag films.

Since a week ago yesterday, when we ceased accepting advertisements for such films, we have encountered a substantial degree of opposition:

We were accused of retreating from the Herald Traveler's traditional position of opposing censorship. The short answer is that our policy does not and cannot stop anyone from exhibiting or viewing such films, nor does it in any way limit the power of theaters to purchase ads in other publications. However, for the record, the Herald Traveler has never opposed self-discipline; it has opposed state censorship, and it is *lack* of self-restraint that creates the greatest danger of government intervention. Our position in this respect has been and continues to be based, at least in part, on the fact that state censorship is an embarrassment in a democratic society which can effectively discourage the sale of garbage by refusing to buy it. In this instance we are attempting to discipline no one but ourselves. We are, in effect, refusing to buy. While we do not insist that others agree with our conclusions and beliefs, we are necessarily governed by them in the discharge of our duty of public service. We do not doubt that brothels exist in our community, but we would not accept ads for them either. With reference to the films we are discussing, we consider the analogy appropriate.

We were accused of failing to appreciate that producers of the films which we regard as merely antisocial phenomena are, in fact, attempting to portray "realism" or "relevance" and to smash the stultifying barriers of prudery. Surely this is a second-rate 'conoclasm, at best, which breaks down nothing but the doors of boudoirs and bathrooms.

We have been told that the situation will soon improve. When movies of this type first made their appearance in Boston, most of us thought it would be a passing fad;

that audiences would soon be bored. But instead of getting better, the situation has grown considerably worse. A sort of Gresham's Law of the box office has been evident with voyeuristic exhibitions replacing worthwhile, artistic movies in some theaters. Others may not believe, as we do, that this constitutes an evil and vicious influence. However, since we *do* believe that to be the case, we do not feel constrained to aid or abet its growth and development.

We have been accused of endangering the continued existence of the rating system. This is an *in terrorem* argument without apparent substance. We are not motivated by any repugnance for films rated "X"—we are motivated by the fact that the overwhelming majority of the X-rated films are, in our opinion, garbage of the sort we have described. If they were lumped together under a designation other than "X," they would still be, by our view, socially undesirable. It should be noted that our refusal to accept advertising does not in any way limit the authority of our movie critics to comment, in what they deem to be appropriate instances, on any film, whatever its rating. It is argued that it is at least theoretically possible that "the greatest film ever produced" might appear someday under an "X" rating. Experience to date does not heighten the probability of such an occurrence in the proximate future, but we are confident that we could deal with that happy dilemma in the unlikely event it should arise. However, since almost all X-rated films have been, in our opinion, merely vulgar fodder for voyeuristic appetites; since the situation appears to be deteriorating rather than improving; since we cannot undertake to screen every one of them in advance in the hope of discovering a rare exception—we consider our decision to be the only practical course available to us. The Herald Traveler has supported the idea of self-regulation by the motion picture industry through a rating system, and we continue to do so. If the industry believes its rating system is endangered by any newspaper's refusal to urge its readers to attend stag films designed for mass audiences, then it might give some thought to refusing to rate such pictures at all, a policy that might prove in the long run completely efficient in identifying them.

Finally, several commercial arguments have been addressed to us: We have been told that some exhibitors are dependent for profits on X-rated movies, and that as long as people are willing to pay for them no one should complain. An identical plea could be offered to justify virtually any commercial activity, legal or otherwise. A few threats have been made that if the Herald Traveler does not back down on its policy concerning X-rated films, other advertisements will be withdrawn. In fact, we have been told that our amusement advertising will be "wiped out." We doubt that the bulk of theater owners and exhibitors would stoop to such tactics. At all events, we have reached our decision in this matter only after becoming convinced that we could not in conscience do otherwise than we have done. Acts of conscience can prove costly. If such is the case here, we will have to pay the price.

THE TREASURER-DESIGNATE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of confusion and I believe misdirected criticism generated by the recent Immigration Service action at the food plant of the U.S. Treasurer-designate, Mrs. Romana Banuelos of Los Angeles.

Much attention has been focused nationwide on the problem of illegal aliens working in U.S. industries. The lapse in the situation cannot be blamed on employers. They do not have authority to compel proof of citizenship as a condition of employment. They do check social security cards, but as columnist Richard Wilson points out in the column below, they are issued without regard to work permits, citizenship, race, creed or color. The unions, who have been vocal in their demands for a crackdown, see fit to accept illegal aliens as members and collect their dues—in fact, the women working in Mrs. Banuelos' plant were required to become union members after 30 days of service.

Mrs. Banuelos is an outstanding representative of the Latin-American community in America. She has built from scratch a business which provides employment to hundreds of people. She has helped found and build a bank which specialized in providing banking services to the Latin community. Just as the superintendent at West Point was unaware that he was employing 26 illegal aliens, as columnist Wilson points out, Mrs. Banuelos is caught unwittingly in the crossfire which is a result of unclear laws and limitations on the authority of employers in this field. The recent crackdown in New York and on the West Coast indicates that we in Congress have a job to do in clarifying the employment situation regarding aliens. It is significant that while some people are attempting to picture the U.S. economy as being dismal, thousands of aliens from all lands are seeking to come here to work, for they know we have the highest standard of living for U.S. workers anywhere in the world.

It is unfair and inappropriate to single out Mrs. Banuelos for critical remarks—as she is only one among many employers of minority groups who are caught in a bind they did not create. She has the backing of the Spanish-American community, people who know her, and who know the good works she has done for the past 2 decades in advancing the cause of the Spanish-speaking peoples in America.

The Nation's outstanding Latin American and other minority groups are solidly behind Mrs. Banuelos, including the GI Forum of the United States, the League of United Latin American Citizens, the Puerto Rican Forum, the National Latin American Federation, and the Cuban Municipalities in Exile Association.

She is a high-caliber businesswoman, hard-working and dedicated—a credit to her city, to the Spanish-speaking community, and an example of the opportunity that is here in our great Nation for those who want to work to better themselves. We in California are proud of Mrs. Banuelos and pleased that the Nixon administration has nominated her to be our next Treasurer of the United States.

I believe the column by Richard Wilson, which appeared in the October 18 Washington Star, presents a fairer view of the illegal alien situation and points out that the fault lies in the law, not with the employers. Text of the column is as follows:

MRS. BANUELOS, WRONGED FOR SAKE OF POLITICS

Please bear with this for a little. It is about no great affair of state—merely a woman wronged in the political crunch.

The facts:

On Sept. 20 President Nixon announced his intention to nominate as treasurer of the United States a successful food processor and bank board chairman of Latin extraction, Mrs. Romana Banuelos of the Los Angeles area.

On Oct. 6 federal agents descended on one of Mrs. Banuelos' plants, a tortilla factory in Gardena, Calif., and carried off 36 employees, mostly mini-skirted Mexican girls and women, claimed to have entered the country illegally and to have gotten work wrongfully.

Conclusion:

Therefore Mrs. Banuelos had connived to circumvent the immigration laws by exploiting Mexicans who had insinuated themselves across the border. She should not be confirmed by the Senate as treasurer of the United States.

So far so good. The only trouble with the conclusion is that it is totally wrong. Mrs. Banuelos violated no law. Her company violated no law. She was not exploiting Mexicans. She runs a union shop with the girls required to join the union and earn union wages after 30 days employment. She had no legal way of knowing if they were Mexican or American citizens.

How about the fact that Mrs. Banuelos' company had been warned by letter by the Immigration Service and that there had been five previous raids? Wasn't it pretty careless of Mrs. Banuelos, however much she was preoccupied with being the first woman chairman of a bank board in California's history, not to have taken steps to satisfy the Immigration Service?

Here again the facts get in the way of political conclusions. Mrs. Banuelos had no authority in law to do what the Immigration Service asked, and the Immigration Service had no authority in law to demand that she require proof of citizenship or alien registration cards from prospective employes.

According to Manuel Ruiz, Jr., a specialist in international private conflicts of law and a member of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, Mrs. Banuelos' authority was confined solely to examining the Social Security cards of job applicants. Social Security cards are issued without regard to race, color, citizenship, work permits or any other such limitations.

"This (proof of citizenship or alien registration cards) is what we would like to get employers to do," said the U.S. Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Raymond F. Farrell, in an interview.

"But," he continued, "if you ask me if there is a provision in law saying we can do it the answer is no.

"I think this poor woman (Mrs. Banuelos, who has a Latin temperament, won't like that) was victimized. It might just as well have been the superintendent of the military academy at West Point, where we have just found that 26 aliens were wrongly employed. The superintendent didn't know anything about it, and I doubt that Mrs. Banuelos knew anything about it."

If Mrs. Banuelos was victimized, it was by the connivance of the Immigration Service that Farrell heads. The raid on the tortilla factory was a put-up job on a newspaperman's tip intended to be a publicity sensation to pressure "superiors in Washington" into providing funds for a big alien roundup.

This was frankly admitted to the Los Angelos Herald Examiner by an immigration

official, Noel Doran, who also happens to be president of the American Federal Government Employes Union, Local 505, made up exclusively of Immigration Service employes.

"There are 250,000 illegal aliens in Los Angeles and Orange County alone," Doran was quoted as saying. "If we were given the funds and ability to round these aliens up, we would create 250,000 new jobs or take hundreds off welfare rolls, but our hands are tied by our superiors in Washington. We chose her (Mrs. Banuelos') firm because we knew it would generate a lot of publicity."

The publicity was perfect: Pictures of miniskirted women hired by Nixon's nominee for treasurer of the United States being herded by the feds and shipped back to Mexico.

But here are some more facts: Of the 300,000 or more alien Mexicans making out in Southern California, 86,948 were apprehended and shipped back south of the border from July 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971.

It is a huge social problem. The handling of the problem is just about as big a mess as will be found anywhere in government.

High wages in the U.S. is an irresistible magnet drawing in hundreds of thousands of people from foreign lands who aren't fussy about U.S. laws and regulations.

It is a grave injustice to blame employers who have no way of knowing or are restrained by law from finding out if these aliens are entitled to employment.

When Mrs. Banuelos appears before a questioning Senate committee in a week or so, maybe she can give it a liberal education on the magnitude of the problem. If not, perhaps the committee can call on the superintendent at West Point for advice.

RESOLUTION ON THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a resolution today proposing that the White House Conference on Aging be held every 3 years. The first conference, called by President Eisenhower and finally held in 1961, offered a new stimulus to make the aging aware of their needs and the means to achieve their goals. In response to the first conference, legislation was passed and programs were instituted that have assisted the aged during the passed decade. Besides the enactment of medicare and medicaid, the following programs have been instituted since the 1961 conference:

First. An Administration on Aging was established by Congress as a focal point in the Federal Government for older people's interests.

Second. The creation within almost every State of a separate unit on aging.

Third. The development of numerous programs in local communities specifically geared to the aged.

Fourth. More than 50 universities and professional schools now train people to work in the field of aging.

Obviously, there has been progress during the last 10 years and this November 28 the White House Conference on Aging will convene for the second time. Called for by a Presidential proclamation on October 6, 1969, the present conference will be under the direction of John B. Martin, the President's Special Assistant for the Aging. There are nine areas of need for old people where committees are now studying problems and readying proposals for the November conference. Problems being discussed include subjects from income and housing to education and spiritual wellbeing.

Although I believe that the conference will establish positive goals and offer continued hope for the future, I feel this is not enough. I believe that one conference every decade is hardly enough support to offer a group that numbers 26,000,000 Americans and has almost one-fourth of its members classified as poor. These are a very special group of people who are anxious to take an active part in solving their own problems. They responded so enthusiastically to the grassroots meeting of September 1970, that it is estimated that these meetings were attended by nearly 1 million of our senior citizens across the Nation. This shows that the aged are eager for reform and are willing to work for it. Why must they be made to wait 10 years for the chance to make themselves officially heard. More than 70 percent of the present 65 plus age members have joined the group since 1961. This population group is growing at the rate of 900 a day or 330,000 a year. Must these new members wait a decade before they have a chance to take an active part in securing their future? I believe they should not. Therefore, I propose the following resolution for consideration by the Congress:

First. That the White House Conference on Aging meet every 3 years for the purpose of studying problems affecting the aged and proposing solutions to solve these problems.

Second. To form a committee within the framework of the Conference that meets on a continual basis and analyzes, criticizes and keeps up to date the proposals of the main conference.

Third. Funding for the entire proposal will come from Federal sources in an agreed-upon amount.

Fourth. A charter will be drawn up to handle the particulars of the proposal. A committee to write the charter will be chosen and include members of the community of senior citizens as well as others who understand their problems.

With the passage of this resolution it will be possible for senior members of our community to become more active in dealing with their own fate by discussing their pressing needs. It is in this way that they can be best kept in the mainstream of public policy and continue to help in the development of a better society.

PRESIDENT NIXON SHOULD NOMINATE CONGRESSMAN RICHARD H. POFF TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, without any criticism of any of the persons whose names have been mentioned for the two existing vacancies on the U.S. Supreme Court, I feel the President should not accept Congressman RICHARD H. POFF'S voluntary withdrawal from consideration for one of these vacancies.

Although this voluntary act of DICK is typical of this great American and national legislator, nothing has saddened me more personally in my 13 years in the House of Representatives.

There is no finer constitutional lawyer in the Congress than DICK POFF. The endorsements of the Judiciary Committee Chairman, EMANUEL CELLER, and the ranking Republican member of that committee, my distinguished fellow Ohioan, WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH; and of former Democratic Governor, "Pat" Brown of California will so attest.

DICK POFF has served long and well on the Judiciary Committee so that my colleagues, Congressmen CELLER and MCCULLOCH, hardly classified as conservatives, had full and ample opportunity to observe and test DICK'S legal abilities, his character, and his industry and dedicated beliefs in America, even though he at times was in disagreement with them philosophically. Our country emerged from and grew strong out of disagreement; and it is a rarity when the Supreme Court acts with unanimity. Justices Holmes and Brandeis became immortal as dissenters.

Former California Gov. "Pat" Brown is an accepted liberal by tradition, philosophy, and action. In his service as Chairman of the Presidential National Crime Commission, of which DICK POFF was a member, Governor Brown had the opportunity to know and appreciate DICK POFF'S abilities and character; and Governor Brown, we now learn, recommended to President Nixon in 1970 that he nominate DICK POFF to the Supreme Court.

How will the liberals destroy the endorsements and testimony of liberals such as Messrs. CELLER, MCCULLOCH, and Brown if DICK POFF'S nomination is sent to the Senate? These are not mouthy, cliche liberals but distinguished American patriots who have faced into the wind time and time again; and often they, too, have been among the opposition on certain issues. They know the value of dissent in the interest of the future good of our country.

I would remind President Nixon that any oppostion to DICK POFF has neither the strength nor vigor of the opposition to the proposed nomination of Louis D. Brandeis to the Supreme Court by President Woodrow Wilson in 1916; but despite this opposition to Brandeis' nomination, President Wilson sent his name to the Senate, and after sometimes vile, bigoted, unfair hearings, Brandeis was confirmed and served as an Associate Justice 23 years until 1939 when he resigned. And there is unanimous opinion that he was one of the truly great Justices of the Supreme Court. He did not let his former vigorous, aggressive, almost populist and Democrat Party affiliation blind him to his pledged adherence to the Constitution in both his majority and minority opinions on the Court. Neither would DICK POFF. As an aside, more than any other man, it was

Justice Brandeis who defeated the late Democrat President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Court-packing plan, despite Brandeis' personal friendship with President Roosevelt.

And all of us can remember the vigorous opposition to the nomination of Hugo Black to the Supreme Court, but President Roosevelt stuck with the nominee and he became a Justice in 1937 and remained on the Court until his resignation just a few weeks ago and just prior to his death. Justice Black, despite his so-called "Southern" background and former short-time membership in the Ku Klux Klan, emerged as a great Justice and a "strict constructionist" of the Constitution. So will DICK POFF, Mr. Speaker.

Remember the nomination of Felix Frankfurter in 1939. Some of those still in Congress have vivid recollections of the opposition to this nomination. But what was Justice Frankfurter's record on the Court until his retirement in 1962? It was as a "strict constructionist" of the Constitution. He, too, will always be remembered as a great Justice. So will DICK POFF, Mr. Speaker, if his name is sent to the Senate, where he undoubtedly would be confirmed, despite the almost hysterical rantings of the "chosen few" who have placed the mantel about themselves as "experts" on who is and who is not qualified to sit on the Supreme Court. Let the great majority of the American people test the patriotism, the inherent qualifications of an acknowledged Constitutional expert, and legislator, such as our own DICK POFF.

I can remember the loud opposition to the nomination of former Attorney General Tom Clark in 1949, by President Truman. But President Truman was not persuaded against this nomination of a "Southerner" and other criticisms of Clark; and despite his refusal to testify at his nomination hearing, because of his strong Constitutional and other well-taken legal views against his testifying, he was nominated and served as a Justice until 1967. The best proof of his record as a Justice is the continued increasing esteem with which he has been held by lawyers and other judges the world over. He was awarded the American Bar Association Medal, the highest legal award of that distinguished association. He continues to chair various committees of that association in the fields of ethics, court behavior, and administration of justice. For the fourth time since 1916; from Brandeis to Black, to Frankfurter and to Clark, the loud opposition has been proven wrong; as it would be by the service of DICK POFF as Justice of our Supreme Court.

So I respectfully urge President Nixon to nominate DICK POFF as a Justice of the Supreme Court, despite DICK's voluntary withdrawal, Mr. Speaker. There are strong and great allies for this nomination—not only in the U.S. Senate, both Democrat and Republican, but in the House of Representatives and throughout the 50 States of our great country. Mr. CELLER from New York; Mr. MCCULLOCH from Ohio; and Governor Brown from California, are only typical of the kind of national support which will rally around the nomination of this great Congressman.

And, in closing, I say to my long and respected friend, DICK POFF, you owe it to your country, your State, to your colleagues in the House, and, most of all, to your fine family to face into the wind of this unpopular, basically sterile—however vocal—opposition. Let your war record and your splendid record of accomplishment in the House speak for you to the Senate and to our people—and the Senate and people will answer with a resounding affirmation of your nomination.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITIES OPPOSE ENACTMENT OF THE PRAYER AMENDMENT AS INVASION OF FIRST AMENDMENT

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is vital that the Members of the House of Representatives, as well as all people, understand that the proposed prayer amendment is in the language of Archibald Cox, former Solicitor General of the United States and now at the Law School of Harvard University, "a frightening departure from our previous tradition and ideals."

As responsible Representatives we must not be stampeded into using the Constitution as an instrument seeking political favor or disfavor. Again, I urge the Members to study the content of the two letters I enclose—one by Archibald Cox and the other from Herbert Wechsler of Columbia University.

In commenting on the proposed prayer amendment, the eminent constitutional authority Wechsler says:

It is the act of officially calling upon people to offer or participate in prayer that I conceive to be offensive to the First amendment; and that I would expect would be regarded as offensive by religious people no less than by the unbelievers.

The texts of the letters follow:

LAW SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *October 12, 1971.*

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

DEAR MR. CELLER: This is to acknowledge your letter of September 27 requesting my comments upon H.J. Res. 191 to amend the Constitution of the United States with respect of offering of prayer in public buildings.

For Congress to propose this constitutional amendment would, in my opinion, be a frightening departure from our previous tradition and national ideals. I am glad that you oppose it and hope the fight will be successful.

One must first be clear about the objective of the amendment: it is to overrule the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in the school prayer and Bible reading cases. Those decisions hold that any prayer or Bible readings or other religious exercises in the public schools, bearing any form of sponsorship by the school authorities, violates the First Amendment.

The phraseology of H.J. Res. 191 appears to be a disingenuous attempt to obscure the essential point. The real issue is one of official sponsorship, either acknowledged or generated by adherence to past customs with some of the outward forms of sponsorship removed. There are no Supreme Court decisions (to the best of my knowledge) holding that the Constitution does not permit persons lawfully assembled in a public building to engage in prayer when they wish and where there is no form of official sponsorship bringing pressure upon the minority to participate or branding them as "outsiders" if they refrain. Many persons do participate in public prayer in public places, as illustrated by practice in the Senate and House of Representatives. Sometimes litigation has been instituted in an effort to establish the proposition that the mere use of public facilities is enough to make such practices unconstitutional, but there is scant reason to suppose that the Supreme Court would reach that conclusion. The real issue, therefore, is one of authorizing state officials to sanction non-denominational prayer in the public schools under circumstances putting an official imprimatur upon the occasion.

The primary objection to H.J. Res. 191 is that its adoption would open the door to local action by State officials impairing the religious freedom of those children and their parents whose consciences oppose participation.

Perhaps the point will appear most clearly if I put it in personal terms that may also be applicable to some of your colleagues. I was brought up in a religious family as an Episcopalian. The saying of prayer and participating in other religious exercises at the opening of the school day seemed normal and essential. Most of those in the same circle felt the same way, or else they took the exercises as a matter of course without caring one way or the other. Broader experience later in my life brought home to me the depth of the affront the official sponsorship of any such exercises gives to sensitive members of other religions, and to some equally sincere and conscientious skeptics and humanists. While making prayers non-denominational may broaden the number who can participate without offense to their own religious feelings, there are people for whom this is no solution. Deeply religious people are often opposed to watered-down prayer lacking (as they say) any depth of conviction. Many communities include members of religious faiths which could not be brought within any non-denominational prayer unless it were stripped of all significance. With the young (as even with some adults) the pressure to conform or suffer the pain of being branded an "outsider" is not appreciably lessened by making participation "voluntary" in terms of any formal rule

I think it indisputable therefore, that school prayers carrying any official imprimatur invade the religious freedom of individuals and minority groups. And this official imprimatur, carrying pressure to conform, seems unescapably present whenever prayers are held in school.

Once the invasion of the religious freedom of individuals or minority groups is recognized—I do not think it can be denied—it should be unnecessary to argue that the Congress should not recommend a constitutional amendment opening the door to impairment of religious liberty in the United States. That the invasion did occur prior to the Supreme Court's school prayer and Bible reading decisions in the 1960's attests only our earlier lack of preception, or perhaps the human tendency of allowing our practice to fall short of the full measure of our ideals.

A secondary but nonetheless important objection to the proposed amendment is its invitation to endless rounds of emotional litigation. The political euphemisms to which the draftsmen have resorted leave uncertain

the scope of what they propose. Although the intent to modify the interpretation of the First Amendment in the school prayer and Bible reading seems apparent, the language of H.J. Res. 191, standing alone hardly compels that interpretation. The sponsors of the earlier litigation will argue that much more than the right to participate in prayer while lawfully assembled is involved in school prayers because of the element of official sponsorship, and that therefore the new amendment does not apply to such prayers. Probably they would not succeed, but there is no point in using words that invite litigation.

There are many places in which people presently are free to engage in prayer while lawfully gathered on public property. In at least some of these instances the First Amendment already prevents abridgment of that privilege. One naturally asks, therefore, whether it is the purpose of the new amendment to enlarge the existing constitutional right apart from school prayers. If so, by how much? Is the aim to enlarge the right to participate in prayer when on public property or is it to create or enlarge some right to go on public property for the purpose of praying?

What is the meaning of "nondenominational" prayer? A Christian speaking to a Christian of another sect might describe the Lord's Prayer as nondenominational, but the definition would be too narrow to encompass Jews or Buddhists. The problems of interpretation are so obvious (when one focusses upon the term) that no other examples are required.

I hope this letter may be helpful.

With best wishes,

ARCHIBALD COX.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
SCHOOL OF LAW,
New York, N.Y., October 18, 1971.

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

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: I am glad to know from your letter of September 27 that you will oppose *H.J. Res. 191*, the proposed amendment dealing with prayer in public buildings.

There is of course a sense in which the Resolution is entirely meaningless, since nothing in the Constitution would now preclude an individual in a public building from offering a prayer, denominational or nondenominational. The difficulty is that the proposal would undoubtedly be taken to override the Supreme Court decisions dealing with the validity of prescribing a prayer to be offered by those assembled in a public building, as was the case with the Regents' rule in New York and the teachers' action in other cases. It is the act of officially calling upon people to offer or participate in prayer that I conceive to be offensive to the First Amendment; and that I would expect would be regarded as offensive by religious people no less than by the unbelievers.

With high regard, I am

Faithfully,

HERBERT WECHSLER.

PRESBYTERIANS OPPOSE PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the following statement, the major Presbyterian groups in this country are opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment regarding prayer in public buildings:

THE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE U.S.A.

EXCERPT FROM "RELATIONS BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA"

(Adopted by the 175th General Assembly The United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. May 1963)

The General Assembly redeclares its conviction that church and state must be organically separate.

C. In order to implement the principle of organic separation of church and state, the General Assembly adopts the following guidelines for study and action by all the judicatories of our Church:

1. The celebration of religious holidays. Bible reading and prayer in public schools.

Public schools are creations of the whole society operating through civil authority and justify their existence solely in terms of their usefulness to the society. Their role is to nurture the cultural, social, and material advancement of all citizens by a special system of instruction through intellectual and social disciplines and to stimulate a free search for truth within this discipline.

In the fulfillment of this role, public schools should not ignore the personal beliefs in God which are a part of the life of its pupils, but should recognize and respect such beliefs. Public schools should neither be hostile to religious beliefs nor act in any manner which tends to favor one religion or church over another.

In this light the Special Committee on Church and State *recommends* that:

a. Churches recognize the administration of religious training and observance as the domain of church and family.

b. United Presbyterians actively strive to recapture from popular custom the observance of religious holidays in order to restore their deepest religious meaning.

c. Since the association of seasonal activities with religious holidays in the public schools tends to pervert their religious significance, such association be discouraged as foreign to the purpose of the public school.

d. Religious holidays be acknowledged and explained, but never celebrated religiously, by public schools or their administrators when acting in an official capacity.

e. Whenever possible, students of various religious faiths should be allowed sufficient time to permit the celebration of their religious observances away from public school property. However, organized religious groups should avoid jeopardizing the integrity of the public educational process by unreasonable demands for time away from public school for any reason.

f. Religious observances never be held in a public school or introduced into the public school as part of its program. Bible reading in connection with courses in the American heritage, world history, literature, the social sciences, and other academic subjects is completely appropriate to public school instruction. Bible reading and prayers as devotional acts tend toward indoctrination or meaningless ritual and should be omitted for both reasons. Ministers, priests, and rabbis should be free to speak in public schools, provided their speaking does not constitute religious indoctrination or their presence for a part of a religious observance.

ACTION NEEDED NOW TO INCREASE HOME HEATING OIL IMPORTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, my Massachusetts colleague MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON presented testimony to the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs chaired by Senator THOMAS MCINTYRE.

The McIntyre subcommittee is examining the critical petroleum price and supply situation, with particular attention to oil-import quotas and other aspects of government oil policy which adversely affect all U.S. consumers.

Mr. HARRINGTON'S statement is an excellent contribution to understanding this areas, and I insert it in the RECORD for the benefit of all our colleagues.

Mr. HARRINGTON also rightly stresses the urgent need for a prompt decision by the President to extend and expand the No. 2 home-heating oil import program. This decision was promised us months ago, and we cannot tolerate further delay. Each day that passes without a decision reduces the chances of securing adequate supplies at fair prices.

The statement referred to follows:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, SENATE BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, OCT. 20, 1971

I do not intend to make a lengthy statement, because I do not believe it is necessary to go to great length to document the undeniable. And it is undeniable that the oil policy of this nation is in itself one of the important reasons that the cost of living in New England is unacceptably high.

Simply stated, the scheme of import quotas and domestic production restrictions which govern the oil industry in America forces the consumers of this country to pay ransom to a handful of large producers. The people of New England are forced to pay an even higher ransom than those in the rest of the country. And the sole purpose of this unfair, unproductive, regressive system is to enhance the position of the incumbent national administration with a small but wealthy—and therefore politically potent—industry.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I object, as I know you do, and as our colleagues from New England do, to having our constituents pay an exorbitant premium on one of the necessities of life solely to enrich the already swollen campaign chest of the President of the United States.

We are told that the purpose of oil quotas it to preserve our national security by preventing the depletion of our own national oil supply. In two years in Congress I have yet to find anyone who could give me even a plausible outline of an argument that would justify restricting the import of foreign oil on the grounds that it preserves domestic supplies. Clearly, the less foreign produced oil we consume, the more domestic oil we will consume, and how consuming more of a fixed resource results in our having more of that resource and not less is a bit of political arithmetic that I simply cannot understand. Unless domestic oil secretly partakes of some of the qualities that were present in the substances encountered by Alice in Wonderland, the more of it we use, the less of it we will have.

There have been times, Mr. Chairman, when the arguments of the oil industry and their protectors within the Administration have led me to doubt the simple logic of this matter. Even palpable nonsense can sound plausible if it is repeated often enough, and in a persuasive way. But the report of President Nixon's own Committee—his hand-picked blue ribbon, high-level Cabinet Task Force—reassures me. Even this group concluded that drastic revision of the import quota system is in order. Unfortunately, their logic is no match for the politi-

cal strength of the oil industry within the Administration's councils, but those of us not subject to that pressure can take their conclusions as support for our position.

The disregard shown by the incumbent Administration for the needs of the people of New England with regard to oil is being underlined even as you sit here this morning. The announcement of new quotas on Number 2 oil, which we have been promised would be made, is now being delayed, possibly for two more weeks, during which time commitments secured by some New England dealers for reasonably priced oil will expire. The members of the New England delegation hoped to be able to discuss this matter with General Lincoln at our scheduled caucus meeting yesterday. But Gen. Lincoln told us he was too busy with the New Economic Policy to meet with 23 members of the House of Representatives to discuss one of his old economic policies that has been a substantial contributor to the inflation of prices he is now seeking to control.

Mr. Chairman, every one of our New England constituents pays an extra $44.00 per year for heating costs because of this import policy, and its domestic concomitants. The benefit we get for this extraordinary tax is the knowledge that the President of the United States is well-regarded by the oil industry. Frankly, I do not think you have to be an old New England trader to regard that as a very bad bargain.

It must be recognized that the high price of oil products is primarily the result of the unrealistic existing oil import restrictions. The quota system allows the price of domestic crude oil to remain 65 per cent above the price of foreign oil and as a result forces consumers to pay 5 billion more for their oil products than would be the case were there no restrictions.

By 1980 the quota system may cost the consumer more than 8 billion annually. This averages out to about $96 per year for the average family of 4. And that is a nationwide figure.

Persons on the East Coast pay 20 per cent more for fuel oil than on the West Coast. In 1969 the Northeast alone accounted for 1.5 billion of the total consumer cost for fuel. When viewed in terms of per capita costs the disproportion for New Englanders is even more marked—the per capita cost of the oil import restrictions was $44 for the New England consumer, while the average cost to all consumers $24.

Since the establishment of the import quota system in 1959, the changes have been less than modest. No modifications have resulted to reflect any policy changes regarding our national security between the 1950's and the 1970's. No comprehensive, high level study was undertaken until 1969 when President Nixon appointed the blue ribbon Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control. The major finding of the Task Force, that import quotas be lifted, add credence to the proposition that changes are long overdue in an oil economy based on import restrictions and increased costs to the consumer.

As it presently operates the oil system is nothing more than the encouragement of a special, privileged position conferred on the oil industry by the Executive—a privilege which has contributed to making oil the most protected commodity in the United States.

Along with the quota system, ensuring the scarcity of fuel products, the top oil companies perpetuate the status quo by tightening control over the energy assets of the United States.

Diversification of oil companies into coal, natural gas, and uranium production is leading to a monopolization of energy sources by the oil industry and the resultant reduced incentive to develop any energy sources competitive with oil. The consumers are again forced to shoulder the burden of any oil industry misfortunes with nowhere else to turn for relief.

The FPC and FTC must start to regulate the burgeoning energy monopolies. Most recently the 4.7 billion dollar rate increase in Southern Louisiana natural gas production was announced, and there seems to be strong reason to believe that the lack of a conscientous effort on the part of the FPC to regulate the producers led to the increase. The FPC seems to rely on those it is supposed to regulate for regulatory information. The continued lack of enforcement and regulation of the oil industry by the FPC is one of the most obvious examples of the special benefits allowed the oil moguls and the unique power of the industry.

Depletion allowances provide another boondoggle for oil companies.

With depletion allowances, oil companies save 1.3 billion a year in taxes—and this does not take into account the cost to the Government of continuing the allowances. Over the life of the average well, this amounts approximately to a savings of 19 times the original investment. It has been reported that in 1968, e.g., all United States corporations paid 40 percent on the average of their income in taxes while United States oil companies paid only 8 percent. The oil depletion allowance is only one of several tax benefits which enable companies with huge net profits to pay a minimal federal tax.

The import quota, by insulating domestic industry from competition has resulted in domestic industry becoming needlessly sloppy, inefficient, repressive and most importantly, unresponsive to consumer needs. Marginal companies are able to survive which would die under free competition. Inefficient wells continue to produce at a minimum capacity while preventing low cost wells from producing at their most efficient rate. One of the major arguments for dropping import restrictions is that domestic industry will be freed to reorganize on a more efficient basis and enable New England and other sections of the country to purchase both residual and home heating oil at competitive world market prices.

The oil import quota while a major cause for New England's desperate situation is apparently not the only cause.

As the Cabinet Task Force on Oil Import Control also made clear, oil company officials grossly underestimated the demand for residual oil in 1970. This demand cut into the supply of home heating oil to the point that this oil is being used more and more often to blend with or substitute for residual oil.

This is particularly true with the shortage of low-sulphur residual in light of the new low sulphur pollution control requirement now in effect. A program must be developed to insure a substantial increase in domestic production of residual oil. The Interior Department has recently served notice of a proposed change in the import program for residual oil. No quota now exists on residual, and the majors are pressing for regulation changes that will make it easier to reimpose quotas. I have just joined Congressman Silvio Conte and other members of the New England and New York Delegations in writing to the Oil Import Administration of the Department of Interior strongly opposing amendments to the Oil Import Regulations which would make it easier for imports to be imposed. Everything must be done to ensure that these quotas are not reimposed.

The possibility of building a low sulphur residual fuel oil refinery capacity on the East Coast should also be considered as a relief measure to the Northeast and a means of revitalizing residual domestic production.

The effect of the present oil control system on No. 2 or home heating oil is also of particular concern to the Northeast which consumes 2 per cent of the domestic demand for this fuel. The price of this oil production has increased 2½ cents since 1964 to the current retail price of approximately 18 cents per gallon.

The cost of import restrictions is dramatically illustrated when this price is compared with that of heating oil in Montreal, Canada, where there are no import restrictions. In Montreal No. 2 fuel retails at 3 cents less than in New England, even though this oil is landed in Maine and delivered to Montreal by pipeline. With free importation of No. 2 heating oil into the United States, this 3 cent savings would mean a saving to New England alone of $135 million each year, and $1.1 billion nationwide.

The cost to consumers of heating oil reflects the high prices generated by import restrictions for all oil products. The prices of No. 2, however, also manifest the singular effect the control program has had in severely limiting the beneficial effect of competition. It is a recognized characteristic of import restrictions that they have an unequal effect on producers, refiners, or marketers within the industry, and the resulting interference with competitive relations introduces competitive distortions. The oil import control program has enabled major oil companies to squeeze out many independent deepwater terminal operators, to control the availability of heating fuel through the entire production process, and, therefore, to dictate the price of this fuel to Northeastern consumers.

Terminal operators are the link between the refineries and the consuming public, and competition among them has kept the retail price of oil products at a marketable level. With the institution of oil import restrictions in 1959, the major oil companies, who refine almost all domestic oil, have bought up many terminal operators in an attempt to create a vertical monopoly—an attempt which has virtually succeeded due to the workings of the quota system.

Under the existing import program, 40,000 barrels of No. 2 oil are permitted into New England a day. A more realistic ceiling is needed with an increase to at least 100,000 barrels per day. Along with other members of the New England delegation I have contacted Mr. George Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness to urge this and other necessary changes.

In addition the restriction of No. 2 imports to Western Hemisphere sources must be eliminated so that we have freer, better access to cheaper oil. It is particularly necessary to develop competitive pressure on Caribbean oil sources. With a million barrel demand a day for No. 2 oil, terminal operators have had to rely on domestic refineries for an adequate heating oil supply. By opening up European markets, independent terminal operators will be able to buy cheaper products from Europe thereby loosening the grip of major oil companies in the heating oil market which keep prices high.

The shortage of No. 2 heating oil is demonstrated by the many requests for emergency allocations of this fuel made before the Oil Import Appeals Board. But these allocations are too small to have any significant impact in terms of a change in price. Increased allocations of No. 2 fuel imports to independent terminal operators would be a step toward providing an adequate supply of heating oil to consumers and assuring the survival of independents as strong competitors.

The most satisfactory and necessary solution at this time is complete abolition of all import restrictions and the subsequent revival of free competition. Only by decreasing the price of domestic crude oil can we be assured that price decreases in oil products will follow—not only in heating oil but also in gasoline and in raw materials for the petrochemical industry.

The extensive research of the Cabinet Task Force showed that free competition would have relatively little effect on the major fields now supplying the bulk of our production, for such fields will be used up no matter

what is done about imports. More importantly, if import controls were abandoned, pro-rationing would become pointless and 1.2 million barrels per day of existing domestic capacity would come into use.

But the most outstanding result of decontrol would be the boom created in the Northeast, the area most readily accessible to foreign supplies. Rather than exporting United States refinery capacity, decontrol would bring about the construction of Northeastern refineries, due to the ease of shipping crude oil rather than finished products and the superior quality of domestically refined oil. Such growth, with proper environmental safeguards, is urgently needed—the East Coast, which uses 45 per cent of the nation's oil, has only 15 per cent of the nation's refinery capacity, largely a result of the present difficulty in obtaining crude oil.

The need for immediate Congressional and Executive action is clear. Legislation for quota repeal which I co-sponsored early in 1971 is locked in House Ways and Means. The repeal of the Connally "Hot Oil" Act which I also co-sponsored along with many of my other New England colleagues early this session is faring better. The bill would remove federal sanction for state prorating which enables the major oil suppliers to obtain information on oil supplies and know at what level to hold down oil production to keep prices high. Congressman Torbert MacDonald of Massachusetts is considering placing this bill on the hearing agenda for his Subcommittee on Communications and Power.

The resolution of the North East Public Power Association to seek legal action challenging the mandatory import control program and Presidential suspension of the Connally "Hot Oil" Act is welcome action.

I have also introduced a bill which would create a National Defense Petroleum Reserve as a substitute to import quotas. The age-old argument for quotas is the need for a full domestic supply in case of conventional war. My bill would provide a more realistic and viable substitution. It would enable New England to enjoy lower oil prices and more adequate supply while conserving our domestic oil.

This bill would conserve and stockpile our oil while guaranteeing that interruptions in our supply of foreign petroleum do not injure our national security. The bill would provide for federal land to be set aside with enough petroleum-producing capacity to protect the United States against one year continuous interruption of oil imports from all those non-contiguous countries which the President determines to be insecure sources. The bill is both in the interest of national security and an important conservation measure. The legislation would also recognize the need for a national energy policy. Such a policy would provide for a concerted, coordinated effort to insure the conservation and rational use of our energy sources.

The bill is in the House Banking and Currency Committee and while its progress has been slow this year, I intend to push vigorously for its consideration and passage next session.

So much depends upon a responsive attitude from the Administration. It is just such an attitude which has so far been lacking on the oil import question and the particular plight of New England. I certainly support the New England Governors in the suit they are preparing to challenge the mandatory oil import control program and hope that positive action comes in time on the part of the President to save the oil consumer in New England from higher prices and a limited winter oil supply.

The problem we face is a real one. It is a question of whether New England's residents will be able to stay warm this winter. It is more fundamentally a matter of ethics and justice for the New England resident.

It has been estimated that the average fuel prices in Massachusetts were more than 56 percent higher in the fall of 1970 than in the previous year. Do we face this kind of price hike again? A price hike built on artificial conditions, resulting in artificially high prices.

It is unconscionable to maintain a system in the name of national security which is archaic in concept and discriminatory in practice. The oil quota system distributes the costs unevenly on the Northeast, on the consuming public and most particularly on lower income groups who lived on fixed incomes and pay as much for heat and gasoline as other residents.

The President can encourage giant oil producers to increase the output of industrial-use residual oil if the incentive was provided to be competitive. This would result if the President abolished the quota system. Nothing will fully cure New England's fuel problems unless quotas are lifted. This is the first priority and the key to all other relief measures for the ailing consumer.

The President has failed to remedy a desparate situation in New England. Oil prices are higher everywhere in the country but skyrocketing in New England. This fact, accompanied with a fuel shortage, demands immediate Executive action and relief measure in the interest of the country.

The cycle of supply shortages and high prices that have characterized our region will remain year after year unless the existing import system and the inherent inequities are abolished.

I commend Senator McIntyre for undertaking these hearings at this crucial time and for bringing the Subcommittee to Boston last week, the heart of the area most affected by the continuing oil crisis.

THOU SHALT NOT SPEAK DISRESPECTFULLY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the first ruling made by the 7-year-old Rockville Human Relations Commission could have widespread implications if the ruling is appealed and upheld by the courts. The 11-member commission is reported to have approved unanimously an order that a Rockville service station manager take a course in human relations, because he called a woman customer a "nigger."

The station owner was reportedly instructed to keep the manager away from customers until the manager was enrolled in a human relations course offered in the adult education department of the Montgomery public schools.

In addition, the commission ordered the owner and the manager to pay the woman $100 for expenses, inconvenience, and embarrassment.

The authority for such an unprecedented ruling reportedly is derived from Rockville's public accommodations law which gives the commission power to order a "reimbursement fee" to persons discriminated against and to issue orders "as the facts warrant" and "a broad power to shape the remedy of the wrong."

If the use of the word "nigger" is so offensive as to constitute a crime then why should not Dick Gregory, author of the book "Nigger," have to pay reparations to every black in the country.

Should the Genocide Convention be approved by the U.S. Senate and become binding on citizens of the United States, it would be reasonable to expect that a U.S. citizen might be accused of causing serious mental harm to a group and might be tried by an international tribunal for referring to two or more persons as "niggers."

If a person can be punished for discrimination by being required to pay reparations to the party offended and to carry out punitive inflictions as penance for his discriminatory action, then the law should make clear precisely what constitutes the offense of discrimination. This matter should not be left up to the whim of an unelected commission or board. Otherwise, we would have government by men rather than by laws, which is antithetical to our constitutional Republic form of government.

With regard to discrimination in relation to addressing another person, a specific list of labels, titles, epithets, phrases, and names which comprise the crime of discrimination should be designated in writing. Otherwise, how will people know which words and phrases are legal or illegal to use?

Apparently the connotation "nigger" is so offensive and discriminatory as to be deemed illegal. What about "pig" when applied to a police officer? "Kike" as applied to a Jew? "Dago" in reference to an Italian? "Racist" when applied to a Southerner? "Damn Yankee" when said to or about a Northerner? "Negro" when applied to a black? "Red" when applied to a Communist? "Red-neck" when applied to a Mississippian? or "Honkey" when applied to a white? And what about the obscene and vulgar words and expressions so commonplace today which are offensive to fundamentalist Christians and other God-fearing people?

And while a Rockville service station manager is punished at the caprice of an unelected commission, a writer for the Daily Cardinal, student newspaper of the University of Wisconsin, went unpunished for labeling Louisiana State University as a "racist" school and the LSU Athletic Department as also being "racist."

If there were "liberty and justice for all," the Wisconsin sports writer should pay reparations to Louisiana State University and to its athletic department. He should also be required to do some appropriate penance to remedy the wrong, such as attending a 4-weeks' course at Louisiana State University in "freedom of choice and fair play." Or better yet, the Rockville service station manager should be completely exonerated and the human relation commission disestablished.

People discriminate during all of their waking hours. Discrimination is certainly no crime. But if it is going to be so considered, then what constitutes discrimination should be published so people

will know how to choose legally a catalog of forbidden words. Like Communist countries, are we now to have what is free speech under the first amendment?

I insert several pertinent newsclippings at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 19, 1971]

MAN SENT TO SCHOOL FOR RACIAL EPITHET

(By Edward Walsh)

In the first ruling it has made during its seven-year existence, the Rockville human relations commission has ordered a service station manager to take a course in human relations because he called a woman customer a "nigger."

The ruling instructed the station owner to keep the manager away from customers until the manager enrolled in such a course, which is available in the adult education department of the Montgomery County public schools.

The commission also ordered the owner and the manager to pay the woman $100 for expenses, inconvenience and embarrassment, and directed the owner to instruct all his employees on the "proper relations with customers of racial or ethnic minorities."

The commission issued the order Oct. 1 following a public hearing on a complaint by Barbara Ann Williams, 28, a Takoma Park secretary for IBM. Miss Williams charged that she was called a "nigger" by Roger King, 28, manager of a Gulf Oil service station at 1900 Rockville Pike in Rockville.

King acknowledged during the hearing that he had used the term, but said he did so only after Miss Williams had referred to herself as a "black nigger" during an argument over a credit card. Miss Williams denied she used the term.

The order was approved unanimously by the 11-member commission. Robert D. Herzog, executive secretary of the commission, said the case was the first in Rockville to result in a public hearing and issuance of an order. All other complaints have been settled through conciliation, he said.

Herzog said Rockville's public accommodations law gives the commission power to order a "reimbursement fee" to persons who have been discriminated against. He said only the District of Columbia human relations commission has a similar power in the Washington area.

Rockville City Attorney Roger W. Titus said the 1964 public accommodations ordinance, which has never been challenged in court, gives the commission broad power to issue orders "as the facts warrant." It is, he said, "a broad power to shape the remedy to the wrong." Titus said he considered the commission's order in this case "appropriate."

In an interview yesterday, King and the station owner, M. J. Adams, indicated they would comply with the commission's order. King said he has continued to wait on customers during busy periods and has not yet enrolled in a human relations course.

The two men have until Oct. 30 to comply with the order.

"The only thing I know to do is to pay the $100," King said. "If I hire a lawyer to appeal, it would cost me more. I hate to do it, because I don't feel like I discriminated against the lady."

King said he probably will enroll in the four-week human relations course offered in the public schools beginning Oct. 26.

Adams said he is circulating a written statement to his eight employees instructing them to show "equal respect to all customers regardless of race, color or creed." He said he does not know if this will satisfy the commission's order to instruct his employees in proper race relations.

He has not prevented King from waiting on customers, as ordered by the commission, Adams said, because "that's not right, it's just not fair.

"He (King) is trustworthy and had taken care of my business," Adams said. "I've never seen him smoke or drink, and I've rarely heard him cuss."

According to the commission's report, the incident that led to the complaint occurred last May 25 when Miss Williams bought gas at the station during her lunch hour.

Miss Williams testified that she told King she was in a hurry and became upset when he took several minutes to approve her credit card purchase. An argument followed and, according to the testimony, King said, "You bunch of niggers just get out of here. I don't want to wait on your kind." (There was another black woman in the car at the time.)

She followed King into the station office, Miss Williams testified, where King said, "Get out of this station, you black bitch."

King testified that during the argument Miss Williams had said, "You took so long because I'm a black nigger." He said that after she used the term a third time, he replied, "OK, you're a black nigger. Now will you leave."

King and Adams both denied that discrimination was practiced at the station. According to the commission's report, at one point in his testimony, King remarked, "You've got to treat a nigger the same way you do a white person."

Following the incident, Miss Williams applied for a warrant charging King with disorderly conduct. The case was tried in late July, but the charges were dismissed after King apologized in court to the woman. Miss Williams then made the complaint to the human relations commission.

In its ruling, the commission said the incident "apparently was the product of loose management and administration of the station in the area of public accommodations, and the rather loose and indifferent daily use of racial epithets between various employees and customers.

"Had the use of such terms been discouraged or prohibited by the owner of the station, it is unlikely that this incident would have occurred." the ruling said.

If an order of the commission is ignored, it would be turned over to the city attorney for criminal or civil prosecution, according to Herzog.

[From the Daily Reveille, Sept. 28, 1971]

TRY A LITTLE BROTHERHOOD

(By Jim Lestelle)

If the feelings of two sports writers on the staff of the University of Wisconsin student newspaper are indicative of the emotions of those students who attend the Big Ten university, then our generation is divided by the same factionalism that has hounded previous generations.

The Daily Cardinal ran two highly unobjective and factually erroneous sports stories that viciously attacked LSU and its sports department and the southern part of the United States and its way of life. Excerpts from the stories are printed below.

Their purpose in being so unfair and in straining to make observations that support their demented attitudes toward persons who are obviously more than just athletic opponents is a little hard to grasp. One might understand their motives if they had been afraid of what the Tigers might do to their Badger eleven. But they had every reason to be confident in their own team.

Down there in LSU territory, where Abe Lincoln is as big a villain as Lester Maddox is a hero, they think they're pretty good at winning football games with a bunch of crewcut, all-American white boys from down South.

But up here in the North where some liberals pride themselves with their supposedly more humanistic feelings, football fans think the Bayou Bengals are bigoted—and really missing out on something.

Isn't it funny that the LSU Atheltic Director's last name is Maddox? His continuing concern, according to the LSU factbook, is "not only to maintain the fine image of LSU athletics, but to improve that image wherever and whenever possible."

In other words, blacks aren't in style. Might hurt the image anyway.

In a telephone interview with Daily Reveille Sports Editor Charlene Dargay, Jim Cohen, author of one of the stories, said his article, headlined "LSU still fighting Civil War—but winning," was aimed not at LSU but at Southern schools in general. It just happened that LSU was on the schedule," he said, and was therefore the victim.

"LSU is a racist school and the LSU Athletic Department is also racist," he said.

It is interesting to note that Mr. Cohen has never spent any appreciable amount of time in the South (a total of five days in Georgia last summer), did not research his statements and relied on the commonly accepted, but in many circumstances inaccurate, assumption that all Southerners are bigoted.

Fans in the stadium were anything but perfect hosts. The Tigers were not greeted with just the usual catcalls and jeers but with several flavors of wine, water, soda and ice which were poured on them as they walked from buses into the dressing room.

As the team ran onto the playing field, small fights erupted in the stands as students vied for battle positions along the players' gate. They bombarded the team with verbal onslaughts of every imaginable variety while flinging bottles and cups at the Tigers.

One team member commented he had *"never seen so much hate"* at an athletic event.

LSU left for Wisconsin with nothing but good wishes from students but came back with an earful of obscenities. Perhaps a little more brotherhood as students and Americans, not sectionalists, and a lot less hate would have made the trip more rewarding.

[FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, OCT. 16, 1971]

BLACKNESS DISPUTE CHILLS BLACK UNITY

(By Gil Scott)

NEW YORK.—The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) has started a dispute in the family of civil rights organizations over the question of blackness.

It all began with an invitation.

At CORE's recent convention in Harlem, national director Roy Innis called for a meeting with the larger National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the Urban League.

The idea was to define nationalist and integrationist views, and then decide whether those professing the differing ideologies could work together on common goals.

But Mr. Innis went further than just extending an invitation. He characterized the other organizations as descendants of "house Niggers," or slaves who were fathered by whites.

On the other hand, Mr. Innis described nationalists, like himself, as descendants of "field Niggers," whose life was not as advantageous.

A vigorous rejoinder by an NAACP official brought a partial recantation from Mr. Innis, he said he would send a letter of apology to Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, and that the house Nigger connotation was not meant to be derogatory.

In his earlier remarks, by Mr. Innis had said:

"I'm saying that we're both derived from our historical antecedents. Plainly, there were two sets of slaves: the black set and the mixed mulatto set. The mixed set descended from the plantation master. They were given money, education, and opportunities for

leadership. These folks were given a jump on the pure Africanoids and became our leaders."

Mr. Innis says the present leadership of the NAACP and the Urban League represent a "mulatto aristocracy," and, in a recent issue of his black nationalist group's publication, CORE, he sarcastically applauded the Urban League for appointing Vernon Jordan, a dark black man, as successor to the late Whitney M. Young Jr.

"It appears that the Urban League may at last have started to lower the very subtle, but pernicious, caste color line that has existed for decades in the organiaztion," he commented.

It was at first surprising that Mr. Innis brought out the color issue, long a sore point among blacks, who can remember when being light-complexioned was considered a way of getting ahead in white society.

ISSUE CALLED DANGEROUS

"It is a clear and present danger to black unity," Mr. Innis insists. "It is the single factor that mitigates against true and honest black unity."

CORE's position is that the majority of black people have been oppressed by interracial discrimination, and that the present leadership among the larger organizations does not represent that majority.

Either Mr. Innis really didn't know what concern his criticisms would cause, or he was taking a calculated risk to promote CORE's programs and its very existence. His remarks brought a swift reply from John A. Morsell, assistant executive director of the NAACP.

"The way he [Mr. Innis] is attempting in the name of unity to divide Negroes on the basis of skin color is a very serious proposition," Mr. Morsell declares. "You just cannot categorize people's integrity, devotion, and commitment on the basis of their skin. If you do that, you insult the memory of hundreds of Negroes who have sacrificed their well-being, health, and even their lives in behalf of racial justice, and who are all different shades.

"He's trying to repeat the old [Marcus] Garvey business of darkness being sacred and lightness being something else."

GROUPS TRACE ROOTS

Marcus Garvey led a back-to-Africa movement in the early part of this century. Many black nationalist organizations today trace their roots to the Garvey movement, which reportedly attracted hundreds of thousands of members.

Mr. Morsell said he didn't see much need for a meeting with the black nationalists, with whose philosophy the NAACP disagrees. He believes that the CORE leader's remarks were designed to bring attention to that organization.

"The best way to get attention is to attack somebody who is more prominent or in a more powerful position than you," Mr. Morsell says.

The Urban League has not yet replied to CORE.

Mr. Innis says, "I hope men of goodwill will accept an honest apology made for a misinterpretation."

POWER ISSUE STRESSED

CORE, Mr. Innis explained, wants a meeting of the nationalist and integrationist groups to consolidate black political power. Such a meeting was called by the late Mr. Young, but it never took place.

It is CORE's contention that the meeting called for by Mr. Young would have done nothing more than consolidate behind the goals of the Urban League and the NAACP.

CORE believes it is considered a stepchild in the civil-rights family. Resources, says Mr. Innis go to the larger organizations, enabling them to carry out their programs while nationalist aims are ignored.

"Peace will never come to America until nationalist goals can be respected and recognized," he warns. "Integrationist policies have caused more tension and fights between whites and blacks. The white structure would be glad for someone to come along with a solution to the problem."

CORE, under Mr. Innis's leadership, has moved a long way from the organization that once was led by James Farmer and later Floyd B. McKissick. While the organization under Mr. Farmer was integrationist in outlook, Mr. McKissick heralded the idea of black economic, social, and political communities.

TIES TO AFRICA STUDIED

Mr. Innis has attempted to project a black nationalist philosophy which seeks, among other things, to renew ties with Africa. In the past few months, he has traveled widely in Africa and the Soviet Union.

CORE is a tightly knit organization, with intelligent, articulate members. Nobody knows how many members the organization has—that is a well-kept secret. There were more than 2,000 persons at the convention, but it is doubtful that they were all CORE members.

GEORGIA L. McMURRAY SWORN IN AS COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1971, several hundred women and men who have been most closely identified with fighting for child care needs gathered at City Hall in New York City to witness and applaud the installation of Georgia L. McMurray as first commissioner of the agency for child development.

The swearing-in ceremony was the final official act in the creation of the first agency in the country completely dedicated to the interests of preschool children and makes New York City the first government in the Nation to recognize the need for one agency to consolidate and administer programs for pre-school-age children. Also sworn in by Mayor Lindsay as deputy commissioner was Miguel O. Martinez.

The new agency is primarily responsible for and has jurisdiction over Head Start, Group Day Care and Family Day Care programs. At the present time, about 28,000 children are being served. The new agency hopes to double that number in the next fiscal year.

Mrs. McMurray is a woman of great talent, compassion and commitment to child care, and her appointment to head this agency is an excellent one. A social worker by profession, she is a graduate of Temple University in Philadelphia and received her master's degree in social services from Bryn Mawr College.

Since coming to New York in 1962, Mrs. McMurray has been in the forefront of developing programs for pregnant adolescents, young families, preschool age children and homeless youth. Her innovative efforts to provide comprehensive health, education, guidance and family services to pregnant adolescents have become a model for similar programs throughout the country. In 1967, she joined the staff of the Public Education Association where she waged a successful campaign to permit pregnant girls to continue their education within the city school system.

Mrs. McMurray has been director of social services planning and special projects for the human resources administration and, most recently, she served as staff director for the Mayor's Task Force on Early Childhood Development.

She was appointed commissioner-designation of the agency for child development on January 12, 1971, and the agency itself was officially established by mayor executive order on July 1, 1971.

An equally distinguished appointment is that of Miguel O. Martinez as deputy commissioner. He was formerly a regional systems manager for the manpower and career development agency of the Human Resources Administration where he was responsible for maintaining liaison with all sponsor groups providing services to the community.

Before that, he was Project Director for VISTA, coordinating the work of VISTA volunteers in the area of programs for young children, school-age youngsters, adults and senior citizens. He has also been a consultant for the Mayor's Operation Sports Rescue, the Office of Economic Opportunity and Mobilization for Youth.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD the remarks made by Commissioner McMurray and Deputy Commissioner Martinez at the swearing in ceremony:

COMMISSIONER GEORGIA L. McMURRAY

Today is a milestone in my life—one that I shall treasure forever. But more important than what this day means to my life—is what it means to the life of New York City. For, with this swearing-in ceremony, the city adds another shining chapter to its long and honored history as a leader in the field of child care.

The Agency for Child Development was officially established by executive order of the mayor on July 1 of this year. Mayor Lindsay cannot be commended too highly for his sure and decisive action in carrying out the basic recommendation of his Early Childhood Development Task Force. New York City now stands alone as the *first* governmental unit in the United States to have an agency whose sole reason for being is its total commitment to children.

The Task Force, under the inspired leadership of Trude Lash, and with outstanding contributions from such members as Elinor Guggenheimer, Dorothy Pitman Hughes, Dorothy Stoneman, Nancie Stewart, David Billings, Cynthia Farris, Mary Codner, and so many others, testifies to its calibre and its concern.

Over the years, all of the Task Force members have worked in behalf of children—sometimes disagreeing about ways and means, but always agreeing about the overall need to change the face of child care in New York City—particularly child care in the neglected communities of our city. The Task Force report stands as a dynamic symbol of citizen and government partnership. The creation of the agency is a tribute to many people who have long believed that government must play a major part in helping children to become truly human adults.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the family unit can only survive with major governmental support—and this is as true for

the rural areas of our country as it is for our cities.

That support must be forthcoming whether it comes in the form of additional income and social services for the poor or takes shape in a reorganization of community and social living patterns for all.

I came here nine years ago after graduating from Bryn Mawr because I believed that New York City offered a real laboratory for experimentation in social services. Who would have thought that, today, I would be virtually in the center of a real revolution in organized child care—a situation, I might add, that I do not find unappealing—social activist that I am!

Because it is highly urbanized, New York City has long been a birthplace of many innovative social ideas. Perhaps a hundred years ago, citizens like ourselves who were concerned about orphans, or deserted children, or grossly neglected children struggled to identify just what society's role should be to insure adequate care for these children.

Since that time, we've come a long way in providing services for children, who, for a variety of reasons, cannot remain with their own families. Today we are on the verge of moving one step further. And that is to prevent the family breakdown that makes it necessary to take children out of their own homes.

The care of children is a public trust and the single most important contribution that our new agency can make is to develop—in close concert with parents and community—the broadest possible range of developmental services for children. We receive early childhood services—and our agency's role in providing them—as a support to and extension of family life—not as an intervention of Government into family life.

As we expand services to children, we must devise a system that allows for the economic and social integration of children in our centers—and also exposes them to a variety of ethnic and cultural values. We cannot permit the establishment of a two-class child-care system—one for the poor and one for the rich. We must bequeath to our children a society that values human life for its humanity.

Yes, the task force report was called The Children Are Waiting for good reason. It recognized—as do all of us here—that, although we have come a long way there is still a long way to go.

I *know* there are differences of opinion about the right way to go. Some people believe that government should help and not hinder because they see government intervention as a threat to family life.

There are others who, while they grudgingly acknowledge the need for services to the poor, cry out against giving the same services to the middle class—although the middle class may, in fact, be the working poor.

There are some who castigate women—particularly black and Puetro Rican and other minority group women—for their use of public services, never stopping to consider that these same women are least able to get jobs—least able to pay for child care—and least able to depend on other family members for support.

These are the issues that the Agency for Child Development must and will confront. We will develop dialogues among ourselves and we will ask to be heard at every level of government. As an intrinsic part of developing our children, we will develop ourselves and our communities. For we and the children are one and inseparable. Our strength is their strength—and their strength is the strength of our city and of this Nation.

Before I close I want to express by appreciation to so many people who made this day possible.

First, I want to welcome my family and close friends who are here today from Philadelphia to share this happy occasion and, by their presence, make it even more memorable. There are no words to express what I owe to their help and understanding and encouragement and love of loving and dedication to public service.

I want also to pay special tribute to my devoted staff who worked so hard for so long to bring this agency to life.

I want also to thank those staff members of the Department of Social Services and the Community Development Agency and the Department of Health who have given so much of themselves over the past months to maintain programs and expand them while, at the same time, dealing with the innumberable tasks involved in making our agency a reality.

And my special thanks to Mayor Lindsay and Administrator Sugarman for their confidence and their support.

And last, but not least, I want to publicly welcome Miguel Martinez as my deputy commissioner and to introduce to you Elizabeth Vernon, Assistant Commissioner for Program Development; Hannibal Herring, Assistant Commissioner for Management, and Robert K. Davis, Assistant Commissioner for Facilities Development. The variety of our backgrounds are, I believe, a symbol of our overriding goal to work together in behalf of all children.

Thank you.

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MIQUEL O. MARTINEZ

Honorable Mayor Lindsay, Mr. Sugarman, Commissioner McMurray, Distinguished Guests, Fellow Commissioners, Family and Dear Friends.

As you know very well we have been entrusted the rather difficult task of being responsible for the first comprehensive Child Care Agency in this great land. With the incentive, support, and leadership of Mayor Lindsay, and Mr. Sugarman along with the brilliant report of the Mayor's Task Force, The Children are Waiting, it became possible for us to do planning, organization, and actual work in the fields of child care. Through our centers we hope to show parents what constitutes good care. We will expose them to the entire scope of our work so that when the unfortunate occasion of child abuse is seen, it can be recognized and dealt with.

We will try very hard to involve parents in our work with the children and the concept of the family. This kind of understanding and communication unfortunately many times does not exist. We want parents to be a part of the decision making which involves the life of their young ones. History will never forgive us, if we allow this great opportunity to go by. We are dealing with the poor, with the not so poor; and we want to deal a little more with that family which is not poor, according to our Federal Government guidelines and the state government. With the help of this city where the costs of living are so high people making $10,000 and $12,000 can feel, and be just as trapped as the so-called poor.

We are also very committed to something which lately we hear rather often, but that has always been with us and unfortunately we have not taken advantage of. I am talking about bilingualism.

There is no intelligent explanation for this cit ynot being a multilingual metropolis. Through our newly formed bilingual Day Care Center concept there is a chance for exposing little ones to a program where more than one language is spoken, because their neighborhood is composed of that kind of a mixture of people. If we adults through our attitudes encourage it, there's no reason why the youngsters could not learn more than one language. What a beautiful thing it is for children with different backgrounds to speak more than one language. What an experience for little ones to come home and tell us about El Coqui—that little animal that the children were talking about in class. We adults can learn a lot of things from children.

Most of you know me from the field of Education, from VISTA Volunteers, Manpower, Housing, or Operation Sports Rescue; but I always believed that the person's personality and habits are formed as early as in the pre-school age and very little really changes after that. Through our program our children will be 100 percent better equipped to take advantage of school and, if your child has a chance to come home saying Buenos dias, Como esta usted? Bon jour, Comment allez-vous, Bon giorno com va, Bon dia, Como vai, don't look at him in dismay; but instead, say Bien gracias, Tres bien, et vous, Molto bene graccie, Ben orbrigadu, and smile!

Many thanks to the staff, and remember we have a big job to do.

In the words of one of the great Puerto Ricans of the past, Eugenio Maria de Hostos "Of all the tortures I can imagine, none is more terrible than wasting time on words when action is needed."

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BANK PROPOSAL HEARING

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I have contended that the problems of the smaller towns, counties, and communities of our Nation are very much the same as those of the metropolitan areas and major cities. In considering the needs for national development and solutions to population problems, I feel that it is vital to approach them on a basis that recognizes the inseparable nature of the relationship between the metropolitan areas and lesser-populated areas. In the hearing I held on August 30 in Brinkley, Ark., witness after witness confirmed my position.

The catalog of needs for expanding and strengthening the economies of their municipalities and counties include improved health services, transportation systems, solid waste disposal, recreation facilities, law enforcement, water and sewer systems, industrial parks and airports. Because I feel my colleagues are interested in this information, I include in the RECORD at this time testimony presented by Frank Bizzell, executive director of the Association of Arkansas Counties; Mayor Willard Whitaker of Madison; R. E. Wallin, city attorney for West Memphis; and Howard H. Beasley, a banker in Cherry Valley.

The testimony follows:

TESTIMONY OF FRANK BIZZELL

The needs of the counties of Arkansas, as a unit of government, are virtually unending. These needs could be met without difficulty *if* sufficient funds were available. However, I realize that adequate financing of all governmental services is an impossible dream. I shall attempt to list the more serious difficulties that the counties of Arkansas are faced with in our day-to-day operations. In the order of their urgency, the following areas of service present major difficulties in all the counties in our State.

1. *Transportation:* Providing an adequate

system of county roads, whether considering a county that is sparsely populated or one that is highly populated, is the most difficult task facing county government in Arkansas today. A great portion of the work force in Arkansas lives in unincorporated communities and daily travel the county secondary roads to and from their place of employment. These same secondary roads are also the primary farm-to-market roads in the State. Our society today demands, and rightly so, more than the all weather roads that, in the past, have been characteristic of the county road system in the State. Most of the counties of Arkansas are attempting to provide and maintain an ever increasing number of miles of hard surface county roads, in a continuing program.

The cost of constructing paved roads that meet the minimum specifications of the Federal Aid to Secondary Roads Program range from approximately $25,000 per mile up to approximately $45,000 per mile, depending on the section of Arkansas in which a road is being constructed. Even with the Federal Aid to Secondary Roads Program paying one-half the construction cost, the tremendous cost of constructing new roads under this program is virtually prohibitive.

Because of the severe limitations of a county's ability to raise funds for road and bridge construction and maintenance, most counties of Arkansas are unable to utilize this Federal Aid Program.

With each county in Arkansas averaging more than 1,000 miles of roads and bridges to maintain, it is no great revelation that transportation is our number one problem.

2. *Health Services:* Providing health services for the rural population, as well as urban people, is an ever increasing "people problem". The majority of health services that are provided, either wholly or in part, by the county unit of government includes—county hospitals, mental health clinics, nursing homes, ambulance service, and county health officers. Of these, ambulance service is the most immediate pressing problem in most counties. This has been brought about by the abandonment of these services by the funeral homes, which had traditionally provided this service in most counties in the State. The counties have inherited the responsibility of providing this service because it is the only logical unit of government to provide this service in most cases. In some counties the municipalities and the counties cooperate in providing ambulance service.

As an example of the additional expense to county government brought about by providing this much needed service, I am told that Mississippi County is subsidizing a private ambulance contractor by approximately $30,000 per year.

3. *Solid Waste Disposal:* Providing solid waste disposal is another "people problem" that is of extreme urgency. The urgency of the problem is to provide adequate disposal systems in every county in the State so that we will never be faced with the problem experienced in some sections of the nation of the threat of being swallowed up by our own waste by-products.

4. *Law Enforcement:* The problems in law enforcement are many and expensive. It could be said that the needs in the counties' law enforcement agencies is a problem of needing more—more and better communication systems, more enforcement officers, more investigative equipment, more training and education in such areas as drug control, riots and civil disorders, and statutory laws, and more and better detention centers, to identify a few of the problems.

5. *Recreational Facilities:* It is becoming increasingly more important to provide recreational facilities for the people. This is brought about by the increasing amount of leisure time that a majority of the people presently enjoy. The demands for recreation are becoming more complicated as does the technological society in which we live. From the county unit of government standpoint, first priorities in this area are placed on the development of parks. However, the use of leisure time has placed more demands on cultural enrichment facilities, and necessitates enlargement of such things as our county owned libraries, and this entails additional expenditures in this area.

6. *Rural Water and Sewer Systems:* In discussing economic development in rural areas, the problems faced in providing adequate water and sewer systems are much the same as the problems of the urban areas, except for one major difference. That difference being the total lack of any existing facilities.

In the rural counties of Arkansas, particularly in the western section of the State, a great portion of the total growth in population is taking place in totally un-incorporated areas. People are building their homes along the major roads and highways between the towns.

Example: Little River County located in the southwestern part of Arkansas, with Oklahoma on the western boundary and Texas across the Red River to the south. This county has experienced a 21% increase in population, according to the census of 1970. Over 50% of this growth is spread across the county, in un-incorporated areas, along the major roads connecting the towns of Ashdown, Foreman, Winthrop, Alleene and Wilton.

I do not know what the answer is to solving the problems facing County Government, as well as all other local units of government. Except that more money to provide, adequately, the services I have mentioned would bring about economic growth.

It is an unattainable dream for the local units of government to even think that we can keep up, not to mention tool up for, economic growth under our present fiscal condition.

Economic growth means that our tax base will grow, but on the other hand, because of our property assessment laws, we are always a year behind in tax collections. This means that we started a year behind in providing services, simply because we did not have the necessary funds.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BANK PROPOSAL
HEARING, CITY OF MADISON, ARK.

(By Mayor Willard Whitaker)

In response to number one on the fact sheet, I submit the following information as to the needs of Madison, and strongly believe that if they were carried out, that out-migration would slow down tremendously; that Madison, which has ample surrounding area for growth, would grow; that the entire county and people residing in the county would greatly benefit.

1. We are in the process of annexing some of the surrounding area and increasing the city limits of Madison. In order to furnish a water supply to the annexed area we need an estimated $210,000.

2. We need a complete sewer system as we are now emptying into the river. This can be done at an estimated cost of $600,000.

3. We need street improvement, including curbs and gutters which would provide adequate drainage. This could be done at an estimated $175,000.

4. We need business development such as supermarkets and service stations so that local residents will shop in Madison and put more money into the local economy. We can make a strong start toward this with an estimated $500,000.

5. We need a Neighborhood Facility and a developed recreational area at an estimated cost of $175,000.

6. We need low-income housing units to provide for the disadvantaged. We would propose 60 units to start at an estimated $1.2 million cost and will need additional units increasing to approximately 150 in future years.

7. We also need to renovate approximately 20 homes in target areas, which could be done at an estimated $150,000 cost.

8. A bridge crossing the St. Francis River and which links the Madison area together was condemned and torn down. This needs to be replaced. It is estimated that this could be done for $600,000.

9. We need small industry to help hold our people at home and to provide a nucleus of stable jobs for our young people. We could make a start toward this at a $450,000 estimated cost.

In response to number two on the fact sheet, the above needs total to an approximate 4 million dollars, which is not a lot of money in our thinking to help keep a small rural town alive.

The plight of Madison is relative to other small rural towns. There simply isn't enough money to provide the needed services to help them grow. Tax money is hard to come by under almost any circumstances, and in a small town, grant-matching money is practically unavailable. People are just not prone to tax themselves no matter how big the need. About the only alternative we have is to tighten our belt and assign the money we have on a priority basis, and this is sure to leave a great number of things undone.

In Arkansas it is impossible to demand much from government because of a constitutional limitation which is pitifully little. About the only alternative the taxpayers have is a good dose of understanding and appreciation of the problem. They can do and say what they want, but this will not change the constitution or provide more money for local government to use for development purposes. Even if the people wanted to raise their taxes to provide additional services, this is simply not possible. The legislature can help, but they have been rather cold to the pleas of small rural towns in the past.

The attitude, therefore, of small town residents is, yes we need to develop and our town needs to grow, but not if my taxes have to be increased.

If an easily accessible new source of financing is not developed to help rural areas and small towns in the rural areas, the cities will continue to flourish with people led astray by the promise of big city jobs which are usually not available upon arrival, and they then end up in ghettos. The cities will continue to get most of the available funds because their problem has been created by the lack of rural development funds.

In response to number three, the accomplishments made in Madison have been fruitful, based on the capital outlay available, but the outlay is just not enough.

We have submitted an application for sewer expansion, which has been approved pending feasibility of funds, and have formed a Development Corporation to work on bringing in industry, and have also had a living conditions and labor study done. The problem which we encounter most frequently is that if we are not large enough we can't get funded How can we get large enough to qualify if we can't get money to grow? We also encounter red tape in that an application must pass through several hands before it gets to the source of funds. Our application for sewer expansion was lost due to the maze through which it had to go; and, consequently, we did not get funded when money was available and now are awaiting feasibility of funds. Why can't applications for development projects go directly to the source of funds as they used to?

We have in St. Francis County, programs set up to help us meet our needs and men working in these programs with the know-how to get the job done, and they help us

all the way. But after all possible sources of funding have been deleted and no money is found for the rural small towns, possibly because it has gone to the big cities, we need somewhere else to go. Therefore, I believe that if a community development bank could be set up, that it would greatly enhance the survival plight of small towns in rural areas.

MEMORANDUM ON NECESSITIES OF VITAL IMPORTANCE TO CRITTENDEN COUNTY AND MUNICIPALITIES THEREIN

Gentlemen: Crittenden County and Municipalities therein have listed the following items as necessities of vital importance to these political subdivisions. The following items are not set forth in any particular sequence other than being listed numerically as most urgent needs of these political subdivisions. We should like to note that it has become more than obvious that the demands upon such political subdivisions by the residents therein, as well as the State and Federal Governments are increasing at a fantastic pace. Locally, residents require services which these subdivisions cannot supply due to lack of funds, on the State basis the Legislature has refused to give the cities and towns an equitable share of general revenues in that the cities only receive approximately two percent (2%) of the total state revenues despite urgent pleas of city officials over the past years, on the Federal level the government imposes numerous requirements in various fields, which we admit in numerous instances are necessary, but the same Federal Government fails to supply the tools in the form of adequate economic assistance in order for these same subdivisions to perform and comply. With these thoughts in mind, we submit the following facts and memorandum which we deem of vital importance to our area.

I

1. Primary and Secondary Sewage Treatment Facilities:
   (a) West Memphis, $1,000,000.
   (b) Marion, $250,000.
   (c) Gilmore, $115,000.
   (d) Sunset, $150,000.
   (e) Edmondson, $100,000.
   (f) Horseshoe Lake, $100,000.
   (g) Turrell, $60,000.

2. Solid Waste Disposal System—Projected County Wide—Encompassing Land Acquisition as well as purchase of necessary and essential equipment: $300,000.

3. Community Service Center—Anticipated central location for housing various public and governmental facilities with emphasis on related preventive health programs, treatment of indigent citizens, neighborhood clinics with related facilities to service areas of medical and dental need. Establishing of such facility would automatically result in a substantial reduction of presently overcrowded hospital emergency facilities as well as private physicians' offices. It is also anticipated that such facility could be utilized for handling food stamp programs, headstart projects, as well as a host of other needed facilities. The anticipated project cost would be in the range of approximately $2,000,000.

4. Industrial Park For Proposed Port of West Memphis.

At present, the City of West Memphis through the West Memphis Port Authority, has executed an option for the purchase of in excess of 800 acres of property for this project and its primary study phase has been completed with approval of the Federal Government, and the City is well under way with its secondary study phase for this port project. Considering land acquisition payments, once the option is exercised and the minimum essentials for financing the project, the engineering estimates would approximate $2,500,000.00.

5. Airport Expansion—The West Memphis Municipal Airport is presently the only approved *relief* airport in Crittenden County for Memphis International Airport. This designation has been established by the Federal Aviation Administration and the airport serves the entire County as well as the City. Due to the control zone of the Memphis Metropolitan Area and the projected traffic for this airport, certain essential improvements are now in evident demand, such as control lower and additional and extended taxiways and ramp space for the servicing of additional air traffic. Engineering estimates indicate a basic need for approximately $200,000.00 for immediate utilization of this facility.

It should also be noted that several large industrial complexes located in the City of West Memphis and Crittenden County which operate their own private jet aircraft refrain from using the present facility due to lack of a control tower and only the operation of the unicom frequencies which serves on a first come basis. This, of course, results in a loss of income to the City as well as an inconvenience to the industries presently located here. Neither is it a selling point for prospective industries which review the assets of the City looking for location.

6. Expansion of Existing Crittenden Hospital Facilities Which Include:
   (a) Development of physical therapy department necessitating substantial ground floor space;
   (b) Increase in upgrade X-ray and laboratory departments;
   (c) Expand emergency and outpatient facilities to approximately twice the present size;
   (d) Expand existing hospital by addition of a minimum of 50 beds of private room type facility;
   (e) Renovate and install bath and toilet facilities in all semi-private rooms in older portion of hospital and converting them to private accommodations upon completion of new private room addition.

It is noted by medical and hospital personnel that these programs must be under way within 18 months and the anticipated cost is projected at $2,500,000.00 in the next 24 to 30 months. Hill-Burton Funds are no longer available to aid in this category.

7. Increased School Facilities Including Additional Personnel and Class Rooms As well as all necessary related equipment.

Immediate projections indicate monetary needs in the amount of approximately $2,500,000. It should also be noted in regard to this topic as well as others mentioned in this report, that the planning consultants for the City of West Memphis alone, have in the course of their analysis of local trends, projected a population of approximately 55,000 people by the year 1990, which will double the problems and demand on services of the community within the span of 20 years.

8. County Wide Park and Recreation Facilities—This topic should be considered in light of the fact of almost total lack of public family and recreational facilities within the County. There is no County Wide public recreation facility which could offer among other things, a public golf course, picnic and camping grounds, public lakes for fishing and water sport activities, etc. While a projected cost factor could not be presented at the present time, the necessity for such facility has substantially been pointed out by various officials and private citizens in the City and the County and analysis of this subject could be rendered within a reasonable time should the means to finance such a project become available.

9. Most of the following items are listed in the same generalized category and the problems arising are without benefit of projected expenditures because of lack of information on which to make a present analysis:
   (a) Convention Center.
   (b) Junior College.
   (c) Street Improvement.
   (d) Improvements and extension of presently existing sewage systems.
   (e) Improvement and beautification of open ditches and bayous through the City of West Memphis.

10. West Memphis Urban Renewal Funds—Approximately $3,700,000.00 for the next fiscal year needed. City applied for $3.8 million and obtained only $400,000.00 for past year.

II

With regard to the funding needs and capabilities of the local political subdivisions to meet these demands, the answer can probably best be stated by saying that we fall within the general category of most political subdivisions in the United States, in that with particular reference to the City of West Memphis, we are limited by the State Constitution in the amount of millage that can be utilized for funding various City operations. These Constitutional limits are presently being utilized to the maximum and it appears that there will be no relief in this regard because of the increase in demands upon the Cities. Efforts to assist the Cities through State Legislation have not been satisfactory due to other economic burdens of the State Governmental Units which the State Legislature has deemed of greater priority. There are no indications that this situation will improve to any great extent in the immediate future. Therefore, it is our conclusion that realization of the items heretofore mentioned can only come through programs initiated and assisted by the Federal Government, either through direct grants, revenue sharing, or extremely long-term loans with acceptable and realistic rates of interest which would be available under our existing State Constitution, or such that they would fall into a category deemed to be excluded by the limitations of the State Constitution on borrowing power and repayment of interest.

III

Insofar as the current attitude of local officials toward Federal Programs is concerned, it appears that there is a definite feeling that present Government Programs are too encumbered by unnecessary duplication and red tape, and too many programs are not promoted, explained, or funded; also, too many programs expend large sums of monies toward the compilation of studies relative to certain projects thereby limiting the direct application of funds to the basic problems encountered while utilizing the other sums purely for purposes of basic study and need. Simply stated, it would be fair to say that local officials generally recognize the problems of the community which they serve and if more funds could be applied directly through the direction of local subdivisions toward eliminating the problems as they know them and find them in fact, and less funds expended toward studies and explaining problems already known to be in existence, then it is felt that our tax dollars would be better utilized toward the more rapid elimination of these various problems.

We should also note that our area carries the concentrated employment program which is designated by the Federal Government and Crittenden County is one of only 18 counties in the entire State of Arkansas under this designation because of its high rate of unemployment. The unemployment factor has been running about six percent (6%) and if these aforementioned projects could be undertaken, we certainly feel that this factor could be greatly diminished.

Respectfully submitted,

TILDEN RODGERS,
Mayor, City of West Memphis.

And the following committee:

Mr. Jack Hogan, Pres. West Memphis Chamber of Commerce and Pres. Bank of West Memphis.

Mr. R. E. Wallin, West Memphis City Attorney.

Mr. Cy Bond, Jr., Engineer.

Mr. P. G. Para, General Manager, West Memphis Utility Commission.

Mr. Lee Cramer, Supt. Department of Park & Recreation.

Mr. Robert L. Smith, West Memphis Councilman.

Mr. O. M. Schultz, Supt. West Memphis School District.

Mr. Bill Barbour, Pres. First National Bank.

Mr. R. F. Scruggs, Administrator Crittenden Memorial Hospital.

Judge Jack Brawley, Crittenden County Judge.

Mr. B. B. McCarley, Chairman Urban Renewal Agency.

Dr. M. D. Deneke, Head of Crittenden County Health Department.

Mr. A. K. Minter, Pres. Fidelity National Bank.

Mayor Charlie Wah, Turrell Mayor.

Herbert Carter, Supt. Marion School District.

TESTIMONY OF HOWARD H. BEASLEY

My name is Howard H. Beasley. I am Executive Vice President of the Bank of Cherry Valley. I, also, hold the non-compensating job of Recorder and Treasurer of the City of Cherry Valley.

Cherry Valley is a small town located in north central Cross County, twelve (12) miles north of Wynne, which is the county seat. Population 1970 Census was 556. Agriculture is the main industry.

Cherry Valley's basic problems are the same as those that face most small towns in rural Northeast Arkansas. Namely, those are: (1) Jobs with which to attract its young people to stay at home, (2) Housing, (3) Medical services, (4) Recreational facilities, (5) Expanded water and sewer facilities, and (6) Most important is money to provide these services.

Cherry Valley's citizens have always been ready and willing to assume their share of costs of municipal services, but we are in a dilemma. In 1965 the city voted a ten (10) mill tax with which to float a bond issue to finance a municipal water system. This system was built without any grant money whatsoever. Until this bond issue is paid off in 1993, no more taxes can be levied for municipal services because fifteen (15) mills is the limit under present Arkansas law and we have five (5) mills for general operations.

With growth that Cherry Valley has had in the past ten (10) years (1960 population was 455) planning is needed very badly. All agencies who do this work are ready and willing but they, also, charge a fee and the city has had no money with which to pay such a fee. Therefore, the necessary planning has gone undone.

Our small city has accomplished much since it was incorporated in 1947. A list of its accomplishments is as follows: (1) All city streets have been paved, (2) Fire protection has been provided (A new modern fire truck was purchased two years ago at a cost of some $30,000.00 on a rental basis), (3) Water system built in 1965, (4) Sewer System under construction now. (Farmers Home Administration loan and grant), (5) Provide some police protection, and (6) Built a modern fire station at a cost of approximately $7500.00, financed by and large with contributions from local citizens.

The current attitude of our local city government toward present federal programs is not very good. For example, we have had an application filed for a public low-rent housing project for about five years and nothing has ever come of it. It has been returned to our local Housing Authority about three times, always with some minor technical reason for disapproval, with the explanation that the application must be re-submitted. Another example is that aid we have received is never enough to do the job as it should be done. In building our sewer system now in progress certain areas of our city will be denied sewage because not enough money was available to cover the complete area. It has always been the old story of too little too late.

Small towns of rural America are the backbone of our Country. Gentlemen, I urge you to do everything in your power to preserve the small towns of this great country of ours.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity of appearing before you.

This is the fourth insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of testimony and other materials which I have gathered during my search for ways to assist community development in areas of low population. Other materials on this subject appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS of September 22, pages 32740–32741; October 1, pages 34505–34506; October 6, pages 35409–35410; and October 13, pages 36133–36134.

LAKEWOOD STORY WINS CANCER EDITORIAL AWARD

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that the Lakewood Story, of Lakewood, N.Y., has won the American Cancer Society's annual award for the best single editorial on cancer published this year by a daily or weekly newspaper in New York State.

As a member of the House Subcommittee on Public Health, and Environment, which recently reported out a $1.6 billion cancer attack bill, I have a very special feeling of personal pride in seeing this award going to a newspaper published in my district.

The editorial appeared during the 1971 Cancer Crusade in Chautauqua County and it is significant to mention that the people responded by contributing a total of $66,812, exceeding their quota by nearly $6,000 and reflecting the deep concern we all have in seeking to defeat this disease which casts its terrible shadow on all of us.

Robert Shelley, editor of the Lakewood Story, is to be highly congratulated for his award-winning editorial and other efforts in support of the Cancer Crusade. The editorial follows:

IN YOUR LIFETIME

The 1971 Cancer Crusade battle cry is "We want to wipe out cancer in your lifetime." A noble goal which is nearer than any of us think. Polio has been licked. Rubella (German Measles) can be prevented. And now they're talking about a cure for leukemia. Yes, a cure. And researchers are working feverishly to make Cancer an obsolete word in the English language.

It takes money. And plenty of it. But it's the best thing money can buy—life, a second chance for countless numbers of men and women. And it's not like you're spending the money for "them", an anonymous crowd of people who will suffer the agony and untimely loss of life from Cancer. You're spending it for you and your family and your friends and your neighbors. Because Cancer isn't discriminatory. It can hit anyone, rich or poor, of any and all backgrounds. Someone you know has been felled by Cancer.

Here's your chance to put an end to this dread disease once and for all. When a Cancer Crusader comes to your door in the days ahead, be generous.

Think of it—a cure for cancer . . . in your lifetime. We're that close!

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON RULES

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, today, at the caucus of the Democratic Members of the House, we discussed the reform of the Democratic National Convention procedures. These reforms were recommended by the Democratic National Committee's Commission on Rules, which I chair, and they are the result of a study which took place over the last year and a half.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that these recommendations will assure that the Democratic National Convention will be representative, open, deliberative, and fair.

The reforms cover the entire range of activities surrounding the nomination of the party's presidential and vice presidential candidates. Together with the guidelines of the Committee on Party Structure and Delegate Selection, chaired by our very able colleague DON FRASER, they comprise the most sweeping reform effort ever undertaken by a major political party.

In view of the importance of these reforms, I believe they are of interest not only to the Democratic Members of this House but also to our Republican colleagues and to everyone interested in our democratic system. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I include the report of the Commission on Rules with respect to the Democratic National Convention at this point in the RECORD.

DETERMINATIONS OF THE COMMISSION ON RULES WITH RESPECT TO THE NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTION

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION ON RULES

Chairman.—Honorable James G. O'Hara, United States Representative, Michigan.

Members.—Professor Carl A. Auerbach, Professor of Law, University of Minnesota.

Honorable Herman Badillo, United States Representative, New York.

Liv Bjorlie, National Committeewoman, North Dakota.

Honorable Edward T. Breathitt, former Governor, National Committeeman, Kentucky.

Honorable Benjamin D. Brown, State Representative, Georgia.

Hodding Carter, III, Vice Chairman, Mississippi Democratic Party.

Joseph F. Crangle, Chairman, Erie County Democratic Committee, New York.

Honorable Thomas F. Eagleton, United States Senator, Missouri.

Honorable A. June Franklin, State Representative, Iowa.

David E. Harrison, State Chairman, Massachusetts.

James B. Hunt, Jr., Assistant to the Chairman, State Democratic Executive Committee, North Carolina.

Irving K. Kaler, Attorney, Georgia.

Joseph D. Keenan, International Secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.

Honorable Dorothy S. McDiarmid, State Representative, Virginia.

Honorable Patsy T. Mink, United States Representative, Hawaii.

Honorable Clarence M. Mitchell, III, State Senator, Maryland.

Stephen A. Mitchell, former Chairman, Democratic National Committee, New Mexico.

Dennis T. O'Toole, Student, Harvard Law School.

Donald O. Peterson, National Committeeman, Wisconsin.

Channing E. Phillips, National Committeeman, District of Columbia.

John E. Powers, National Committeeman, Massachusetts.

Paul Sanchez, United Farm Workers Organizer, New York.

Honorable Samuel H. Shapiro, former Governor, Illinois.

Barbara Sylvester, National Committeewoman, South Carolina.

Honorable Charles A. Vanik, United States Representative, Ohio.

Counsel.—Howard G. Gamser.

PART I: STANDING COMMITTEES

Final Recommendations, standing committees of the convention

I. Election of Convention Committees and Chairmen

A. Platform, Credentials, Rules Committee

1. The members of the Platform, Credentials, and Rules Committees shall be elected by the state's national convention delegates present at a meeting of which adequate notice of time and place shall be given and at which a majority of the state's delegates shall be present.

2. If, at the time any convention committee meets, any state's delegates to the Democratic National Convention have not yet been elected, such state's temporary representatives on such committee shall be elected by a procedure which takes place during the calendar year of the Convention at an open, well-publicized meeting of a democratically-elected party committee. It is also provided that members selected in this manner are temporary, and permanent members of the committees be elected as soon as possible after the regular delegate selection process has been completed.

3. The Chairman of the Platform Committee shall be elected by the Platform Committee at its first meeting. The Chairman of the Rules Committee shall be elected by the Rules Committee at its first meeting. The Chairman of the Credentials Committee shall be elected by the Credentials Committee at its first meeting. These meetings will be called by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee who will request nominations for Chairman from the membership of these Committees. An Acting Chairman of the Credentials Committee shall be elected whenever the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee shall deem such election advisable, on the majority vote of those members of the Democratic National Committee present and voting at a meeting of the Democratic National Committee.

4. States that elect a single committee member to each of the standing committees should divide their representatives to the committees as equally as possible between men and women. States that elect two or more representatives to the committees should elect an equal or nearly equal number of men and women to each committee, giving due regard to the race and age of the men and women elected.

B. Arrangements Committee

1. The members of the Arrangements Committee shall be elected by the majority vote of those members present and voting at a meeting of the Democratic National Committee held at such time as the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee deems advisable but only after notice to the members of the Democratic National Committee that such election will be conducted at such meeting. The election of the members of the Arrangements Committee shall be held no later than the first meeting of the Democratic National Committee in the year in which an election is held for the office of President of the United States. The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, after appropriate consultation shall make nominations for the membership of the Arrangements Committee and shall report his reasons therefor. Nominations may be also made by any other Democratic National Committeeman. Each Presidential Candidate shall, upon qualifying as a Presidential Candidate, be entitled to appoint one non-voting member to the Arrangements Committee.

2. The members of the Arrangements Committee and its Chairman need not be delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

3. The Chairman of the Arrangements Committee shall be elected from its elected membership at the Arrangements Committee's first meeting.

II. Arrangements Committee

A. *Authority.* The Arrangements Committee shall be responsible for and have authority over all of the Convention's business and operations, including pre-Convention activities, except as specifically otherwise delegated in these rules, including, but not limited to—

1. housing.

2. communications, radio, television, and press.

3. seating of delegates in the Convention.

4. security.

5. transportation.

6. finances.

B. *Number of Members.* The Arrangements Committee shall consist of between five and fifteen members.

III. Platform Committee

A. *Authority.* The Platform Committee shall be responsible for drafting and presenting to the Democratic National Convention the Platform of the Democratic Party.

B. *Number of Members.* The Platform Committee shall be composed of 150 members allocated to the states in accordance with the state's delegation size, with the provision that each state shall have at least one member.

C. *Regional Hearings.* The Chairman of the Platform Committee shall determine the number (which shall in no case be less than eight), place and time for conducting Regional Hearings and shall name the presiding panel for each Regional Hearing. The Chairman of the Platform Committee shall, to the maximum extent possible, arrange, in consultation with members of the Platform Committee, for these hearings and for a representative group of witnesses to testify at the Regional Hearings.

D. *Written Submissions.* Any person may submit a written statement concerning the Platform to the Platform Committee at any time and may request permission to testify at any hearing.

E. *Drafting.* Prior to the first meeting of the Platform Committee, the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee shall arrange to distribute to the members of said Committee a document outlining the issues and alternative positions to be considered by the Platform Committee. The Platform Committee shall, at its first meeting, elect 15 persons to serve on a Drafting sub-Committee and shall also elect the Chairman of the Drafting sub-Committee. The Chairman of the Platform Committee shall, after appropriate consultation, make nominations for membership on the Drafting sub-Committee and shall nominate one of such persons as the Chairman thereof. In addition, one non-voting representative of each Presidential Candidate, appointed by each Presidential Candidate, may serve on the Drafting sub-Committee. The Drafting sub-Committee shall be responsible for the Drafting of the Platform's provisions under the direction and with the approval of the full Platform Committee.

F. *Participation of Presidential Candidates.* Each Presidential Candidate shall be invited to submit to the Platform Committee a written statement of recommendations at any time.

G. *Committee Report.* The Report of the Platform Committee and any Minority Report shall be prepared for public distribution and shall be mailed to all of the delegates no later than ten days prior to the commencement of the National Convention.

H. *Minority Report.* Upon the request of 10 per cent of the members of the Platform Committee present and voting at a meeting, a Minority Report shall be prepared for distribution to the Convention delegates as part of the Committee's report. The Committee staff shall assist in the preparation of such report.

I. *Open Meetings.* All meetings of the Platform Committee shall be open to the public.

IV. Credentials Committee

A. *Authority.* The Credentials Committee shall determine and resolve all questions concerning the seating of delegates at the Democratic National Convention, subject to the full Convention.

B. *Number of Members.* The Credentials Committee shall be composed of 150 members allocated to the states in accordance with the state's delegation size, with the provision that each state shall have at least one member.

C. *Notice of Intent to Challenge.*

1. Written Notice of Intent to Challenge shall be filed with the Chairman of the Credentials Committee, the State's Democratic Chairman, and the challenged delegate or delegates within 10 calendar days after the completion of the delegate selection process in the state.

2. The Notice of Intent to Challenge may be filed only by a resident of the state in which the challenged delegate resides.

3. As soon thereafter as possible, but in no event more than 5 calendar days after the filing of the Notice provided in C(1), the challenger shall file with the Credentials Committee the following:

(a) A description of the delegates or portion of the delegates challenged, including their names and addresses if known to him.

(b) A short and concise statement of the alleged violations by the challenged delegates of provisions included in but not limited to the Call of the Convention, National Party standards and guidelines or state laws or party rules.

(c) If the challenger proposes that he be seated in the state's delegation, a short and concise statement of the relief requested.

(d) A Request for Findings of Fact in the form of distinct numbered propositions of the facts; each separate proposition shall be separately numbered.

(e) A list of witnesses and each witness' address and telephone number if any are known at the time of filing.

(f) A list of documents which the challenger proposes to have considered by the Committee if any are available at the time of filing.

(g) A statement indicating whether a hearing is desired and the place which the challenger believes would be most convenient to the parties and witnesses to have the hearing held.

(h) The name, address, and telephone number of the challenger's attorney of record or other representative, if any.

4. The challenger shall have reserved to him the right to amend any of the matters required in this paragraph 3 prior to the hearing with due notice to the Committee.

D. *Answer.*

1. Within 10 calendar days of receipt of written Notice of Intent to Challenge, each challenged delegate shall file with the Committee the name, address, and telephone number of his attorney of record or other representative, if any.

2. Within 10 calendar days of receipt by the State Democratic Chairman of Notice of Intent to Challenge, the State Chairman shall file with the Committee 5 complete sets of his state's relevant laws, regulations, and rules and his state's party rules relating to selection of delegates to the Democratic National Convention.

3. Not later than 10 days after receipt of the challenger's Request for Findings of Fact, the challenged delegate or group of delegates shall file with the Committee:

(a) A specific answer, by paragraph, to the facts alleged by the challenger. A separate response must be made to each fact alleged. Such answer shall state agreement with or denial of each fact alleged. Where a fact is denied, the challenged delegate must submit in his answer the facts the challenged delegate believes to be true which would substantiate the denial. Failure to so respond in good faith shall automatically deem the challenger's alleged facts to be admitted as true.

(b) The challenged delegate may submit additional facts or a counterstatement of facts provided it conforms with the form set forth in 3(d) above.

(c) A list of witnesses and each witness' address and telephone number if any are known at the time of filing.

(d) A list of documents the challenged delegate proposes to have considered by the Committee if any are available at the time of filing.

(e) A statement indicating whether the challenged delegate desires a hearing and a designation of the place which the challenged delegate believes would be most convenient to the parties and witnesses to have the hearing held.

(f) A short and concise statement of why the challenge should be dismissed and of why the challenged delegate should be seated.

(g) The name, address, and telephone number of the attorney of record or other representative if any.

4. The challenged delegate or delegates shall have reserved to him the right to amend any of the matters required in this paragraph 3 prior to the hearing with due notice to the Committee.

E. *Hearing Officer.*

1. After the challenged delegate has filed his Answer to the challenger's Request for Findings of Fact, the Chairman of the Credentials Committee shall appoint a Hearing Officer, who shall be responsible for finding the facts.

2. The Hearing Officer shall be a person who is known by reputation to be fair and impartial in the context of the challenge and is experienced in the law, particularly in fact finding and procedural due process.

3. The Chairman of the Credentials Committee shall make a reasonable effort to secure the agreement of the parties to the Hearing Officer appointed by him for the challenge.

F. *Hearings.*

1. If any party so requests, an open and public hearing shall be held within the state at such times and places as shall be determined by the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer may select one or more assistant Hearing Officers to assist in conducting the hearing.

2. The Hearing Officer shall inform the parties or their attorneys of record, if any, of the time and place where the hearing will be held.

3. The Hearing Officer shall hear the evidence, conduct the hearing, dispose of procedural requests and similar matters, and, to the extent possible, obtain stipulations of the parties as to the facts of the challenge.

4. Evidence

(a) If a hearing is held, each challenger and challenged delegate shall have the right to present his case or defense by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross-examination as, in the discretion of the Hearing Officer, may be required.

(b) The Hearing Officer may require one or more challengers or challenged delegates to consolidate or separate their challenge or defense for purpose of the hearing.

G. *Findings of Fact.*

1. The Hearing Officer shall make written Findings of Fact which shall be submitted to the parties or to their attorneys of record or other representative and to the Credentials Committee in sufficient time so that respective cases may be prepared for argument before the Credentials Committee.

2. Any challenger or challenged delegate or group of delegates may submit to the Credentials Committee written Exceptions to the Findings of Fact and to the rulings on procedural matters which are alleged to have prejudicial effect.

3. The Findings of Fact shall not include recommendations concerning the seating of delegates. This determination shall be made only by the full Committee.

4. All hearings and meetings shall be open to the public.

H. *Record.* The official papers and pleadings shall be maintained in the offices of the Democratic National Committee in Washington, D.C., and shall be open and available for public inspection at reasonable times and for duplicating at actual cost to the Democratic National Committee.

I. *Consideration by the Full Committee.*

1. The Credentials Committee shall begin meeting not later than two weeks before the commencement of the Democratic National Convention to consider the challenges to the seating of the delegates.

2. All meetings of the Credentials Committee shall be open to the public.

3. Request for Consideration.

Within 5 days after receipt of the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, the challenger or challenged delegate may file written Notice of Request for Consideration by the Full Committee with the Chairman. Each Notice must contain a short and concise statement of the grounds upon which the Request for Consideration is based.

4. Briefs.

(a) Any party may file a brief to the Credentials Committee prior to 20 calendar days before the commencement of the Democratic National Convention.

(b) Any party filing a brief shall file as many copies as there are members of the Committee plus 10 copies for the Chairman and his staff.

5. Argument

(a) Each party shall be entitled to oral argument before the full Committee, but not exceeding 30 minutes.

(b) The Chairman of the Credentials Committee shall notify the parties of the time for oral argument.

(c) The Chairman of the Credentials Committee may require one or more challenger or challenged delegates to consolidate or separate their challenge or defense for purpose of oral argument.

6. Decisions.

(a) The Chairman shall convene the whole Committee at convenient times to decide challenges.

(b) Committee members and a representative of the challengers from the state in which a challenge is made may participate but may not vote on their state's challenge.

J. *Committee Report.* The Report of the Credentials Committee shall be prepared for public distribution and made conveniently available to all of the delegates no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of the National Convention.

K. *Minority Report.* Upon the request of 10 per cent of the members of the Credentials Committee present and voting at a meeting, a Minority Report shall be prepared for distribution to the Convention delegates as part of the Committee's Report. The Committee staff shall assist in the preparation of such report.

L. *General.*

1. All papers filed by a party with the Committee shall contain a certificate of service of such papers upon all other parties to the challenge.

2. These Rules shall be interpreted so as to provide justice and fairness to the parties. The Chairman or the Committee may waive any provision of the Rules when such waiver is required so as to provide justice and fairness or to prevent undue economic hardship to any party.

3. In the event that any of the state's delegates are selected less than 70 days prior to the convening of the Democratic National Convention, the Chairman of the Credentials Committee may provide such special procedural rules, for such state, in respect of written submissions by the parties, hearings, and consideration by the full Credentials Committee, so as to achieve the resolution of any Credentials challenge for such state at the meeting of the full Credentials Committee held during the second week preceding the commencement of the Democratic National Convention.

4. Section IV. of these Rules pertaining to Credentials challenges shall be distributed and made available to the people of the states.

V. Rules Committee

A. *Authority.* The Rules Committee shall have the authority for recommending the Rules of the Convention, the Convention's agenda, and resolutions providing for the consideration of any other matter not provided for in the Rules of the Convention and not contained in the report of other Committees.

B. *Number of Members.* The Rules Committee shall be composed of 150 members allocated to the states in accordance with the state's delegation size, with the provision that each state shall have at least one member.

C. *Committee Meetings.* Meetings shall be convened in advance of the Convention at such time and places as the Chairman shall determine.

D. *Committee Report.* The Report of the Rules Committee and any Minority Report shall be prepared for public distribution and shall be mailed to all of the delegates no later than ten days prior to the commencement of the National Convention.

E. *Minority Report.* Upon the request of 10 per cent of the members of the Rules Committee present and voting at a meeting, a Minority Report shall be prepared for distribution to the Convention delegates as part of the Committee's report. The Committee staff shall assist in the preparation of such report.

F. *Open Meetings.* All meetings of the Rules Committee shall be open to the public

G. *Presentation by Rules Commission.* The Chairman of the Committee on Rules shall arrange for the presentation of the recommendations of this Commission by its Chairman or his designees to the Rules Committee at the first meeting thereof or as soon thereafter as shall be appropriate.

VI. Certification of Delegates and Committee Members

Each state's Democratic Chairman shall certify in writing to the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee the election of his state's delegates to the National Convention within 3 days after the completion of the delegate selection process in the state and shall certify the election of Committee members within 3 days after their election, giving the full name and address of each of such persons.

VII. Definitions

A. "State" shall include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, and Guam.

B. "Presidential Candidate" shall mean any incumbent Democratic President of the United States and any other person who has established substantial support for his nomination, as determined by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in 3 or more states.

PART II: LOGISTICAL ARRANGEMENTS

Final recommendations, logistical arrangements

I. Site of Democratic National Convention

A. Site Selection Committee. The Democratic National Committee shall elect a Site Selection Committee, whose membership shall be comprised of two members residing in each of the four regions of the Democratic National Committee and three members at large and shall not be limited to members of the Democratic National Committee. This Site Selection Committee shall make a recommendation to the Democratic National Committee. Among the criteria to be considered by the Site Selection Committee are—

1. The need for providing low cost meals and lodging to the delegates and alternates, where desired.

2. The provision of adequate facilities, adjacent to the Convention floor, for caucus and other meetings of the delegates.

3. The provision for the Presidential Candidates* of adequate space in the Convention hall and its immediate environs.

4. The provision of space for adequate facilities adjacent to the Convention floor for press, radio, and television personnel and equipment, including easily accessible interview booths, camera stations commanding a full view of the proceedings, and sufficient light to permit color telecasts with the cooperation of the broadcasting industry.

5. The provision of facilities and telephonic and other forms of communication adequate to assure press, radio, and television personnel the opportunity to communicate with delegates, the podium and the representatives of the Presidential Candidates.

6. The seating of alternates on the Convention floor.

7. The extent to which the host committee is willing and able to assist with the expenses of the Convention.

B. *Determination of Site.* The final determination of the site for the Democratic National Convention shall be made by the Democratic National Committee after considering the recommendations of the Site Selection Committee.

II. Expenses.

A. *Delegates.* Each State Democratic Party shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that the cost of attending a Convention shall not preclude any duly elected delegates or alternates from attending the Convention. If a State is unable to provide such assistance, it shall communicate its inability to the Democratic National Committee, and the Democratic National Committee shall make every effort to assist the State Parties in this regard.

B. *Standing Committee Members.* A travel and per diem allowance for the members of the Standing Committees of the Convention for meetings held prior to the opening of the Convention shall be paid by the Democratic National Committee.

C. *Housing and Facilities.*

1. The Arrangements Committee shall allocate housing to the States' delegations by lot.

2. Facilities for the Presidential Candidates and their representatives shall be allocated by the Arrangements Committee on an equitable and fair basis which shall not afford an advantage to any Presidential Candidate over another. The costs of such facilities shall be paid by each of the Presidential Candidates.

III. Convention Manager.

A Convention Manager shall be elected by the Democratic National Committee at a meeting of the Committee, after notice that such election will be conducted at such meeting. Subject to the authority of the Arrangements Committee, the Convention Manager shall be responsible for all business and financial affairs of the Democratic National Convention.

IV. Seating.

A. *Floor Location of Delegates.* The Arrangements Committee shall determine by lot the seating location on the floor of the Convention for the States' delegations.

B. *Aisles.* The aisles in the Convention floor shall be sufficient in frequency and width to permit easy and ready movement among the delegates. There shall be sufficient space between rows of seats to assure the easy movement of delegates.

C. *Alternates.* Alternates shall be afforded preferential seating over visitors and others, and on the Convention floor if possible, so they are as close to their respective delegations as arrangements will permit.

D. *Visitors' Seating.* The allocation of seats for guests and other observers shall be made by the Arrangements Committee and shall be fairly apportioned to the States according to the States' relative delegate strength. The Arrangements Committee shall make such allocation of seats as promptly as reasonably possible and shall give public notice to the States of the number of seats allocated to each of the States. Guest seat passes shall be distributed by the Arrangements Committee to the Chairmen of the States' delegations in sufficient time to enable the States' Delegation Chairmen to make a prompt, fair and equitable distribution of passes.

E. *Press Seating.* The allocation of seats for press and other media coverage of the Convention shall be made by the Arrangements Committee or its designee on a fair and equitable basis which shall assure complete coverage of the event.

F. *Delegates' and Alternates' Floor Passes.* The Arrangements Committee shall distribute the States' delegate and alternate floor passes to the Chairmen of the States' delegations. In the case of credentials challenges to the seating of any delegate or alternate in a State, the Arrangements Committee shall be responsible for assuring that the delegates and alternates certified on the temporary roll and that the delegates and alternates certified on the permanent roll receive the floor passes and credentials to which they are entitled as soon after such certification as is possible.

V. Floor Access

Floor access shall be given to delegates, alternates, such number of representatives of the Presidential Candidates as the Arrangements Committee shall decide are necessary, such press, radio, and television personnel as have received floor passes, and such other persons as the Arrangements Committee shall have determined are minimally necessary for the proper functioning of the Convention. The Presidential Candidates shall be entitled to an equal number of floor passes. The number of floor passes and the names of persons to whom floor passes have been allocated shall be public information.

VI. Presidential Candidates' Space and Facilities

The spaces and facilities which are provided for the Presidential Candidates in the Convention hall and its immediate environs shall be fairly and equally apportioned.

VII. Communications

A. *Microphones.* There shall be one floor microphone for each State delegation, which shall be located at the position of the Chairman of the State delegation. Each delegate shall have access to the microphone.

B. *Electronic Support.* Adequate provision shall be made for communication between the floor and the Chairman of the Convention so as to advise the Chairman of the identity of any delegate seeking recognition to speak and the purpose for which recognition is sought. Requests for recognition to speak shall be electronically registered in a manner visible to the Chairman, the delegates, and the news media.

C. *Telephones.* There shall be installed one telephone for each State delegation and such additional telephones and means of communication, including telephone directories, as shall afford all delegates reasonable, adequate, and private telephonic communication both within and without the Convention hall.

D. *Floor Facilities.* The Chairman of each delegation shall also be furnished with necessary facilities to conduct the business of the delegation.

E. *General.* No communications equipment other than that authorized by these rules or by the Arrangements Committee shall be permitted on the floor of the Convention.

VIII. Facilities for News Media

The Arrangements Committee shall provide adequate facilities immediately adjacent to the Convention floor for press, radio, and television personnel and equipment, including easily accessible interview booths, camera stations commanding a full view of the proceedings, and sufficient light to permit color telecasts with cooperation of the broadcasting industry.

IX. Security

Security within the Convention hall premises shall be under the sole authority of the Arrangements Committee.

X. Financial Report

The Arrangements Committee shall make public a general report and an audited financial report on or about January 1 of the year succeeding the Democratic National Convention.

XI. Records

All Convention, pre-Convention and post-Convention records of business and correspondence of the Convention's committees, its officers, and of the Democratic National Committee, relating to the Democratic National Convention shall be collected and maintained at the office of the Democratic National Committee, and they shall be open and available for public inspection at reasonable times. Copying, without expense to the Democratic National Committee, shall be permitted.

*As used in this Part, the term "Presidential Candidate" is defined by Sec. VII. B. of Part I which reads: "'Presidential Candidate' shall mean any incumbent Democratic President of the United States and any other person who has established substantial support for his nomination, as determined by the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in three or more states."

PART III: DELEGATE ALLOCATION FORMULA

Delegate allocation formula

I. Number of Votes To Be Cast

The number of Convention votes for the delegates to the Democratic National Convention shall be approximately 3,000 as set forth in the compilation included in these recommendations.

II. Formula for Apportionment of Votes

A. One half of the Convention votes shall be allocated to the States and the District of Columbia on the basis of population as determined by the most recent decennial census. The other half of the Convention votes shall be allocated to the States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the vote cast for the Democratic nominee for President in the 3 preceding Presidential elections.

B. Each delegate shall be entitled to a full vote and fractional votes shall not be permitted except that a delegation allocated less than 16 votes under this formula may send up to 16 delegates to cast the vote to which it is entitled.

C. In determining the voting strength of the District of Columbia or of any State, Presidential elections in which it was not possible for voters of that jurisdiction to cast their ballots for the nominees of the Democratic Convention shall be disregarded.

III. Bonus Votes

No bonus votes shall be apportioned nor any votes allocated which are not dictated by the application of the apportionment formula set forth above.

IV. Alternate Delegates

The Democratic National Committee is authorized to devise a formula of alternate delegate apportionment which recognizes the logistical problems that attend a Convention which will cast approximately 3,000 votes, and, at the same time the need to provide the smaller delegations with adequate representation at the Convention.

V. Territories

Consistent with the Commission's determination to have the Convention reflect equally Democratic voting strength in the past three Presidential elections and the population recorded in the most recent decennial census figures, these recommendations do not provide for the apportionment of votes to the Territories, i.e., Canal Zone, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. This matter is being forwarded to the Democratic National Committee for final determination with a recommendation that fair and equitable voting representation be provided for Territories and Possessions having voting representation at the 1968 Convention.

Delegate apportionment formula

State:	No. of delegates
Alabama	36
Alaska	4
Arizona	21
Arkansas	24
California	294
Colorado	32
Connecticut	51
Delaware	8
District of Columbia	12
Florida	83
Georgia	52
Hawaii	11
Idaho	10
Illinois	181
Indiana	79
Iowa	45
Kansas	32
Kentucky	46
Louisiana	42
Maine	16
Maryland	54
Massachusetts	107
Michigan	140
Minnesota	64
Mississippi	21
Missouri	75
Montana	11
Nebraska	21
Nevada	6
New Hampshire	12
New Jersey	115
New Mexico	14
New York	301
North Carolina	65
North Dakota	10
Ohio	163
Oklahoma	35
Oregon	32
Pennsylvania	196
Rhode Island	18
South Carolina	28
South Dakota	11
Tennessee	49
Texas	139
Utah	15
Vermont	7
Virginia	53
Washington	53
West Virginia	32
Wisconsin	69
Wyoming	5
Total	3,000

PART IV: PROCEDURAL RULES

Final recommendations, procedural rules of the convention

I. Temporary Chairman

The Chairman of the Democratic National Committee shall call the Convention to order and shall preside until a Chairman of the Convention shall be chosen in accord with these rules.

He shall appoint a temporary secretary and such other temporary officers as may be required to assist him in the conduct of the business of the Convention. These temporary officers shall be composed equally of men and women.

II. Temporary Roll

The Democratic National Committee shall determine a temporary roll of delegates to the Convention which shall consist of those persons whose names have been certified as delegates unless a credentials contest shall have arisen with respect to any such person, in which case the Democratic National Committee shall include on the temporary roll the name of the credentials contestant recommended for inclusion by the Committee on Credentials in its report.

Persons whose names are included on the temporary roll shall be permitted to vote on all matters before the Convention until after adoption of the report of the Committee on Credentials provided that no person shall be permitted to vote on his own credentials contest.

III. Order of Business

The order of business for the Democratic National Convention shall be as provided in these Rules and in any special order of business adopted under Article IV. The Chairman of the Convention may, at appropriate times, interrupt the order of business provided for in these Rules for introductions, announcements, addresses, presentations, resolutions of tribute and appreciation or remarks appropriate to the business of the Convention.

A. Report of Committee on Credentials. The report of the Committee on Credentials shall be acted upon before the consideration of other business.

1. The Chair shall recognize the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials for thirty minutes to present the Committee's Report unless a longer period of time shall be provided in a special order of business agreed to by the Convention. The Chairman of the Committee may present committee amendments, may yield part of his time to others and may yield for the presentation and disposition of minority reports without losing his right to the floor.

2. The Chair shall arrange for the orderly presentation of amendments offered at the direction of the committee and of minority reports. Twenty minutes shall be allowed for the presentation of each committee amendment or minority report unless a longer period for any committee amendment or minority report is provided in special orders of business agreed to by the Convention. Time shall be equally allotted to proponents and opponents of each committee amendment or minority report. The question shall be put on each committee amendment or minority report immediately following its presentation without intervening motion.

3. Upon conclusion of the consideration and disposition of committee amendments and minority reports, the Chair shall put the question on the adoption of the report of the Committee on Credentials with amendments previously adopted, if any, presentation without intervening motion.

4. In the event that the Committee's Report shall not be agreed to when voted upon, the Committee shall immediately reconvene to reconsider its Report and shall present a new Report to the Convention as soon as possible. The Convention shall be in temporary recess until the Committee shall have adopted a new Report.

B. *Convention Chairman.* The Convention shall then proceed to elect the Convention Chairman in the following manner:

1. The Chairman of the Committee on Rules shall be recognized to offer a nomination for Convention Chairman as recommended by the Committee on Rules. Nominations from the floor shall then be received.

2. When there are no further nominations or upon adoption of a motion to close nominations, the Chair shall, after giving any nominee the opportunity to decline nomination, conduct a vote for Convention Chairman.

3. A majority vote of the delegates present and voting shall be required to elect the Convention Chairman. Balloting shall continue until a Chairman is elected.

C. *Convention Vice Chairman.* The Convention shall then proceed to elect the Convention Vice Chairman in the same manner in which it elected the Chairman except that nominations shall not be accepted for persons of the same sex as the Chairman. The Vice Chairman shall perform all of the duties of the Chairman in the Chairman's absence.

D. *Report of Committee on Rules and Order of Business.* The Chair shall then recognize the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Order of Business to present the Committee's Report for the Rules of the Convention and minority reports, if any, in the same manner as that provided for the presentation of the Report of the Committee on Credentials.

E. *Committee on Resolutions and Platform.* The Chairman shall then recognize the Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions and Platform to present the Committee's Report and minority reports, if any, in the same manner as that provided for the presentations of the reports of the Committees on Credentials and Rules.

F. *Nomination of the Democratic Candidate for President.* The Chair shall then receive nominations from the floor for the office of President of the United States in the following manner:

1. Requests to nominate a Presidential Candidate shall be in writing and shall have affixed thereto the written approval of the nominee and the name of the delegate who shall be recognized to nominate the Presidential Candidate and shall be delivered to the Convention Chairman not later than 6:00 P.M. of the day preceding the day designated in the official Convention Program for the commencement of Presidential nominations.

2. Each such request must be accompanied by a petition indicating support for the proposed nominee signed by delegates representing not less than 50 nor more than 200 delegate votes, not more than 20 of which may come from one delegation. No delegate may sign more than one nominating petition.

3. The order for nominating Presidential Candidates shall be determined by the Committee on Rules by lot at a drawing, that shall be open to the public, on the morning of the day designated in the official Convention Program for the commencement of Presidential nominations.

4. Each Presidential Candidate shall be allowed a total of 15 minutes time for the presentation of his name in nomination by a nominating speech and not more than two seconding speeches; the time to run without interruption from the recognition of the nominator.

5. Delegates and alternates shall maintain order during and following nominations for the office of President, and demonstrations on behalf of Candidates shall not be permitted.

G. *Roll Call Ballot for Presidential Candidate.* After nominations for Presidential Candidates have closed, the Convention shall immediately proceed to a roll call vote by States on the selection of the Presidential Candidate. A majority vote of the Convention's certified delegates shall be required to nominate the Presidential Candidate. Delegates may vote for the candidate of their choice whether or not the name of such candidate was placed in nomination. Balloting will continue until a nominee is selected.

H. *Acceptance Speech by Presidential Candidate.* Immediately after the selection of the Democratic nominee for President, the Chairman shall appoint a committee to advise the nominee of his selection, to determine if he will accept the nomination and to invite the nominee to deliver an acceptance speech to the Convention.

I. *Nomination for the Democratic Candidate for Vice President.* The selection of a nominee for Vice President of the United States shall be conducted in the same manner as that heretofore provided for the selection of the nominee for President of the United States except that:

1. There shall be at least a 12 hour interval between the nomination of the President and the opening of the nominations for the Vice President.

2. A request to nominate must be filed not later than 3 hours before the scheduled opening of the nominations for the Vice President.

J. *Roll Call Ballot for Vice Presidential Candidate.* After nominations for Vice Presidential candidates have closed, the Convention shall immediately proceed to a roll call vote by states on the selection of the Vice Presidential Candidate. A majority vote of the Convention's certified delegates shall be required to select the Vice Presidential Candidate. Delegates may vote for the candidate of their choice whether or not the name of such candidate was placed in nomination.

K. *Acceptance Speech by Vice Presidential Candidate.* Immediately after the selection of the Democratic nominee for Vice President, the Chairman shall appoint a committee to advise the nominee of his selection, to determine if he will accept the nomination and to invite the nominee to deliver an acceptance speech to the Convention.

IV. Special Orders of Business

It shall be in order at any time for the Committee on Rules and Order of Business to report to the Convention a resolution providing a special order of business for debate of any resolution, motion, committee report or minority report or amendment to a committee report or for the consideration of any matter for which provision is not made under these rules.

V. Powers and Duties of Chairman

It shall be the responsibility of the Chairman to conduct and expedite the business of the Convention and to preserve order and decorum in its proceedings.

The Chairman is authorized to:

1. Appoint a secretary and such other officers as may be required to assist him in the conduct of the business of the Convention, to be composed equally of men and women.

2. Appoint any delegate temporarily to perform the duties of the Chair in the absence of the Vice Chairman.

3. Take such lawful action as may be necessary and appropriate to preserve order throughout the Convention hall.

VI. Voting

A. *Secret Ballot.* No secret ballots shall be permitted at any stage of the Convention or its committee proceedings.

B. *Proxy Voting.* Neither delegate nor alternate delegate votes may be cast by proxy.

C. *Roll Call Votes.*

1. Voting shall be by voice vote or, when prescribed by these rules, by roll call vote. A roll call vote may also be had if the Chair is in doubt or upon the demand of any delegate supported by 20 percent of the delegate body as evidenced by (a) a petition submitted to the Chair indicating support of the demand by delegations which comprise not less than 20 percent of the authorized delegate body or, (b) by the rising in support of the demand of not less than 20 percent of the delegates present. In the case of a petition in support of a demand for a roll call vote, a delegation shall be taken to support the demand if a majority of its delegates vote to do so.

2. When a roll call vote is ordered the roll shall be called by states in the sequence determined by the results of the drawing for seating preference and the Chairman of each delegation or his designee shall report the vote of his delegation and shall send to the rostrum a tally showing the vote of each member of his delegation indicating whether such vote was cast in person or by an alternate. It shall be the duty of the Chair to arrange to have copies of roll call tally sheets received by him promptly made available to the news media.

3. On a roll call by States, the vote of a delegation as announced, may be challenged by any member of the delegation before the next State is called and the votes of that delegation shall then be recorded as polled without regard to any state law, Party rule, resolution or instruction binding the delegation or any member thereof to vote as a unit with others or to cast his vote for or against any candidate or proposition. The Convention Chairman may send a representative to the delegation to conduct the poll. At the discretion of the Convention Chairman, the roll call may continue instead of awaiting the result of the polling.

4. A demand to poll a delegation may be withdrawn at any time before the actual polling has begun.

D. *Interruption of Vote.* When the question has been put, the vote thereon may not be interrupted for any purpose other than a demand for a roll call vote or a point of order directed to the conduct of the vote.

E. *Determination of Question.* Except as otherwise provided in these rules, all questions, including the question of nominations of candidates for President and Vice President of the United States, shall be determined by a majority vote of the delegates to the Convention.

VII. Death, Resignation or Disability of a Democratic Nominee

In the event of the death, resignation or disability of a nominee of the Party for President or Vice President, the Democratic National Committee is authorized to fill the vacancy or vacancies by a majority of the total number of votes provided at the Convention. The full vote of each delegation is to be cast by its duly qualified member or members of the Committee with each member casting a proportionate share of his delegations votes.

VIII. Interpretation of Rules

In interpreting these rules the Chair may have recourse to the rulings of Chairmen of previous Democratic National Conventions, to the precedents of the United States House of Representatives and to general parliamentary law.

IX. Appeals

The Chair shall decide all questions of order subject to an appeal by any delegate which may be debated for not more than ten minutes, the time to be equally divided between the delegate appealing the ruling and a delegate in favor of sustaining the ruling of the Chair; provided that an appeal shall not be in order while another appeal is pending or from decisions on recognition, or from decisions on dilatoriness of motions, or during a roll call vote or on a question on which an appeal has just been decided or when in the opinion of the Chair, such appeal is clearly dilatory.

Before the question is put on any appeal, the Chair shall be entitled to briefly state the reasons for the ruling being appealed.

X. Motion To Suspend The Rules

The Chair shall entertain a motion to suspend the rules which shall be decided without debate and which shall require a vote of ⅔ of the delegates voting, a quorum being present.

XI. Motions

No question of privilege nor any motion other than those provided under these rules shall be entertained except the motion to recess (to a time certain or at the call of the Chair) which shall be privileged, and the motion to adjourn which shall be of the highest privilege.

Motions to adjourn or to recess shall be in order at any time except when the question has been put or a vote is in progress and shall be decided without debate. The Chair shall not entertain motions to adjourn or recess when such motion closely follows another such motion if in the opinion of the Chairman such motion is dilatory.

XII. Amendments

No amendments to resolutions or motions before the Convention shall be permitted except amendments to Committee Reports offered at the direction of the Committee or in a minority report of the Committee and amendments to resolutions reported from a Committee offered at the direction of the Committee or with the written support of 10 percent of the membership of the Committee, provided, that no motion or proposition on a subject different from that under consideration shall be admitted under color of amendment.

XII. Minority Reports

Minority reports of committees shall not be considered as such unless adopted by at least 10 per cent of the members of a committee present and voting at a committee meeting.

XIV. Responsibility

By participation in the Democratic National Convention each delegate assumes the responsibility for doing all within his power to assure that voters of his state will have the opportunity to cast their election ballots for the Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees selected by the Convention and expressly agrees that he will not publicly support or campaign for any candidate for President or Vice President other than the nominees of the Convention.

XV. Debate

Unless otherwise provided in these Rules or in a resolution providing for a special order

of business, debate on any question shall be limited to a total of 20 minutes and shall be equally divided between proponents and opponents unless they and the Chairman agree on an additional or lesser amount of time.

XVI. Division of A Question

When a question contains two or more separate propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain, it shall, on the demand of any delegate, before the question is put, be divided for voting.

XVII. Quorum

A majority of the delegates to the Convention shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of transacting business. Upon a point of order of no quorum being made, the Chairman shall ascertain the presence or absence of a quorum by visual estimation and shall not proceed until a quorum is present provided that a motion to adjourn may be offered and voted upon without a quorum present.

XVIII. Journal of Proceedings

A record of all actions taken each day by the Convention shall be printed and made available to all delegates and alternates the morning of the following day.

In addition, a journal of the full proceedings of the Convention shall be printed within the year following the Convention.

ROBERT T. STEVENS

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, recently, a very important anniversary in the life of an outstanding American came and went but, typical of the man, he did not want great fanfare of the event to take place. I speak of the 50th Anniversary with J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc. of Mr. Robert T. Stevens, who has served as chief executive officer of the company longer than any other man since the company and its predecessor companies were founded in 1813. He currently is chairman of the company's executive committee.

I am especially pleased to take note of Mr. Stevens' anniversary in the important American textile industry because of the vital contributions the Stevens Company has made to the Nation and, particularly, South Carolina, including the third congressional district, which I am proud to represent.

Colonel Bob, as he is known to some of his friends, is a man of many talents and is an enthusiastic participant in a wide variety of activities. He served his country in World Wars I and II in the Army with distinction and dedication. Again, during the latter stages of the Korean War, he answered still another call to duty and served the United States as Secretary of the Army and won the plaudits of his countrymen for his unswerving allegiance to the highest tenets of, duty, honor, and country. He was decorated with awards from the Departments of Defense, Navy and Air Force, the first Secretary of a service arm to be so decorated by its sister services. Among his other awards, Mr. Stevens earned the Distinguished Service Medal for service to the country.

I am proud to count the Honorable Robert T. Stevens among my close friends and many other Members of this House also know him as I do, while still others in the other body know him also as a great American.

At a very small dinner a few weeks ago, a few of Colonel Bob's friends and associates in the Stevens Co. paid tribute to him for his long service to his company, the textile industry and, very importantly, the United States of America.

In response, Colonel Stevens made a few remarks, excerpts of which I include below.

In conclusion, I would like to say that former Secretary Stevens still has many years of service remaining to the Stevens Co., to the textile industry and, hopefully, to our great country. Based upon his outstanding contributions and accomplishments, I think we have good reason, as Mr. Stevens does, to be optimistic about the future.

Excerpts of Colonel Bob's remarks follow:

On Monday, September 12, 1921, at 8:30 a.m., I walked up the long flight of stairs to the office of J. P. Stevens & Co. on the second floor of the old building at 23 Thomas Street in the downtown textile area known as the Worth Street Market. This was a day I had long looked forward to.

Ever since I was a very small boy, I had wanted to get into the textile business. I had wanted to skip college and get going in JPS & Co. but my father wanted me to have a college education so I complied, compromising the situation by majoring in economics. That was where I learned about tariffs, imports, exports and the wonders of free trade. I learned then, as a lot of people are learning now that realistically there is no such thing as free trade, if one includes the appropriate proviso that free trade must also be fair trade.

Evidently my work was ok and I was then assigned to the credit department where I served a short tour of duty before being shipped to the Dunean Mill in Greenville, S.C., to "learn the mill business". This was one of the luckiest breaks in my business career. I loved the work, loved the people and loved the Piedmont area of South Carolina.

We worked a 55-hour week, 10 hours for five days and 5 hours on Saturday. My superiors took an active interest in me. I made lots of friends. It was a wonderful year before I was called back to New York and attached to the Cotton Goods Sales Department under a legendary character named Bill Gallon. And what a worker and salesman he was—a terrific contributor to the success and growth of the Company in those days.

While the 1920's are recorded as a boom period in American economic history they were not boom years for the textile industry. We all worked hard to keep our modest-size Company moving forward and, as it turned out, this was a good preparation for what was to follow in the depression years of the 1930's.

Very unfortunately for the Company, Mr. J. P. Stevens, Sr. passed away on October 27th 1929, just at the time of the big Wall Street crash. These two shocks, coming at the same time, really subjected the Stevens Company to a severe test. We regrouped, reorganized and started out to do our job, fortunately, with the great experience and ability of Mr. Nat Stevens to lean on. I have always felt that the terrific problems of the depression pulled us all together as a team that had winning spirit. Perhaps that experience has application in the business today.

Surely, the outstanding impression of my long association with the Company has been the privilege of being associated with so many fine and dedicated people. They have built a reputation for Stevens that is unique in the industry and it must always be preserved with great care. It is a priceless asset that does not appear on the balance sheet.

JUDGE J. FRED BIBB PASSES

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 29 a news bulletin brought sad news to East Tennesseans—Judge J. Fred Bibb has heart attack.

Judge Bibb passed away the next day, and left behind thousands of friends. He had served 24 years as a criminal judge in Knox County and was one of the most respected judges and citizens in the State of Tennessee.

My life, and the lives of all who knew him, were made better by his examples; it was indeed an honor to have had such a friend.

As a small tribute to the memory of this outstanding jurist, I place in the RECORD a few comments from the Knoxville, Tenn., news media at this point:

[From the Knoxville Journal, Oct. 1, 1971]

JUDGE J. FRED BIBB

With the death of retired Criminal Court Judge J. Fred Bibb, Tennessee has lost one of its most distinguished jurists and one of its most respected citizens.

Judge Bibb was noted for his legal knowledge, his common sense, his character, his humor and his distinctive dignity. To know him was to admire him.

During his 24-year tenure as a criminal judge in Knox County he gained a reputation for precise adherence to the law. Decisions reached by his court were seldom reversed by higher courts. He was never reversed for an error in his charge to a jury.

Although he was a firm believer in the death penalty in certain cases, he was also noted for giving first offenders a second chance and for his leadership in promoting the hiring of former convicts. This rare blend of qualities was also reflected in his retirement from the bench five years ago. His mind was still keen and his health good, but he was able to reach the decision that too often eludes other judges of similar age.

Judge Bibb set standards on the bench that few will ever equal.

[From the Knoxville News-Sentinel, Oct. 1, 1971]

JUDGE J. FRED BIBB

Knoxville lost one of the most colorful and best-liked men in the state's judicial system with the death of Judge J. Fred Bibb.

The 78-year-old jurist retired from the Criminal Court bench in 1966 after 24 years as judge and 16 years before that as attorney general. After his retirement he continued to sit and helped keep the court docket here current.

Judge Bibb will be remembered for many things, but high among them was his help and encouragement of law students and young lawyers. One student graduated from

the UT College of Law at 10:30 one morning many years ago and was at work in the office of the then attorney general at 1:30 that afternoon.

Hamilton S. Burnett, retired chief justice of the State Supreme Court, summed it up well when he said of his longtime friend:

"I often designated him to go try the really hard cases. He was one of our truest public servants."

[From the Knoxville Journal, Oct. 1, 1971]

RITES TODAY FOR RETIRED JUDGE BIBB

Funeral services will be held at 4 p.m. today at Mann Mortuary, Bearden, for retired Criminal Court Judge J. Fred Bibb, 78, who died Wednesday.

Interment will be in Highland Memorial Cemetery.

The family has asked that memorial contributions be made to Church Street United Methodist Church or the University of Tennessee College of Law.

Judge Bibb, who retired after 40 years as attorney general and judge in 1966, suffered a heart attack at his home, 819 Cherokee Boulevard, and died several hours later.

Because of the funeral for Judge Bibb, some Courthouse offices will be closed all day, some part of the day. Here is the schedule: Closed all day: Circuit Court clerk, Criminal Court clerk; at 1 p.m., County Court clerk, county judge's office, Fourth Circuit Court clerk, property appraiser, register of deeds; open all day, General Sessions Court, trustee and Election Commission.

WBIR RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS

Tennessee has truly lost one of its most knowledgeable and most popular jurists with the sudden death of retired criminal court judge J. Fred Bibb.

Judge Bibb has served three eight year terms on the bench—longer than any elected official in Knoxville and Knox County—when he decided to step down in September of 1966.

His successor, Judge Joe D. Duncan, speaks for all of us when he termed Judge Bibb: "A Judge's Judge." He was kind, considerate, and fair, but could be firm when the occasion called for it.

We'll remember Judge J. Fred Bibb, not just for his prominence as a trial judge, but for his sly unexpected courtroom quips that added that little touch of the human quality to the solemnity of deliberations.

Judge J. Fred Bibb has left our midst but we'll remember too his sincere smile and his big "glad hand" as he exchanged greetings with court house friends and others during his daily strolls downtown.

Judge J. Fred Bibb . . . truly a "Judge's Judge" and a friendly face this community will miss.

BEHIND THE FILM ON RURAL MIGRATION

HON. BOB ECKHARDT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Speaker, on October 14, I had inserted in the Extensions of Remarks the script of the television special "Leaving Home Blues—An NBC White Paper on Rural Migration."

This documented a serious problem in the country and, with great impact, told the problems of young people forced to move to the cities to seek employment.

Not included in the RECORD of October 14, however, were the credits for that documentary. I would like now to pay tribute to the work of two people from my home State, Texas, who served as consultants on that report.

Martha Hamilton and Jim Hightower are quite dedicated to improving life in rural America and for those who have been forced to leave the rural areas. These two Texans made a significant contribution to the NBC special and I would like for my colleagues to be aware of their work.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION HELPS RURAL KENTUCKY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the small communities of Dishionville, Highland, and Hall Gap are rural places in my district of Kentucky that do not appear in the Post Office Directory, but they are making their way onto the map of communities destined for bigger and better things.

Dishionville, Highland, and Hall Gap are among six communities of Lincoln and Pulaski Counties that will jointly celebrate the closing this month of an $800,000 loan and grant from the Farmers Home Administration to link themselves in a modern, intercommunity water system.

This kind of project is becoming the hallmark of progress in our rural region of southeastern Kentucky.

Rural development is a struggle the people of rural areas waged for many years with little help, and in the face of much scoffing and skepticism.

What chance for the backward crossroads town, the old-fashioned family farm, in the ultramodern America of the future?

But today, the national point of view is changing. Rural areas are being reappraised as the best hope for building clean and workable communities in the years ahead.

And the people of today's rural communities are pouring renewed initiative into the work of rural development, but now with a growing measure of effective support from State and Federal public agencies.

Progress is visible in the form of new business and industry, better farms, widespread building, and a new look of quality in housing that prevails in the towns and along the country roads.

Among the most productive of all public programs are those of the Farmers Home Administration. This agency of the Department of Agriculture has grown in importance as a fallback source of credit for three prime necessities in rural areas—that is, up-to-date water and sewer services, modernized housing, and adequate financing of the family farm.

The water project I have mentioned, that of the Eubank Water District, will abolish the old primitive methods of water supply for the towns of Eubank, Pulaski, and Waynesville, and the rural neighborhoods of Dishionville, Highland, and Halls Gap. A 40-mile system of water line will circulate through this county-line rural area of Pulaski and Lincoln Counties, reaching 450 homes in the towns and countryside and five schools with a total enrollment of 1,757 students.

This system will have the capacity to take on nearly twice as many homes and businesses as the original load.

Here is a project that lays the foundation for growth and diversification, for better living standards in this area.

It gives rise to hope that far more of those 1,757 young people now in school will grow up to find opportunity to stay in their home surroundings—rather than disappear into a mass of rural-to-city migration of the kind that has drained the countryside of bright, young people and contributed to misery and chaos in urban America.

Seventeen such rural water systems have been approved to date in counties of our Fifth Congressional District, and plans are in development for 11 more new systems or expansion projects to be realized within the next 1 to 2 years.

A dozen systems now finished and running have received about $4.5 million of financing through the Farmers Home Administration. About $3.75 million of this represents loans to be repaid from service receipts of the water systems. Thus for a net investment of about three quarters of a million dollars in public funds, the rural program has moved large areas outside the main towns, and thousands of people onto a new basis of modern sufficiency in the all-important matter of water supply.

For a broader picture of what is happening in up and coming rural areas, here is a profile of progress in Laurel County, Ky., another of the central counties of the Fifth Congressional District.

Like many places that relied in earlier times on agriculture and natural resources, Laurel County suffered a heavy loss of people who left in search of work. Its population fell below 25,000 by 1960, and in the early 1960s its work force stood at about 6,300 people with an unemployment rate of 10 percent.

Since that low point, Laurel has achieved a 10-percent population growth. The 1970 census reported a county population of 27,386. And by 1970 the work force had grown to more than 7,400 people, with a one-third reduction in the unemployment rate.

People of Laurel County and their county seat, London, have been working for this turnaround since the late 1940's. The weekly luncheon meeting of the London-Laurel County Development Association has been an unbroken tradition for 22 years. Progress has evolved from the untiring, self-reliant efforts put forth by this association, and by other civic and service organizations in the communities of Laurel County.

One of the first moves in the 1950's was to establish London-Corbin Airport, putting the area on regular commercial airline service. Good rail service is provided by the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, and there is a good road system. Laurel is fortunate to be a crossroads of the new

east–west Daniel Boone Freeway and north–south Interstate 75, making all parts of the State more accessible than ever before.

Since 1960 the number of businesses operated in London has grown from 500 to nearly 900. Variety and number of industries is impressive—27 new plants in 13 different fields, including yarn processing, clothing, a poultry hatchery, cheese processing, lumber, concrete, furniture, metal fabrication, bakeries, and more. London has become a regional hospital and medical treatment center; the site of a new vocational school; the center of a thriving recreation area based on lakes and a State park constructed in Laurel County.

Much of this development has come since the Farmers Home Administration rural water program took hold in the 1960's. Four rural water systems now encircle London in outer Laurel County, and a fifth is soon to be built. City-style water through rural lines now reaches half the population of the county. With this liberation from the ancient rural well and waterbucket standard, homes, farms, towns, and land where industry could prosper have undergone a transformation.

In 1960 there were 7,000 housing units in the county—35 percent with complete plumbing. Now there are 9,000 units—more than two-thirds with complete plumbing.

Both the water program and the rural housing program administered by Farmers Home are reflected in this improvement.

Private credit has financed most new homes, but Farmers Home has accounted for some 300 housing loans, totaling $3 million, to families of lower and moderate income who found no credit available from other sources. The former substandard houses of these families would still be a blight on Laurel County, but for the rural housing program. For Members of the House of Representatives with a rural or small town constituency, I need not dwell overlong on the boost the local economy has sustained from the $3 million investment.

Farming once was dominated by tobacco. Now cattle production is double what it was 10 years ago with some 20,000 head in Laurel County. There is water from the rural water systems for cattle, and for the 86 grade A dairies now operating in Laurel County. And there is the increasing reassurance of FHA credit for water, for housing and for farming operations, if other resources are not available, that enables many families to improve their farms and homes and remain on the land.

Throughout the Fifth District, Farmers Home has outstanding today more than 3,900 farm loans for real estate and production, totaling $16.7 million.

And the powerful supplement of FHA rural housing credit has accounted for some 4,000 new or modernized homes, town and country, for families in the modest income bracket. This is $25½ million added to the housing credit available in our district.

Progress as we find it in Kentucky invariably is the product of local initiative, reinforced where necessary by the practical application of public resources.

Farmers Home must rank foremost among Federal agencies that have made a visible contribution to community progress in our district. Its credit and technical services are extended to the people through offices at the local county level. Its personnel are people in and of the communities where they serve.

We commend Administrator James V. Smith and State Director John H. Burris on the quality and expansion of Farmers Home Administration services brought about in our district under their leadership.

We believe that the principle of service to rural people through local rather than distant city offices has been upheld in the success of FHA's delivery of its programs in the rural areas they are meant to help.

We urge every possible support for these programs. And we are gratified to know that the preservation of this great system of Farmers Home Administration local service offices is provided for in the President's plan for a more efficient reorganization of the Federal Government.

AMERICA'S DEFENSE MUST KEEP PACE—SCHRIEVER

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the best that goes on in Dallas, it is well to keep up with Felix McKnight of the Times Herald. Felix summed up the basic statement of Gen. B. A. Schriever.

Schriever is no longer active in the service. He speaks with objectivity in stressing the need for the United States to keep pace with Russia. We get further behind in missiles, in aircraft, in naval ships. It is time that America remembers that only the strong shall be free.

Here is the full editorial written by Felix McKnight on October 17, 1971, in the Dallas Times Herald:

FACTS, NOT SWORD RATTLING

(By Felix R. McKnight)

The rangy man of the Gregory Peck mold—piercing eyes, voice of quiet urgency—leaned into the microphone and threw the admonishment that is gaining volume these days:

"It's the national attitude I'm talking about—the strange apathy that endangers our country's security. If we don't reverse it we are in trouble . . . deep trouble. The Soviets are pulling away."

Out front, the faces of a hundred young Dallas leaders—the briskly progressive Dallas Assembly crowd—firmed into acknowledgment. It was a sober message from recently retired Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, U.S. Air Force.

They had to believe this tall Texan, the man who put the protective Intercontinental Ballistic Missile System (ICBM) into being. This German immigrant who came to Texas at age nine; rose to wear the four stars of a full U.S. General. A passionate lover of his adopted land.

What Ben Schriever was telling them in Dallas a few days ago is coming from all directions; most recently from Defense Secretary Melvin Laird in a somber warning that U.S. intelligence verifies the growth of a vast Soviet strategic weapon capability.

The U.S. capability is losing by default in this nation under the incessant cry of the antiwar element nurtured by the unpopular Vietnam war. And a large portion of that cry comes from liberals of the Congress.

Ben Schriever is no war monger because he wore a military uniform. He abhors the stench of war. He designed and fathered the missile system that stands as the U.S. defensive sentries of today. But he prays that not one will ever be fired; that the sanity of disarmament will prevail in the world.

Yet, he is a realist. He believes that Red Chinese capability to hit us is 10 to 15 years away, but he knows that Soviet multipronged warheads could shower our defense silos in less than 15 minutes if they elect to strike within the next few years. Unless, he stresses, we keep pace with our own strategic weaponry.

He is saying no more than the presidentially appointed Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, of which Dallasite William P. Clement Jr. is a member, when it warned the President and Congress that if present observable trends continue, "The United States will become a second-rate power incapable of assuring the future security and freedom of its people."

Schriever, the Texas A&M graduate who headed the wondrous research and development program of the Air Force Systems Command, now sits on a Presidential commission searching for ways to channel technology developed for the military into peaceful domestic areas of urban growth.

He prefers that our technological talents be pointed in that direction. But he also argues that we will be a jittery nation if we continue to default in the nuclear strategic field. Unhappily these days, a man has to keep his back door guarded while he goes about his home work.

Even the New York Times, outlet of the anti-war forces, has gravely reported within the past few days on the shocking growth of Soviet missile sites and missile submarines. The Soviets now have almost equalled in number the 41 Polaris submarines that once gave us security superiority. And they keep building while our program lags.

President Nixon recently commented that "neither power at this time could, if it wanted to, gain that superiority which would enable it to, frankly, blackmail the other one. . ."

But Secretary Laird this week knocked that down with the admission that the gravity of the Soviet surge is "far greater" than the estimate he gave Congress just seven months ago.

Texan Ben Schriever is not rattling swords—just unpalatable facts.

IMPORTS AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. O. R. Strackbein of the nationwide committee on import-export policy is recognized as

an able and dedicated authority on the problems brought upon American industry through foreign imports. Recently he presented a statement to the Ways and Means Committee of the House which is entitled "Imports and Full Employment." I feel it should have the benefit of the wide circulation of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I submit it for reprint.

IMPORTS AND FULL EMPLOYMENT

(By O. R. Strackbein)

Recent governmental action on the international front in the form of higher import duties and the flotation of the dollar calls for a reassessment of our foreign economic policy as it relates to the achievement of economic revival leading to full employment.

The goal of full employment in this country was adopted in pursuance of the Employment Act of 1946. Since the recession of 1969–71 this goal has continued to recede, rainbow fashion. What will be the effect of the newly announced import and dollar measures on the achievement of this objective?

BABEL OF VOICES

Economists, be they of the fiscal or monetary school, have long vied over the course to be pursued. The persistence of high unemployment concurrently with inflation has mystified the onlookers no less than the managers of what was known as the "game plan." Evidently something is basically wrong. But what is it? Will the newly adopted course meet the problem? The assortment of diagnosticians on all sides offer different findings and a variety of remedies.

Thus far they all appear to overlook the great change that has come over the landscape of American enterprise in the postwar years. Until these changes are identified and measured the traditional approaches will not lead to a solution.

Why, for example, is the investment climate important?

For reasons that should become apparent as we go on, the fortunes of our economy and our materialistic well-being and progress are dependent on economic growth or expansion. Ours is not a static economy. It is geared to growth. If we stand still under present conditions we fall. Unless this fact is perceived in full clarity, we cannot understand the nature of our present crisis. Oh, yes, we may hope to weather temporary recessions or even depressions, as we have in the past, and then take up again as we put our house in order. Such is our history. Today, however, it is different—radically different. The ground has shifted beneath our feet. We cannot abide stagnation. We cannot live with it. We must move upward or collapse.

In order to understand this we must first ask what is the nature of our particular economic system? At what point in its development did we depart from our forerunners in Europe, more particularly, England? And when did we forsake our own past?

THE OLD ECONOMICS

We learned our economics from the British, beginning with a two-century-old lucid exponent of the elements of political economy, Adam Smith. He is still revered by the followers of the free-trade doctrine. He laid bare for all to see the beauties of a free exchange of goods, both locally and among nations.

The British did him homage and to a considerable degree built their colonial system on his precepts as opposed to those of the mercantilists. The colonial empire spread all over the world and came to flower during the long reign of Queen Victoria.

While the American colonies broke away at the very time Adam Smith was bringing out his renowned Wealth of Nations, they nevertheless, as a new nation, took their subsequent understanding of economics from their British preceptors such as Smith, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill and others.

ATTITUDE TOWARD WAGES

One of the characteristics of the early capitalism following the Industrial Revolution was hostility toward wage earners and any notion that they had rights of their own. The class system which was then rampant in Britain regarded labor as a commodity or tool to be bought at the lowest possible rate and exploited for the benefit of profit-making factory owners. Anything to the contrary was heresy. A few dissident voices made themselves heard, arising, however, from humanitarian feelings rather than economic enlightenment. It was not surprising therefore that among the most effective protesters were lords who were revolted by the harsh practices of the factory system (eg. Lord Shaftesbury). The inhuman conditions of child labor, in particular offended the sensibilities of some of these hereditary noblemen; and they with others promoted reform.

Nevertheless the hostility toward rising wages persisted, and is indeed not dead today. Ricardo's "iron law of wages" based on heartless economic theory neatly supported the wage-repressive proclivities of the industrial owners and managers in England and elsewhere in Europe no less than in this country.

Emancipation from these economic shackles awaited the development of the American economy. Until late into the 19th century we followed the British example. After the Civil War, however, came the Knights of Labor and later the American Federation of Labor. They were expressive of new ideas but could make little headway since unionism was legally still widely regarded as conspiratorial; and the courts were not friendly. Moreover, the higher productivity that alone justifies higher wages had not yet been developed but we were on the threshold.

THE EVILS OF MONOPOLY PERCEIVED

Developments that signaled a departure of our system from its forerunners across the Atlantic began to take shape. The evils of monopoly power were perceived by our more independent academic economists, particularly as great trusts and combinations began to rise like skyscrapers over the Eastern landscape. Populists tutored by the more articulate economists, hurled their anathemas at the trusts as exploiters of the people. The economists demonstrated that competition was needed if the people were to share in the benefits of our nascent machine-fostered productivity. Many inventions were leading the way to higher levels of production, but if the world were left to the monopolists these would become rich while the people as a whole would benefit but little from the wonders that our budding technology might lay at their feet.

In 1890 the Sherman Anti-Trust Act was passed. This Act represented official recognition of the cost-reducing function of competition by assuring the passing of any such reductions to the consumer in the form of lower retail prices. With monopoly in the saddle, the lower prices might have been avoided or postponed at the pleasure of the monopoly power. The era of "trust-busting" had dawned.

After the turn of the century, the American productive system was on the threshold of the take-off that, symbolically with the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk, would launch us upon a new economic world.

The American people had the inventive genius, the robust toil-willingness and the thrift necessary to capital-formation. It was at this time that we could indeed have taken a road that would have closed the door to the development of the unique American productive system. Had someone not perceived the link between rising output and the market outlet for the goods produced, we should have continued along the pedestrian path that continued to be the preference of Europeans, including the British.

RECOGNITION OF THE FUNCTION OF FAIR COMPETITION

What did we do that cut us loose? We followed the Sherman Act of 1890 with Clayton Act, the Federal Reserve law and the Federal Trade Commission Act (all under the Wilson Administration), and later the Robinson-Patman Act, designed to assure the passing of economies of production to the consumers and the availability of capital to others than the industrial giants. In other words the legal substratum was readied for what actually followed (with some distortions, to be sure).

THE BIRTH OF MASS-PRODUCTION

Perhaps no better example can be found by way of illustration of our unique development than the automobile industry. Early in the present century a number of odd-looking horseless carriages made their appearance. The cost per unit was necessarily high, and not many of the new contraptions could be sold if the cost remained high. What were the prospects?

If the product were improved and at the same time the price lowered it became evident from the public reaction that the horseless carriage would enjoy widespread public acceptance.

THE FUNCTION OF MASS-CONSUMPTION DISCOVERED

Henry Ford is usually credited with the fruitful vision that opened the way not only to a vast automotive industry but no less also the way for a similar proliferation of other goods. Evidently he saw clearly that if he increased his output he could spread his overhead over more units and come out with a lower-priced car. Yet, what assurance had he that he could sell the increased number? Well, he took the plunge and found the market receptive even though the "tin-lizzie" was all but inspiring as an esthetic achievement.

What was left for him to do? Would he find customers if he built ever more cars? In other words would still lower prices turn up more customers? He tried and found the answer to be "yes." The demand for his product was elastic, i.e., the lower the price the higher the number of customers!

LOWER PRICES AND ELASTIC DEMAND—A VERITABLE BONANZA

What would be his limit? To assure himself of a growing market, Ford instituted the $5 a day wage, no doubt hoping that other employers would follow suit. He reasoned that the market was not really measured by the number of people who might wish to buy his product but by how many would have the means of doing so. In other words if you wish to produce massively you must have massive consumption. Assured of the elasticity of demand for his product, Ford took full advantage of the cost-reduction that came from mass-production, and established as a model for others to follow the connection between mass-production and mass-consumption, with the latter supported by good wages.

Employee compensation from the raw material stages of production through the finished product accounts for some 80% of total production cost under free competition and absence of monopoly. Ford thus saw wages in a new light: the very heart of mass purchasing power. Wages made the market.

THE NEW FORMULA

All that was necessary thereafter, as other enterprisers could see from the Ford ex-

ample, was to find a new product, nonessential but attractive to potential consumers because of its contribution to comfort, ease or convenience, its durability, beauty or ego-flattering assets, and then to reduce costs through further labor-saving improvements and higher and higher volume of production. As the price would fall, more and more consumer pocketbooks would be opened.

WAGES PERCEIVED IN A NEW LIGHT

The function of wages once seen as the source of consumer demand, converted wage earners into customers in the eyes of businessmen. This was a far-reaching transformation. While resistance to wage increases persisted it lost its former vehemence and bitterness.

THE GREAT AMERICAN ECONOMIC DEPARTURE

With the acceptance of this vision and its spread this country became radically differentiated from other capitalistic nations. The vision of a great and profitable mass market based on the great expansibility of human wants backed by an adequate payroll acted as motivation toward lower costs. We developed beside the automobile, a great variety of products under the impetus of this vision: a wide assortment of household appliances, leisure and recreational stand-bys, such as motion pictures, radio, television, music players, cameras, etc. We needed no competition from abroad to bring automobiles within the reach of wage earners; nor did we need it to fill our homes with radio, telephones and record players. We needed only to remember Henry Ford to build millions of low-cost refrigerators, bath facilities, dishwashers, vacuum cleaners, motor lawnmowers, pleasure watercraft, athletic goods, prefabricated houses, and much else. Higher productivity meant yet lower costs and broader markets even after mass production became universal.

It was indeed not enough to mass-produce to reach a mass market. As technological improvements could be made, productivity could be increased yet more. Capital equipment itself devoted to producing consumer goods, was no exception. Cigarette-making machinery, shoe machinery, virtually automatic textile machinery, baking equipment—every producing apparatus imaginable could be improved again and again to produce ever more goods per man-hour. Greater productivity supported higher wages and lower costs. More and more people could be employed and moved from minimum to higher consumption levels of a greater variety of goods. Elasticity of demand for consumer goods not only produced more jobs directly but also indirectly by stimulating employment in machinery and equipment manufacture.

Of course, this proliferation of goods had limitations. The amount of food that could be consumed, for example, was limited by the number of stomachs. This fact made for inelasticity of demand for necessities. In this country we learned that the production of essential goods alone would not turn many factory wheels. It was the nonessential goods in almost limitless forms that led to growth and expansion of industry and greater payrolls. The appetite for sugar, meat, bread, salt, etc. had definite termini. Not so the desire for millinery or other wardrobe fillers and seemingly unlimited varieties of other goods.

The modern American economy became ever more dependent for its business volume and employment on nonessential goods. This fact also made the economy more vulnerable, which is to say more responsive to psychological factors, such as fear or confidence. The purchase of nonessentials may be postponed or curtailed at the consumer's judgment. In turn, this fact makes the producer more wary lest he overproduce in relation to the market. If he suffers a loss of confidence for whatever reason he will not so readily commit his finances to expansion plans, and employment soon stagnates or declines.

UNIVERSAL DIFFUSION OF AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY

After World War II the other leading industrial countries, having observed the vast industrial power of this country at work during the war, cast their future economic lot with our system. (Russia and her followers took a different route). We helped them in numerous ways, including massive financial infusion. With 20 years they had absorbed much of our technology. In many instances they built plants and facilities new from the ground up, whereas we replaced obsolete or obsolescent machinery and equipment over a period of time. Foreign productivity advanced more rapidly in proportion than our upward trend since they moved upward from a much lower base.

The other countries did not however, so readily accept the second part of our equation, namely, the building of consumer purchasing power based on higher wages. While their wages rose rapidly they did not close the gap that separated them from our wage levels. With their productivity coming close on our heels but with wages far behind, foreign producers soon widened their competitive advantages. Union organization, though often more extensive, is not as effective abroad as in this country. Because of the lag of consumer purchasing power in those countries in relation to output of industry, dependence on exports to dispose of surplus products became acute. The United States provided the single largest and most open market for these goods.

We had meantime (from 1934) entered upon a program of tariff-reduction that lowered the protective effect of our duties by some 80%. From an average level of a little over 50% on dutiable imports we came down progressively since 1934 to 9.07% by the first half of 1971, while approximately 35% of our total imports pay no duty at all. Had our great lead in productivity continued after 1945 as it was before the war, we might have withstood the bombardment of our market by imports, but this lead had shrunk badly by 1968.

THE GREAT DILEMMA

Beyond the competitive disadvantage that overtook us during this period, we had done much in this country, as other countries had also done, to narrow the margin of competitive maneuverability of our producers. Most of the cost factors were trussed in regulations and controls that left but little room for cost-reduction. The result was that the only hope of gaining a competitive advantage or holding an exising one was to reduce the man-hours needed to produce goods—which is to say, higher productivity or greater efficiency. This could be accomplished by displacing the number of workers needed to produce a given quantity of output in a given amount of time.

In the past that course was precisely the classic way of assuring ourselves of a broadening market, as we have seen.

Why would it not work in the present-day world?

We faced a paradox. One of the very pillars of our success, namely, free and fair competition confronted us with the prospect of our economic undoing.

Under the pressure of the Great Depression we largely abandoned the free enterprise system, such as it was, and entered the road to a controlled, regulated and partially planned economy. There is little prospect of turning back. To repeat, the significant factors of production, including wages, the most important of all, were rendered inflexible so far as cost of production was concerned in all directions but one, namely reduction of man-hours per unit of work, or, greater productivity. Since employee compensation is by far the greatest cost element under nonmonopoly conditions, as it is also by far the principal element in consumer purchasing power; and since employee compensation in this country was much higher than in all other countries (Canada excepted) and realistically could not be reduced we found ourselves competitively outflanked by other industrial countries that took their mass-production cue from us and, with our help, raced us for possession of our own growing inner market.

Our help was not only financial in billion dollar-volume multiples, but beyond that we had all but dismantled our tariff defense. We stood on a high materialistic plateau, beneficiaries of an affluent society generated by our high technology, buoyed by handsome employee compensation and by our insatiable consumer demand for nonessential goods, constantly stimulated by advertiser incitement. Meantime recognition of toxic and noxious fall-out and perilous side-effects of our growth and proliferation confronted us with yet higher costs. These to be sure, were coming also to confront other countries in some degree.

The old approach now no longer serves us. When we reduced costs by inventing more productive machinery and installing it we reduced costs. As the lower costs were passed on to the consumer lower layers of income were tapped. Consumption expanded and before long we employed more workers than the new machines had displaced. The process was axiomatic—provided we dealt with goods that enjoyed an elastic demand.

Reaction of Producers and Manufacturers

To counter the outflanked position in which they found themselves our producers looked abroad for investment. They moved into foreign countries with branch plants, modern technology and joint ventures. There they could take advantage of the lower prevailing wages and supply foreign markets from within and even ship from there to third markets rather than from the United States. These investments grew at a galloping rate and while they were tempered by governmental restrictions they were not halted. Today our direct private investments abroad are some $75 billion.

It is safe to say that if our earlier enterprisers who gave us our mass-production, mass-consumption system, had been confronted with the conditions our industries face today in the form of import competition, our unique system would have remained unborn. If, on the other hand, the other countries had started with us fifty or more years ago and developed the same system we would also not now face our present import problem. However, they did not do so, and now we face the paradox of being confronted with our system coming back upon us competitively under circumstances that carry our undoing if we do not stem the tide.

It is not the number of workers displaced directly by rising imports, harmful as this is, that poses our worst problem. It is the employment that cannot materialize and that we sorely need if we are to make substantial headway toward full employment, that generates our nightmare. We have some 2 million additional workers coming on the labor market each year. Some of our industries must employ substantially more workers since the growth of the service industries, much as these have mushroomed, cannot absorb so vast a horde of newscomers, if our unemployment is not to grow; or we need new industries, such as came to our rescue in the past.

Two difficulties then face us. Our existing industries are under growing pressure from

imports to become more efficient, i.e., to produce more goods with fewer workers. Under comparable conditions our coal industry struggled for survival from 1950 to 1965 and succeeded in regaining competitiveness, but the cost was harsh indeed. Some three out of four coal miners lost their jobs (some 350,000 in all) and we were left with the problem of Appalachia.

Today other industries are under heavy pressure to follow the example of coal, possibly in a somewhat more moderate degree. Textiles, steel, electronics, footwear, office equipment, machine tools, hand tools, vegetables, and much else including our merchant marine; but we cannot absorb multiple Appalachias.

The other difficulty, even more oppressive, lies in the dead end faced by new industries that might aspire to perform the job-breeding functions of their forerunners that made their way in a beckoning environment, wherein rich markets lay within reach if the right formula were followed. Today that avenue is all but closed.

Foreign producers and American branch plants operating abroad, are poised, ready with lower-cost foreign goods, to head off efforts of domestic industries to reach our mass market with new products (or with innovations of established products) that were formerly available to domestic producers within this country. There are those who believe that our prime hope lies in the "high-technology" industries as export leaders, such as computers and other "sophisticated" items. Unfortunately the experience with household electronic products and automobiles does not support such an escape.

The mobility of capital being what it is, our large companies readily go abroad or license foreign producers to use American patents.

Left behind are the American workers (who comprise the bulk of consumer purchasing power), the smaller companies, the suppliers of materials and parts to domestic assembly production and the many agricultural and mining pursuits that are not salvageable by exports.

It is no accident that our imports have been growing more rapidly than our exports; that our imports increasingly consist of manufactured goods that incorporate the full complement of low-priced foreign labor; that our manufacturers seek foreign havens for investment, and that our employment is lagging behind the growing labor supply. It is no accident that we are confronted, as we are, with the imperative of wage and price control and import restrictions. Our unique production-consumption system, dependent on expansion as an alternative to collapse, cannot adjust to lower-cost competition from abroad for two reasons: (1) other countries, with their modern technology and low wages can beat us to the lower cost levels, and (2) our wages are proof against either a standstill or a reduction. Therefore the only door open to a better competitive position is that of worker-displacement, and this runs counter to full employment and a buoyant market, in view of the trump held by foreign sources.

STRUCTURAL DIFFERENCE WILL NOT YIELD TO NEGOTIATION

The difference is structural and is not negotiable in international conferences. It may be likened to a geological fault as a generator of disturbances and earthquakes. It will not yield to cosmetic applications, such as a duty surcharge or currency manipulation, or investment tax credits or export incentives. These measures can be of value only for the purpose of buying time. Tariffs under the Most-Favored-Nation Clause principle, are not a suitable instrument for over-all trade regulation.

If we wish to continue our system of dependence on constant industrial and economic expansion we must restore the climate in which the system was born. New products and improvements of existing ones must have the promise and lure of our domestic mass market restored to them. If they qualify for popular acceptance they must have access to the rich market rather than facing the prospect of being shunted aside from it by imports bearing unbridgeable cost advantages. These are in a position to despoil completely the lure of the beckoning mass market that was the yeast that leavened our accustomed expansion.

With the door securely shut against repetition of past patterns of product and employment proliferation, labor and the segments of industry that depend on the domestic economy, face stagnation. For the very reason that imports have the upper hand in our market we cannot look to exports to come to the rescue. Today we successfully export only a few manufactured products in a volume greater than our imports: machinery and equipment, such as computers and aircraft, and chemicals (mostly semi-manufactured). Our lead is declining even in these products. In nearly all else we are on the run. Our heavy machinery exports are now seen as something less than a blessing to us because they lead to higher foreign productivity, greater foreign production and a creeping shrinkage of foreign markets.

ALTERNATIVES WE FACE

Unless we elect to retreat from our accustomed vision of dynamism and economic growth and become willing to rest on our oars as consumers, satisfied with a lower quota of consumer goods, a "lower standard of living" and unless we can become content to live with less of the yeasty materialism that now besets us and holds us in thrall, we must restore the economic climate in which we grew so lustily to world industrial leadership.

That such a demarche could not be accomplished without extremities of discontent and rebellion goes without saying. Some there are, to be sure, who purport to be bored with our affluence and others who decry our crass materialism, but they have not been tested under the drab habiliments of an endless recession or, more appropriately, a relentless and endless depression.

CONCLUSION

The restoration of the earlier economic climate would demand nothing more drastic or complicated than reserving for domestic producers a reasonable share of the domestic market with respect to all goods that are under pressing encroachment from imports. Higher tariffs would not meet the need. They would be inflexible, inequitable and deficient because of the Most-Favored-Nation clause. Yet freer trade would be fatal in the absence of ceilings. Higher exports in sufficient degree to restore full employment are not attainable under the present comparative competitive levels subsisting among the nations.

Ceilings on imports with appropriate provisions for flexibility to avoid rigidity represent the most acceptable approach to the controls that are necessary to assure continued viability of our hitherto unique economic system. Properly devised and secured the establishment of ceilings on imports could remove the need for tariffs altogether.

DOCK STRIKE

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, although President Nixon invoked the Taft-Hartley Act to halt the 3-month-old west coast dock strike, a national emergency may shortly exist if the east and gulf coast dock strike is allowed to continue much longer.

In 1968 and 1969, the Port of New York as well as all other east and gulf coast ports were shut down for more than 2 months as the International Longshoremen's Association and port employers failed to reach agreement on new contracts. That strike plunged numerous small businessmen into bankruptcy, tied up 4 million tons of cargo worth $2.5 billion, and cost the Port of New York $2 million a day. Other regions suffered daily losses ranging from $300,000 to $1 million during the strike.

Clearly, we cannot permit a repurcussion of that situation today. With our international trade balance heading for its first deficit since 1893, the reverberations of a prolonged longshore strike could be disastrous for the Nation's economic recovery.

An article in the September issue of Traffic Management, quotes David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank, and Austin Tobin, executive director of the Port of New York Authority as saying that a prolonged dock strike could have extremely serious consequences for the Nation.

I include the article, written by Lawrence M. Lesser and entitled, "The Waterfront Crisis," in the RECORD:

THE WATERFRONT CRISIS

(By Lawrence M. Lesser)

"I'm convinced that I don't want a strike. I'm convinced my people don't want a strike. So what we've got, don't try to take away from us."

With this warning to management, Thomas W. (Teddy) Gleason, president of the 110,000-member International Longshoremen's Association, opened the door last month to negotiations over new contracts for 60,000 East and Gulf Coast dock workers. The old contracts expire Sept. 30.

This marks the fourth time in 10 years that the men who load and unload the ships at East and Gulf Coast ports have sat down with the port employers to negotiate new contracts. In the past, contract talks led to lengthy strikes that tied up ships and cargo and caused countless losses. In fact, since 1948, no settlement has been reached without a strike.

On the Pacific Coast, 15,000 members of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union walked off their jobs July 1 for the first time in 23 years.

Some very tough language on the West Coast situation comes from Harry Bridges, president of the ILWU. In a statement Traffic Management obtained directly from Mr. Bridges, he said:

"Our real economic power rests with our strength to keep vessels from loading or discharging in the Pacific Coast ports of the United States. There is enough power in that strength to prevent the movement of vessels, except military, to win the strike. The economics of the profits in this industry is the quick turnaround time. Keep the ships at sea carrying cargo. That's where the employers make their money.

". . . The power of the union lies in its ability to prevent ships from moving with cargo. . . . As long as that power is exercised, we have a tight strike.

"We have a good tight strike, and we know for sure that should we need it, we will have the full support of the entire AFL–CIO and the labor movement everywhere."

In 1948, a dock strike shut down Pacific Coast ports as well as all other ports throughout the nation for up to 95 days.

David Rockefeller, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank, feels a longshore strike can run on for about two months without having any lasting impact on the nation as a whole. "But a strike that lasted more than two months would have extremely damaging effects on the economy. By that time, you would have used up stocks of all sorts of imported raw materials, and industry would just start winding down."

For the past six years, the maritime industry has been going through a tremendous worldwide technological revolution in order to increase productivity. New automated ships, with such names as LASH (lighter-aboard-ship), Seabee (sea barge), Ro/Ro (roll-on, roll-off) and OBO (oil-bulk-ore), are starting to appear on the sea lanes of the world. Highly productive cargo-handling equipment, such as container cranes and overhead conveyor systems, has replaced manual labor. Twenty tons of cargo can now move as a single unit in a container across the world in less than half the time it took 10 years ago. In short, an industry that for years depended heavily on manual labor is now becoming so automated that much labor is finding itself unwanted and unneeded.

It is the owners and operators of this highly mechanized equipment that provide the number one target for their employes who are fighting for job security and a share in the expected benefits from this new technology. By the same token, these ship owners and port operators are more vulnerable than ever to a strike, since they cannot afford to let their huge capital investments stand idle for very long.

Richard Pollard, vice president and maritime loan officer for Chase Manhattan, a major lender to the ocean carriers, believes that a prolonged longshore strike is "going to be a serious thing" for the steamship industry. "The U.S. flag subsidized liner services have been running pretty tight cash-wise and profitwise over the last couple of years," he explains. "And it's unfortunate timing for a longshore strike, because they're hitting these companies just when they are in the poorest position to really absorb that kind of a blow."

One of the most vulnerable steamship companies is Prudential-Grace Lines, which earlier this year and last had its brand new $25 million LASH vessel, described at the time as "the United States' most innovative ship," tied up for nearly 12 weeks by a labor dispute with the ILA. The cancellation of three voyages cost the company an estimated $500,000 in out-of-pocket losses.

On July 19, the chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Helen Delich Bentley, warned the ILA that Prudential-Grace "sits on a financial precipice which threatens to give away to disaster with only the slightest push." Without refuting her statement, A. W. DeSmedt, president of Prudential-Grace, says the same statement applies to almost all the major American flag lines with heavy investment in new capital equipment. "We've seen the Penn Central, for instance, go into receivership, and if that can happen without the government blinking an eye, I guess we can go down, too, and the American shipping industry can go down."

American Export Industries, parent company of American Export Isbrandtsen Lines, also is suffering financial woes. Last year, the shipping-based conglomerate lost $15.6 million and ran another deep deficit in the first quarter of this year. Several months ago, Jakob Isbrandtsen, whose family controls almost 25% of the company, was ousted as president and chief executive officer in a major management shake-up.

"I would say it's tough to single out one of them as being ripe for failure," says one Wall Street analyst. "But I would say that all of them are in a position where a prolonged strike could do serious damage."

Labor's demands center around wage hikes, increased pensions for retired longshoremen, tightened control over the handling of containers and guaranteed pay for 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, whether or not work is available.

While longshoremen in the Port of New York and several other East Coast ports have received a guaranteed annual wage (GAW) since 1965, none of the ports on either the South Atlantic, Gulf or Pacific Coast have pay guarantees, and labor insistence on establishing such programs has met stiff employer opposition.

New York, regarded as the pacesetter for the rest of the industry, wants to do away with the GAW completely. In the past four years, hirings there dropped 21%—a decline of one million jobs. But because of the guarantee, management had to pay for work that wasn't there. The Port of New York, which includes New Jersey piers, is the world's largest container complex.

Alexander P. Chopin, chairman of the New York Shipping Association, the bargaining agent for most East Coast ports, told delegates to the ILA convention in Miami Beach July 21 that the guaranteed income was costing the industry $30 million this year, or double the original projection. He also said that at least four major New York-based shipping companies were on the verge of bankruptcy.

Faced with fewer jobs and an aging membership (many longshoremen are in the 58 to 63 age bracket), Teddy Gleason recently explained to Traffic Management why the ILA is seeking to extend the GAW to South Atlantic and Gulf ports:

"We're looking for that because of all the brand new ships coming out in that particular area—they'll be increasing their productivity anywhere from 1,000% to 1,500%. We're also looking for better pensions to encourage men 62 and 63 years of age to get out of the industry. Some of our guys . . still have families at 62, and they have to support them," he added, four days before being reelected to his third term as president of the ILA.

Management—the shipping companies, port authorities and businesses that suffer from a disruption in the flow of goods—is far from sympathetic, however. They criticize longshoremen for picking and choosing only the easiest jobs and for turning down work when it is available.

"They don't really want to go to work every day taking pot luck on good ships and bad ships," says the director of a leading East Coast port. "If they're handling one type of cargo and they come to something they don't like, they just walk off. And there's not a damn thing you can do about it!"

Michael R. McEvoy, chairman of Sea-Land Service, the largest U.S. container operator, warns that the maritime industry cannot go on much longer paying guarantees for work not actually performed. "We've either got to bring work to the worker or bring the worker to the work—one way or the other," he says in reference to New York, where jobs go begging in one area of the port while men sit idly by in another. "This industry will go completely bankrupt just having to pay guarantees on a straight 40-hour week to people," he claims.

When alerted to Mr. McEvoy's comments, the fiery ILA chief, who will be 71 on Nov. 8, replied:

"It's very funny. They were looking up a mule's ass 10 years ago and last year, they made $39 million in profits because of the longshoremen. They increased their productivity tremendously from the old ships to what they've got now.

"I sat down with them when they didn't have anything; they were lucky they had a rowboat. And I convinced our men that we should go along with progress . . . and in return for that, they said no man should lose his job because of automation . . . In New York alone, attrition took 5,000 jobs away from us last year—men dying and those going on pensions.

"It's only a matter of time, if this type of attrition continues, that there will not be enough men in the industry to service it. And there won't be any guaranteed annual wage!"

With the contract deadline drawing near and barring a sudden reversal in the positions of labor and management, it may well be up to President Nixon to decide whether much of the foreign commerce of the United States will be moving on October 1.

PROPOSED MERGERS

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, those of us interested in the future of American naval strength and development read with particular interest the recent article by L. Edgar Prina of Copley News Service which appeared in the October issue of "Sea Power." Entitled, "Will the Minnow Swallow the Whale?" This article is a penetrating discussion of the present debate going on within Pentagon and congressional circles over the proposed merger of the Military Sealift Command with the Army's Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service. I am pleased to share with my House colleagues Ed Prina's analysis of this vital issue.

The article follows:

WILL THE MINNOW SWALLOW THE WHALE?

(By L. Edgar Prina)

"It's the minnow swallowing the whale."

That is how Vice Admiral Arthur R. Gralla, boss of the Military Sealift Command, characterizes the Defense Department plan to transfer ocean transportation management and procurement from MSC to the Army's Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service (MTMTS).

What the doughty admiral had in mind, among other things, was that MSC did an $891 million volume of business in fiscal year 1971 while MTMTS rang up a much more modest $177 million. As for employees, MSC has more than 9,000; MTMTS, 5,580.

The Defense Department—in this case, Deputy Secretary David Packard and Barry J. Shillito, Assistant Secretary for Installations and Logistics—caused the controversial directive to be issued last February 24. The tidal waves of controversy it has caused in the maritime community, the Pentagon and Congress have yet to subside.

At the heart of the order was the decision to consolidate a number of MSC-MTMTS functions, with the Secretary of the Army to be the new single manager of surface transportation (including the ocean mode) for the Pentagon, replacing the Secretary of the Navy.

The far-reaching move, which purportedly seeks to eliminate duplication and bring new efficiencies and economies to defense surface transportation, burst upon the Navy like a "bombshell," according to Gralla. "It was a complete surprise," he said.

Gralla and the Navy were not the only ones who didn't know what was coming. Major General Clarence J. Lang, Commander of MTMTS, said he, too, was caught by surprise, albeit happily. Major General Maurice Casey, Director of Air Force Transportation, made it unanimous for the uniformed services. He said he didn't know, either.

NEVER IN HISTORY

Nor were the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the principal military advisors to the President of the United States and Secretary of Defense, or the pertinent congressional committees told beforehand.

Shillito's power play was close to the vest. Perhaps too close.

When Representative F. Edward Hebert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, heard of the directive, he called upon Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird to postpone implementation until his group had a chance to look into the matter.

The JCS, for its part, requested of the Secretary an opportunity to review the directive. This should have caused some embarrassment to Laird, who has frequently boasted that never before in history has a Secretary of Defense had such an intimate working relationship with the nation's highest military officers.

Representative Edwin A. Garmatz, Chairman of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, was one of the first "outsiders" to hear about the directive. His group held hearings early last spring, but since has appeared to have deferred to Hebert. At one session, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, blasted the Pentagon plan as bad for the merchant marine and bad for the Navy.

The Pentagon made a strategic retreat in face of the Hebert request and regrouped. Packard directed Robert F. Froehlke, then Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration, to study the Shillito plan along with such alternate solutions as a genuinely joint Army-Navy agency and a proposal in which MSC take over the MTMTS functions.

At the time of this writing, the Froehlke group's findings and recommendations had still not been made public. Now that Froehlke has been appointed Secretary of the Army he hardly can be considered unbiased in the matter. Accordingly, the study group's recommendations are not likely to be announced.

After Laird agreed to hold up implementation of the Shillito plan, Hebert appointed a subcommittee, headed by Representative Alton Lennon (D-N.C.), to make a thorough review of the organization and management of military transportation. His panel was organized September 9. It held its first hearing four days later, with Gralla as lead-off witness.

The Lennon review could be one of the most important ones of its kind for the Navy in many, many years for this reason: If the Army is given control of ocean transportation procurement and a major (perhaps dominating) role in contingency planning involving the merchant marine and is made the Pentagon's point of contact with the Maritime Administration and the shipping industry, the result would be further fragmentation of U.S. sea power. (It already has been to the detriment of American security, with the earlier elimination of the Secretary of the Navy from the Cabinet of any spokesman for the broad spectrum of maritime affairs at the Presidential level.

It is quite clear that the Navy and the maritime industry must work more and more closely together. The fierce competition for funds between national security requirements and social welfare needs means that the Navy is not going to be able to rebuild its combatant fleet—its No. 1 priority—and still be able to buy ships for sealift.

As the Navy's new build-and-charter plan will hopefully demonstrate, private financing for the needed new freighters and tankers for national defense is possible when long-term government contracts to shipping companies are part of the picture.

SPEAKING BLUNTLY

In his testimony before the Lennon subcommittee, Gralla spoke with bluntness, saying:

"I think the issue should be: Why do we want to disrupt, disorganize and, I suspect, demoralize the relationships between military sealift and merchant marine interests to create a duplicate, Army-oriented sealift command?

"I think the burden of proof must be on those who would make this chaotic change to show what savings or greater efficiencies in the national defense are to be achieved . . . I conclude, gentlemen, that this proposed reorganization will adversely impact upon both our peacetime ability and our wartime readiness."

The admiral emphasized that the transfer of procurement and all its related functions is "not just a small administrative change" but, rather, is something that goes "to the heart of some of the basic missions of the Navy."

In addition to the loss of procurement, the Navy would be largely stripped of its role in contingency planning, perhaps illegally, according to testimony at the Lennon hearings.

Subcommittee Counsel George Norris said recent "add-ons" to MTMTS responsibilities under the Packard-Shillito plan included these:

To develop the ocean needs with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and advise them what the needs are.

To plan the efficient use of military-owned and commercial transportation resources.

"These were functions given to the Navy by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended," Norris said.

Whether Defense Department legal experts agree that there is a conflict between the plan and the law was not ascertainable immediately.

The hearings brought out the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by a 3 to 1 margin, with the Army chief, General William C. Westmoreland in the minority, twice took substantial issue with the Shillito plan—in memoranda signed last June 9 and July 6.

CLOSED-DOOR SESSION

However, in a recent closed-door session with the subcommittee the chiefs reportedly were evasive and unwilling to take direct issue with their civilian superiors at the Pentagon. Later, Lennon voiced his dismay at this turn of events, saying that all the subcommittee wanted was the truth.

Some subcommittee sources said privately that it was evident to them that somebody in the Administration was "turning the screws pretty hard" to present a facade of unity behind the Shillito plan.

"Shillito has strongly suggested that he is going to implement the plan just as soon as these (Lennon) hearings are conducted," one source declared.

The appearance of Andrew Gibson, Maritime Administrator, September 27 appeared to buttress suggestions that the White House has sent out the word to soft pedal any differences of opinion over the controversial MSC–MTMTS consolidation plan.

Will the Maritime Administration be affected by the consolidation and, if so, how? the subcommittee asked.

I don't really know," Gibson replied. "I just don't know enough about the plan."

In his prepared statement, the Maritime Administrator put himself squarely on the middle of the fence, neither supporting nor opposing the Shillito plan in so many words.

Gibson clearly wanted to talk about the "how" not the "who" of military ocean transportation procurement. That is the key, as far as he and the merchant marine are concluded he said.

But Lennon voiced a belief that Gibson really opposes the Pentagon action but human nature and the bureaucratic facts of life prevent him from saying so openly. The chairman pointed to those paragraphs in Gibson's statement:

"There is a clear, immutable, and inevitable relationship between DoD peacetime sealift procurement practice and emergency sealift readiness capability. . . .

"I . . . believe, based on the growing effective working relationship with the Navy, that nothing should be done in the proposed realignment of procurement responsibly to in any way impair or disturb these efforts."

General Lang, the MTMTS boss, followed Gralla to the Lennon subcommittee stand and made a strong pitch for taking over ocean traffic management for MSC.

TOTAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

"I am convinced it will save people and it will save money and it will save time," he asserted. "It will promote efficiency and responsiveness of the total transportation system for the Defense Department."

When Norris noted that the Joint Chiefs (less Westmoreland) recommended July 6 that the transfer of the sealift procurement function from MSC MTMTS be reconsidered in order to enhance the contingency readiness of the Navy, Lang replied:

"Procurement by the Navy is not essential to sealift readiness. . . In the first place, the Navy has had the undivided responsibility for procurement for almost the past 25 years—21 to be exact. The present deteriorated condition of the merchant marine is well-known by everybody, in Congress, outside, and in the Navy.

"This is one reason why I can't see that the procurement that they had had for this period of time has done anything about sealift readiness.

"No. 2, the condition of the (MSC) nucleus fleet is equally deteriorated, if not worse."

BUILD NEW SHIPS

Lang asserted that the Navy spent $137 million last year to perpetuate use of the aging nucleus fleet when, in his opinion, it should have used the funds to build new ships.

"From the caliber of that (128-ship nucleus) fleet, it would be equivalent to flying C–47's or Connies," the general said.

Norris then asked the witness whether it was true that the procurement policy under which the Navy has been operating was set down by the Department of Defense and not by the Navy.

Lang replied: "Yes."

Although the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General John Ryan, sides with the JCS majority in opposing essential elements of the Shillito plan, General Casey told the subcommittee:

"We have no reason to oppose this merger. We support the decision of the Secretary of Defense."

The Military Airlift Command is not directly involved in the MSC-MTMTS consolidation proposal, although some subcommittee members cautioned that MAC might be next as far as the transportation merger is concerned.

Casey, who appeared as wanting only to stay out of the controversy, made it plain, however, that the Air Force would vigorously oppose any Pentagon effort to include MAC in any unified agency run by the Army.

Thus, the battle goes on. The Lennon subcommittee probably will not finish its work and issue its report until later this month.

Meanwhile, it's the status quo ante, with Uncle Barry Shillito waiting in the wings, all set to put on his production.

POSTAL SERVICE GETS DOWN TO BUSINESS

HON. WILLIAM O. MILLS

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. MILLS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 17, the Washington Star published an article by staff writer Miriam Ottenberg. The article was titled "Postal Service Gets Down to Business," and is a comprehensive review of the conversion of the mail system to an independent agency of government. Ms. Ottenberg's article is extremely enlightening and informative, and outlines in detail the efforts being made to create a more efficient and businesslike organization of postal service. The Postal Service is of tremendous importance to every American, and I believe this article should be available to the millions of Postal Service customers. For that reason I am inserting the article in the RECORD:

POSTAL SERVICE GETS DOWN TO BUSINESS

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The U.S. Postal Service has become big business, operated by ex-industry executives, promoted with Madison Avenue flair, determined to please its 200 million customers with new techniques for speeding the mail. It even has its own complaint department.

After 181 years under the sheltering arm of Congress, the new Postal Service has embarked on the road to self-sufficiency. As of July 1, the Postal Service started operating the mail system as an independent agency of government. It replaced the Cabinet-level department that dated back to colonial times.

Just like any business, the Postal Service has its own chief executive officer and chairman of the board. Winton M. Blount, the 59th Postmaster General of the old department was named by the new board of governors as the first Postmaster General of the Postal Service. The governors, who represent the public and direct postal operations, also elected him chairman of the board.

Before the Postal Service gained its independence, the covering wing of Congress had become more crippling than sheltering. Some post offices pre-dated the Civil War, postal pay was such that workers broke tradition by staging a work stoppage, budgets were too paltry to take advantage of the new technology, politics dominated the management. And the public protests grew.

Letters often took several days to get across town. Jokes abounded.

The standard crack was that Martha Mitchell would stop using the telephone so much if she could rely on the mails to reach her target. Even the President joked about the slow mail.

As he signed the Postal Reorganization Act on Aug. 12, 1970, President Nixon commented: "I wrote the Postmaster General three days ago telling him some of the things that I have said here today. I don't think he has received the letter yet."

He couldn't say that today. By the end of this month, at least 95 percent of all zip-coded letters mailed by 5 p.m. to addresses in the same city or nearby areas will be delivered the next day. The system already tests at better than 90 percent effective.

PIONEERING

Overnight mail delivery is one of more than a score of new developments now in effect, in the experimental stage or under contract as the postal service starts doing its own thinking, planning and pioneering.

The developments are coming so fast that the question naturally arises: Why didn't they start operating this way years ago?

The swift answer from postal officials is that they could not plan ahead when they didn't control their budget and couldn't manage their own affairs.

"Now," said William D. Dunlap, assistant postmaster general for product management, "we can make decisions in key areas without having to go to Congress for approval, we can negotiate wages directly with our employes, we have a say on rate-making and what our prices will be, we can sell bonds to the public for the first time, we don't have to depend on congressional appropriations and we can appoint postmasters on a non-political basis."

The 33-year-old Dunlap is typical of the bright young men loaned by industry to get the postal service through the transitional stage who have decided to stick around.

"I found it so exciting I decided to stay on," Dunlap explained. "Here's an institution with nearly three-quarters of a million people and $10 billion dollars going the same way for 181 years, founded by the Continental Congress, now in a very dramatic changing process. This is probably the biggest government reorganization plan in the history of the country. How well we do here will certainly have some effect on other reorganization plans.

"This is the only organization in existence that has direct contact with every home in America every day. That makes us a very public organization."

How is the change affecting the public?

The cost of stamps has gone up and probably will rise again but, as the postal flacks say, compared to other costs, the eight-cent stamp is still "one of the best buys for the money that exists anywhere in the world."

The mail is now moving faster, not only in town but across the country with fixed performance goals to meet by certain dates.

Parcel post—the only area where the postal service faces competition from private industry—will reach its destination at least twice as fast and damage-free when the new bulk mail network goes into operation. Construction of bulk mail facilities has already started and the cross-country network is expected to be completd by 1975.

Self-service units where you can buy stamps, stamped envelopes and postal cards, weigh and mail packages, check zip codes or change money are appearing in shopping centers, college campuses, big apartment complexes, new towns and postal lobbies. Some 550 of the units are now in operation and the number will double within a year. By the end of 1973, postal authorities hope to have 1,600 of the do-it-yourself units in operation.

NEW LOOK

Most people get their first hint that times have changed when they go into a postal lobby. The Benjamin Franklin post office in the Washington headquarters of the Postal Service was the first to get the new look. Others are following suit.

In these lobbies, wanted posters have disappeared from the walls. Carpeting has appeared on the floors. Doors are self-opening, a boon to the package-laden. Writing tables where customers stand to address their packages now have shelves nearer the floor at each end where children and people in wheel chairs can do their addressing. Muzak plays softly in the background, to be replaced at Christmas time by Miss Zip telling people to be sure to zip-code their Christmas cards or advising customers that they will be served faster if they just step down to the No. 2 or No. 4 position, where the lines are shorter.

But attractive lobbies are only surface signs of a major upheaval. What's in the testing stage now is much more exciting, as if Blount had given his men carte blanche to think big. All down the line, the stress is on innovation, experimentation, pioneering technology. Like any business, this one is looking for new products, new business.

And like business, one of the postal service's new "products" has an unprecedented money-back guarantee. Still experimental, it's called "Express Mail Service." The new service provides guaranteed overnight service between downtown postal stations in 33 cities as far apart as New York and San Francisco.

Here's how it works: Somebody with an important document or some other item he wants to get safely across the country in a hurry takes his letter or package to the Express Mail Window before 5 p.m. The addressee can pick up the dispatch at the Express Mail Window in his city at 10 o'clock the next morning. If it's not there by 10, the sender gets a refund.

What makes the express service possible is the time saved by by-passing mail processing centers in the origin and destination cities, using the most desirable air flight between the two cities and immediate delivery to the post office on arrival at the destination city.

To spread the word about the new service, the postal people have put out a brochure listing the cities, the terms and conditions and the price schedule. It costs $1.50 to send a package weighing up to half a pound between any of the 33 cities in the program. The rates go up from there by weight and distance.

TIME VALUE

Another Express Mail Service is still experimental and available only on a contract basis to meet the needs of businesses and institutions for regularly scheduled shipments of financial records, documents, intra-company correspondence and other material with a high time value. This service operates four ways. The Postal Service will take it from the door of the business to the door where the shipment is to be delivered or from the door of the business to the airport in the city of delivery. Or the sender could take the shipment to the airport in his city to get Express Mail Service to the addressee in the city of destination. Or, the fourth option, the Express Mail Service could go airport to airport—the sender taking it to one and the recipient picking it up at the other.

Going overseas, the Postal Service is also testing a United States-to-England express mail service on a contract basis. The goal is 24 hour service from U.S. office to British office through a link-up with Britain's "Datapost Service." Because of an agreement the Postal Service has negotiated, the British will give Express Mail from the United States priority treatment in England.

What's being billed by the Postal Service as the "newest, fastest, most exciting way to mail a letter" doesn't use the mails in the traditional sense at all. It's the "Facsimile Mail Service," now being tested between New York and Washington to determine how much it will cost, how much revenue it will bring in, customer response and the technical requirements of its future use.

It involves the electronic transmission of visual information over telephone lines. Suppose you've got an urgent document that must reach New York in a matter of minutes. You take it to the post office where a machine (leased for the trial period) transmits an exact copy to a receiving machine in New York. Within 10 minutes, a hard copy is ready to be taken by special delivery messenger to its destination.

Of course, you have to pay for all that speed. A letter-size document delivered to its destination costs $5 and a delivered legal size document costs $6. Both sizes are 75 cents cheaper if the recipient picks it up in the postal lobby. But the Postal Service super-salesmen indicate facsimile would be cheap at twice the price.

CAN'T WAIT

"It's worth a thousand words—show what you mean with charts, blueprints, artwork," says the postal brochure entitled Fax Facts, "It's for salesmen who count minutes in terms of dollars when a price changes. It's for contractors with a last minute bid. It's for lawyers who need a brief. It's for a hot news story, a changed specification, a confirmed agreement, an authorizing statement. It's for anything that's too important to wait."

It's also a potential money-maker for the fledgling postal service.

MAILGRAM service is another postal gimmick, introduced last year and now available to Western Union's business subscribers in 32 cities and to the general public in New York, St. Louis and Los Angeles. It's a telegram-letter combination which assures delivery on the next business day anywhere in the country. It starts with a person telephoning his message to a local Western Union office or a business firm typing its message on the local telegraphic machine. The message is computer-routed by ZIP code to the right post office where the "telegraphed" message enters the mail stream and the local postman delivers it.

One of the headaches shared by businessmen and their public is the stolen credit card—particularly the one that goes astray before it ever reaches the customer. The Postal Service has now introduced an experimental system to provide added security for credit card mailers. The key to the system—and what discourages possible thefts within the post office itself—is that the credit cards are logged all the way.

The system is known as CONTROLPAK. The postal service says tests in Chicago and New York have proved that it significantly reduces credit card losses. The credit card mailer prepares the cards for mailing in the usual way, addressing the envelope and putting on first-class postage. Then he sorts the envelopes by delivery point and packages each batch in a plastic bag. He seals the bag and addresses it to the supervisor of the Zip code delivery unit from which final distribution will be made.

Now the Postal Service takes over. Each bag is sent under controlled conditions, watched over every step of the way to the designated supervisor. There's no chance of successful pilferage because the log shows who has the bag all the time. The supervisor himself opens the bag and transfers the individual envelopes to the carriers for final delivery. The Postal Service says it's not only thief-proof but cheaper than registered mail.

Like any business with retail outlets, the Postal Service is selling "retail products" in its postal lobbies—that is, in addition to stamps which are its biggest "retail product." They're now selling National Gallery of Art reproductions of famous paintings in the Greensboro, N.C., and Nashville, Tenn., post offices to test public reaction. The postcards, laminated plaques and 11x14 poster-size reproductions turn out to be money makers both for the National Gallery and the Post Office.

In the postal lobbies of 80 cities they also accept applications for passports. That's been going on for a year but it's still in the testing stage.

While all the gung-ho officials of the new Postal Service are looking for new products, new money-makers, new services, they're also committed to doing a better job on existing products. They look at their money orders and ask, "Do we promote them enough, can the form be improved, do we give good service?" A money order study is underway now.

They're also examining the lock boxes in post offices with an eye to decreasing the vacancy rate with various promotion plans emphasizing the convenience and security of having a box. Currently, a study is underway to determine whether it would be a good idea to offer free boxes to residents within a quarter of a mile of a post office where there is no free city delivery and they have to pick up their mail general delivery. The boxes would be free until customers came along to rent them.

With the twin goals of serving the public and making money, they're considering a number of new ventures. One would provide wrapping material and, perhaps, boxes at post office counters—not for free, of course. Another would provide a photocopying machine in postal lobbies for those who have nowhere to go to copy important documents. They're considering stamped envelopes with the customer's return address in the corner.

The Postal Service is directing special attention to some of its best customers—the stamp collectors. Management is giving top priority to the collectors, which isn't too surprising, since Blount has spent more time on stamp collecting than any postmaster general since James Farley, who was interested because Franklin D. Roosevelt was a stamp collector.

POSTERS

The service's historic stamp posters are now in their third printing to keep pace with customer demand for them. The 30-by-40-inch color reproductions are on four themes—space, transportation, environment and history. Approximately 135,000 posters were sold in 10 weeks. The latest printing is for 80,000 posters. They're selling posters for $1.50 or a set of four for $5 plus a 50-cent handling charge.

A Postal Service "salesman" in this new business era is promoting stamps among schoolchildren—giving lectures, showing films and leaving them with a lot of promotional material.

As every world fair stimulates business, the Postal Service is going to hold the first international stamp conference here. All governments will be invited to display and sell their own stamps. The emphasis will be on the concept that stamps are an international language, overcoming all political considerations.

With all the attention to news services, the Postal Service is still keenly aware that what people want most is to get their ordinary everyday mail on time. And that's what the new Postal Service is trying to do at a time when the airlines have knocked out 900 flights so far this year, mostly in the critical late evening hours, and the Amtrak has sharply curtailed the trains.

Soon after Blount announced a goal of next-day delivery for air mail between cities within a 600-mile radius and second day delivery between most major cities in the country, he raised the Postal Service air taxi routes to a total of 150.

Air taxis are planes hired under contract to operate on schedules best suited for mail deliveries. Most of them operate on round-trip schedules to permit delivery overnight between origin and destination points and cities along the line. The average round trip is about 500 miles and usually hits a big town and neighboring smaller towns. Although the new routes are designed primarily to improve air mail services, the planes also carry a large volume of first-class mail where service would be expedited.

Postal officials say, though, that you can't gamble on your eight-cent stamp buying you 11-cent service. First class mail is carried on planes only on a space available basis where air transportation provides a significant advantage in delivery time over surface transport.

The rail cutback has particularly affected the delivery of daily newspapers. Because nobody wants to read an old newspaper, the postal service has replaced the laid-off trains with express trucks. They're supposed to provide good service to all classes of mail, but preferential treatment goes to newspapers and news magazines because of the time element. The trucks travel 400 miles on their daily rounds.

Since well over 50 percent of the 52 billion pieces of first-class mail handled annually is for delivery in the city where it's mailed or in nearby communities, Blount has focused attention on getting the mail across town, as rapidly as across the country. His goal: overnight delivery of virtually all local first class mail put in a mailbox by 5 p.m. on weekdays in business areas and at collection points on main thoroughfares. Of course, it's got to be zip-coded to make sure of overnight service.

In residential areas, where postmen pick up the mail earlier than 5 p.m., notices have been posted telling people the location of boxes in shopping centers, near postal stations or on main thoroughfares where collections are made at approximately 5 p.m. Blount expects 95 percent of the area mail will reach its destination overnight by the end of this month, and the mails will be constantly monitored to identify any problem areas.

FRUSTRATION

"Most service-oriented businesses—television repair, auto repair and the like—give the public a deep sense of frustration," commented Harold F. Faught, senior assistant postmaster general for mail processing. We're trying to reverse the attitude toward one service operation.

To pinpoint the frustrations, the Postal Service now has its complaint department, formally known as the Office of Consumer Affairs. David L. Ordway, the postal ombudsman, tries to deal with individual complaints by way of the complainant's own postmaster, but he also alerts the Postmaster General to conditions that could affect many customers. "Our primary role," he said of his office, "is to identify with customers who have not had a voice before now."

A typical complaint: "You always deliver my bills on time but I never get checks soon enough." Or, "I get so much junk mail I couldn't find the piece I was looking for, an ad for a clearance sale." Or, "I received three copies of The New York Times the same day, all of them late."

One way or another, the Postal Service is finding an answer for all three of those complaints. The first will be taken care of by the overnight delivery of checks as well as bills.

The newspaper complaint is, as mentioned before, being resolved by adding more express truck routes to replace trains.

The junk mail complaint will be answered in a small way by the new postal rates. The Postal Service doesn't share the public aggravation with junk mail—which is referred to more politely as third-class advertising material—because it more than pays it own way. The third class mailers process, bundle, zip code and sometimes even truck their mail right to the postal dock. When the rates for third-class go up after the price freeze is lifted, some of the advertising circulars—possibly as much as 3 percent of them—will disappear from the mails. That doesn't sound like much of a percentage, but it amounts to an estimated 600 million pieces for the rest of this fiscal year. Where will they hawk their wares? They will increase the number of stuffers in newspapers because that's cheaper

than paying five cents apiece to the Postal Service—the rate proposed after the freeze.

Some of the complaints have prompted special studies. One of them involves special delivery—the slowness of it on occasion. Investigators are trying to find out what's wrong. Meanwhile, Ordway disclosed, postal officials are considering the idea of reimbursing people who pay for special delivery service and don't get it.

Another consumer investigation involves the change of address system, particularly as it affects the older people who go south for the winter and try in vain to get their mailing address changed. Ordway said the Postal Service has gotten a lot of complaints on that one. Typical of the complainants was a woman who duly handed in her change of address form when she went south. The checks she was expecting didn't follow her south and she had to go to a bank in a strange town for a loan to tide her over. That's the sort of thing the Office of Consumer Affairs is trying to solve. And it looks to the local postmasters to help solve the problems, on the ground that the postmasters are now businessmen and have to be responsive to their customers.

SECURITY

Just as any big business has its uniformed guards and behind-the-scenes detectives the Postal Service has its Postal Inspection Service to detect misuse of the mail and a newly created security force to guard postal installations. Crime, whether it's a mail fraud ring in organized crime or wholesale pilferage from a post office, is expected to double the Postal Inspection Service budget by the end of this fiscal year—mainly to finance the new security force.

To underline the importance of the Postal Service's law enforcement responsibilities, Chief Postal Inspector William J. Cotter has been named as Assistant Postmaster General reporting directly to the Postmaster General.

Cotter, who came to the Post Office from the Central Intelligence Agency and the FBI, has found Blount enthusiastic about enlisting inspectors in the administration's strike forces against organized crime. As a result of strike force investigations by the Postal Inspection Service, Cotter reported, close to 200 organized crime figures have been indicted.

At the same time, complaints of unsolicited obscenity in the mail have dropped by more than 40 percent largely because investigations by postal inspectors have led to the indictment of all the big smut dealers.

What's new in the Postal Inspection Service and recognizable in many postal lobbies are the uniformed officers of the Postal Service Security Force. Men and women, many with military or police experience, are being given an intensive course in law enforcement at the University of Oklahoma and then put on duty in the big city post offices. Cotter says they've done more good in a few months—including capture of some heroin sellers on the floor of a postal facility—than was done in decades by the old building guards.

Equipped with walkie-talkies, alerted by closed circuit television, controlling exits to stop thieves from walking out with the mail, the security officers cut down on pilferage and assaults on postal employees working the late shifts. Their presence is also considered a deterrent to hold-ups. That's why there will be 2,600 of them on duty by the end of the fiscal year.

Like the rest of the Postal Service, the Postal Inspection Service has reduced the size of its headquarters force and pushed more day-to-day operations out to the field, where the action is. All the major criminal cases, however, are sent right to headquarters because so many of them—the intricate frauds—have coast-to-coast ramifications.

As it strikes out on its own, the Postal Service is going heavily into capital improvement, getting the new installations it couldn't afford during the years that Congress treated the post office like a poor relation.

With the Army Engineers taking over construction, the Postal Service expects to spend more than $1.5 billion on a massive modernization program. That includes construction of 30 major postal buildings and a $950 million "Bulk Mail Network" which will process parcel post and second and third-class mail.

The "Bulk Mail Network," scheduled for completion by the end of 1975, will consist of 21 highly mechanized centers specifically designed to prevent damage to parcels. Parcels will not be allowed to drop more than nine inches anywhere in the system. The network is expected to return an annual savings of $309 million, besides what it saves in paying for damaged parcels.

Local parcel post, which now takes six days to deliver, will be delivered in a maximum of two days and the delivery time for long distance parcel post will improve from something over 15 days to a maximum of seven.

All the parcel post improvements are coming not a minute too soon because, according to Representative Robert Nix, D-Pa., chairman of the House Post Office subcommittee on postal facilities, the Postal Service is losing customers to private companies. Nix was simultaneously cautioning against more postal rate increases and putting in a plug for a constituent, United Parcel Service, which, he said, handled almost as many parcels last year as the Postal Service.

Just as private industry finances its capital investments with bond issues, so will the Postal Service. It expects to start selling $250 million in bonds in January.

The Postal Service's chief financial officer, James W. Hargrove, assistant postmaster general for finance and administration, said the first bonds will be sold to the public rather than to the Treasury to "bind ourselves into a discipline that we'll have to observe and live with through the years." He said that even though the Postal Service is a part of the government, the full faith and credit of the United States will not automatically attach to these securities since they will not be guaranteed by the Treasury. Instead, the Postal Service will sell bonds on its own financial strength.

"To flee to the sheltering arms of the Treasury would be to crawl back into our nest," Hargrove said. "We don't have any intention of doing that. Now that we're an eagle, we'll fly, not crawl."

That's a reference to the new postal emblem—a dark blue eagle poised for flight on a white field. It replaces the horse and post rider which had been the Post Office symbol since 1837.

The bonds are only for building the long-overdue new facilities. To make the day-to-day operations self-supporting, the Postal Service promptly asked for rate increases as the Postal Reorganization Act intended. That's when first-class stamps went to eight cents and airmails to 11 cents. With a $1.4 billion rate increase now in effect on a temporary basis, and a $1.4 billion subsidy, the Postal Service has virtually wiped out its long-standing deficit and considers itself self-supporting in its first year of operation.

If the rate changes now in effect on a temporary basis are finally approved, Hargrove said, the service will be in a position to operate on a sound financial basis for the first time in many years.

END IN 1984

The subsidy, he explained, takes two forms. One is a general public subsidy to keep rates lower than they would otherwise be. The other subsidy is for certain types of mailers—the blind whose mail goes free, non-profit organizations using second, third class and some fourth class mail who are given 10 years to get to the point where they at least pay the out-of-pocket costs of their mail, and the second-class and other commercial mailers who are given five years to reach the proposed increase in their mailing charges. The subsidies are supposed to be phased out by 1984, when the Postal Service is expected to become self-supporting without subsidy.

Unlike private business, the Postal Service isn't supposed to make a profit, but it is supposed to break even.

Congress and the administration expected the first round of rate increases to cover substantial wage increases for the postal workers. There had already been talk however, of seeking a second increase next spring to cover subsequent wage boosts, but Blount told Hargrove last week that he won't ask for another increase to take effect next July because he wants to cooperate with the President's anti-inflation program.

The President's freeze has already caught the Postal Service with a third-class mail increase it can't put into effect and a scheduled pay boost it can't pay. Right now, Blount—like any other businessman—is waiting to see what kind of guidelines are forthcoming on which he can do some wage and price planning.

Blount is not the final arbiter on the price of stamps. Here's how a rate increase comes to be: The Postmaster General tells the Board of Governors that the Postal Service has a gap between the money it takes in and what it pays out. So the Board of Governors authorizes him to lay the facts and specific proposals before the Postal Rate Commission, a separate regulatory board, which holds hearings and fixes rates for postal services and products.

If the Postal Rate Commission has not reached a rate decision in 90 days, the proposed rate is published in the Federal Register and 10 days later, may take effect on a temporary basis.

That's where we are now on the eight-cent stamp and other proposed rate increases. The five-man Postal Rate Commission heard 96 witnesses, accumulated about 250 exhibits and over 12,000 typed pages of testimony. Now its hearings are complete; the Postal Service and other intervenors are preparing their briefs; the hearing examiner is working on his findings and the commission is going over the evidence while waiting to review his report and make its rate decision.

The commission could say the stamp should cost more or less than the Postal Service has put in effect on a temporary basis. In other words, it could say the stamp should cost nine cents or seven cents—although that's pretty unlikely in view of the pay raises it has to finance. Or it could say the postal deficit—the gap between expenses and revenue—could be made up solely with second- or third-class rather than first-class increases. That's unlikely too, because second-class mail (used by newspapers and magazines) is already set for a 140 percent boost, and third class mail, facing a 28 percent increase, will be covering its costs and making a healthy contribution to postal overhead.

Once the commission reaches a conclusion, its decision is submitted to the nine-man Board of Governors. The governors can approve the commission's decision and order it into effect. Or it can allow the decision to take effect under protest and either ask the court for a ruling or send it back to the commission to take another look.

Or the governors may reject the commission's decision and the Postal Service may resubmit its request to the commission for

reconsideration. Then, the commission tries again.

The second time around, the governors, by unanimous written consent of all of them, can modify the decision if they find that it doesn't give the Postal Service as much revenue as it needs to make ends meet.

The Postal Rate Commission is expected to make its decision by Christmas. What takes so much time is the fact that many different rates for various classes of mail have to be settled and some are very controversial.

Some newspapers and magazines have already raised their rates because of the admittedly large increase in second-class rates, and Look Magazine blamed the Postal Service for putting it out of business. Hargrove doesn't buy that.

"In 1970," he said, "Look lost $5 million. Its postage costs for that year were $4 million. If we had given them free postage, they still would have lost $1 million. Under the circumstances, it's hard to see how we caused their demise."

As far as Hargrove is concerned the rate is fairer today than it used to be when Congress ran the show.

The Postal Service doesn't expect to raise the price of stamps every time its three-quarters of a million employes get a raise—even though 80 percent of its operating costs are labor related. Instead, it's looking for ways to save money.

One early money-saving gambit that paid off was an offer to give a bonus to veteran employes in the headquarters and regional offices who retired. A high percentage of the eligibles—about 2,000—took advantage of the offer, and the Postal Service will pay out $20 million in bonuses. While that was a sizable bite, it enabled the Postal Service to reduce its next budget by $80 million. Hargrove, for one, hopes to make that an annual savings by keeping the level of employment down. At the end of the fiscal year, there were 13,000 fewer employes despite a 2 billion piece increase in the mail.

The present work force totals 728,000, and the Postal Service expects to get it down to 719,000 a year from now. For postal employes it's a new ball game. Manual work is giving way to machines, which do the job both swifter and more efficiently. Employes are being trained in the new technology and for the first time, management courses are being given to create a more professional team—the kind of courses that every enlightened private business offers its men regularly.

A more businesslike organization has been set up across the country to make better use of the better-trained managers.

What that means to the public is that a new cadre of managers will be held responsible for keeping the mail moving at the new standards of high speed, managers who will be encouraged to spark with new ideas and rewarded for their ingenuity.

Here's Postmaster General Blount's forecast of what lies ahead for the Postal Service:

"Five years from now I see a nationwide utility known as the U.S. Postal Service operating efficiently and effectively and giving service at an economical cost."

JIM FULTON

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1971

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of serving with JIM FULTON on the Science and Astronautics Committee for all the years I have been a Member of the Congress. JIM demonstrated over the years, as the ranking Republican on that committee, an imagination toward the future possibilities in space that uniquely qualified him for a committee exploring new worlds and seeking new answers. Although my first reaction to many of his ideas was that they were farfetched and impractical, over the years I saw many of them become realities which were adopted by our Nation's space program. He often showed himself to be ahead of his time in this way. JIM's uniqueness and ability to stimulate thought will be sorely missed on the Science and Astronautics Committee, by our Nation's space program and by his colleagues in Congress.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN HEW

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, it is sad to observe that our Federal agencies, which should be in the forefront of the fight to end job discrimination against women, are lagging shamefully in fulfilling this responsibility.

A revealing article on this subject, written by Judy Chase, appears in the October 15 issue of Science. I think that it would be of interest to my colleagues, and insert it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

INSIDE HEW: WOMEN PROTEST SEX DISCRIMINATION

(By Judy Chase)

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) is a massive conglomeration of agencies trying to fill the cradle-to-grave needs of all Americans. Increasingly, however, HEW is facing charges of not even meeting the 9-to-5 needs of its own employees.

Nearly two-thirds of HEW's 102,000 [1] employees in Washington, D.C., are women, a higher percentage than any other cabinet-level department, and dissidents among them complain that HEW systematically relegates them to "second-class" status. Although blacks in HEW have gained by using confrontation tactics, women employees so far have been apprehensive about defying department officials. Secretary Elliot L. Richardson has been more responsive to employee demands than his predecessor Robert H. Finch, particularly since blacks staged a sit-in last December which resulted in 52 arrests and a lot of unfavorable publicity. Richardson seems to be testing a different approach on women: several women interviewed said they think he may be trying to divert the ire of his female employees and avoid further embarrassment by making token concessions before dissatisfaction spreads.

To satisfy some of the women's demands for equality, HEW last March established a Women's Action Program (WAP), which Richardson defined in a 17 February memo to assistant secretaries and agency heads as a program which "will assist me in meeting my commitments to women in HEW, as well as to the growing issue of women's rights and responsibilities in the society." In fact, the program lacks sufficient resources and people to do much original research or the authority necessary to play more than a passive advisory role in the making of program and policy decisions that affect women. Members of WAP—although they did manage to squeeze in occasional "consciousness-raising" sessions with department employees of both sexes—spent most of the program's first 6 months writing recommendations for the Secretary based on the extremely sparse sex-differentiated data which now exist.

Some WAP boosters say there are indications that President Nixon's 5 percent cutback in government employment will be used as an excuse to reduce the program's capabilities further. WAP's initial 6-month budget of approximately $100,000 did not even cover the salaries of the 15 women involved full-time, and it is debatable whether the program can get as much for the next half year. Xandra Kayden, 31, who joined HEW in 1969 as a management intern in education after completing work for her master's degree at Columbia University, gave notice months ago that she planned to return to graduate school on 15 September, but her replacement has not yet been named. After at least two female administrators with proven records of doing something for women expressed interest in the director's job, HEW reportedly downgraded the position from a proposed GS–17 [2] (salary $32,546 to $36,886) to GS–15 ($24,251 to $31,523) in order to discourage them.

Bernice Sandler, who, as spokeswoman for the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL), [3] filed specific charges with HEW against 250 universities, abandoned the firing line earlier this year to become WAP's deputy director for policy—but her activism was even less appreciated internally than it was outside HEW. She left HEW in August. Furthermore, most of WAP's first members were detailees who returned to their regular HEW jobs in September, leaving only a handful of women to keep WAP alive until Richardson decides where the program is going. He is reportedly considering separating women employees' concerns from external problems of women and placing the former under HEW's Equal Employment Opportunity office (EEO). If past experience with including women's problems under EEO is any indication, such an action could be a decisive setback to the department's women.

The success of the women's movement within HEW depends largely on the women employees' determination to effect change. Right now, even WAP members seem content to let male administrators define their movement for them. Women's leaders throughout the department—many of them white, middle-aged, middle-class professionals—stressed the "official," "moderate" nature of their efforts in interviews with *Science*. Many became defensive at the suggestion of a link between WAP and the national women's liberation movement because, while they are committed to upgrading women's employment status, they are leery of a movement that may involve further changes in their relationships with men. Few of the HEW women scientists interviewed were willing to discuss personal grievances with a reporter, preferring to limit themselves to generalizations; and those who talked about themselves agreed to do so only on the condition that their names be withheld.

---

[1] HEW employees in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area totaled 101,977 as of 1 July; nationwide, they totaled 442,111.

[2] Kayden has been serving in the WAP program as a consultant with a salary approximately equivalent to that of a GS–12 ($15,040 to $19,549).

[3] WEAL was incorporated in 1968 in Ohio to promote greater economic progress on the part of American women and to seek solutions to economic, educational, tax, and employment problems affecting women. There are members in more than 34 states.

Even if WAP had all the support needed to deal with the problems of HEW women, the problems they face are monumental. Women comprise 63 percent of all HEW employees, but they are concentrated in the routine, dead-end jobs below the GS–9 watershed mark, and they are paid accordingly. The higher the salary and status of an HEW job, the more likely it is to be filled by a man. About 89 percent of the agency's women hold ratings of GS–9 and below, and their proportion declines steadily from grades 11 through 16. The median grade for all women in HEW is 5.2 compared with 10.9 for men—a difference of 5 grades. There are only four women among the 75 HEW employees with grade 17 civil service ratings, and no women among the 19 with GS–18 ratings. Of 21 persons specifically designated as top executives in HEW, Patricia R. Hitt, assistant secretary for community and field services, is the lone woman. In some individual agencies within the department, women are even less visible among upper-echelon employees. For instance, there are no women above grade 15 in the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

HEW's 344 public advisory committees of nongovernmental experts, more than half of which serve NIH, are also characterized by a paucity of women. At NIH, for instance, there are only 105 women among the 1939 members of the various advisory groups, which shape the course of extramural research affecting both sexes. The only NIH committees on which women predominate are the seven concerned with nurses' training, according to a survey by Florence Moog, a zoology professor at Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

A limited supply of women scientists in the United States, due to well-documented discrimination in higher education, as well as other factors, explains why the female-male ratio in the 11 to 18 grade range at NIH is considerably lower than the 50–50 one might reasonably expect. Actually, NIH employs more than its share of the available women scientists. Nevertheless, the inadequate supply argument fails to explain why the proportion of women declines progressively between grades 11 and 15, or why women's share of positions in the grades usually assigned to lab technicians (GS–7 to GS–9) is 67 percent, while in the grades usually reserved for top administrators (GS–16 and up), it is 0 percent. Nor does it account for Moog's calculation that 2.8 percent of NIH's extramural advisers (excepting those on nursing committees) are women, while 7.5 percent of all Ph.D. scientists and 7 percent of all doctors in the United States are women.

Regardless of rank, HEW women, like most women in the U.S. labor force, perform "mainly the long-accepted 'serving' jobs: clerks, secretaries, nurses, staff assistants, and occasionally a 'deputy chief' of something. Positions of real program responsibility and authority—with few exceptions—are held by men." [4]

Although comprehensive data on specific agencies, such as NIH, are unavailable, small-scale studies and the experiences of individual women interviewed suggest certain patterns. There are proportionally more professional women scientists in the agency's extramural division than in its intramural division. In the extramural sector, professional women tend to work as intermediate-level scientist-administrators. Women are mainly technicians in the intramural laboratories, although a select few do research. A disproportionate share of NIH's high-ranking women are in the Division of Nursing.

Joy Hochstadt-Ozer, a guestworker at NIH from the American Heart Association, told *Science* that a study she conducted on a sample of 596 National Heart and Lung Institute employees shows that, in general, there is "a 2 to 3 grade difference between men and women with the same education and service time." The median GS rating for women with Ph.D.'s is 13 (salary $17,761 to $23,089), whereas for men with Ph.D.'s it is 15 ($24,251 to $31,523).

Those women who do climb to the higher grades rarely wield authority as directors or chiefs. For instance, only one of the intramural laboratory chiefs at NIH or the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) is a woman, and only two women now serve as branch chiefs in the institutes' extramural divisions. Jane Wilcox, now with the Florida State Health Department, told *Science* that she left her job as acting chief of the extramural Cardiac Diseases Branch 2 months ago, after 20 years with NIH, because she realized she was only filling the job until a man could be recruited to replace her. "They told me the reason I couldn't be chief was that they needed an M.D. [she holds an Sc.D. (doctor of science degree) in epidemiology], but the man who replaced me is not an M.D. Also, he has had less than 1 year's experience at NIH and is 10 to 15 years younger than I am." Two other women scientists who are still employed in the institutes related similar experiences during interviews.

The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) provides another example of the problems women encounter when they aspire to decision-making posts. In the FDA's 17 field offices, there are no women among 90 top managers and supervisors. When one field office designated a woman as acting supervisory inspector recently, every man under her called in sick, according to Charlotte Gallogly, the agency's detailee to WAP, who said she heard about the incident at a conference last summer.

Among the reasons women don't tend to become policy-makers in HEW is that they lack the experience often required, said Elsa A. Porter, chief of the department's Manpower Planning and Staffing branch. At NIMH, for example, where experience as a laboratory section chief is usually prerequisite to an internal promotion to lab chief, women account for only two of the current 40 section chiefs. A few women get administrative experience in the institutes' extramural programs, such as NIH's Division of Research Grants, but they usually are assigned to head impotent service units. "Where do you go from Claims Review Section Head, Property Utilization Section Head, or Shipping Unit Head?" asked one high-ranking NIH woman.

Women also miss out on special training opportunities at federal institutes, conferences, or seminars, Porter said. The experience of one high-ranking female doctor at NIH indicates the deep-seated prejudices that bar women. The M.D. said that about 2 years ago her lab section head recommended her for a slot in a top-level administrative training program, pending approval by her institute. "What does *she* want it for?" was the selector's immediate and only reply, she said. He never even bothered to interview her, she said.

Women scientists whose highest priority is to do laboratory research in their specialized fields often have to choose that over advancement in the bureaucracy. Although the same problem faces men scientists, it is more acute for women. A female Ph.D. who has worked in one NIH lab nearly 17 years, told *Science* that the one time she requested a promotion from grade 13 to 14 she was turned down. "He [her lab chief] knows I'm not likely to leave," she said. "Lab chiefs are very much aware that women tend to follow their husbands and, therefore, are not likely to leave for jobs in other parts of the country. Many men in my position probably would have left, but I can't afford to push too hard. I probably could get a promotion by going over to Grants or FDA, but right now I don't want to spend a lot of time reviewing applications."

Another woman Ph. D. in an NIH lab said she had to take a grade cut in order to land her job there. "I was simply informed that it was very bad I was a woman," she said. "They promised to raise my grade back from 11 to 12 in a year. Eight years later, I finally did get my 12 back—and I'm still a 12."

MATERNITY MADE DIFFICULT

HEW guarantees very little assistance to career-minded women in the form of maternity benefits, day care, or part-time employment opportunities, said WAP member Ruth Krubit. "There is no such thing as maternity leave," she said, although a woman may use up to 26 days of combined vacation time and sick leave (if she has it coming) to have her child. Her supervisor willing, she may take up to a year's leave without pay, but after 14 weeks the Civil Service Commission does not guarantee her job back as it does men entering the military service, she added. Also, according to Krubit, the time HEW women take for maternity leave does not count toward promotions or retirement benefits as does the time most male employees spend in the military.

HEW's two day-care centers, both demonstration projects that opened this year, provide developmental care for a maximum combined total of 110 children of Washington employees. One center's waiting list of 200 children attests to a greater need, and some HEW women are advocating that the department offer day care as an employee benefit like health insurance. However, Krubit said that a December 1970 memo from the Office of Management and Budget directed department heads not to spend salaries and expense money for day care.

Part-time employment is formally available to a total of 40 professional women; under a program called the Professional and Executive Corps, although only 20 of these slots are now filled. A WAP survey shows that a total of 1324 women and 266 men work at HEW on a part-time basis, but most of them are clerk-typists and secretaries. According to Porter, "An extremely rigid accounting system, based on estimates of full-time, permanent employment, makes it difficult to extend part-time opportunities to large numbers of professional women."

Theoretically, with such programs as EEO and Upward Mobility, there should be no need for a separate program to deal with women's employment problems. But both EEO and Upward Mobility were originally designed for blacks, who enjoy higher political priority than women in HEW, and the blacks who administer both programs place little emphasis on women's concerns. Samuel M. Hoston, a black who heads EEO, was assigned responsibility for developing a women's program 3 years ago, but a former EEO staff member said virtually all he did in that capacity was joke about being "the official sex coordinator." Hoston admits that his program, which employs about 800 persons throughout HEW's various agencies and regional offices, has traditionally focused on black concerns, but he contends that he has never had enough staff or money to do much for women. James A. Robinson, vice-chairman of the $20-million Upward Mobility program's steering committee, told *Science* that, although he considers the women's issue important, his priority, as a black male, is "to strengthen the black family unit by providing a strong male breadwinner."

HEW women's advocates ask where that leaves black women, who, together with other minority members of their sex, comprise 75 percent of all the department's minority employees and 32 percent of all its women. In terms of status, it leaves them concentrated at the very bottom. Nearly half of HEW's minority workers are in grades 1 to 4 and 85 percent of these are women. In terms

[4] Taken from an unpublished 8 July 1969 HEW report entitled "Equal Employment Opportunity for Women."

of the officially sponsored advocacy structure, it leaves them outside.

Interviews with black women at HEW indicate that, in general, they see WAP as a program conceived by white women to promote white women's interests. As Marion E. Primus, a young, black, social science analyst detailed to the Women's Action Program from NIMH, analyzed the situation: "You don't have a heavy concentration of blacks involved in women's action because many feel they have to deal with their blackness first. Some say: 'Hell, what good is this to me? Let me get up there where they [white women] are, first.' As a mental health professional, I am perhaps more interested in the Women's Action Program than I would be otherwise."

One of the most critical obstacles to achieving equity for HEW's women is the preconceived attitudes of both sexes about the role of women. Expressed attitudes of men at the managerial and supervisory levels make women's rights advocates particularly angry. Estelle R. Ramey, a Georgetown University professor of physiology who occasionally addresses NIH women's meetings, related a couple of typical comments men there have made in responses to her remarks: "One man told told me he never discriminates against hiring a woman in his lab," she said. "As he put it: 'I've always said you get more talent for the buck. Women are usually willing to come in at lower grade levels than men.' Another one told me: 'Frankly, I am less comfortable working with professional women than men.' But I noticed he has a lot of women lab technicians working for him."

Although Richardson seems more sympathetic to feminist concerns than many men under him, several HEW women noted that his sensitivity is recently acquired. Only last year he publicly made a remark about women (facetious, he later claimed) that he probably wouldn't have dared make about blacks. During a meeting with young management interns, Richardson said he would hire a woman for an upper-grade position if one applied; but it was his impression that women did not want responsibility. He cited as evidence that he hardly ever saw women on commuter flights.

As for the White House, one way to measure the attitude toward women is by looking at the President's record on women's appointments. The number of HEW women in grades 16 to 18 increased from 12 as of 1 May 1971 to 15 as of 1 August 1971; during the same period the number of HEW men in the same grade range increased from 358 to 372. Many employees in GS–16 to 18 slots are presidential appointees, and all in that range require political clearance. Elsewhere, Nixon's record for appointing women is equally undistinguished.

For example, although he claims to have named 200 women to advisory groups, he fails to add that 61 of these are on a single committee—the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The President did issue a memo on 21 April 1971 directing all heads of executive departments and agencies to develop and enact by year's end plans to increase the number of women in positions classified GS–13 and above and the number of women on public advisory committees. But, noting the President's new economic policies and the fact that his memo is moot on any action beyond December, several veteran HEW women interviewed said they interpret it as an empty, last-minute gesture to camouflage his abysmal record on women's appointments until election day 1972.

Women's attitudes about themselves also hinder them from asserting themselves as men's intellectual and professional equals, because society does not consider aggressive behavior "feminine." Most women in the department have remained silent on the women's issue so far, but that does not mean they don't have problems. Many women misunderstand the discriminatory oral practices operating against them. "It also depends on how they define discrimination," Ramsey observed. "If you see yourself as a researcher in a lab under a great male scientist, and he treats you well, then you don't think you're discriminated against, but, if you think you should have the same options as men with similar talents and experience, then you realize you are. Equality in job situations will come when female mediocrity moves along at the same rate as male mediocrity—not when a female Einstein makes it."

Some women who have fought their way up through the thicket, and, in some cases, come out with jobs comparable to men's, feel that, if they could overcome the hardships, younger women should be able to also. These women sometimes have a negative image of their sex and refuse to be associated with other women in women's groups. Increasingly, however, well-respected and highly qualified women are becoming involved. For example, membership in the National Institutes of Health Organization for Women, an independent advocacy group composed mostly of professional women employees, has grown from a handful to 300 during its first year.

This month, WAP in recommending formally to Richardson that the program be continued as essentially an advisory group, according to Kayden. "We don't want to be women doing things for women, but a catalyst to change the system, so that women can have an equal opportunity to participate within it," she explained. The advisory approach she outlined is similar to that tred by blacks in the early days of EEO, Hoston commented, "and we found it didn't work. You have to get involved in the making of program and policy decisions."

Perhaps the most potent force undermining the HEW women's movement is fear of reprisal. Not only the silent women, but also movement leaders throughout the department, share the fear that they will be labeled "troublemakers." The vocal women have been emboldened by the Secretary's official endorsement of WAP, which makes it respectable to organize and express one's concerns. But it is doubtful that, at this time, the momentum of the HEW women's movement could sustain itself independently. That could change.

HEW Advisory Jobs to Go to Women

Almost all upcoming appointments to HEW advisory committees will be filled by women, if HEW officials take to heart a strongly worded memorandum issued on 29 September by Secretary of HEW Elliot L. Richardson. The committees covered by the directive include the 181 advisory committees—staffed by some 2000 scientists—which advise the National Institutes of Health on the funding of research and training in health-related fields.

The new directive updates a 4 June memorandum in which the Secretary urged HEW officials to pay heed to the importance of hiring more women. The new statement is more pointed:

"At least one woman shall be appointed to each advisory committee by December 31 if there is a qualified woman available for appointment. Substantial representation of women shall be deemed to be one female for every two males. Assuming qualified women are available to fill vacancies, at least one-third of all nominees or appointees for committees shall be women."

The document instructs HEW officials to make monthly progress reports to Edward Henley, III, the committee management officer for HEW.

The directive stipulates that "all advisory committees shall have a substantial representation of women as soon as possible." But it offers what would appear to be a loophole for those advisory committees—including many of the NIH committees—that deal with technical matters; "This definition shall not apply to appointments to technical level advisory committees if it is determined after substantial efforts at recruitment that sufficient women are not available in a given field of expertise."

Ronald Lamont-Havers, Associate Director of NIH for Extramural Research and Training, says that for several months, NIH has been looking at the issue of female representation on its advisory boards and is keeping lists of women scientists who might qualify for vacancies. He says that the goal of one woman for every two men on NIH committees cannot possibly be achieved by 31 December. Committee members serve for 4-year terms; hence only one-fourth of the membership terminates each year.

Julia Apter, professor of surgery at Rush Medical College and a women's rights activist, estimates that, exclusive of women on the nursing panels (who are, by and large, nurses rather than academic or industrial scientists), only 48 of the 181 NIH scientific advisory committees have women as voting members. A total of 52 women currently sit on the panels, a decline from her head count of 141 women 3 years ago.

Apter also estimates that 499 positions on these committees have or will become vacant at some time during 1971. Of these, 254 have been filled, but only 9 of them by women, and about 13 by other minority group members. She says, 245 vacancies remain unfilled. Barring any loopholes, the new Richardson directive could mean that these prized seats will go to women scientists.

THE NEED FOR PRISON REFORM

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative William R. Anderson of Tennessee, made an excellent speech regarding prison reform on October 5, 1971. Representative Anderson spoke at Potter's House, Washington, D.C., an ecumenical coffee house operating under the auspices of the Church of the Saviour. His remarks are worthy of our attention:

Remarks of Representative William R. Anderson

There has been vast discussion about the tragic incident at Attica—the 42 who died, and omens of future turmoil within our system of corrections.

Much of the talk which this event has stimulated has centered on means for "quelling" such disturbances, increasing security, and tightening controls.

Indeed, what happened at Attica has not awakened a new American conscience; it has only divided and further polarized the American people. Governor Reagan of California attributes prison rebellion to a "hard core" group of revolutionaries who seek to overthrow the system, a reaction which is all too common among persons who would rather put the 426,000 Americans behind jail bars out of sight and out of mind.

In a cumulative sense we have been having Atticas for a long time. Thus, if the true cause is a "hard core" of revolutionaries, we have had a "hard core" of revolutionaries for a long time. The Attica of a few weeks ago was unique only in the appalling number of lives lost, and in the extent to which a whole network of shocking circumstances merged to form one epic tragedy.

The real causes of prison rebellion stem from our most fundamental concepts of justice and order in America, which can be traced back many years. It involves the basic concepts of "punishment," and "deterrence." When we finally erase the notion that if one is punished enough he will make a good citizen, we will be on the track of making meaningful reforms. We must begin to realize that approximately 95 percent of the crimes in this nation are stimulated by causes which punishment will only make worse:

1. The major crimes of passion, which include most of the murders and sexual assaults committed annually, cannot be and never have been deterred by stiff sentencing and harsh treatment.

2. The economically motivated crimes—robbery, burglary, and holdups—cannot be prevented by the threat of imprisonment, and the causes of such are often aggravated by the financial hardships faced by a newly released felon.

3. The third major category of criminal behavior involves abuses directly related to physical dependency on drugs, be it alcohol or heroin. The punitive atmosphere of prison life only aggravates the drug dependent person to recede to his former state.

4. The last major category of our 95 percent figure includes those felons who suffered from mental illness, and who should be under the care of trained and qualified psychologists and psychiatrists.

There is only one area in which the threat of long term imprisonment acts as an effective and reliable deterrent to criminal behavior, and that is in the category of what has come to be called "White collar" crime—corporate price fixing deals, kick back arrangements, and the activities of organized crime syndicates. It is only in these instances that the threat of incarceration has actually proven to deter further abuses.

Rather than deterring crime, our system of corrections is, in fact, encouraging it.

Last spring Alvin W. Cohn, director of correctional programs of the Center for Administration of Justice at American University, said, "I don't know of anyone in the field who is willing to state that the prison system materially reduces crime. In fact, it produces embittered people who for the most part leave to be bigger and better criminals."

Excerpts from the many letters I have received from prisoners seem to demonstrate the validity of what Director Cohn said. A few of these:

"Mr. Anderson. . . . in the ——— jail I am not able to protect my rights nor able to prepare for trial, the sleeping on floors and poor food and brutality of the jail guards greatly hampers a poor man who is unable to post bail, so he pleads guilty and tries to get out of jail."

"Mr. Anderson. . . . I am being forced to commit homosexual acts at the point of a prison made knife. . . ."

"Mr. Anderson. . . . Dope flows through this prison like water."

"Mr. Anderson. . . . While I was out of prison, I was working 14 to 15 hours a day, six to seven days a week, trying to help my dad to pay off some of his bills, and trying to save some money. . . . now that I am back (in jail) my dad will lose everything. . . ."

"Mr. Anderson. . . . I have been in the hole for a month because I feared for my life at my work station, and refused to work."

The letters keep coming.

Conditions such as these are by no means rare. At San Quentin one prisoner remarked earlier this year, "Here you lose all sense of values. A human life is worth 35¢, the price of a pack of cigarettes. After five years on the inside, how can you expect me to care about somebody when I get outside?"

Throughout the nation, in over 4,000 local jails, 187 state prisons, and 39 federal institutions, both guards and inmates are ridden with fear. Guards are grossly underpaid. Corrections officers, whose job requires them to be at once, counselor, judge, and police officer, rarely make more than a Washington bus driver.

Where do we go from here? Where will we place our priorities in order to exact true reform within our system of corrections? We are confronted with two major difficulties. The first is jurisdiction; the second is finances.

The U.S. corrections network is a maze of uncoordinated and overlapping functions and facilities which share no common framework, despite the fact that for lack of space federal prisoners are often housed in state facilities, youths are imprisoned in adult institutions, and local jails are very often used as temporary custodial quarters for prisoners of all types while in transit.

Thus it is that we encounter a strange mix of persons all at odds with one or more facets of society, locked together and transferring habits and knowledge of their particular problems to one another. Nationally, 52 percent of the persons in local jails are confined for reasons other than being convicted of a crime. Thirty-five percent are awaiting trial; 17 percent are awaiting transfer to other authorities. The other 48 percent in local facilities are convicted inmates.

The range of offenses allegedly committed by the persons within these walls varies from traffic related offenses to murder.

The plain fact is that local officials have neither the time nor the resources to differentiate between offenders or to treat them according to their needs. What is plainly needed are separate facilities for offenders at the first level of contact with institutionalized life. Treatment afforded prisoners prior to sentencing is often much worse than that which is received after assignment to a prison.

This brings us to the second difficulty—resources. Last year $390 million was appropriated to the Justice Department for the FBI—only $90 million for the Bureau of Prisons. Ninety-five percent of that sum went purely for custodial purposes. Nationally, only three percent of the $1.5 billion spent on corrections was directed toward meaningful reform.

In the entire American system there are only 50 full-time psychiatrists—one per 8,000 prisoners. Eighty percent of the nation's corrections personnel perform services of a custodial nature; and less than five percent of all prisoners are receiving any benefit whatsoever from constructive rehabilitation projects.

Numerous officials who are particularly erudite on the subject of prisoner rehabilitation have stated that of current prison population at least 85 percent should be on a probationary or parole status, and that the remaining 15 percent should be housed in institutions of less than 100 individuals.

Community oriented corrections are the only answer to the high recidivism rate of first offense felons. There can be no quarrel with the fact that to a major extent our current high rate of recidivism, which has been estimated at 40 percent, is directly caused by the damage done to individuals in confinement. Although lack of research in this area makes accurate percentages impossible, it is safe to say that 80 percent of all the felonies committed in the United States are made by persons with a history of confinement, persons who have had prior exposure to our archaic system of corrections, persons for whom prior punishment has only made social adjustment all the more difficult.

To shift the emphasis from punitive incarceration to meaningful rehabilitation will take more money and more controls. This year the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration will be funded at a level of $699 million, which is more than ten times the amount first authorized in fiscal year 1969. Yet, 85 percent of this amount is granted on bloc basis to the states (based on population), provided the states submit a Law Enforcement Improvement plan showing a fairly even spread of monies between enforcement programs, courts, and corrections. Thirty-two percent of the total money goes to corrections. While this may seem to be a substantial amount, it is insufficient. It will take large sums to build modern facilities nationwide. Even on the federal level, one-third of the prisons were constructed prior to 1900. It will take still additional effort and funds to truly professionalize the people charged with corrections and rehabilitation.

Under Part E of the 1970 Safe Streets Act, $97 million will go purely to corrections, to improve ex-offender employment programs and juvenile services.

But unless this authorization is increased, all that is advanced in the name of reform may prove to be more damaging than helpful. An underfunded innovation can be more damaging than the evil it was designed to replace.

For example: There have been many cases in which felons considered mentally unstable have been remanded to state hospitals rather than terms in prison. All very well. Yet these facilities themselves are so understaffed and underfunded that the following incident, attributed to a well-known judge by the *Center Magazine*, is not uncommon:

"Judge David Bazelon tells the story of the fellow who was arrested in the District of Columbia for indecent exposure. The prosecuting attorney on the day of the trial thought the fellow looked a bit peculiar and, in his discretion, decided to send him out to St. Elizabeth's menta lhospital instead of holding him for trial, in which case he would have gotten perhaps 60 days in jail. Fifteen years later this fellow was released from St. Elizabeth's and a week later he was arrested for indecent exposure."

This is but a small example of what can happen to one individual who finds himself the victim of our hodge-podge uncoordinated system of justice.

The only way we will erase the onus of crime in a free society is to first recognize that in over 90 percent of all criminal cases we are dealing with persons with problems, and that they should be treated in a manner which will diminish, not increase, these personal difficulties. The sledge hammer crack down approach will do no more than reap higher recidivism rates, more vengeful prisoners, and more prison rebellions.

In 1961 this country made a commitment to put a man on the moon in a decade. We did it. With the same type of national effort applied to crime and meaningful rehabilitation, I am certain we can make our streets and homes safe again.

We must void the pitfalls of putting the rule of order above the rule of life. We must face the fact that billions of dollars must be committed to rehabilitation programs to aid persons at odds with society, rather than pushing them further and further away, behind stronger walls, out of sight and out of mind. We owe ourselves no less.

FREDERICK, MD., CHOSEN AS OLYMPIC TRIALS SITE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Olympic Committee has announced that it selected Frederick, Md., as the site of the 1972 women's track and field Olympic

trials on July 7 and 8, 1972. This event will select the women's track and field team to represent the United States in the games of the 10th Olympiad August 26 through September 10, 1972, in Munich, Germany.

Selection of the site for these trials is largely based on significant performance of the community in the past. Frederick has a long history of participation in women's track and field events. It has excellent athletic facilities. The selection of Frederick for the trials indicates the importance of sports in this community and the intense local pride of the people. I want to congratulate all those who made Frederick's successful competition possible.

EDDIE COTTONSEED

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we Americans have inventive minds whch function even under the most strenuous circumstances. Proof comes from the Schulenburg Sticker. Mrs. Florence Bosl has captured the warm, even humorous flavor of the story of Eddie Janecka who may some day be called the Eddie Cottonseed somewhere near Qui Nhon, Vietnam. It is a well-written, good-time story about a spot in the world where we seldom get good news. It is positive journalism. It tells the patriotism of those hardy people of central Texas—and their love for their land and their heritage. Instead of complaining, Eddie Janecka did something good, something symbolic, and something that may start a new way of life.

I insert this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I heartily recommend it for reading.

The article follows:

A BIT OF DUBINA AT QUI NHON

The natives are a bit restless at Qui Nhon, Vietnam, and small wonder.

It's not the war; they cut their teeth on that.

It's those funny-looking things that American soldier grows in his little fenced-in garden, and we don't mean his moustache.

Specialist 4 Eddie Janecka, son of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Janecka of Dubina, thought about home a lot as he sweated under Vietnam's hot sun. It made him think of the cotton and other hot weather crops back home.

It gave him an idea for a time-killer, and with permission from his commanding officer he sent home for various seed, cotton and milo among others, just to see how they'd grow at Qui Nhon.

He had to dig out the rock soil on his base and replace it with soil that looked more like Dubina's. And he had to irrigate a little. But crops came up, and they're doing fine, as any Dubina farmer can tell from the above picture.

The Vietnamese had never seen cotton or maize. They were particularly amazed when they saw the bolls open. And when they were told this fluffy stuff makes into cloth they were downright interested. Restless, you might say.

One of these days there may spring up in the village of Qui Nhon a legend about a big, smiling, American who distributed the seed from his strange plants.

Maybe they will call him Eddie Cottonseed.

A REMARKABLE HUMAN BEING

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we have occasion to acclaim the courage, determination, and accomplishments of a truly remarkable human being.

My constituent, Helen M. Cotton, of Granby, is such a person.

A victim of cerebral palsy, Helen Cotton has overcome her disability to lead an active life most of us would call exhausting. Indeed, she is the best known resident of the fine community of Granby. Miss Cotton has enrolled in rigorous correspondence courses at the University of Oklahoma, has taught history classes at the Children's Hospital, and has become a skilled student of and crusader for political participation.

She serves as an inspiration to us all, but most particularly to young people who are handicapped and who benefit from her wise counsel and her vigorous example of a full, productive life despite personal disadvantages.

For the information and interest of my colleagues, a recent article about this brave and talented woman which appeared in the Hartford Courant follows:

"GET INVOLVED," EX-PATIENT TELLS YOUTHS

(By Francis Allen)

GRANBY.—Helen M. Cotton, Granby's best known resident friend of President Nixon, Republican crusader, inveterate letter writer and history and political student-turned-teacher, will arrive in Newington today to teach a class in political participation at Newington Childrens Hospital. Miss Cotton is an alumnus of the hospital's high school. Since childhood, the 37-year old plucky young woman has been a victim of cerebral palsy. The disability caused her to enter the hospital at an early age.

Her drive for self improvement is matched only by her zeal for politics and a determination to inspire others to campaign for candidates of either party.

Last year she taught a similar class at Newington. A year ago, she also enrolled in a correspondence course in professional writing at the University of Oklahoma.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAISE

This year, a scholarship from 'Newington' made possible a course for Miss Cotton in post Civil War American History at the same university.

This most recent undertaking drew a letter of praise from President Nixon. He wrote his Granby admirer: "While you are taking on a large assignment with the American History (course), the Nixons have no doubt that the same courage and vitality that have brought you across so many hurdles will see you over this one with complete success."

Miss Cotton's topic for her one-day course in Newington could easily substitute as a one-line description of her life: "Don't Wait, Become Involved Now."

The lowering of the voting age to 18 puts members of the class on the threshold of political participation. She will remind her students that they are closer to the privileges of voting than she was at their age.

The indomitable Miss Cotton will arrive in Newington today in the family car driven by her father, Harold B. Cotton, a life-long Democrat. The car will be crammed full of charts, pictures and teaching materials.

BUTTON, BUTTON

Each class member will receive a picture of President Nixon and a "Vote 18" button. Among the props for the course, is a sample voting machine.

How the buttons came to school is one example of the teacher's determination never to accept 'no.' Unable to find the buttons in Connecticut, she wrote the National GOP headquarters in Washington. There were none to be had there, but buttons were finally obtained from the New York State Republican Committee.

A list of signers of personal messages to the class today represents national and state Republican leaders. Besides expressions of best wishes from President Nixon, the class will see greetings from: Vice President Agnew; Gov. Meskill; John Volpe, secretary of transportation; Gov. Reagan of California, and former Connecticut Gov. John Lodge. He was governor when Miss Cotton was in Newington.

Among national lawmakers sending letters are: U.S. Sen. Ribicoff, Weicker, Brooke, and Kennedy; Rep. Ella Grasso and Rep. Robert Steele. Other letter writers are Gloria Schaffer, secretary of state; Robert Dole, National Republican chairman and Don Sundquist, chairman of the National Young Republican Foundation.

VOICE IMPORTANT

The lesson today begins with a reminder of local elections this fall.

"Many people feel that local elections are not important, but they are dead wrong. At the local level your voice is very important, because your local leaders are bound to be the leaders in your state, and many state leaders attain federal office. This is why it is important that you participate and help select the top qualified in your community.

"You have another important decision to make and that is which party should I join . . . You could be an independent voter but I would advise that you join a party. By not joining a party you are depriving yourself of complete party participation . . . I am not telling you which party you should join . . . but I am telling you that you will be the loser (otherwise) as you will have no voice at a party caucus in choosing your local officials . . . When you have chosen your party, feel free to split your ticket but don't be changing your party affiliation as a party needs sound affiliation . . . You should always have an open mind and vote the way you desire. Don't allow anybody to push you around, as this is a free country. . ."

IRELAND

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the struggle of the Irish people for liberty is familiar to all of us. Recently, we have been made acutely aware that this struggle is not finished, that discrimination and injustice continues in Northern Ireland.

We daily read accounts of the number of lives lost, the number of men wounded, and the number of children left homeless. The situation is mentioned, perhaps, in a passing conversation. Yet, because this tragedy has not directly and

painfully touched many of our lives, we too often remain silent. I am pleased, therefore, to join my distinguished colleague, the Honorable HUGH CAREY, in cosponsoring his resolution and in praying for a new birth of peace in that troubled land.

A LOOK AT PRISONS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the revolt at Attica has focused attention of many Americans on the problems of our prisons. Recently, a number of proposals have been introduced in the Congress which would revamp the correctional systems in the various States. I have supported some progressive steps designed, among other things, to establish a Commission on Penal Reform, improve correctional facilities and enhance job training and work opportunities for probationers and those out on parole.

Additional public concern is needed. In a useful series of radio editorials, WCBS–Radio, in New York City, broadcast some of its views on the conditions in prisons and suggestions for reform.

The text of the editorials follows:

A LOOK AT PRISONS

There's little argument about it among most prison experts. The long-needed reforms of the penal system in the United States must include more education and job training for prisoners. There is a need for more black and Puerto Rican guards—and housing for them.

If the lesson of Attica means anything, it is that there must be a fundamental reappraisal of the aims and methods of prisons and their officers.

It's apparent that our society pays an increasingly high price for systematically dehumanizing the men and women it puts behind bars.

We are not suggesting that prisons be turned into resorts. But prisons should be centers of rehabilitation instead of the finishing schools for crime that they are at present.

Attica is all too typical of New York state prisons, with an inmate population that is predominantly black and Puerto Rican. Staffed by all-white guards. With its inadequate facilities for education and therapy. Meals of poor quality. Once-a-week showers for prisoners working in high-temperature workshops.

Prison officials cannot afford to wait until the flash point of prisoner unrest is reached. They must start to introduce large-scale rehabilitation programs that have been successful elsewhere. We'll look at some of them in a future editorial.

New York State's correctional system could profitably expand model rehabilitation programs at Clinton prison and elsewhere.

As an incentive for good behavior, Clinton prisoners are assigned to one of several hundred plots of land within the prison compound. They can grow flowers or vegetables on these fenced-off plots or use them for other recreational purposes.

Clinton's Diagnostic and Treatment Center recently completed its fifth year. There are significantly fewer repeaters among its graduates than among ex-inmates who have not been through the Center. Yet, the prisoners selected for therapy are typically "hard cases".

In six other states, the federally funded NewGate educational project is transforming hardened prison inmates into solid citizens with college degrees.

According to Governor Ronald Reagan, California has succeeded in reducing the number of its repeat offenders by 35 percent during the past decade. He gives much of the credit to the state's three-day passes for convicts, work furloughs, and broad programs of counseling, therapy and job training.

The cost of crime for all of us is so crushing that we cannot afford any further delay in reforming a prison system that has so clearly failed.

Recently, New York City's Correction Commissioner, George McGrath, said that one of the major causes of unrest in City jails was the inability of overworked guards to help inmates with personal problems. From bail to clean towels.

Last month, the Commissioner introduced a prison program that will use federal funds to hire correctional aides—most of them young blacks and Puerto Ricans. After a training period, they'll work three days a week at city prisons and study two days a week, tuition-free, at John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

Commissioner McGrath concedes that many of the young aides hired have arrest or prison records but he says none are "serious felons."

But already, the Correction Officers Benevolent Association is attempting to shoot down the fledgling program. The union's president, Leo Zeferetti, objects that prison guards have enough to do "without looking after an inside assistant who will probably deter rather than help." He says his union will go to court to stop the program.

There are obvious pitfalls in a program of this kind. But we believe that, given careful hiring and training policies, plus tight supervision, its potential for good far outweighs its dangers.

On balance, the correctional aides program seems to us a significant attempt to upgrade the City's prison system.

CONGRESSMAN FULTON PROTESTS LATEST HEW ACTION REGARDING FORT WORTH DRUG REHABILITATION CENTER

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there comes a time in every man's life when he turns to his fellow man for help in solving a problem he cannot, for one reason or another, handle by himself.

I am sure each of us would like to think that when we needed such help, it would be available—that someone would care enough to help us back on our feet.

What I learned yesterday, however—that our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare ducked not only their opportunity but also their duty to help 92 drug addicts at the Fort Worth, Tex., rehabilitation center—greatly disturbs me.

The facts all too graphically reflect HEW's irresponsibility and lack of concern in this matter. A major drug cure program, serving addicts from several States, was functioning in Fort Worth. The administration sought a decentralization of this and similar programs. The Congress, debating in conference committee whether such grassroots community efforts could as effectively meet the addicts' needs, never learned until too late—never heard until this week that on October 8, the rehab facility was closed with nothing to replace it.

What did this do to the addicts? In more cases than not, it left them with nowhere to go but back to the environment spawning their addiction and, in some cases, their sales of illegal drugs.

What does this show to my colleagues and the American people? That Congress received a quiet but most effective slap in the face? True. But even more galling, that a Government agency established to help serve our people's needs would instead turn its back to trespass in the field of inhumanity.

Let this serve as my protest of such HEW action—now and for the future—and my plea to Congress to act restoring to operation this important Fort Worth facility.

A MODEST PROPOSAL

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, now that the judiciary review committee of the American Bar Association has apparently demolished Judge Mildred Lillie's chances for appointment to the Supreme Court, I have a suggestion which might enable Mr. Nixon to take care of two troublesome birds with one master stroke.

Mrs. Lillie, of course, is not the only lady from Los Angeles favored by the President but plagued by circumstances.

There is also Mrs. Romana Banuelos, Mr. Nixon's choice to become Treasurer of the United States. But this nomination, too, is in jeopardy, because of Mrs. Banuelos' unhappy propensity for putting illegal Mexican nationals to work in her Los Angeles area food processing plant.

Why not get off the hook by withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Banuelos and naming instead Mrs. Lillie for the Treasurer post?

Then Mrs. Banuelos would be available for nomination to the Supreme Court. Of course, the lady is not a lawyer much less a judge, but then this administration does not seem overly concerned about the professional qualifications of so many of its prospective and actual candidates for the High Court. And insofar as those carping attorneys of the ABA are concerned, Mrs. Banuelos' record is clean—in fact, nonexistent.

As a member of the loyal opposition, I am happy to offer these thoughts for a veritable coup, by the President, to confound his enemies, titilate his friends, and save both these damsels in distress for future public and political service.

In any event, our suspense should not be unduly prolonged, since Mr. Nixon has indicated he will let us know tonight the course he will follow in filling the Supreme Court vacancies.

THE NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter regarding the nondenominational prayer amendment.

AMERICANS UNITED FOR SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE,
Silver Spring, Md., October 8, 1971.

Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASSMAN: Several of our Baptist members in Louisiana have asked that we send you copies of the enclosed editorial from the Louisiana Baptist Message of October 7. We hope you will give this editorial your careful consideration before voting on the "nondenominational prayer" amendment on November 8.

Sincerely,

EDD DOERR,
Director of Educational Relations.

[From Baptist Message, Oct. 7, 1971]

COMMENT

For the past two decades the hue and cry as to increasing governmental control has waxed louder and louder. For that reason, the proposed prayer amendment represents a genuine paradox, in that, its advocates are asking for governmental control in religion. Many of the proponents of the prayer amendment are well-meaning people, but they have what has been labeled as "a firm grip on confusion." The confusion started with an erroneous interpretation by the secular press when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled against governmental control of religious activities in public schools. Some politicians for political gain have used it as an emotional issue to garner votes and support. In an effort to offer factual information to an enlarged falsehood (nearly 200 prayer amendments have been offered), religious journals have devoted endless pages to the subject during the past eight years. Southern Baptist journals have been at the forefront in an effort to enlighten their readership. The SBC has passed resolutions, as have state conventions, and executive boards of state conventions. The Executive Board of the Louisiana Baptist Convention has done so on several occasions, and no later than last week. If you have been a careful reader of the *Baptist Message*, then you know that during the past four months a great deal of space has been devoted to the subject. As a part of a continuing effort these editorial comments are offered.

History reveals that Baptists have played a major role in the establishment of religious liberty in America and since we have enjoyed the fruits of their labors, we must make every effort to guarantee religious liberty now and for future generations. It means we are going to have to become involved individually and collectively and let our voices be heard. It means writing Congressmen and Senators as to your opposition of House Joint Resolution 191. Indebtedness demands it and gratitude should prompt such action. A brief glance at history as to the part Baptists have played in the securing of religious and soul liberty is offered in evidence.

In 1612 a Baptist minister by the name of Thomas Helwys authored the first book ever printed in the English language in behalf of full religious liberty and complete separation of church and state. He dedicated his book to King James I and in that dedication he said: "The King is a mortal man and not God and therefore has no power over the immortal souls of his subjects to make laws and ordinances for them and to set spiritual lords over their churches. He is but dust and ashes as we. Yet though he kill us, speak the truth to him." The King sentenced him to prison and let him stay there until he died. During the early days of our nation, Baptists became pioneers in the fight for religious liberty. Roger Williams founded the first Baptist church in America after he was forced from the Massachusetts Bay Colony because his views differed from those of the ruling church there. Under his leadership Rhode Island became a colony. It was the first time in history that church and state were separated. Even today, his stubborn efforts stand as a symbol of religious liberty in all the United States. The new American nation embraced his concepts not only because its founders desired freedom of worship; not only because they detested the meannesses and dreaded the hostilities of sectarian conflict, but, above all else, because they believed with complete fervor that religion, as Madison said, "flourishes in greater purity without than with the aid of government." John Leland, a Baptist minister in Virginia, espoused the cause of religious liberty—as a consultant and a friend of Thomas Jefferson—also by becoming a candidate for the ratification convention of Virginia. James Madison was his opponent. As the so-called father of the Constitution, he had not included a Bill of Rights. George Washington, because of his desire for a Bill of Rights, arranged a meeting between Leland and Madison. They met at a picnic and as they sat under an oak tree, Leland scribbled on a piece of paper. Historians record that the scribblings contained practically the identical wording of the first amendment of the Constitution. Leland passed his suggestions to Madison and asked if he agreed. He said yes. Leland withdrew from the race and supported Madison. Unless Virginia had ratified the Constitution with the Bill of Rights there would be no American Republic of today.

Instead of condemning the U.S. Supreme Court for 1962–1963 decisions it should be commended. In 1964, it was this writer's privilege to appear before the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives in opposition to the Becker Prayer Amendment. At that time I stated:

"History reveals that government should never attempt to enforce Christianity. Christianity had its beginning and grew under oppression. Where it has depended upon the sword of civil authority for its authority, it has been weakest. To advocate putting the power of the government behind the religious practices of the people is to advocate the deterioration of both Christianity and government. It is not the business of government, local, state, or national, to formulate and prescribe or promote prayers to be used in the public schools. Both the state and the church are essential to the other, but neither can survive for long without according the other its rightful place in the scheme of life. Each would attend to its own affairs and avoid intruding into the realm of the other. The modern church or religion in America may appear to be sick or feeble at times, but it does not need governmental medicare. When the first amendment was adopted only 1 of every 13 citizens was a church number—'And all they asked was that the government stay out of religion.' Now, one of every two citizens is a church member and churches are teeming with large congregations everywhere. Yet, we are asking the government to come in and help us. The obvious conclusion is that religion for many of us is becoming a spiritualized patriotism and, far from standing in judgment on the state with magnificent independence, the churches are now leaning on the state. Regardless of how hot the religious issue may be, it seems to me that you and your congressional colleagues have the important task of deciding whether you will turn back the clock of religious liberty to medieval days, or before the days of the separationists or help to rewind the clock for the generations to come. Let us not turn aside from the first amendment because of misunderstanding or false charges and in a climate of emotionalism do serious damage to both the church and state. While trying to be friends of freedom of religion we become its own worst enemies."

Where do you stand—for or against, religious liberty and voluntary prayer? If you do not wish to write a letter to your congressman, then clip this editorial and mail it, merely stating, "I agree."

A PHONE CALL FROM SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in my remarks an article which recently appeared in the Boston State College paper Chalkdust written by a member of the class of 1974, Mr. Joe Langis. I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues and indeed to all men and women in public life.

Mr. Speaker, the story told by Mr. Langis is further evidence of the greatness of our beloved former Speaker, the Honorable John W. McCormack. Speaker McCormack never forgot the people and the people will never forget him.

I would also like to extend my appreciation to Mr. Langis for affording us all the opportunity to read of the continuing concern on the part of Mr. McCormack for all of us. Mr. Langis shows a keen insight into what constitutes greatness.

The article follows:

A PHONE CALL FROM SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

(By Joe Langis)

I am writing this article because I believe it would be of interest to the students and faculty.

About 4 weeks ago I wrote a letter to former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable John W. McCormack. Enclosed with the letter were 70 questions reflecting on his 51 years of dedicated service in Government. Well, on Monday, September 20, 1971 those questions were answered. At about 11:30 p.m. the phone rang and at the other end of the line was Speaker McCormack. I couldn't believe it. I was shocked and stunned to think that the man, who could have been President of the United States had called me.

We spoke for about an hour, he answered my questions, unfortunately because I was so surprised at his phone call that I didn't have a pen or pencil available to write down

what he said. His calling gave me a feeling, which I had never experienced. It's hard to explain. At the end of the interview I told him that I didn't write the answers, but he was very understanding and told me he would send back the answers in a few weeks. That wasn't the end of the phone call. He asked where I was going to school, what my intended major was and various other questions. He took a special interest in me. I could have spoken to him for hours. I have never met the Speaker yet he made me feel as though I knew him all my life. Of all the things we spoke about that evening there were two statements, which impressed me the most: 1. I said to him that I couldn't believe that he would call me for I'm a nobody. His response was, "Your a person and my life has been dedicated to helping people and talking to them."

The other statement was 2. I praised him for his devotion to his sick wife, not many men your age would still have so much love in him for his wife. He told me, "When I married my wife, Harriet, I took certain vows and I'm going to live by those vows."

No wonder this great man was so successful in politics—he never forgot the people—which is what politics is all about. Many say that the old politicians never gave the people true representation. Well, Speaker John W. McCormack is an old politician and an example of being the representative of the people. Now that Mr. McCormack is retired from public life—he still hasn't forgotten the people.

WESTERN FIRMS HELP SOVIET UNION, NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times this morning carried a short story noting that the U.S. Department of Commerce had approved export licenses authorizing American companies to sell more than $280 million worth of foundry equipment to the Soviet Union to help build the Soviets' Kama River truck plant. This is deplorable. It seems that some of the companies involved in this deal understand just how deplorable it is since the names of these firms are being withheld by the Department of Commerce.

Possibly the U.S. firms helping to build the Soviet truck plant do not want to be embarrassed. It is hard for an American to explain why he wishes to contribute to the growing Soviet military might and help the North Vietnamese war effort along. This is, of course, exactly what is being done by those companies helping to build the Kama River plant.

The following portion of Mr. Antony C. Sutton's forthcoming book, "Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development," Volume III—the first two volumes are already in print and cover the years 1917–45, goes into the direct Western contribution to the Communists war of aggression against the people of Southeast Asia. While this short excerpt deals simply with the help given by the West to the Soviets in the area of merchant ships making the run from the Black Sea to Hanoi there are many other areas where similar major contributions can be identified. The trucks used by the North Vietnamese Communists are all of Soviet manufacture.

The story from the New York Times and the excerpt from Mr. Sutton's book follow:

NEW SALES TO SOVIET FOR TRUCK FACTORY LICENSED BY THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, October 20—The Department of Commerce has approved export licenses authorizing American companies to sell more than $280-million worth of foundry equipment to the Soviet Union for a truck plant.

Department spokesmen confirmed reports tonight that approval had been given to 10 American concerns negotiating with the Soviet Union to supply equipment for the $1.4-billion project. The officials did not name the companies, however, and said that the total amount of the authorized licenses could exceed the $280-million figure mentioned in earlier accounts.

The department granted export licenses in August for $162-million in equipment for the Soviet complex. Mack Trucks, Inc., had been negotiating with the Soviet Union for a $750-million contract to construct the huge plant, but withdrew on Sept. 15 when the United States Government failed to give approval.

WESTERN TECHNOLOGY AND SOVIET ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By Antony C. Sutton)

It is known that the Soviets use about 100 vessels on the supply run from the Black Sea and Vladivostok carrying weapons, munitions, supplies, fertilizers and so on to Haiphong and to the Cambodian port of Sihanoukville for supply of the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam and Cambodia. The names of 96 of these vessels was obtained[1] and Table 28-2 lists the origins of their main engines:

Footnotes at end of article.

TABLE 28-2.—WESTERN ORIGINS OF MAIN ENGINES IN SOVIET SHIPS (96) USED ON THE HAIPHONG SUPPLY RUN

	Engines manufactured— In USSR	Engines manufactured— Not in USSR
DIESEL ENGINES		
Manufactured in the U.S.S.R. to Soviet design	0	
Manufactured in U.S.S.R. under license and to foreign design:		
Skoda (at Russky Diesel)	5	
Burmeister & Wain (at Bryansk)	8	
Manufactured outside U.S.S.R. to foreign design:		
Skoda		5
MAN		11
Fiat		2
Burmeister & Wain (in Copenhagen and elsewhere under license)		8
Sulzer (Switzerland)		13
Lang (Budapest)		4
Görlitz (GDR)		10
United States (lend lease)		7
United States (not lend lease)		1
Krupp (Germany)		1
Total, diesel engines	13	62
STEAM TURBINES AND RECIPROCATING STEAM ENGINES		
Manufactured in U.S.S.R. to Soviet design	0	
Manufactured in U.S.S.R. to foreign design	[1] 1	
Manufactured outside the U.S.S.R.:		
Canada		1
United States		3
United Kingdom		1
Sulzer (Switzerland)		2
ZUT (Switzerland)		1
Total, steam turbines	1	8
Grand total:		
Diesel engines	75	
Steam turbines	9	
	84	
Not identified	12	
	96	

[1] Possibly Sulzer steam turbine.

Source: U.S. Naval Institute, proceedings, January 1970.

Of the total 96 vessels, identification of main engines was possible in all cases except 12. Of the 75 diesel engines it was determined that 62 had been built outside the U.S.S.R. and 13 inside the U.S.S.R.; however, the 13 domestic diesels were either Skoda or Burmeister & Wain design. Only one steam turbine was of Soviet manufacture and design, and this is listed only as a possibility.

The Burmeister & Wain technical assistance agreement with the Bryansk plant has produced engines for numerous ships used by the Soviets for military purposes. Table 28–3 indicates some Haiphong run vessels with Burmeister & Wain engines built at Bryansk.

TABLE 28-3.—HAIPHONG RUN SHIPS WITH ENGINES MADE UNDER THE BURMEISTER & WAIN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AGREEMENT OF 1959

Name	Soviet register No.	Year	Tonnage	Type	Engine model No. (Burmeister & Wain)
Belgorod Dnestrovskiy	4776	1965	11,011		B. & W. 774-VT2BF-160.
Berezovka	5450	1967	10,996	Cargo	B. & W. 674-VT2BF-160.
Bryanskiy Rabochiy	569	1964	11,089	do	B. & W. 774-VT2BF-160.
Partizanskaya Slava	5492	1967	10,881	do	B. & W. 674-VT2BF-160.
Pavlovsk	2127	1964	11,089	do	B. & W. 774-VT2BF-160.
Perekop	2172	1963	11,089	do	B. & W. 774-VT2BF-160.
Polotsk [1]	2232	1963	9,500	do	B. & W. 674-VT2BF-160.
Pridneprovsk	2268	1964	11,089	Tanker	B. & W. 774-VT2BF-160.

[1] Lloyd's indicates built at Bryansk; Soviet register indicates built in Denmark.

Source: U.S. Naval Institute, Proceedings, January 1970.

Quite apart from main engines, the most significant part of a vessel, complete ships have been built in the West and utilized for military purposes. The following is a selection of ships known to have supplied material to North Vietnam together with their Western origins:

Registration No.	Year of construction	Name of ship	Place of construction	
			Hull	Engines
M26121	1960	Kura (4,084 tons)	West Germany	West Germany.
M25151	1962	Simferopol (9,344 tons)	Poland	Switzerland.
M11647	1936	Artika (2,900 tons)	United Kingdom	United Kingdom.
M17082	1962	Sinegorsk (3,330 tons)	Finland	Sweden.
M3017	1961	Incur (4,084 tons)	West Germany	West Germany.
M26893	1962	Iman (3,455 tons)	East Germany	Do.

The 'Ristna' was reported off Ghana in 1966 with arms for internal revolts,[2] the engines of the 'Ristna' are M.A.N. six cylinder (570 mm bore and 800 mm stroke) built in Hamburg.[3] Ballistic missiles brought to Cuba by the Soviets in the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 were carried in the 'Poltava' class of dry cargo carrier. These have an exceptionally long No. 4 Hatch (13.5 meters) enabling transport of intermediate range missiles. The class consists of a number of vessels with common construction characteristics, thus details of the Poltava will make the point clear. The 'Poltava' (Soviet registration number M–22600) is an 11,000 ton dry cargo ship with engines constructed by Burmeister & Wain Company of Copenhagen, Denmark. The engines are two cycle supercharged, six cylinder diesel marine type, with a cylinder diameter of 740 mm and piston stroke of 1,600 mm; some vessels of the class have engines made in the Soviet Union but based on the Burmeister & Wain engine. The Polotsk, for example, has a Danish engine but the Perekop has a Soviet built engine B&W of the same type.[4]

In brief, there is a direct identifiable military utilization by the Soviets of technologies, equipment and products supplied by Western governments under the erroneous assumption that these were peaceful goods.[5] Even further there is evidence that there has been a considerable 'leakage' of Western equipment under export control.[6] This is of course a different proposition to innocent export of peaceful goods where reliance is placed upon Soviet intent not to use these for military purposes. Where products are defined as strategic and still find their way in quantity to the U.S.S.R. there is a problem of ineffective administration.

THE FAILURE OF WESTERN EXPORT CONTROLS

The United States, in the Export Control Act of 1948 and the Battle Act of 1951, and other Western nations under equivalent legislation have attempted to restrict exports of military goods to the Soviet Union. In the United States the export of purely military goods is administered by the State Department while the export of 'strategic' goods is vested in the Department of Commerce, although the State Department also has a major influence in this area. Department of Defense has been overruled on sufficient occasions in regard to strategic goods that its influence may be considered as subordinate to that of the State Department.

The provision of fast, large ships for Soviet supply of the North Vietnamese will indicate the type of problem where export control has failed. Two segments of the Soviet merchant marine were examined to determine the relationship between Western origins and the maximum speed of Soviet ships. It was anticipated that because of the NATO limitations on speed of merchant ships supplied to the U.S.S.R. (reflected in export control laws) that the average speed of NATO-supplied ships would be considerably less than ships supplied either by Eastern European countries to the U.S.S.R. or built within the U.S.S.R. itself. The results of the analysis are as follows:

SEGMENT 1—AVERAGE SPEED OF SOVIET SHIPS USED ON THE HAIPHONG SUPPLY RUN (42 ships)

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in the Free World, 14.62 knots.

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in Eastern Europe, 13.25 knots.

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in Soviet Union, 12.23 knots.

(All built after 1951, i.e., implementation of Battle Act.)

SEGMENT 2—AVERAGE SPEED OF SOVIET SHIPS ADDED TO THE MERCHANT FLEET IN 1964–5 (392 ships)

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in Free World, 14.93 knots.

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in Eastern Europe, 11.93 knots.

Merchant ships with engines manufactured in Soviet Union, 10.95 knots.

The most obvious point to be made is that the average speed of Western supplied ships used by the Soviets in the Haiphong run was 2.4 kots (i.e., about 20 per cent) above that of Soviet domestic built ships used on the run. This segment includes only those ships built after 1951 (i.e., implementation of the Battle Act) and its stated limitation of speed and tonnage of ships supplied to the U.S.S.R.[7] The second segment (ships added in 1964–5) indicates that the gap in speed between Western and Soviet built ships is widening—to almost four knots or 36 per cent faster than domestic built ships. We may conclude that, not only has this discrepancy gone unobserved among Export Control officials, but that whatever export control principle is utilized is actually becoming eroded over time.

Reference to Figures 28–1 and 28–2 suggests that the illegal administration applies also to weight limitations—the faster, larger Soviet ships are from the West and the slower, smaller ships are from the domestic Soviet shipyards.

It is relevant to point out that under the CoCom machinery each nation participating in the embargo of strategic materials submits its own views on shipment of specific items. There is also a unanimity rule. In other words no item is ever shipped to the U.S.S.R. unless all participating nations agree. Objection by any nation would halt the shipment. Douglas Dillon, former Under Secretary of State has pointed out:

". . . I can recall no instance in which a country shipped a strategic item to the Soviet bloc against the disapproving vote of a participating member of CoCom."[8]

It must therefore be presumed that the United States delegates participated in, and approved of, export of ships of high average speed, as well as marine diesel engines and the Burmeister & Wain technical assistance agreement of 1959 for Soviet manufacturers of marine diesels—all later used against the United States by the Soviets in supply of North Vietnam.

In sum, the evidence suggests that the U.S. delegates to CoCom knowingly allowed export of ships above the NATO speed and weight limits and these were later utilized by the Soviets against the United States. This question clearly demands further investigation.

STRATEGIC ASPECTS OF RELEASE SOURCES

The most important feature of technical transfers from one country to another may be the most difficult for the 'layman' to appreciate: that of the release of domestic resources. By providing assistance from outside the Soviet economic system, internal resources are released and by substitutions at the margin enable such released resources to be devoted to political objectives of the system.

This substitution is of major importance to military objectives because the industrial base of any country is the prime determinant of its military strength and is in the ultimate determinant of success in military operations. The United States military does not produce its own weapons. Research, development and production is largely handled by private industry. It is the flexibility and efficiency of American private industry that is the basic resource upon which the American military structure depends.

The Soviet military is equally dependent upon Soviet industry. It has top priority but also reflects Soviet weaknesses brought about by centralized planning and almost totally absent innovative effort. Flexibility and innovation for Soviet industry are imported from the West, thus paradoxically the prime features making for efficiency in the Soviet military production are Western initiative and efficiency. The ability to buy finished products and semi-finished manufactures overcomes the critical shortages brought about by centralized planning; the ability to adopt Western innovation ensures that the Soviet military will have the latest technical support.

FOOTNOTES

[1] U.S. Senate, *Export Expansion and Regulation*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency, 91st Congress, 1st Session, (Washington: 1969) pp. 423–5.

[2] *Registrovaya Kniga Morskikh Sudov Soyuza SSR 1964–5* (Moscow: 1966).

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] The numerous statements contrary to this conclusion do not stand up to penetrating analysis. For example, Assistant Secretary of State Nicholas de B. aKtzenbach: "We should have no illusions. If we do not sell peaceful goods to the nations of Eastern Europe, others will. If we erect barriers to our trade with Eastern Europe, we will lose the trade and Eastern Europe will buy elsewhere. But we will not make any easier our task of stopping aggression in Vietnam nor in building security for the United States." U.S. House of Representatives, *To Amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945*, (Washington: 1968), p. 64.

It is obvious that the Katzenbach reasoning is based on assumptions inconsistent with observed facts as presented in this chapter.

[6] See Chapter 7 "The Arms Runners" in J. B. Hutton, *The Traitor Trade*, (Obolensky, New York: 1963). Hutton is a former Soviet agent employed in smuggling strategic goods. As the book has an epilogue by W. Averell Harriman it is presumably authentic.

[7] G. Adler-Karlsson, *Western Economic Warfare, 1947–67*, (Almquist & Wiksell, Stockholm: 1968), p. 93.

[8] U.S. Senate, *Export of Strategic Materials to the U.S.S.R. and Other Bloc Countries*, Hearings before the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and other Internal Security Laws, 87th Congress, 1st Session, Part 1, October 23, 1961, (Washington: 1961), p. 45.

BUY AMERICAN, NOT SWEDISH—FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FREE WORLD

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, while the President seeks to solve the Nation's inflation and unemployment problems by a wage and price freeze, there is a direct and positive route that can be taken by our people to solve the balance-of-payments deficit—simply buy American rather than Swedish. It is simply a matter of keeping our people rather than those who are anti-American. I think that Victor Riesel explains it most positively in a recent column which follow my remarks:

[From the Morning Advocate, Oct. 4, 1971]

SWEDISH PROMISE FAILS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—In a darkened corner of 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 Capitol 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 POWs (Prisoners of War) and MIAs (Missing in Action).

NO BOYCOTT

As the POWs 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 POW 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 figure 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.

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.

$20 MILLION

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.

DEALING FOR YEARS

As for mainland China, the Swedish industrialist 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.

It is easy to say, "Buy American." Some say it is provincial, or jingoist. But if one wants to patronize the world, why subsidize those who subsidize the enemy?

DEPENDENCE OF UNITED STATES UPON SOVIET UNION FOR CHROME ORE

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Indianapolis News of September 30 contains an excellent editorial on the recent vote by the Senate to end the dependence of the United States upon the Soviet Union for chrome ore, a material vital to national defense.

The editorial points out that the House version of the bill on which the Senate voted contains no provision leading to chrome ore. The editorial expresses the hope that the legislation in its final form will include the chrome provision.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the editorial, entitled "Fatal Weakness," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

FATAL WEAKNESS

By voting last week to permit the purchase of chrome ore from Rhodesia, the U.S. Senate took a step toward correcting what could be a fatal weakness in America's defense posture.

Chrome is a vital component of U.S. defense production. Without it, missiles, jet aircraft, nuclear submarines—to name but a few of the instruments of modern defense—could not be produced.

Having an insignificant domestic supply of chrome, the U.S. must import this commodity. Before the United Nations boycott of Rhodesia began five years ago, that central African nation was our main supplier. Today, our chief source of chrome is none other than Communist Russia. Before the Rhodesian boycott, the U.S. bought 30 per cent of its chrome from the Soviet Union. Today the figure is 60 per cent.

As incredible as it seems, U.S. defense production is now largely dependent upon imports from the very nation against whom we are supposed to be defending ourselves, the nation whose ambitions of world domination have caused us to arm. The Soviets thus have the ability to cripple our defenses.

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., Independent-Va., argued last week that it was "senseless to be dependent on Communist Russia for a material vital to our national defense," and the Senate agreed. Approved was a provision of the military procurement bill forbidding the President to bar purchase of strategic materials from non-Communist countries if import of the same materials is permitted from Communist countries. Effect of this language would be to reopen trade with Rhodesia and break Russia's grip on American defenses.

Unfortunately, the House version of the bill contains no such provision. The Nixon administration, moreover, opposes the Senate provision and the State Department is actively seeking its defeat. Hence, the outcome when Senate-House conferees meet is in doubt.

Now would be an appropriate time for Congress to hear from the people. No less an issue than America's ability to survive is at stake.

ADOPTIVE CHILDREN OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues my introduction of a bill which amends section 1072 of title 10 of the United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of dependent.

I believe that children placed for adoption in the household of a member of the Armed Forces are, in fact, dependents of the member of the Armed Forces from the moment of placement, in the same sense as are other dependents. He has agreed to support and care for them and the agreement is effective in sickness as in health. There should be no distinction made between such a child and other children in the household.

It is unfortunate that a member of the Armed Forces, because of his low pay, is foreclosed from adopting children who have some congenital heart condition—requiring surgery at a later date—or may have another physical handicap such as orthopedic problems, cleft palate and lip, and so forth, who in fact are the children in greatest need of adoption. My bill,

therefore, will correct the inequity in the law so that these children can be adopted and considered dependents with medical and dental benefits accruing to them in the same manner as natural-born children of members of the Armed Forces.

H.R. —

A bill to amend section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, to include a foster child within the definition of dependent

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting ", a foster child," after "adopted child" in clause (E).

(2) By adding the following new flush sentence at the end:

"For the purpose of clause (E), a foster child is one who is, or was at the time of the member's or former member's death, in fact dependent on him for over one-half of his support, and residing in his household in a parent-child relationship. However, only that medical and dental care may be furnished to a foster child under this chapter which is not furnished by other non-Federal agencies."

CHINA ISSUE AT UNITED NATIONS

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I strongly and unequivocally support the President's stated position that the expulsion of Nationalist China from the U.N. General Assembly is unacceptable to this Government. I would certainly hope that no American leader would ever consider any other policy.

The immediate reaction to the announcement that the President would visit Red China was an expression of optimism that dialog was at long last being opened with the sleeping giant of Asia, who, everyone agrees, must soon be reckoned with.

While reasonable men might disagree as to the wisdom of that action, any reasonable man could admit that something might be gained from such an initiative. Then, too, there was the quite reasonable rationale that, "it doesn't cost us anything to talk."

Unfortunately, however, the President's visit was almost immediately seized upon as a pretext for ushering Red China into the United Nations. Whether that result was anticipated or not, I do not know.

Be that as it may, the practical result is that our "talk" has already cost us dearly in terms of our historic effort to keep Red China out of the United Nations—and we have not yet begun to talk.

We have virtually abandoned our first line of defense—opposition to the admission of Red China—and our second line of defense—opposition to giving Peking the seat Taiwan now holds on the Security Council—and we have fallen back on the very weak third line—opposition to the complete expulsion of Nationalist China from the United Nations. And we have absolutely nothing to show for what we have given up.

To document the conclusion that we have already paid dearly, it is necessary for me to discuss the nature of the resolutions now pending before the United Nations, and the order and legal framework in which they will be considered.

Three resolutions are pending. A resolution by Albania calls for the expulsion of Taiwan and the seating of Red China in both the General Assembly and the Security Council.

One U.S. resolution, the so-called important question resolution, provides that any proposal to deprive the Republic of China of its seat is an important question. The effect of this resolution, if adopted, would be to require a two-thirds majority vote to adopt the Albanian resolution.

Our second resolution provides for dual representation of both Red China and Nationalist China in the General Assembly and recommends the seating of Red China in the Security Council, replacing Nationalist China, which now holds that seat.

My understanding is that we will seek to have our "Important Question" resolution considered ahead of the Albanian resolution. The game plan is that if that is done and our resolution passes, then Albania's resolution will fall short of the necessary two-thirds vote and our resolution proposing dual representation will be considered.

But it is a weak game plan, my friends. There is no assurance that the General Assembly will agree to take our "Important Question" resolution first, or that it will not require a two-thirds vote for adoption, rather than the simple majority we hope for. If we fail with that resolution, all is lost, for the Albanian resolution is virtually certain of passage if it requires only a simple majority, and if it does pass, our "Important Question" resolution is automatically tabled.

You may have heard it said that admission of Red China is an issue whose time has come and there is no way to stop it. If that is true, and I personally doubt it, it is nevertheless equally true that we do not need to help it along by compromising the principle which guided the policy of every administration since the United Nations was founded.

That principle is embodied in article 4, section 1, of the United Nations Charter:

Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organiaztion, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

Red China has never qualified as a peace-loving nation, and she has never been willing to carry out the obligations of the Charter.

As Dr. Richard L. Walker of the University of South Carolina pointed out in his study "The Human Cost of Communism in China," Red China has annihilated, by conservative estimate, more than 34 million people beginning with the first civil war in 1927 and running through the second civil war and the subsequent political liquidation campaigns, the Korean war, the Tibetan struggle, and the cultural revolution. The great bulk of these political murders have taken place since the United Nations was founded in 1949. Red China has amply demonstrated that she is not a peace-loving nation. And her own leaders have repeatedly declared her contempt for the principles and obligations of U.N. membership. Nothing has happened to change that picture.

The U.N. Charter further provides in section 2 of article 4 that:

The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly *upon the recommendation of the Security Council.* (Emphasis mine.)

Under the charter's provisions we are in a strong position to argue that any resolution to admit Red China must originate in the Security Council. But again, we have abandoned the fight before the battle lines are even drawn. I have obtained a copy of a memorandum attributed to the State Department which might be called "a handbook on how to abandon our position gracefully." It explains how it is possible to do exactly what the backers of Red China want to do; that is, avoid the Security Council where we might win, and permit the decision to be made in the General Assembly where it looks more and more like we will will lose. The rationale is that China is already represented in the United Nations—by Taiwan—and, therefore, this is not a question of membership but a question of representation. Thus, the General Assembly could not only vote on seating Red China, but could recommend to the Security Council the seating of Red China, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of the memorandum at this point in my remarks:

SEPTEMBER 29, 1971.

A question has been raised as to the legal basis for seating the People's Republic of China in the UN Security Council as one of the five permanent members of the Council.

It should be noted that the question of participation of the People's Republic of China in the UN does not involve the question of admission of a new member to the UN. China is already a member, and the question to be resolved is "How shall China be represented?" The proposal that both the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China be represented in the General Assembly, with the People's Republic of China seated as one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, would accord fully with existing realities and the objective of permitting all of the people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait to be effectively represented in the UN.

Since the General Assembly represents all the membership of the UN and is the UN's only completely representative body, it is entitled to state its opinion to the Security Council on the question of the Chinese seat in the Council. Indeed, some twenty years ago, in 1950, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 396 (V) which states that "in virtue of its composition" the General Assembly should consider questions concerning competing governmental claims of this character. While, under the Charter, the Security Council must of course finally determine questions concerning its composition and operations, it is perfectly clear that the members of the Security Council would pay the most serious attention to a General Assembly

expression of opinion. Amendment of Article 23 of the Charter would not be required in order to seat the People's Republic of China as one of the five permanent members of the Council, since the right of representation of the PRC in the Security Council would be derivative from the status of the ROC as an original member of the U.N. dating from the entry into force of the U.N. Charter pursuant to Article 110 (para. 3) of the Charter.

What, then, is left? We have abandoned the principle that Red China should not be seated in the United Nations. We have abandoned the strategy which might prevent her being seated. We have in fact proposed dual seats for China in the General Assembly and a seat for Red China alone on the Security Council. We stand a good chance of losing on a resolution which would expel Nationalist China altogether. We are likely to lose on that issue because our protest that we oppose expulsion is received in the U.N. diplomatic circles as in the immortal words of William Shakespeare, "Methinks the lady doth protest too much." Is it any wonder our protests are misread in the light of our actions?

What is of greatest concern to me is that Red China has made it very clear she will not accept admission to the United Nations on a dual basis with Nationalist China. If we have given in this much before the "talk" ever begins, what hope have we of winning when negotiations do begin? What is it finally going to cost us when the talking starts?

FAMILY PLANNING ADVICE NOT REACHING ENOUGH OF THE POPULATION

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of Planned Parenthood World Population, has written to the National Center for Family Planning Services indicating his deep concern that enough of the population is not being covered by family planning service advice and information.

His letter says in part:

We strongly urge, therefore, that the regulations governing this program eliminate entirely any eligibility criterion or "means test." In the event that the Secretary regards an eligibility criterion as necessary, however, we would urge that the regulations carry as the eligibility level for free family planning services the lower minimum budget level formulated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which, at least in our experience, is relatively realistic as a criterion for defining those who need and would use subsidized family planning care.

I concur with Dr. Guttmacher's statement, and I have joined in asking that Federal assistance be made available to as many people as possible within this eligibility level. I am sure this is what members of our Ways and Means Committee and most Members of the House had in mind in approving the Federal family planning services.

TENNESSEE PROSECUTOR OUTLINES NASHVILLE'S "STOP THE SMUT" PROGRAM

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, most Americans in recent months have become increasingly aware of the spread of violent crime throughout our Nation. I fear, however, that only a comparative few recognize the growing threat posed to our society by a nonviolent, yet equally insidious morals decayer—pornography.

The debate on what constitutes pornography has raged for years in our courts. The frustration of being unable to put an end to "smut" peddling for too long has been building in the jurisdictions of city, county, and State police, and prosecutors.

As in most areas, this seeming helplessness, this inability to legally pinpoint pornography and obtain major convictions against publishers and sellers, has been felt in and around my district, Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn. However, that situation hopefully is changing. In a front-page story printed in the Saturday, July 3, 1971, Nashville Banner, Tennessee Assistant District Attorney General Richard P. McCully outlines what problems face the prosecutor battling pornography and remarks on the actions Nashville-Davidson County has taken, to help control socially cancerous "smut."

I include Mr. McCully's informative article in the RECORD at this point:

SMALL BUDGETS, NO MANPOWER PLAGUE PROSECUTOR: PORNOGRAPHY THREATENS COMMUNITY

(By Richard P. McCully)

It is safe to say that in virtually all prosecutors' offices across the nation that a significant rise in crime is recognized. Yet, the prosecutor is plagued with small budgets, crowded court dockets and insufficient manpower to cope with all the facets of criminal deviant behavior.

Although the pornographer does not offer a direct threat of violence to the community, his threat must also be countered by law enforcement if the dignity of the law and the community is to be upheld.

The Tennessee General Assembly enacted the law (Section 39-3003, etc.) that defines what is and what is not "obscenity," making the publishing, possession or selling of prescribed materials a misdemeanor, punishable by a term of confinement in the county workhouse up to 11 months and 29 days and/or a fine up to $5,000.

The Tennessee definition follows the judicially enacted definition of obscenity rendered by the U.S. Supreme Court. That is, the "material" taken as a whole must be patently offensive, taking into consideration contemporary community standards, and have no redeeming literary, social or artistic value.

To date, the Tennessee law withstood the onslaught of several recent attacks by legal counsel who represent the persons selling material alleged to be obscene and it is the opinion of the state attorney general's office, as well as the district attorney general's office, that we do have a workable legal scheme in Tennessee with which to successfully prosecute the offenders.

MORE ATTENTION

Of all prosecution categories, perhaps the field of obscenity is the nosiest. It receives far more attention from the news media than the average crime of violence, while, on the other hand, the community has yet to realize any significant convictions—and an end to the peddler of pornography.

At issue is the fact that the obscenity on the market today—on newsstands, in bookstores, in the U.S. mail and on more and more motion picture screens—is hard core pornography of the most degrading and perverted type, as opposed to the argument that no published material can be proscribed under the freedom of speech provisions of the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

However, the U.S. Supreme Court has rejected the latter argument and there is a wealth of constitutional authority to refute any argument by the pornographer that his "filth" is protected by the First Amendment.

There is the problem of applying obtuse and changing Supreme Court decisions to the task of defining what is and what is not obscene.

The Supreme Court has ruled that citizens censorship boards are illegal and that the question of what is obscene can only be determined in court with both sides given the opportunity to argue their position. Moreover, the Supreme Court has prevented police seizures of obscene films and books and the closing of movie houses and book stores—again on the ground that the person selling the material has a right to be heard in court before any action can be taken.

Thus, there is the misconception that the district attorney general can padlock or close down a theater. This is untrue. The only effective way to deal with pornographers is to prosecute on a case-by-case basis.

Nashville has more than its share of obscenity. Significant distribution centers are the four "adult" bookstores operated locally by International News Co. and managed locally by Edwin L. Miller.

Within the past few months, Miller testified before U.S. Dist. Judge Frank Gray that he had no idea whom he worked for or who was paying his salary. Yet, in Division III of the criminal court of Davidson County, he testified before Judge Allen R. Cornelius Jr. that International News Co. was a Delaware corporation. After some prodding by Asst. Dist. Atty. Gen. Robert Schwartz, he admitted that his immediate supervisor was a man named Tom Hollister. When asked where Hollister was located, Miller replied: "I really don't know. He stays on the road most of the time."

The pornographer is in a profitable business and able to employ expensive and competent legal counsel, who have been known to deluge the courts with an endless maze of pre-trial motions, pleas and other delaying tactics. In my experience since September of 1969, not one obscenity case has actually come to trial whereby a jury of citizens from the community could judge for themselves whether the material the pornographer peddles is fit for human consumption.

In a series of recent Supreme Court cases the high court ruled that defendants such as pornographers cannot enjoin or sue the prosecution in a federal court until all state remedies have been exhausted. This means that the old defense tactic of suing the governor, attorney general and law enforcement officials every time a pornography prosecution was about to commence will no longer be a delaying tactic by the defense.

Currently, the Davidson County district attorney general has a case pending against every major distributor of pornography in this community. Several cases can be ex-

pected to come to trial during the fall term of court. We intend to ask the juries in these cases to return the maximum penalty in every case. Hopefully, when the community becomes fully aware of the obscenity problem in Nashville, more citizens will be willing to assist law enforcement in its effort to crack down on such activity.

The average citizen has really little contact with the pornographer's products and we agree generally with the theory expressed by Earl Nightingale:

"In my opinion, those interested in pornography fall into two main classes—1. the very young who do not have a clear and honest understanding of sex, and 2. the lopsided adult who has been denied, for one reason or another, a good upbringing and a healthy sex life. We can understand the natural curiosity of young people. As for adults, interest in smut and pornography indicates neurosis or sub-normal mental equipment."

The legislature has provided the law and the district attorney general has sworn to uphold all the criminal laws. We intend to prosecute the profiteer pornographer to the fullest extent.

ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARIAN FREEDOM

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, October 23 marks the 15th year since the Hungarian people rose up against the Soviet rule of their traditional homeland. This proud people will never give up the dream of liberty and we should be cognizant of this fact each day this oppression continues.

The Hungarian people have suffered greatly in their struggle for independence. The primary force contesting this independence has come from the great plains to the east of their land. Hungarians threw off the Mongol invaders, but the danger to the east now manifests itself in the Soviet presence. The Hungarian people have the historical claim to the area they inhabit as they were the first tribes to inhabit this region, known as the Carpathian Basin. The present Soviet occupation is a blatant example of the economic depravation that either imperils or inflicts all nations within the Soviet sphere of influence.

The Hungarian freedom fighters aroused the sympathy of the free world in 1956. We have been reminded of their struggle recently by two dramatic events. The first being the emergency of Josezf Cardinal Mindszenty after 25 years of imprisonment. Hungarian Catholics still respect him as their spiritual leader in spite of his absence from the public view. The valiant cardinal preferred to live imprisoned in his land rather than free, in exile. His patriotic courage serves as a symbol to Hungarians of their religious heritage denied them by the Communist regime. The cardinal is still honored by all people who cherish the love of liberty. Most of all, he is honored by his Hungarian constituents.

The second reminder comes from Ottawa. A young Hungarian refugee assaulted the visiting Soviet Premier as a small retribution to the memory of his homeland. We should be aware of the many thousands of Hungarian refugees who were compelled to leave their birthplace rather than live under Soviet domination. If it were not for the proximity of Hungary to the Soviet Union, these people would not be separated from their family, friends, and homeland.

The rapidity with which events transpired on October 23 is reflective of just how strongly these people resent the Soviet domination. On this very first day of independence, freedom fighters seized all the outlets of public information and began to broadcast their message of help and freedom to a stunned world. This was the first opportunity the Hungarian people had had to transmit their cause to whoever would hear them since 1946. With each day the countryside was mobilized while the fighting raged in the cities. The free world was powerless to intervene due to the global implications. All of the Communist satellites awaited some response—but none came. Eventually, after 2 weeks of bitter fighting, the Hungarian dreams of independence were crushed under by Soviet tanks. The repression that followed was swift and horrible. The Kremlin hoped this punishment would serve as an example to other satellites planning revolution. However, the hope of liberty had flickered faintly in the hearts of these peoples. The Soviet invasion could never extinguish these aspirations for freedom.

The 17 days of armed Hungarian resistance were a time of bloody heroism. The people, though vanquished, magnified their historical resolution and those that survive will pass the legacy of 1956 on to their sons. This proud nation will some day see that legacy become a reality. History will never forgive the Russian invaders, nor will time heal the wounded Hungarian pride, until they are free.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE: A CRITICAL ISSUE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, as the House Ways and Means Committee begins its hearings on national health insurance, it is important that we recognize the need for dispassionate consideration of this subject. I am sure there will be those who will seek to make political capital out of our problems and give short shrift to the very real accomplishments of our health system.

I believe the Nation's press has summed up the situation for those of us in Congress who must make these decisions. I would like to quote a few comments from newspapers across the country who have commented on this issue this year.

In an editorial entitled "Health-Care Challenge" the Washington Star commented:

Congress certainly must ease warily into this enormously complex and expensive innovation.

The Washington Post stated:

The health care problem is so monumental in scope and so intricate in detail that every idea is entitled to a full hearing on its own merits. Somewhere, out of such a free debate, a national consensus must develop, a concensus that rests on facts and solid theory, not on the whims of doing something to improve the situation or on notions of reaping political credit for the final product.

The Industrial News Review said:

One thing is becoming clearer each day. Until the views of medical authorities such as these are heeded in the formulation of laws pertaining to health care, there is a better than even chance that health care services will go the way of the postal service. This would be a tragedy that would haunt the nation for generations to come.

The San Francisco Examiner, commenting about hearings by the Senate Health Subcommittee in that city earlier this year, said:

In improving medical care for the few, let us not degrade the medical care for the many. Such is the danger of a national health service, however much it might be touted as a panacea. Senator Kennedy and his subcommittee should not allow the adverse nature of the testimony that gravitates to the hearing rooms to obscure those many favorable aspects of American health care. Sound legislation can be based only on the whole truth.

It is well that we in the Congress heed the advice given above. We must rely on facts. We must attack the real problems. We must consider the good in the present system and the damage the tinkering of bureaucrats would do.

We must not on the other hand be afraid to innovate, to experiment, to encourage diversity and new methods

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE REYNALDO GARZA FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICE

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, whenever a vacancy occurs on the U.S. Supreme Court there is always considerable speculation about who will fill it, there are always local favorites in different areas of the country. I, too, have a candidate, one I feel to be eminently qualified. In connection thereto, I sent the following telegram to President Nixon on September 21:

WESTERN UNION TELEGRAM,
September 21, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

In view of the vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court, I respectfully submit for your consideration the name of U.S. Southern District Judge Reynaldo Garza of Brownsville, Texas, to fill this seat. An illustrious jurist, Judge Garza would bring to the court the benefit of his vast constitutional experience and a mature judgment which would dignify that august body. We of south Texas consider Judge Garza the best Federal Judge in the

land and while our area would feel his loss keenly, the nation would benefit by his selection to this place on the high court. I pray your close consideration of this recommendation over which I do not presume to have any authority other than to seek your consideration thereof.

Yours respectfully,
E. (KIKA) DE LA GARZA,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the high esteem in which Judge Reynaldo Garza is held throughout the entire southern district of Texas is reflected not only in the telegram I sent President Nixon, but also in an editorial carried October 18 in the Brownsville, Tex., Herald. I am including this editorial in my own high recommendation of this outstanding gentleman for a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court.

[From the Brownsville (Tex.) Herald, Oct. 18, 1971]

JUDGE GARZA AND THE SUPREME COURT

(By Ward Walker)

In all walks of life every so often a superstar comes along—a Ty Cobb or Babe Ruth, a Bobby Jones or Ben Hogan, an Alexander Graham Bell or Thomas Alva Edison, a Winston Churchill or General Douglas MacArthur . . . and in the halls of justice in South Texas there is such a man, U.S. District Judge Reynaldo G. Garza, respected, admired and loved by the people of this area.

It really is no surprise, then, that a strong movement has developed to call to the attention of President Nixon the attributes of this remarkable man . . . a man of rare talents, shaped by time and place and heritage for a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court.

These are troubled times in the history of the United States, an era in which rebellion (up to and including high explosives) has become fashionable in certain circles, in which drug culture has replaced near-beer and bootleg whiskey, in which authority at every level is being challenged. It is not fanciful to say that the fate of this Republic with its unique concept of individual liberty will be settled in the next twenty years. And it is an incontestable fact that the U.S. Supreme Court will be a major factor in determining that fate.

There isn't a man or woman in South Texas that wouldn't sleep sounder if Judge Garza were appointed to that august body and could bring his great mind and wit, his great love for this nation and all of its people, his knowledge of the law and its great purpose, to bear upon the problems of the day.

In many ways this is still a frontier community, a border where passions burn a little hotter and violence is never very far away, where thugs and grifters gather in the hopes of a desperation buck, where the stakes are high and it's a twenty-four hour game.

It is in this setting and against such a backdrop that Reynaldo Garza has built his reputation, dealing out justice with such honest compassion that even those who are sentenced to jail do not rant or rail against him.

Attorneys marvel at his knowledge of the law and speak with awe of his ability to get at the equities of a situation, be it a complicated suit involving millions of dollars or the case of a lovesick Don Juan charged with illegal entry.

There are all too few jurists of Judge Garza's standing, one reason perhaps that American courts are in such a tangle. He is a strict constructionist of the Constitution as he understands the word and as this editor understands it . . . but in Judge Garza's case that understanding is tempered with a great love for the human race and the dignity of man.

If there is one man in the United States tailored-made for a seat on the United States Supreme Court at this moment in the nation's history, that man is Reynaldo Garza, U.S. District Judge, Brownsville.

THE PRAYER AMENDMENT—BEWARE THE BOOMERANG

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message on the so-called prayer amendment by the grand commander, Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Freemasonry, Southern Jurisdiction, United States of America:

SCOTTISH RITE OF FREEMASONRY,
Washington, D.C., September 26, 1971.

Re: So-called Prayer Amendment.
To the Active Members and Deputies, The Supreme Council, 33°, Southern Jurisdiction, U.S.A.

DEAR BRETHREN: There is enclosed a copy of my Message for November "Beware the Boomerang" in opposition to the so-called Prayer Amendment.

Expectations are that the House will vote on this November 8, that unless grassroots opposition is developed it will pass.

I strongly recommend that if you feel as I do we generate grassroots letters and wires to our elected Representatives in the Congress. In my opinion this is essential to stop "the foot in the door."

Good wishes,
Faithfully and fraternally,
HENRY C. CLAUSEN,
Sovereign Grand Commander.

BEWARE THE BOOMERANG

Congress soon will be asked to pass and to submit to the states for ratification an amendment to the Constitution permitting "nondenominational" prayers in public schools.

That raises these critical questions: Who is going to say what is a "nondenominational" prayer? What authority, governmental or private, will determine the place and content of such prayers? Who will be the super spokesman? How will the prayer be enforced? What provisions of our Constitution will the amendment discard? Will the amendment, in effect, rewrite the Bill of Rights?

These are insoluble and contentious questions in a country of diverse religious creeds. Any attempt at answering them would entangle the government disasterously in a conflict where there should be peace among pluralism. That is why many church organizations oppose the amendment, especially since they feel our Bill of Rights and its First Amendment as presently written adequately protect religious liberty, and that tinkering with the language would intrude the government wrongfully into the religious arena.

It will be recalled that the United States Supreme Court case of Engel v. Vitale in 1962 struck down as a violation of our Constitution a practice of New York that forced its public school children to recite this daily "prescribed" prayer:

"Almighty God, we acknowledge our dependence upon Thee, and we beg Thy blessings upon us, our parents, our teachers, and our Country."

There then swept across our Nation in some quarters an emotional and psychological wave criticizing the Court. This cast up upon the shores of Washington several proposed amendments. It was erroneously assumed that the Court was against God. But all that the Court barred was the enforced recitation of a state-composed prayer. Any child then or now may pray in a public school voluntarily. The vice of the New York practice was the State compulsion. That is the opposite of American voluntaryism.

It is no official concern of the state whether a child prays or is trained in religious values. That is for the parents, the home, the churches or, if desired, religious schools.

Before deciding to amend the Constitution, we should take a deep breath. Like matrimony, it is something that should not be done lightly. We should understand first what will be the full impact upon our future lives. It is not something with which to "tinker." I am reminded of the popular verse of some years ago that ran:

"I thank my God the sun and moon
Are both stuck up so high
That no presumptuous hand can stretch
And pluck them from the sky.

"If they were not, I do believe
That some reforming ass
Would recommend to take them down
And light the world with gas!"

The present attempt to amend our Constitution so as to permit the so-called "nondenominational" prayers should be firmly rejected. It would invade our present fundamental Constitutional rights and basic freedoms rather than confer an additional one. It would impair the integrity of our hardwon guarantee of religious liberty. It would tinker with the solid base of interpretive case decisions that have given life and substance to the means by which our Founding Fathers set out to preserve peace and harmony among our people. Such a deviation as now proposed, however slight and however well meant, would be exploited by religious zealots. It would be the foot in the door, the camel's nose in the tent, sure to result in further and eventual fatal intrusions.

May I suggest that as an individual you make your voice heard. Tell your views to your elected representatives. Your help can be decisive.

HENRY C. CLAUSEN, 33°
Sovereign Grand Commander.

PAST EXPERIENCES OF OTHER COUNTRIES CAN HELP US IN WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the eminent American philosopher, George Santayana, said:

Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.

Obviously the American people, and especially the Congress, can remember and learn from the past experiences of other countries and our own country during World War II that wage and price controls do not work. A recent article which appeared on pages 29 and 30 of the October 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report discusses lessons learned in Europe when wage and price controls have been imposed. The results prove almost conclusively that inflation has not been stopped and consumer prices have generally skyrocketed. It is my hope that my fellow colleagues will be governed by

the hard lessons of these European countries and, remembering, not let themselves be stampeded into extending wage and price controls. I submit the article from U.S. News & World Report:

CONTROLS: LESSONS FOR UNITED STATES FROM EXPERIENCE IN EUROPE

(Note.—Official restraints on wages and prices have been tried for years over much of Europe. The results—They're not too encouraging for Americans.)

Many Americans, wondering whether new controls on the U.S. economy will really show results, are starting to look across the Atlantic for clues.

Countries in West Europe have used such controls in the past. Some are still relying on them. By and large, Europeans have not found the experience encouraging.

While official controls or guidelines often have worked reasonably well for a short time, they have generally failed to snap inflationary spirals and restore stable wage-price conditions over the longer run.

Europe's experience also suggests that labor support is vital for success of controls. Many times, the controls collapsed in a storm of labor unrest and wildcat strikes.

Over all, the evidence is that European countries that leaned heavily on controls in the 1960s have had an even worse record in limiting inflation than those without significant restraints.

For example—

The seven industrial nations that have resorted to controls have seen consumer prices soar 39 to 60 per cent since 1963. They are Britain, France, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and the Netherlands.

Even during the last 12 months, their price increases have ranged from a little more than 5 per cent to more than 10 per cent, according to figures from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

In contrast, nations essentially without controls in the same period include Italy, West Germany and Switzerland, as well as Canada and the United States. Their consumer prices have risen only 27 to 35 per cent since 1963. Their increases in the last 12 months have been as little as 2.8 per cent in Canada, and up to 6.8 per cent for Switzerland. U.S. inflation has been 4.3 per cent, according to the OECD.

CONTENDING VIEWS

Does that mean controls generally are doing more harm than good?

Some economists in Germany and Switzerland say yes. Others insist that statistics do not tell the whole story, with economic, social and political conditions varying greatly from one country to another. France and Sweden, for instance, might have had even greater inflation without temporary measures to freeze prices.

Controls in Europe often have been adopted as stopgap measures for three to six months or so. They were intended to keep a lid on inflation until broader stabilization programs—such as tighter money and higher taxes or restraints in government spending—made their full effect felt.

But prices and wages have tended to speed up again, once the brief restrictions have been lifted or eased.

Controls maintained over longer periods of time, ranging up to several years, apparently increasing the risk of sudden "explosive" changes, once the checkrein is released. Lengthy controls were followed by wage explosions in the past decade in the Netherlands, France and Britain.

While Europe's experience looks gloomy, experts note that at least three circumstances now present in the United States—but not always present in European countries—would appear to be in the Americans' favor.

For example, prospects for effective controls are better if there are unused production facilities and plenty of raw materials and manpower, as is the case in the U.S. Controls can take hold more easily in an economy with some slack in it than in one that is overheated.

Strong public support is another factor. This seems to be present in the U.S. Also, there is the reserve threat of legal sanctions.

Finally, controls win wider backing if they are imposed when there is an external crisis, such as the present U.S. troubles with the dollar and the gaping deficit in the American balance of payments.

For a detailed look at the experiences of some individual countries—

LONDON'S STRUGGLES

Britain's Labor Government in the late 1960s set wage guidelines to keep incomes closer to productivity. However, co-operation with the trade unions broke down, even before the defeat of the Labor Party at the polls in 1970. A wave of strikes spread across Britain after a lengthy period of austerity and moderation in pay demands.

Wages and prices in Britain since then have advanced by leaps and bounds. Latest figures show wage rates up about 13 per cent in the past 12 months. Consumer prices are about 10 per cent higher than in 1970.

The Conservative Cabinet rejects the idea of imposing Government controls. Leading industrial firms, however, recently adopted a policy of voluntary price restraint to help ease the inflationary push.

THE FRENCH RECORD

France has long used price controls that are more or less rigid. Price freezes or price "supervision" have worked in the short term. But they have not produced lasting effects.

A period of austere policy, from autumn, 1963, onward, with tight limits on credit and prices and only moderate pay hikes, was followed by a 15 per cent wage increase after a worker-student revolt in May, 1968.

Since the franc devaluation in August, 1969, Paris has turned to more-flexible price controls. The aim: to cut the annual rate of inflation to 3 or 4 per cent.

However, the Government finds French retailers hard to harness. Price inspectors are few.

French consumer prices are now advancing at a 6 per cent rate. Hourly wage rates in manufacturing are up 11 per cent in a year.

French industry recently has offered to co-operate in an effort to hold price rises on manufactured goods to 1.5 per cent in the six months that started October 1. In return, the Government has promised not to raise taxes or charges in the public sector of the economy.

Union co-operation in the French fight against inflation is, however, far from certain.

DUTCH EXAMPLE

The Netherlands was regarded as a "model nation" after World War II, when it came to cooperation among labor, management and Government in voluntary wage and price restraint. But the Dutch system broke down in 1963, under a bombardment of labor unrest and wildcat strikes. Wages quickly were pushed up 17 per cent.

Dutch workers have been less docile since then. Hourly wage rates have soared 110 per cent since 1963.

Prices have bounded up 52 per cent.

Last autumn, the Dutch Government again slapped on temporary price controls. That program was succeeded by a wage freeze for the first half of 1971—to buy time, at least, until after a national election last spring. Now the controls have been removed.

Despite the series of controls, wages are expected to climb an additional 12 or 13 per cent this year and prices could go up 8 per cent.

NO NORDIC ENCOURAGEMENT

Scandinavian experience with controls is found to be hardly more encouraging. Sweden, Denmark and Norway have all turned to price controls since 1970. Yet the prices that consumers in the area now pay are still 5 to 7 per cent above those of a year ago.

Norway also applies some controls to head off "excessive" wage drift on top of official pay rates under union contracts. Wages, however, are about 16 per cent higher in a year.

In Sweden, a labor settlement for 1971 to 1973 provides average pay boosts of close to 30 per cent. Total labor costs probably will leap 35 to 40 per cent. With that impetus, price inflation is certain, analysts believe.

FINNS' TEMPORARY SUCCESS

Finland is one of the few countries where income policies based on a broad stabilization agreement worked for a while. That came after devaluation of the markka in 1967. Consumer prices rose less than 3 per cent annually in 1969 and 1970. Wage advances remained moderate.

However, efforts to prolong the agreement at the end of last year fell apart. Nationwide strikes hit the economy.

Now? Wages are again up 11 per cent in a year. Prices are up 7 per cent.

GERMAN, SWISS, ITALIAN FREEDOM

For the most part, prices and wages are free in West Germany, Switzerland and Italy. A recent exception: Rome has just adopted a temporary price freeze on such state-controlled services as the postal, telephone and railroad systems.

Italy's aggressive labor unions turn thumbs down on any form of incomes policy or wage restraint.

In Switzerland, the Federation of Commerce and Industry, inspired by President Nixon's economic program for the United States, a few weeks ago proposed a one-year freeze on wages and prices to stop the erosion—by inflation—of Swiss competitiveness. Labor unions were quick to oppose that idea.

In Germany, Chancellor Willy Brandt insists that his Government will avoid wage and price controls despite persistent inflationary trends.

Bonn is hoping that a coming slow-down in business, coupled with export losses because of the upward float of the mark, will tend to prick excessive wage demands. Chemical workers recently accepted a relatively moderate pay boost of 7.5 per cent.

However, wage demands in the metal industry still are in the 9 to 11 per cent range.

Latest figures show German wage rates in manufacturing are up 15 per cent in a year. Consumer prices are up 5.4 per cent.

Thus, in country after country, the battle to beat inflation is far from over. Government controls, effective in some stages, have provided Europe no sure-fire way to win the war.

Following are comparative results shown on U.S. News and World Report chart between Western governments which have and have not imposed wage-price curbs in recent years:

Among Western governments, some have imposed wage-price curbs off and on in recent years—while others have generally avoided them. Which group has had more success over the long run in coping with inflation? A look at the record.

COUNTRIES THAT HAVE MAJOR CONTROLS

Increase in consumer prices since 1963
(In percent)

Denmark	60
Finland	56
Netherlands	52
Britain	50
Norway	50
Sweden	44
France	39

COUNTRIES WITH FEW IF ANY CONTROLS

Switzerland	35
Italy	34
Canada	30
West Germany	27

THE RESPONSE OF A FEDERAL AGENCY IN HELPING TO MEET THE NATION'S HEALTH MANPOWER NEEDS

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, because one of my major concerns as a Member of this body remains that of medical and health care for all Americans, it was my particularly high privilege to participate last week in dedication ceremonies that marked the opening of the new Allied Health Education Building at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Durham, N.C.

The creation of this new facility—the first of its kind in the Nation—represents the consummation of a happy marriage between the Veterans' Administration and the Duke University Medical Center in that it combines the initiative and expertise of two major health entities in our city.

The principal speaker for this proud occasion was Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. Marc J. Musser.

For Dr. Musser, the occasion marked a homecoming, for he headed the Veterans' Administration regional medical program for 4 years, prior to elevation to his current responsibilities.

Because his remarks explain so lucidly and succinctly the function of this unique new building, and the purpose of the program, Mr. Speaker, I commend them to you and to my colleagues:

THE RESPONSE OF A FEDERAL AGENCY IN HELPING TO MEET THE NATION'S HEALTH MANPOWER NEEDS

(By Marc J. Musser, M.D.)

It is a special pleasure to "come home" to North Carolina, and back to Durham where we made our home for a period of 4 years which we will always remember as personally pleasant and professionally rewarding.

It is, however, particularly satisfying to come to the campus of Duke University to dedicate a new Veterans' Administration facility.

This occasion affords me the opportunity to say a number of things which, in my judgment, need to be said and are appropriate at this particular point in time when health care in general, and various aspects of it, in particular, have become critical national issues.

The fact that we are today dedicating a building expressly planned and built to provide facilities in which allied health personnel can be trained will have a direct beneficial effect in terms of helping to provide badly needed health manpower.

A local fact of national significance is the important and productive relationship that has been developed between Duke University Medical School and the Durham Veterans' Administration Hospital. The benefits of that relationship in terms of better health care for all of the veterans in North Carolina and adjacent states in the Southeast are well known. Its further benefits in terms of providing a national model of what can be achieved by a cooperative relationship between a private academic institution and a local element of a Federal Agency is also of great significance. This model and its benefits can and are being replicated throughout the country where other academic institutions and VA hospitals are in close geographical and/or organizational relationships.

Tracing the development of such relationships over the past 25 years tells a story that must be fully understood if the ultimate benefits and potential of this unique type of Federal private cooperative effort is to be appreciated.

In 1946 Dr. Paul Hawley, the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans Administration's Department of Medicine and Surgery, issued Policy Memorandum No. 2. That historic document called for the development of relationships between VA hospitals and the medical schools of the country to help improve the quality of medical care given to veterans. Prompted by a spirit that combined post-war patriotism and a pragmatic need for clinical resources and faculty support, the medical schools of the country developed mutually beneficial affiliations with VA hospitals.

In 1946, the idea of a working relationship between a Federal Agency and the medical schools of the nation was a bold and unprecedented proposition. Even more remarkable is the extent to which that proposition endured and has grown. Today, 97 VA hospitals have active affiliations with 83 of the nation's 108 medical schools. And yet, in 1946, the idea and its implementation was the effort of just a few imaginative and untrammeled men—the names of General Omar Bradley, Dr. Paul Hawley, Dr. Paul Magnuson, and Dr. Charles Mayo stand out on the VA side—and their counterparts on the medical schools side were Dr. Michael DeBakey, Dr. Brian Blades, and Dr. Barnes Woodhall—though it should be noted that while all this was going on, they were serving in the Office of the Army Surgeon General.

As it has endured, the affiliated program has changed. It also has had its share of problems, but no more, perhaps, than should be expected in such a dynamic, and growing, and changing concept. The Duke-Durham VA Hospital affiliation epitomizes all of these circumstances. Its history catalogues a series of developments in patient care, research and education, reflecting the chronology of medical developments in this country that have led to not only the great body of knowledge that we now have in medicine and its application to the quality of care we are capable of providing. They also have produced a number of critical circumstances that now are of national concern. These can be summed up in the three categories of *facilities, manpower* and the *utilization of both . . .*

The pressure for *modernization and expansion of antiquated facilities and the need for greater space* in hospitals and academic health centers for expanding and adding facilities to accommodate new techniques and new services.

The need for greater space and additional staff and faculty to help *recruit, teach, and more equitably distribute greater numbers of qualified health personnel* to implement these new techniques and new services.

The need to *maximize the utilization of existing facilities and resources* to insure the availability of the highest quality of care to the greatest number of people and at the lowest possible cost.

The critical nature of the current state of the nation's health affairs is such as to encourage the same kind of bold and unprecedented actions that characterized the development in 1946 of the VA-Medical School affiliated program. We must be particularly concerned today with the improvement of the delivery of health services and its critical relationship to the recruitment, education, training and distribution of the health manpower necessary to make these services available and effective.

While these critical circumstances exist nation-wide, the fact has become clear that there is no common solution for them that is applicable to all areas, nor is it possible to deal with them quickly or completely. It is now evident that a series of social, political, economic and professional forces have come together over the last several decades not only to create so-called "health market area", but also to place each of them in a different status of needs and potential for meeting these needs. These facts were clearly demonstrated to me in the four years during which I directed the Regional Medical Programs here in North Carolina, and worked with the medical leaders in North Carolina and my colleagues who were operating the other 54 Regional Medical Programs across the country. As a result, we in North Carolina veered away from the all-too-prevalent attitude of looking for national solutions that were generally applicable to all Regions. Instead, we sought out local solutions to local problems which, if solved, could ultimately provide at least a balanced system of care for all people in a geographic area or Region, consistent with that Region's potential for providing such care and, together, give the country *a collection of balanced systems as a total health care system.* From the standpoint of the VA-Medical School relationship and with the leadership of Dr. Woodhall, Dr. Anlyan, Dr. Stead, and Dr. Estes, we probably are better off here in Durham in this regard than anyplace else in the country.

For most people their understanding of the VA medical program is limited to their awareness and knowledge only of their local VA hospital. Actually the VA medical program is a total *medical care delivery system* made up of institutions and services in each of the various "health market areas". It is the largest total operating system in the nation, consisting of 165 hospitals, 202 clinics, 72 nursing homes, and operated by a staff and work force of some 150,000. Together, these elements of the system operate to serve the medical care needs of a potential of 28 million veterans of whom 90% live no further than 100 miles or two hour's drive from one of these regional facilities.

All of our university affiliated hospitals are actively involved as a group in the annual education of some one-third of the nation's medical students, and responsible for the residency training of another one-third of the new physicians engaged in post-graduate education. Further, the VA hospitals have similar affiliations with all 51 dental schools, and, to a greater or lesser extent, all of our facilities are providing faculty and clinical facilities for programs in more than 400 universities, colleges, junior colleges and technical training schools. As a result they have a direct stake in the training of more than 60,000 allied health workers each year.

Although the VA system, *as a system,* has developed these relationships and affiliations, it must be acknowledged that it actually is a *collection of a number of subsystems.* Each has its own unique characteristics that reflect the nature of local needs and the capability which exists to meet them. It might be concluded that it is from this heterogeneity of operational patterns that the VA derives its greatest strength.

There is virtually no area of the country served by a VA hospital that does not also include other health care and educational institutions. In addition to established universities and colleges, the many community junior colleges and vocational schools have the interest and the capability to contribute to the production of health workers. Health service agencies, such as community hospitals, clinics, outpatient services, and even health practitioners' offices are involved, usually unilaterally, in some phase of the preparation of health workers. In such places it has been demonstrated by the VA, often in conjunction with other regionalizing groups, that small additional investments can frequently achieve the coordination of these efforts de-

creasing educational costs and increasing production of trained personnel.

The unique location and resources of VA hospitals make them ideal agencies to serve this coordinating and cooperating role. In addition to the wealth of clinical material, the availability of up-to-date equipment, and at least some available education space, the staff of the DM&S facilities include those who can and are more than willing to teach. Collectively, that group represents the nation's largest "clinical faculty" of 25,000 allied health professionals trained at the baccalaureate level or higher, and certified and/or licensed in their specific disciplines. These are in addition to the nearly 6,000 full time physicians and dentists, who also contribute to these training programs in addition to their own efforts in education of medical and dental students.

In the area of education and training, a number of new and exciting developments have been taking place—besides those here in Durham. There are at least other examples of similar efforts which now are coming into being.

Through the VA Hospital in Little Rock, Arkansas, the Department of Medicine and Surgery is providing implementing funds for opening a new school of allied health professions within the University of Arkansas which will bring together the disparate and partial programs for the education and training of health workers that currently exist in the Little Rock VA Hospitals, within the Medical Center, the Medical School, the University Hospital, the undergraduate campuses in both Little Rock and Fayetteville, and some in the private hospitals in the City of Little Rock.

Another such arrangement is being made through the St. Louis, Missouri VA Hospital. In addition to the traditional services of a large medical school affiliated teaching hospital, that hospital is becoming a major base for training and employing of inner city ghetto residents.

A coordinator and two additional associates have been assigned to the VA Hospital in Seattle, Washington in time to assure the adequate planning of a newly authorized education building on the hospital grounds similar to the one we dedicate today. There, however, special attention will be given to the retraining and utilization of highly skilled scientists who are presently unemployed in the community.

We are equally interested in finding ways in which our unique system enables us to experiment not only with new types of health personnel, but also with new patterns of utilization of personnel trained in the traditional health disciplines. For example . . .

Following the pattern set here at Duke, some 20 VA hospitals will be affiliated with seven academic programs for the training of Physicians Assistants by the end of this year at which time we expect VA affiliated programs will be producing 200 graduates a year. Our hospitals offer an unparalleled resource for this kind of training because of their freedom from the strictures of state licensing laws; independence of third-party-payment systems; and the freedom from the constraints of local professional conservatism.

In mid-1972 a new dental education building at the VA hospital, Birmingham, Alabama, will be completed and will allow for both training and practice of dental professionals and dental auxiliaries.

At least 10 VA hospitals are now providing clinical experience for Nurse Practitioners.

A third area of great interest to us relates to the economics of producing first-line health service workers. There is recognition by both the VA and community hospitals that training of health workers at the lower level of the career ladder is actually the most costly in terms of the hospital's own budget because the training takes place exclusively in the hospital system and is not shared by the regularly financed educational systems. The VA has undertaken two major programs aimed at the alleviation of this serious problem.

The Education Service has entered into a contract with the three campuses of Miami-Dade Junior College in Florida designed to develop a process by which all of the educational and health care resources of a community can be combined to train, and adequately utilize, supportive health workers. This effort will also provide a means to improve the mobility of such personnel, both in terms of their own careers and in their utilization by employers.

The second of these innovative studies is being undertaken by a consortium of health care and educational institutions in southern California led initially by the Los Angeles Community College, in affiliation with the Brentwood VA Hospital. This program will provide an experience similar to that of the Miami program, but is designed specifically for personnel to work with patients not confined to hospital beds, but who are under care for mental and emotional illnesses including drug and alcohol dependence.

We believe that the VA health care delivery system, working with the nation's medical schools as it has for 25 years, and collaborating as it might with community health institutions in the private sector, constitutes a tremendous national resource for the expansion of efforts to resolve the many problems with which health care in the United States is confronted. We in the Veterans Administration are committed to encouraging the maximum use of our resources for the purpose. We already have made some progress.

We also clearly realize that the work that must be done, the progress that must be made, will take place in the many institutions that comprise the VA health care delivery system and the medical school affiliated program. Thus this expanded educational facility here in Durham simply increases the opportunity for the testing of new ideas and the development of new and better ways to get the job done. I can assure you of our intent to help in every way we can—and for the moment there remains only to wish you Godspeed.

RESULTS OF CONGRESSMAN BIESTER'S MOST RECENT QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, I mailed a questionnaire to the residents of the Eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania requesting opinions on some of the issues now before Congress. More than 15,000 replied, many enclosing letters detailing their reasons for their responses.

I would like to express my appreciation to all those who replied and I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the results of my most recent questionnaire.

The results follow:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Concerning the war in Vietnam, which do you believe is the best U.S. policy—

A. Withdrawal in accordance with President Nixon's Vietnamization program—

Yes	64.2
No	35.7

B. Withdrawal of all troops with a definite deadline of December 31, 1971 for the return of all troops—

Yes	54.8
No	45.1

C. Immediate withdrawal of all air and ground support and combat troops—

Yes	31.2
No	68.8

D. Intensification of the war effort to seek a military victory—

Yes	13.9
No	86.0

2. With regard to China, do you favor—

A. Recognition of Communist China by the U.S.—

Yes	78.1
No	21.9

B. Admitting Communist China to the UN in addition to Nationalist China—

Yes	81.9
No	18.0

C. Admitting Communist China to the UN instead of Nationalist China—

Yes	9.6
No	90.4

D. Not admitting Communist China to the UN—

Yes	28.2
No	71.7

3. Do you approve of the President's handling of the Middle East situation—

Yes	65.9
No	34.0

4. With regard to our troops in Western Europe, would you favor—

A. Unilateral withdrawal of about 50,000 troops this year.

Yes	37.6
No	62.4

B. Unilateral withdrawal of about 150,000 troops this year (Mansfield amendment).

Yes	44.0
No	56.0

C. Mutual withdrawal of troops only as the Soviet Union withdraws its troops from Eastern Europe.

Yes	71.3
No	28.8

D. No withdrawal of troops.

Yes	21.5
No	78.4

5. Do you favor the President's revenue sharing proposal which would provide the return of 1.3 per cent of the individual income tax base to the States and local governments.

Yes	75.6
No	24.4

6. Which course of action would you favor regarding election campaign reform—

A. Receiving a Federal tax credit for your political contribution.

Yes	31.4
No	68.6

B. A maximum spending limitation placed on campaigns.

Yes	90.0
No	9.9

C. A limitation on expenditures for radio and television only.

Yes	37.7
No	62.2

D. Full disclosure of contributions without any limit on expenditures.

Yes	40.5
No	59.5

7. Do you favor President Nixon's proposed family assistance plan.

Yes	51.6
No	48.3

8. Medical costs continue to rise. A number of health plans have been suggested to meet these costs. Do you favor in principle some form of national health insurance.

Yes	70.8
No	29.1

9. Do you think Presidential nominees should be selected in a National Primary—

Yes	78.3
No	21.6

10. Congress has interceded several times in recent years to prevent nationwide strikes in transportation systems. Would you favor legislation requiring binding arbitration when labor and management in that transportation system cannot reach an accord—

Yes	89.2
No	10.8

11. To combat inflation, would you favor—

A. Reduced Federal domestic spending—

Yes	58.6
No	41.4

B. Reduced military spending—

Yes	80.7
No	19.2

C. Wage, price, and profit controls—

Yes	76.6
No	23.4

D. Increased taxes—

Yes	8.2
No	91.8

12. Do you believe that each municipality across the country should designate some space in its land use policy for low income housing—

Yes	49.9
No	50.0

PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us in this body are familiar with the outstanding services rendered by our chambers of commerce.

The list of their contributions is most impressive. They serve as public information centers. They help to get roads paved, bridges built, and traffic lights installed. They help to create better housing and recreation and cultural facilities.

They handle consumer complaints and provide up-to-date information on legislation affecting their communities. The value of their community services cannot be overestimated.

But in order for the chambers to continue and expand their community services they must have sustained support from their communities, especially since they are largely supported by dues from their members.

And that is why I am particularly pleased to announce that the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce, in which I am privileged to hold membership, will be honored by the county during Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce Week which runs from October 25 to 31.

The citizens of Prince Georges County who already know of the chamber's accomplishments are pleased to have this opportunity to thank the chamber and demonstrate their appreciation.

And I am certain that those who are not now familiar with the Prince Georges Chamber will share our thanks when the chamber's contributions are fully publicized because the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce has served in the noblest traditions of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this point to insert into the RECORD a proclamation which I feel embodies the heart and spirit of the Prince Georges Chamber's good works and expresses the heartfelt appreciation of all the citizens of Prince Georges County:

A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, Prince Georges County is proud of the Prince George's Chamber of Commerce for its efforts in making our county a balanced community and a better place in which to live, work and play,

Whereas, the Prince Georges' Chamber of Commerce has protected and maintained the Free Enterprise System, encouraged private initiative and provided the organizational framework necessary to make the business community an effective partner in our civic, cultural, economic and educational activities,

Whereas, in order to inform our citizens as to what the chamber of commerce is and how it can benefit them, what the chamber is doing in the present, has done in the past, and hopes to accomplish in the future,

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that We, the Prince Georges' County Executive and County Council do hereby proclaim October 21–31, 1971, as Prince Georges' Chamber of Commerce Week, and call upon all citizens to recognize this special week and to join in its observance.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR., HONORED BY RUTGERS UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, PETER RODINO, was honored by the board of governors of Rutgers, the State university of New Jersey, for his outstanding service in the areas of civil rights and immigration and for his role in the establishment of Columbus Day as a national holiday. The citation presented to Congressman RODINO reads in part:

Resolved, that the Board of Governors of Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, commends its loyal son and alumnus for his outstanding vision and leadership on behalf of all the people of New Jersey and of the United States on the occasion of this first celebration of Columbus Day as a National Holiday.

During his long and enlightened service on the Judiciary Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality, PETER RODINO has earned a reputation for fairness and a commitment to justice. I am delighted to add my warm and personal congratulations to him and I commend to the attention of my colleagues his remarks on the occasion of the acceptance of the Rutgers' citation which follow:

REMARKS OF HON. PETER RODINO

On the eve of the first observance of Columbus Day as a national holiday, I am especially proud to be honored by a university and particularly by Rutgers University which has played so vital a role in the larger community.

The university has traditionally provided a forum for questioning and has been a vehicle of progress. While those of us who legislate may supply the tools for implementation of programs, often we depend upon the university community for the expression and discussion of ideas. Therefore, to talk of the problems of our time, to talk of the challenges of the 70's—of unemployment, prejudice, housing, drug addiction—is to repeat a litany with which you are all familiar. The array of statistics that show the magnitude and intractability of each and every one of these crises makes a grim picture indeed.

To conquer these injustices, to find solutions for these problems, will take nothing less than the tenacity and the indomitable will of the man whose birthdate we celebrate tomorrow. He fought tenaciously, suffered terribly because he wanted to find the truth and to make it triumph. Christopher Columbus achieved the impossible dream. His honor lies not only in the achievement of that onerous feat of discovery, but that he sought to distill the mixture of fact and legend of his time. Those who are unwilling to accept as inevitable the ills of our society—injustice, prejudice, hunger and poverty are present day disciples of this great visionary.

We most often remember Columbus as the father of immigration. And indeed, this contribution was incalculable. For through his voyage a pattern was established for a nation of many nationalities, traits and beliefs, Columbus was a prophecy of the America to come—of the immigrant who uprooted himself from his homeland in search of opportunity.

Those of us of Italian heritage rightly point with pride to his origins and achievements, while not forgetting that it was the hispanic contribution which supported his venture, the Portugese charts which guided his course, the British who colonized our shores and the Irish and Germans and Poles and Slavs and men from every part of the globe of every color and creed who inhabited them, improved them and who inspired their development. Common to each of these immigrants and to future generations of Americans were the hopes of opportunity, progress and justice.

Though dedicated to the ideals of equality and justice, we have fallen short of the goals we have established. At times our actions have failed to mirror our intentions. The legacy of this Nation—of Montesquieu and Locke and Jefferson—the foundations of sovereignty and democracy are our rich heritage. The ideas and ideals for the formulation of a social order predicated on just powers derived from the governed and dedicated to liberty and equality of all men were embodied in one of the great written documents in recorded history.

The late Justice Hugo Black termed our Constitution "the best hope for the achievement of freedom for men everywhere." This remarkable document and its framers provided future generations of Americans with

the vision and tools to grow, question, challenge and flourish.

This is a time in history of universal search for national as well as individual identities, or questioning, of seeking opportunities not unlike those sought by the immigrants, a time of rediscovery. It is time for the rediscovery of the world within ourselves, within our spirit, that is still the vastest and deepest world to be explored.

In the last two decades we have suffered the pains of maturation—I am hopeful and confident that the next two will produce an America which has a greater understanding and appreciation of her heritage. We can achieve these goals inspired by the example of Columbus—the man who roused the world, stirred it up and launched it toward a new destiny. It is appropriate that on the eve of Columbus Day, of honoring the great journeyman who personifies the spirit of discovery, who sought to distill the truth from myth, that we rededicate ourselves with that same Columbian spirit to a voyage of rediscovery toward peace, justice and brotherhood for all men.

MINORITY VIEWS ON HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to consider the largest higher education bill ever before the Congress. In the past few days we have received dozens of requests for information about each of the many titles and parts of the bill. I understand that many of our colleagues have had a very difficult time in acquiring copies of the committee report.

In order that Members and interested citizens might have available the views of minority members on the Education and Labor Committee, I am inserting into the RECORD those portions of the committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that every Member of the House take the time to become conversant with the major issues of H.R. 7248, as this bill will influence higher education in significant ways for a long time to come.

The material follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

This is one of the largest, most comprehensive bills to be reported to the House from the Education and Labor Committee in several years. It extends without change some existing programs. It significantly amends others. And it proposes several new Federal initiatives in all levels of education, including elementary and secondary. As such, it is doubtful that any single Member of the Congress could fully agree with—or fully disagree with—every feature of every title of the bill. We on the Minority are proud of the work of our Committee in many respects. We believe much in this bill will allow the Federal government to continue its history or positive leadership and support for quality postsecondary education.

But the bill has major weaknesses. Not just minor differences of judgment, but serious matters which relate to the fundamental question of national purpose and priorities. There are three issues in particular which we feel warrant the serious consideration of every Member—

(1) The full Committee proposal makes absolutely no progress towards achieving our long-standing goal of removing financial barriers to postsecondary education for all who qualify. By refusing to adopt amendments to the Education Opportunity Grant (EOG) program which would assure that students of the greatest need get assistance first, the Committee has left to the Members of the House the task of reaffirming an important national commitment.

(2) Without anything near adequate information and understanding of its implications, the Committee is proposing that we give out hundreds of millions of dollars to institutions for general operating funds—based mainly on the number of students enrolled. Such a law, if funded, would initiate a fundamental change in the relations between the Federal government and an institution of higher education. Before we take such a step, we believe much more adequate data must be gathered and analyzed. For now, therefore, we prefer a cost of education allowance instead of any per capita institutional aid formula. In addition, for those institutions which do indeed face a severe and immediate financial crisis, we strongly support the Committee provision for temporary relief grants to such institutions.

(3) The need for assistance in supporting new approaches to post-secondary education—as embodied in the proposed National Foundation for Higher Education—has been eloquently stated before our Committee, through professional journals, in the popular press, and at numerous educational meetings. Yet, our Committee regretfully voted this proposal down. The desperate need for innovation and reform remains.

EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

Since 1965, the Education Opportunity Grant program has assisted over 700,000 students in their pursuit of higher education. For many of those students, they would not have been able to attend without the aid. But many others who benefited from the aid did so at the expense of needier students who were not able—because of where they lived or where they wanted to attend college—to acquire grant assistance to pursue further education. This is due in large measure to the inequitable way in which the present program is designed and administered. This bill would extend for five years the same inequities—in fact, it could further detract from achieving equal access.

First, this program is dependent on an irrelevant and arbitrary state allotment formula. Under the present state formula, allotments to 31 states deviate more than 3% from the national mean. The Committee not only refused to improve this situation, but adopted a modification to the state allotment formula which would scatter the money for initial year awards even more! Based on the same appropriation, allotments for initial year awards to 38 states would vary more than 3% from the national average. We ask, in a program which is supposed to help needy students, why New York, Oregon, Wyoming and the District of Columbia should get less than 15% of their approved requests for EOG's (using this year's appropriation), while Arkansas, Hawaii, and South Carolina would get over 40% of their requests? There are inequities in any state allotment formula. Is it right that a student not get a grant in one state while a student from another state with even a higher income can receive a grant—just because of some arbitrary state formula? We believe that the EOG's should be available to the neediest students wherever they reside or attend college.

That is not the only inequity in the Committee proposal. Once the state allotment is made, uneven distribution of funds within the state could result because so much depends on the college's request to the Commissioner for funds. Those colleges which started with a large base of student aid programs and those with the most experience in this aspect of the "grantsmanship game" come out ahead. So a student becomes dependent on the success of his college in getting a sufficient share of the state allotment.

Still greater inequities could occur—and do occur under the present program—in how the college itself selects students for EOG's. It is entirely possible under this program for a given college to give some students grants; and others in the very same or worse financial situation no grants. It is possible to give smaller grants to the needier students. Or to use the grants to "bid" for certain types of students. This whole process requires that students must shop around at different colleges to see where they can get the best deal. It is no wonder that some bright, but poor, students never even try to further their education.

The proposed program perpetuates all of the above weaknesses found in the present EOG program. A recent survey conducted for the highly respected College Scholarship Service indicates that "institutional practices for awarding student financial aid generally do not favor the neediest students." Findings of the study indicate that:

Students from more affluent families generally attend higher cost institutions and, because measured need is based on these costs, they received as much aid as lower income students attending lower cost institutions.

High need was only weakly associated with increases in the grant share of the aid package and sometimes negatively correlated with the grant share.

In private institutions, the average effect of having need of $1,000 reduced the student's probability of admission by seven percent. (Costs of private institutions made the impact of this effect even greater.) In public institutions, the average effect of similar need reduced the probability of admission by 11% (adjusted to take into account the effects of admissions policies at public institutions for out-of-state students).

The students most likely to be excluded from higher education by inadequacies of aid are those with the greatest need.

Those who favor the Committee EOG proposal must be willing to put an unusual amount of faith in the financial aid officer at each participating institution. They will be the ones making the crucial decisions in how students get assisted under this program. We are aware of many highly professional aid officers. Several of them have testified before our Committee. But we must look at the national picture. A recent survey on financial aid officers found that:

a. There is an annual 28 percent turnover in the position of student financial aid administrator.

b. Twenty-nine percent of financial aid administrators are employed part time.

c. Thirty-seven percent of financial aid administrators are rated at a low level of professionalization. (Only 15 percent are rated at a high level.)

d. From 34 percent to 42 percent of those financial aid administrators responsible for aid policy are rated low in professionalization.

e. Student financial aid administrators have the lowest median salary of all college administrators.

Those findings refer to colleges and universities with some past experience in administering student aid programs. We are concerned what will happen when, as provided for in the bill, hundreds of proprietary schools begin to participate in such a loosely controlled program. Most of these institutions have no experience administering public student grant programs.

The Committee proposal follows present practice in requiring that each institution analyze a family's income and assets, number of children, number of children in college, unusual medical expenses, any business failures, etc. in determining the expected "family contribution". Most institutions now

use the services of the College Scholarship Service or American College Testing to do this analysis. But other colleges use different systems. So any hypothetical student could go to one institution and be told his expected contribution is $250. Another college might say $325 and another $400. Why should this be? It just adds to the confusion and trouble a student must go through to find the best deal. We believe a student's contribution should be analyzed, using every important ingredient that can equitably be considered. But we ask that a student's expected contribution be determined under the same system wherever he chooses to go.

Presidents Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon have all established equal opportunity as a national goal. We believe that the majority of Congress wishes to see that goal become reality. To do so requires that we make sure our EOG program adheres to the following basic principles:

(1) EOG's should be available to eligible students wherever they pursue further education.

(2) A student's financial resources should be evaluated alike by all institutions.

(3) Students with similar need should receive similar aid.

(4) Prospective students should be able to count on aid, according to their resources, as a help in planning for post-secondary education.

(5) Whatever Congress appropriates, those students who have the least in the way of financial resources should receive the grant aid first.

Not one of these principles is assured of being followed if the Congress accepts the EOG provision now in this bill. We must remember that for many this program does make the difference between going on to further education and not going on. Most middle- and upper-income families have various options as to financing a child's postsecondary training. The very needy student often has no option. He must look to this one EOG program.

We cannot believe that Congress, given the opportunity, would refuse to adopt an amended EOG program which will make sure that all of the principles outlined above are made into reality. We intend to give it that opportunity.

Our proposal would assure that Federal student aid under this one program would be directed first at those students who can make the least contribution to their further education. But middle-income students would benefit as well. The amount of each EOG would be $1400 minus expected family contribution, or one-half of the student's need—whichever amount is the lesser. This formula is similar to that in the Senate-passed bill, S. 659. It would have the effect of bringing each needy student to a point equal to that of the student who can contribute $1400.

The proposal has been developed after consultation with dozens of experts in the financial aid community. It would remove the inequities which will abound under the proposal in the Committee bill. It will allow the Congress to reaffirm the oft repeated promise that "no student should be barred, because of a lack of resources, from pursuing further education if he is qualified and motivated to do so."

INSTITUTIONAL AID

Never before has the Congress assumed the role of financing general operating costs of all public and private institutions of higher learning through a general institutional aid formula. We have provided funds with few strings attached to selected institutions on the basis of their making a contribution to national goals—e.g. aid to land-grant colleges, overhead on research contracts, assistance to developing institutions, institutional stipends to universities enrolling Federally-assisted graduate students. But this bill pushes the Federal government over a heretofore uncrossed policy threshold.

Federal dollars now constitute over 20% of the total budget of our higher education system. Most of these dollars flow to institutions through research contracts, student assistance programs, and categorical programs related to specific national objectives.

Before we move toward sharing with the states a responsibility for providing general operating funds to all institutions of higher education, we should at least have: (1) a full understanding of the consequences in relation to future state funding patterns; (2) an understanding of the effect of the formula on internal institutional practices; (3) some comprehension of how well colleges are using their present resources; and (4) a fair and sound formula directed, in part at least, to meeting the needs of those institutions and states which are making the greatest effort to meet their own financial obligations.

We do not know much at all about these issues. (For example, no one has yet been able to define the nature of "deficits" at public colleges.) But these issues can be understood and the bill provides in two separate sections, for thorough studies related to the financing of higher education, including recommendations on the most appropriate means for the Federal government to provide assistance. To get locked-in to a formula based on enrollment, before these studies are made, is a tragic mistake, certain to lead over the years to a waste or misdirection of Federal funds badly needed in other critical areas.

The argument for rushing through an institutional aid bill before we have good data and analysis is that "our institutions of higher learning are experiencing a financial crisis." Section 1201 of the bill reads "* * * an emergency condition has arisen which threatens * * *," and "It is therefore the purpose of this title to meet this critical need. * * *" Although there have been some very worthy studies made in the last year or so, the evidence does not indicate that all or even a majority of institutions are yet in serious trouble. Most institutions do not find, just as millions of families and businesses and public school systems, that they have all the resources they would like to have. That circumstance is not unique to higher education.

We think it is clear, however, that *some* institutions are in deep financial trouble. Many of them do deserve special consideration for Federal assistance. But their problems will not be solved by doling out money on an even-handed basis to all colleges. Their situation should be met through a program which can pinpoint real need and focus aid on that need. That is the reason we support Title XVIII of this bill—Temporary Relief for Institutions of Higher Education in Financial Distress. Under this program, the Congress can respond to legitimate cases of institutional need without scattering aid in such a way that no institution, with that aid alone, can recover from a serious financial condition.

Prior to full Committee action, the basic proposal now in the bill would have given to each and every accredited college $100 for each lower-division student, $150 for each upper-division student, and $200 for each graduate student. No study—or even a logical rationale—has been presented to the Committee which shows why these are the right figures or, indeed, the best possible approach. That formula still remains in the bill, except that two-thirds of the money would be distributed under this approach and one-third under a "cost of education" approach.

We believe *all* of the aid to be provided at this beginning time should be based on the cost of education principle. That approach supplements and complements the existing Federal priorities as reflected in student assistance programs. Since no student pays his full cost of education, the Federal government would assume a responsibility for following Federally-assisted students with cost of education grants. Our proposal would be to give each college a percentage of the total Federal aid received in a given year for the Education Opportunity Grant, College Work Study, and National Defense Student Loan programs, and a portion of the G.I. Bill benefits going to veterans who had not previously been enrolled in an institution of higher education.

What has been the position of the higher education community on this issue? Naturally many college presidents see greener pastures ahead if the Congress would lock itself in to per capita institutional grants. They know how difficult it would be to change the formula once it was funded—especially since the large public colleges would have the greatest stake in keeping the per capita approach. They understandably look with great anticipation on the prospect of Congress building another "impact aid" program, but this time for higher education.

The major higher education associations have endorsed the per capita formula. Although their continuing disagreements often filter through their public position, their leaders decided early in the game to reach a compromise on the points at issue and then present a united front to the Congress. The amazing fact is that no association has been able to present a sound, logical rationale for the per capita formula in the bill. Nor have they presented the Committee any intellectual analysis of the consequences for higher education of adopting this formula over some other.

But important and reasoned arguments have been presented from the higher education community against any sort of per capita formula. These voices argue that general aid may be a wolf in sheep's clothing, especially for private institutions which may become overly dependent on such aid only to discover that they must accept increasing Federal involvement in their internal affairs to keep receiving the aid.

Another weakness which may have pointed to is the lack of a strong requirement that state legislatures maintain their own effort on behalf of higher education. What we predict is that many legislatures will use this institutional aid bill as an excuse to cut back their own appropriations. If they do so on the hope that Congress will appropriate the full $950 million—the estimated first year cost of this title—the results could be disastrous. Many institutions could end up with *less* public money than they would have without this bill. The Committee proposal does require that each institution—public and private—expend an amount not less than its average expenditures over the previous two years in order to qualify for Federal institutional aid. One quickly realizes that this feature of the bill will harm those institutions which need it the most—the ones who do not have enough money to spend as much as they did in the past. So if an institution's enrollment goes down, or the stock market is having problems, or if the legislature cuts back for some reason, or whatever . . . that institution would not qualify for aid under this proposal. As one way out, many institutions might be tempted to increase tuitions in order to have the same amount in its budget as it had the past two years. Let us hope not.

Finally, any per capita approach puts our private colleges at a severe disadvantage. Although their combined total enrollment is increasing, the proportion of students attending private colleges is going down each year.

That means private colleges as a group get less and less of the pie each year. Since small colleges (most of them private) can not realize the same economies that can be

achieved at large institutions, the real impact of dollars tied to per capita formulas tends to be less at the small institution.

So we see many of these weaknesses as sound and persuasive reasons for keeping out of broad, per capita institutional grants at least until we have completed projected studies that will supply sufficient background data. We agree with many of the candid comments of Dr. Ralph Dungan, Chancellor of the New Jersey State Department of Higher Education, who testified before our subcommittee on behalf of the State Higher Education Executive Officers. Dr. Dungan, cautioning against jumping too quickly towards a formula grant program, said, "Unfortunately I myself believe that higher education as well as health care in this country is among the least best managed of our public enterprises. . ." Explaining that before we launch into any formula program we should understand the true nature of the financial problems of higher education, Dr. Dungan stated that he "would not like to see the Federal Government come in . . . with a massive injection and/or even a modest amount of money which freezes bad practices."

Dr. Alice Rivlin, Senior Fellow at Brookings Institution, also counseled the subcommittee against any kind of formula grant, saying we "should use more selective instruments better adapted to meeting [these] various kinds of crises." She, along with Frank Newman of Stanford University, recommended the cost of education approach as the best method presently known of getting additional unrestricted Federal aid to institutions who are assisting in meeting national priorities.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommended the cost of education allowance almost three years ago. It is a well-thoughtout, justifiable, and appropriate response to the emergency need to get more money to institutions.

That is our preference—cost of education grants. This ties the money to Federal priorities. It does not put private colleges at a disadvantage (since they get a larger dollar volume of Federal student aid money per student than do the public institutions). It does not lock the Congress in to a formula which will be most difficult to alter even if further studies show it to be inadequate or inequitable. We hope the Congress does not get the national government locked in to any per capita approach to institutional aid at this time.

INNOVATION AND REFORM IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

Some periods of history find people more receptive to innovation and change than others. And some segments of society are more prone to change at one point in time than another. We believe that now is the time to assist postsecondary education reevaluate its role, and adjust to the changing needs of society and its students, move toward new approaches to the teaching/learning process and generally pursue new courses of achieving excellence and efficiency.

More than two years ago the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education recommended the creation of a "National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education." President Nixon soon thereafter made a similar proposal to the Congress. Again last March the President recommended the creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education. Its shape and function were somewhat different than the first proposal. In the last couple of months, members on our Committee helped shape yet another proposal for a Foundation, changing many of the specifics in the Administration bill to conform with the several valuable suggestions made by the higher education community.

It is regrettable that some Members on the Committee did not fully understand the potential of this proposal. No one is suggesting that the Federal government now start dictating what changes should take place in our institutions of higher learning. On the contrary, what is being suggested is a Federal role in assisting colleges and universities to adapt themselves more closely to what they would like to become. That often takes "seed money" which is hard to weasel out of tight institutional budgets. The paradox is that if appropriate changes could take place, the institution might be better able to maintain a solid financial footing on its own.

What kinds of innovations and reform are we talking about? What areas of involvement would be appropriate for a Foundation? Much of the answer is found in a statement of endorsement from fifteen academic deans and other college administrators from around the country. They point to the following changes taking place in parts of higher education which could be coordinated and encouraged by a National Foundation:

The integration of undergraduate social concerns with the formal educational process

The widening of the age range of students

The modification of the traditional four-year undergraduate format

The introduction of various media and technical devices including computers as learning aids

Increased creative and independent work at the undergraduate level

New clienteles such as housewives, members of the labor force, and minority students

Goals of the undergraduate degree to be determined by experiences rather than an accumulation of a magic number of credit hours

Colleges to place more emphasis on teaching effectiveness and its evaluation

Greater fiscal responsibility and concern for both the cost and benefit aspects of the educational experience

More effective coalition of public and private master plans

Courses to demonstrate and instill a respect for the ethnic pluralism of our society

Consortia arrangements for both efficiency and quality considerations

The meeting of degree requirements outside of the traditional institutional setting.

Again, the need for such reforms in postsecondary education has been voiced over and over throughout the media. Reports such as that of the Newman Task Force on Higher Education, the excellent series of reports from the Carnegie Commission, The Assembly on University Goals and Governance—all of these and more have provided valuable roadmaps for needed change in higher education. As we increase the percentage of high school graduates who go on to college, the need for additional diversity in the opportunities they have becomes crucial. New types of institutions may be called for. Education outside of brick-and-mortar institutions should become a more viable option.

With this massive bill, within which we unfortunately included the continuation of some old programs which many feel have outlasted their usefulness, surely we should be able to include a Federal Mechanism for the support of innovation at the postsecondary level. We will make a big mistake if we pass this opportunity by.

SUMMARY

These then are the major issues. There are other provisions in the bill which we would like to see changed. But these seem to us to have the most profound consequences for the future of higher education. To sum up—

(1) We believe that as a matter of national conscience, Education Opportunity Grants should be available first to the neediest students. As it stands, the bill would result in a setback to all who believe in providing equal opportunity to pursue further education. We encourage other Members of the House to join us in supporting an amendment to reaffirm this important national commitment.

(2) We believe that further studies about the nature of higher education financing and implications of specific formulas are necessary before we can confidently adopt any per capita formula for general aid to all institutions of higher learning. Provisions for such studies are in the bill. Until then, we believe the sounder alternative is to provide cost of education allowances to institutions, based on the amount of student aid received from the Federal government. In addition, for institutions in severe financial distress, we support the bill's provision for temporary relief assistance grants.

(3) We believe the reported bill leaves a big gap in Federal higher education legislation by not providing for a mechanism to stimulate and encourage educational innovation and reform. We urge the creation of a National Foundation for Higher Education to fill this need.

ALBERT H. QUIE.
ALPHONZO BELL.
JOHN DELLENBACK.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.
EARL F. LANDGREBE.
ORVAL HANSEN.
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

I am in agreement with the Supplemental Views except for the endorsement of cost of education grants to institutions of higher learning. It is my belief that the role of the Federal government should be distinct from that of the State. Federal funds should go to institutions in support of specific and important national objectives—not simply because a college exists. While the cost of education approach has some tie to Federal objectives, e.g., assisting students which would otherwise find it difficult to pursue further education, these grants would be scattered among all but a small handful of institutions which have not chosen to participate in Federal student aid programs. The cost would be significant; the results minimal.

Why should the Federal government pour millions of dollars in general aid into state colleges and universities which the states refuse to adequately fund? If we want to assist private institutions, why should we distribute general aid in such a way that the difference between the costs of attending a private school and a public school continues to increase? Why is it not better policy to provide more student assistance, so that students would have a freer choice of where to attend and take additional money with them to pay their costs?

There are other questions which should be answered before we put such a high priority on institutional grants. Why should an institution which uses its facilities 50% of the time get the same Federal aid as one that uses theirs 80% of the time? Why is it important national policy to build a greater budget deficit in order to give general aid to schools with millions of dollars in endowment funds? And do we really know whether it is a good investment to put large amounts of general aid into those 600 colleges with fewer than 500 students?

The publicity on the plight of our colleges and universities has created somewhat of a bandwagon. But to give out aid indiscriminately to all colleges—a shotgun rather than a rifle approach—is a mistake. It is far wiser public policy to assist only those institutions which prove themselves to be in severe financial difficulty, and which can show promise of recovery if given temporary grant

assistance. I endorse the provision to do this, Title XVIII in the Committee bill, but must oppose any program which would distribute aid to all institutions unrelated to any specific national objectives.

JOHN N. ERLENBORN.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We strongly support the provision of Title X which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in employment in educational institutions. We, however, have a deep concern about the provisions of Title X affecting enrollment admissions policies, not because of a prohibition against discrimination on the basis of sex, but because of further Federal restrictions and control over institutions of higher education. We will recall the strong opposition of institutions of higher education when some in the Congress proposed punitive legislation which would have withheld funds from such institutions if they did not crack down adequately on rebellious students.

Through the years, institutions of higher education have been single-sex institutions, predominantly single-sex institutions and completely co-educational institutions. Of the latter, some put no restriction on the number of students of each sex and others attempted to reach the 50/50 level of entering students.

Our own feeling is the Federal Government should not reach into the heart of private institutions and remove a part of an institution's control over the makeup of its own campus. The change away from single-sex institutions is occurring and we don't believe that it needs a Federal "push."

Single-sex institutions of higher learning are rapidly decreasing in the United States. In the past decade, the number of single-sex institutions has dropped from 445 to 347, representing only about three percent of the total student enrollment in colleges today. At the same time, the number of co-educational colleges is increasing. During the last decade, co-educational institutions rose from $1,533 to 2,226. Single-sex institutions have a long history in education, and legitimate controversy continues between educators over the relative merits of single-sex versus co-educational institutions. With the conversion of many colleges to co-educational and the changes in social mores relating to the role of women and their enrollment in higher education, there exists a broad range of sex ratios on the various campuses across the Nation. One of the great strengths of the American higher education system is its tremendous diversity in the types of educational institutions and experiences. Students should be allowed to choose on the basis of personal preference, and colleges should have an absolute right to offer, the type of environment they desire in college, and whether there will be only one sex, predominantly one sex, or any other ratio. For the Federal Government to legislate away one of the most fundamental types of diversity, the ratio of sexes at any one institution, is to deny the individual student a full range of choice and to curtail the autonomy of private institutions.

Equality in education does not mean that all colleges must be equal, or that all students must go to the same school. Neither should it mean that individual colleges should be precluded from determining for themselves the makeup of their own student body. Recent court cases have indicated that denial of admission to a school on the basis of sex does not violate the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment as long as there is an opportunity available elsewhere within the system for an equal education. While there is some evidence of specific instances of discrimination in undergraduate admissions on the basis of sex, there is no showing that such discrimination is nationwide or of such scope that equal educational opportunities are not available elsewhere in higher education. In spite of all the allegations made, broad underground discrimination on the basis of sex has not been demonstrated or documented.

It is significant to note that while the percentage of high school graduates which are female has been *declining* since 1945, the percentage of first-time undergraduate admissions represented by females has been *increasing*. The following figures demonstrate this relationship: [1]

[In percent]

	Percentage of high school graduates (female)	First-time undergraduate female enrollment
1945	56.8	28.3
1970	50.5	44.7

Similarly, females have continued to represent a larger percentage of the total undergraduate enrollment, increasing from 31.7% in 1946 to 41.1% in 1970.

In our opinion, it is unreasonable to require colleges to change their admission policies in order to balance the ratio of sex in the student body. Such action would create a reverse quota, requiring a minimum number of students instead of a maximum. As long as admission policies are not discriminatory, a proper balance or mix between the sexes will occur naturally as a result of individual qualifications and the pattern of applications. It is inconsistent and unreasonable to insist on imposing *any* artificial ratio or quota on the basis of sex.

In order to protect institutions from application of minimum admission quotas based on sex, we believe the House should at least adopt language which had been adopted in the subcommittee which would not require colleges to alter their admission policies or recruitment of students in order to achieve a certain quota of students based on the division of sexes, nationally, in the state or in the community or region surrounding the college. That language reads:

"Nothing contained in this section shall be interpreted to require any educational institution to grant preferential or disparate treatment to the members of one sex on account of an imbalance which may exist with respect to the total number or percentage of persons of that sex participating in or receiving the benefits of any federally supported program or activity, in comparison with the total number or percentage of persons of that sex in any community, State, section, or other area: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not be construed to prevent the consideration in any hearing or proceeding under this title of statistical evidence tending to show that such an imbalance exists with respect to the participation in, or receipt of the benefits of, any such program or activity by the members of one sex."

This language is similar to Title VII, Section 703(j) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which does not require employers to grant preferential treatment to any minority group on account of an existing imbalance with respect to the number of minority group employees in comparison with the total number or percentage of such minority group persons in any community, state, section or any other area. In addition, this provision is similar to language in this bill added to Title IV, Section 403(b)(3) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, in regard to the preparation of teachers and other academic leaders from minority groups.

ALBERT H. QUIE.
JOHN M. ASHBROOK.
JOHN N. ERLENBORN.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.
EARL F. LANDGREBE.
ORVAL HANSEN.
EARL B. RUTH.
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.
VICTOR V. VEYSEY.

[1] SOURCE: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1971 edition, Tables 68 and 92.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

We are vitally concerned with the safety of young people who attend camps each year in this country, and have consistenly supported efforts to protect them. The question, therefore, is not whether to enact youth camp safety standards, but rather how to proceed in developing such standards in the most orderly, effective and meaningful manner.

We are unable to accept the Majority views whereby the Youth Camp Safety Act contained in Title XIX of this Act was adopted. In our opinion, the adopted version far exceeds any legislative action warranted by the limited evidence placed in the record during hearings, and is so sweeping in scope and replete with Federal powers as to endanger the continued existence of many youth camps. We are compelled to reject the shotgun approach of the Majority and advocate the promulgation of initial Federal standards to provide immediate protection to young campers along with a provision for developing vital statistics and evidence upon which more meaningful and responsive standards can be based.

We participated in the Select Subcommittee on Labor hearings last July on H.R. 1264, Mr. Daniels' Youth Camp Safety Bill, and fully looked forward to considering the bill in executive session of the Subcommittee and at mark-up. We object to the hasty action which has removed the youth camp safety bill from the Subcommittee without any markup or formal Subcommittee consideration at all, and added it, with substantial revision, as Title XIX of H.R. 7248.

The Youth Camp Safety Act (H.R. 1264) was extensively modified and presented to the full Committee as an additional title to H.R. 7248 because of the Senate action last August adopting a youth camp safety title in its Higher Education Bill, S. 659. With less than four hours of hearings over two days, and without any further Subcommittee consideration or action, the Youth Camp Safety Act was extensively rewritten to include stringent duties as well as penalties, fines and other extremely broad grants of enforcement power to the Federal Government, and persented to the full Committee for adoption. Members of the full Committee were not even aware of the provisions of the bill or the broad, far-reaching implications they will have.

We cannot accept the youth camp safety provisions adopted by the Committee in H.R. 7248, and feel compelled to support a more viable, realistic alternative. In our opinion, the approach represented in the version adopted by the Committee is a classic example of legislative overkill.

All of the witnesses testifying at the hearings concurred that statistics concerning illness, accidents and deaths at youth camps were sadly lacking. Absent the availability of these vital statistics, necessary for the basic understanding of the problem and to establish the actual need for legislation, broad, sweeping laws and regulations are unwarranted. While all the witnesses favored some initial action in the field of youth camp safety, they candidly expressed the need for compiling and developing supporting evidence and underlying statistics. Mr. Howard Pyle, President of the National Safety Council, while urging the Subcom-

mittee to develop strong Federal standards and enforcement, did indicate the need for proceeding in an orderly fashion in adopting such standards. He also clearly indicated the need for underlying statistics and stated the situation as follows:

"The injury/illness data pertaining to youth camps is, in our opinion, fragmentary, limited and entirely too inconclusive to support reliable, long-range accident prevention program planning

"For the sake of explicit emphasis, we offer these three observations:

"1. There is a woeful lack of sufficient reliable data on injuries or illness arising out of the operation of youth camps to know the true scope of the problem in its broadest terms or what the priorities should be in dealing with the problem as a whole or in its major parts;

"2. There is not enough known about the specific circumstances of youth camp injuries and illness to take all of the specific actions necessary to lead to a solution of the problem; and

"3. That until information is reasonably well established, the effectiveness of any broad-scale or long-range action will be, at best, somewhat uncertain."

Without the benefit of any supporting material or statistics, with no clear understanding of the scope of the problem or the areas requiring legislative action, the Committee version creates a Federal monster top-heavy with penalties and inspection requirements. Such a far-reaching approach is, quite frankly, like hunting for sparrows with a howitzer, and squarely plants the Federal Government in the youth camp police business with both feet.

In addition, there has been no indication of what the broad, extensive program contained in Title XIX would cost. At a time when Federal expenditures are being cut, it seems inappropriate to us to pass legislation creating unwarranted and far-reaching programs without the least consideration of cost or the possibility of obtaining adequate appropriations. Without full-funding, proper enforcement of the proposed program would be impossible.

Upon questioning at the Subcommittee hearings, the President of the National Safety Council stated that children are probably safer in properly-run camps than they are at home or in most neighborhood playgrounds. In light of this disclosure, one wonders where the logical extension of the proposed Youth Camp Safety Act will lead us. Will the Federal Government next reach into the homes of individual citizens with comperhensive safety regulations to protect children? We feel that the efforts of responsible government are best expended in other areas of more critical need.

We favor an approach which will provide for Federal youth camp safety standards with the continuing compilation and development of underlying statistics. This would allow initial protection to campers as well as the continuing opportunity to develop meaningful standards based on statistical evidence of need. Anything less than this falls short of responsible legislation.

MARVIN L. ESCH.
VICTOR V. VEYSEY.
JOHN N. ERLENBORN.
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.
EARL F. LANDGREBE.
EARL B. RUTH.
EDWIN B. FORSYTHE.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF REPRESENTATIVE VICTOR V. VEYSEY

I would like to emphasize the fundamental improvement this bill can make in the status of post secondary vocational education in America. There is nearly unanimous agreement that the traditional academic degree programs are not satisfactory answers to the needs of a great number of students. But years of exposure to the idea that college is the only respectable educational goa' convinces most students that they must pursue a degree program.

One provision of the Occupational Education Title of this Bill will require for the first time that States receiving vocational education assistance take active steps to see that vocational education opportunities are explained to students while they are in high school and even in elementary school.

Before a grant under this program can be made the State must provide an assurance that this strategy of early exposure to vocational education as an option is incorporated into the State's plan. I am pleased that the Committee accepted my amendment strengthening the assurances in this regard. I urge my colleagues in the full House to lend their support to the Committee's action.

VICTOR V. VEYSEY.

INTERESTING THINGS I FOUND IN THE MAIL TODAY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 14, and 15 there appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material on the now controversial nomination of Howard P. Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. I say controversial for it is my understanding that Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has indicated that he will vote against the confirmation of Mr. Mace, thus suggesting that all the facts at hand are not favorable to Mr. Mace. The mere fact that several individuals opposed Mr. Mace's confirmation before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee additionally indicates that his selection is not a unanimous choice.

Further evidence of the controversial nature of the nomination is provided in two items, one pro and one con, which I have received. The first is a copy of a letter to Chairman FULBRIGHT against the nomination by a former Foreign Service officer John Reed. Mr. Reed states:

This man is widely and infamously known throughout the Foreign Service as "The Executioner.

The second item is an endorsement of Mr. Mace in a document on State Department letterhead which purports to be a memo to Mr. William Macomber, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, from Mr. Martin Herz, Deputy Assistant Secretary in the Bureau of International Affairs.

Both items stress that Mr. Mace alone is not wholly responsible for all that transpired in the personnel office during his tenure. This was, of course, accentuated by Mr. John Hemenway in his testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee who still found justification, in his judgment, for opposing Mr. Mace.

The interoffice memo, if it is authentic, might well explain some of the mail members of the Foreign Relations Committee might possibly be receiving supporting the confirmation. The last paragraph of the memo discusses "letter-writing on behalf of Howard Mace by individual FSO's." This is a legitimate means of petitioning Congress with which there is no quarrel. However, the use of coercion or pressure upon State employees could well be the subject of review by the House Internal Security Committee under the provisions of a present Executive order on Government security.

I insert the two items mentioned above in the RECORD at this point:

CHEVY CHASE, MD.,
October 18, 1971.

Hon. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Presidential nomination of Howard P. Mace to be Ambassador to Sierra Leone is currently before your Committee.

This man is widely and infamously known throughout the Foreign Service as "The Executioner." He is being rewarded for having faithfully carried out within the Department of State a personnel policy of duplicity and cynical expediency almost without parallel in our era. Some of his actions already have been the subject of testimony before the Committee and in the press. To the best of my knowledge, none of these actions has been denied or refuted.

No one pretends that Mr. Mace is responsible for all personnel decisions or actions of the Department of State. But the top level of the Department wishes to reward him for his years of faithful service as the Department's hatchet man. Thus, if Howard Mace is approved, it will be a slap in the face of every Foreign Service officer aware of his record. We hear a lot these days about the calibre of Supreme Court nominations. Although they are not completely analagous to high level Foreign Service nominations, I believe the *principle* of nominating an unqualified person to the Supreme Court is the same as nominating a Mace to be an ambassador.

For the foregoing reasons, Senator, I respectfully urge you and the other Members of your Committee to reject Mr. Mace's nomination.

Sincerely,

JOHN REED, *exJ-FSO.*

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., October 6, 1971.

To: Mr. Macomber.
From: Martin Herz.
Subject: Mace Case and Career Principle.

I hope you didn't think that I spoke out of turn when at yesterday's staff meeting I pointed out that the Mace case involves an even more important principle than the fact that a career officer needs to be protected by his fellow-officers in the face of unfair accusations. My point is that the Mace case involves the question of accountability and of the relationship between career officers and the political leadership. Let me explain it better.

But before I explain, let me say that the following thoughts are my own and do not necessarily reflect AFSA's views although I am trying to get AFSA to go on record in support of them. In my opinon, the position AFSA takes on this question is of great importance for its future relationship with you and the men who come after you in your position.

As I see it, there is no essential difference between Mace working for M (or O) and other career officers who might be put in nomination and whose background is, say, in a geographic bureau whose activities have been controversial. Career officers give their best advice to their superiors, but in administering policies they are executants of the political leadership. The policies are made or approved by the principals on the seventh floor. At that point they cease to be policies of individual career officers.

In other words, if it is charged that our Vietnam policy is bad, it wasn't the policy elaborated by Phil Habib when he was working for Bill Bundy, but it was the policy of the Johnson Administration. If our Congo policy was no good, it wasn't the fault of Sheldon Vance (who was vigorously questioned by a House committee on his policy recommendations) but the responsibility of the Kennedy Administration.

This does not detract from the accountability of the man for his actions within the bureaucracy. If he gives bad advice to his superiors, if he bumbles or lacks courage or initiative, if he represents his country badly abroad, then he should not be promoted (or proposed for Presidential appointments). But the individual career officer does not make policy. It is the Administration that is responsible for the "system"—just as much as it is responsible for our foreign policies.

Applying the same thought to your own shop, if our personnel policies were sometimes arbitrary, if there are skeletons in the closet of the Personnel shop, then the fault does not lie with Mace but with the people who made or continued the policies. AFSA made only half the point when it said that it thought the Mace hearings should not be utilized to "personalize the Department of State's structural problems."

The other half of the point is that the Departmnt of State—i.e., you and your superiors in the Administration—is responsible for the structure. Admittedly you inherited a very imperfect system, and you certainly deserve credit for the efforts you have made to change it. But this does not alter the fact that when it comes to accountability, just as Secretary Rusk (and not Sheldon Vance) should take credit or blame for the Congo, just as the Johnson and Nixon Administrations (and not Phil Habib) should take credit or blame for Vietnam, so the present administration should step forward and say: We are responsible, we have the authority, Mace worked for us within the limits we set for him, it isn't admissible to hold him accountable for faults in the structure that were not in his authority to change.

You said the AFSA statement was weak. I think it was strong on the point that matters, when it said: "The inadequacy of an essentially paternalistic system has been aggravated by the manner in which it has been administered over by the years by a series of senior State Department officials. But the problem is fundamentally institutional . . . Senior personnel administrators have made decisions of great impact on the lives of individuals, decisions based too much on personal assessments and personal values in the absence of a clear, equitable procedure with due process established by law."

"We do believe in reasonable accountability within the bureaucracy," the statement ended, "and we believe that the administrative practices and principles of an individual officer are a proper consideration as one of his qualifications to be an Ambassador. But if we pretend that one man is somehow responsible for a system and for policies of long standing, he becomes the lightning rod, and we are distracted from the urgent need for reform through legislative and administrative action."

What they might have added is that if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee wants to talk with the people who are responsible for the practices that were being discussed, then the political leadership of the Department should step forward and declare themselves accountable for the system that is being attacked in the person of Howard Mace. In my own acquaintance, there is a widespread question why this has not been done. I might add one more thing:

Letter-writing on behalf of Howard Mace by individual FSO's is not the answer to this question. I have heard it said that this sort of activity is too easily recognized as not spontaneous. As a career officer, Howard Mace deserves the support of other career officers. But he deserves even more the overt support of his superiors. There has been a good deal of discussion of loyalty (up) of late. This is a question of loyalty (down). The two are inescapably intertwined.

DR. JAMES E. ALLEN, JR., CRUSADER AND EDUCATOR

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened on Monday to learn of the untimely death of Dr. James Edward Allen, Jr., and of his wife Florence. Dr. Allen was a distinguished educator, a forthright and candid public servant. He served in the New York State Education Department from 1947, first as executive assistant to the commissioner of education, then in 1955, at the age of 44, he became commissioner of education, and president of the University of the State of New York.

During his term as commissioner of education in New York Dr. Allen, a champion of civil rights, fought for desegregation in the schools and the use of busing to achieve racial balance. He considered the problem of segregated education, equalizing education and civil rights a very difficult problem and, as he said it is "one of the most important of this century that some way or other we find a way of eliminating the discrimination and practices that have come about as a result of some 300 years of discrimination in this country."

In 1968 he played a prominent role in settling the New York City's teachers' strike and was responsible for the decentralization of the schools in New York City. I believe it can be truthfully said that Dr. Allen made an enduring impact on New York State's tremendously intricate school system.

Some of Dr. Allen's thoughts on youth, on educating for the security of mind, on quality in education give us a keener insight into his dedication to the cause of youth and the importance of education—youth is leading the way—

Rather than our challenging youth, it is they who are challenging us and it is, I believe, a most heartening and hopeful situation when exhortation is more needed by age than by youth. In ways that are fundamental and serious, despite the more evident, highly regrettable, excesses of expression, it is the students, who, in their understanding, their attention and dedication, are leading the way. In their awareness of a responsibility to get on with the "unfinished business" of bettering mankind's lot, they are shaming the lethargy, the apathy, the blindness that has so tragically limited the efforts of my generation. They envision a world that can be better not just for a favored few by for the waiting many. They call for and deserve our support in such an endeavor.

On educating for security of mind—

I am convinced that we shall fail in our attempts to educate our young people of today and tomorrow for successfull living in the world which is theirs if we do not recognize the need of educating for security of mind.

The knowledge that one is able to earn an adequate living and to achieve a reasonable standard of material security is, of course, basic and essential to security of mind. However, security of mind demands that each individual be educated also for the broader task which is common to all—that of citizen and member of the brotherhood of man. This education which aims to develop security of mind must foster first of all a sense of individual worth and personal responsibility.

To be secure of mind, each individual must be educated to an acceptance of his responsibility to himself and to his fellow man. He must be educated to an understanding of the world in which he lives. He must be educated to the fullest possible development of his abilities and talents.

To provide a program which meets the needs of education for security of mind is the challenge of education in our time. It is obvious that we are facing a task of tremendous magnitude. In the world today, problems and difficulties have multiplied and broadened to create a situation which is making and will continue to make unprecedented demands on our educational system.

We must find ways of preparing young people to live in a world of increasing population which creates further problems of housing, transportation, and human relations. We must devise programs which satisfy the need for scientific and technological growth, and, at the same time, provide the additional understanding which will enable future citizens to be masters, not servants, of the developments they bring about. The urgency of the need for solutions of these problems is forcing education into an era of rapid expansion and change.

Present methods must be re-examined and re-evaluated in terms of their efficiency and in providing solutions for these new problems. When current practices and plans are judged to be inadequate, we must then be resourceful and creative in finding new ways. We will have to be willing to experiment, to discard some old theories and traditions, to change set patterns.

On quality in education—

When it comes to quality [in education] there can be no compromise, no half-way measures. A poor or mediocre school can be almost worse than no school. An improvement in the quality of the education provided in schools should be the reason underlying every decision made, every policy adopted, every person employed, every dollar spent.

Quality in education is a matter first and foremost of teachers and teaching. Children are educated not by courses or programs but by persons—by those who prepare the courses design the programs and do the teaching. The competence and character of those who teach profoundly influence the competence and character of those who learn.

Upon assuming his role as Assistant Secretary for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1969, Dr. Allen outlined his special dimension to responsibility for education, when he stated:

As I enter upon my duties as Assistant Secretary for Education and United States Commissioner of Education, it is my pleasure to address this brief message to the teachers, adminstrators, and trustees of our nation's schools and colleges.

The decade now coming to a close has been one of ferment, change, uncertainty, and unrest—a period of reappraisal and planning. The sixties have also been years of great challenge and high promise—a time of many advances at an ever-increasing tempo. Many forces that have long been building up are now coming into full play. Years of debate and analysis are beginning to pay off in a clearer understanding of our

shortcomings and a surer notion of what our goals must be.

All of us interested in education in America and all who benefit from it, which in our "one world" stage of history must include all of mankind, can do nothing but rejoice in the compelling determination to improve education.

But the very vigor of this determination and the very urgency of the needs which are today so widely felt add a special dimension to the responsibility resting on those who formulate and guide our educational policies and programs.

The strength of America's educational enterprise springs from a variety of sources, but certain principles deeply imbedded in our democratic beliefs and practices have been a main source of that strength and have influenced the character of our system, Foremost among these principles are:

The right of every individual to have an equal opportunity for an education suited to his needs and interests;

The concept of a common school, open to all, providing a firm foundation for a democratic society.

The exercise of citizen responsibility and participation in the determination of educational policies

The right of academic freedom, including freedom from partisan political control and the undue influence of special interests

The principle of separation and Church and State

The concept of a Federal-State local partnership, a balance that gives to each those responsibilities and functions to which it is best suited.

Our educational system must, of course, be responsive to the dynamic changes and the urgent needs of our age. But, if we are to achieve this responsiveness and at the same time keep education the force for uniting our pepole and for preserving our democratic ideals and freedoms, these principles must continue to prevail.

I do not mean to imply that our allegiance to these principles is weakening. On the contrary, many signs point to an increasing awareness of their value. But there is a danger that the urgency of the needs of the educational community and the growing impatience with delay in answering these needs could lead to sacrificing these principles in the name of expediency. I believe the eventual result of such actions would be a weakening rather than a strengthening of our schools and colleges, and the defeat of many of the goals we are seeking to promote.

All of us who work in education, who appreciate its contribution to our individual and national well-being and its importance in preparing us for world responsibility, will need to be mindful of these fundamental principles.

Our responsibility for education in these turbulent times has a special dimension. Difficult though it will be, we shall need to maintain a calm, judicial approach—to cultivate the objectivity necessary for the scrutiny and evaluation of proposed laws, policies, and plans in terms of the proved values of past experience, as well as the pressing demands of the present and the future.

Improve our educational programs and practices we must, and improve them we will, not only as a matter of national pride and progress, but as a necessity for the survival and advancement of civilization. Let us continue then the forward thrust of the past few years, but let us at the same time see to it that in our haste to move forward we do not weaken those principles which have been the foundation and the strength of America's educational system.

After a term of only 13 months Dr. Allen left his position with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and became a visiting lecturer at Princeton University, joining the faculty of the Woodrow Wilson School of International and Public Affairs where he served until his death.

GUN LAWS FAIL TO CUT CRIME

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the Sunday Times of London, England, published October 10, 1971, reporting that gun laws fail to cut crime in England.

That excellent article says that the sawn-off shotgun and the revolver are now commonplace in England and that the English gun laws are not working to prevent crime.

The article follows:.

[From the London (England) Sunday Times, Oct. 10, 1971]

GUN LAWS FAIL TO CUT CRIME

(By Denis Herbstein)

The sawnoff shotgun and the revolver are now a common place. Tighter regulations seem an answer. But unpublished Home Office figures show that the 1967 Criminal Justice Act, which for the first time provided for the control of shotguns, is making no noticeable difference to the use of these weapons in violent crimes. On the contrary, the use of shotguns has doubled in contrast to the use of firearms—revolvers, pistols and rifles—for which certificates have been required for over 30 years.

In each of the two years before the Act came into effect in January 1968, there were over 50 armed robberies with shotguns in England and Wales. In the two years after the figures jumped to 100. The comparable figures for firearms fluctuated between 340 in 1966 to 484 in 1969.

These figures indicate that registration of all types of firearms makes no real difference to the criminal, who never uses a legal weapon anyway. The Home Office's working party on firearm control under the Chief Inspector of Constabulary, John McKay, will wonder whether there is any point in recommending even tighter controls on firearms.

Chief Inspector Colin Greenwood of the West Yorkshire Constabulary, who has just spent six months at the Institute of Criminology at Cambridge researching the effect of firearm control, says: "There is no case on record of anyone applying for a firearm certificate to enable him to commit an armed robbery and there is not one shred of evidence to suggest that the absence of a certificate prevented a single criminal from carrying a gun."

The 600,000 British holders of shotgun certificates own some two million weapons between them. But there must be hundreds of thousands who have not bothered to register since 1968. There are almost 250,000 legal firearms, but again, Mr. Greenwood thinks "there are more illegal pistols than legal ones in Britain."

Any criminal worth his salt will know the man and the pub where you buy a gun. Harry Roberts, the Shepherd's Bush murderer, was found with a veritable arsenal of illegal weapons. Yet he had been prohibited for life from possessing firearms. War time souvenirs, especially German Lugers, help to keep the black market trade lively, despite the surrender of 186,000 weapons in amnesties since the war.

The dock areas of towns like Harwick and Dover are excellent places for buying guns smuggled in from abroad. In the case of shotguns they need not even be smuggled. The law says if you have lived in Great Britain for less than 30 days in the past year a shotgun certificate is not required. This accommodates itinerant grouse shooters from foreign parts who wish to use their own trusted weapons for a few days "sport." And the less reputable.

Applications for firearms certificates are carefully investigated by local police stations. Exact details of each weapon, where it is to be kept and used and whether the applicant suffers from a mental disorder are some of the questions. This year Bradborn police station has rejected five out of 14 applications. (The successful ones were all members of rifle clubs.) One of the five inherited a revolver, but he was only allowed a license to get rid of it to a gunsmith.

Now the police have to register shotguns too. Controls are much less stringent. An applicant merely has to satisfy conditions about his character and antecedents. No records of weapons is shown on the certificate nor is there any need to notify the police when it changes hands.

Criminologists, police and the gun trade agree that the controls have had little effect in cutting down crimes of violence. John Farr, MP for Harborough, complains that even where there is a conviction, the penalties are too small. Thus in the last three years, there have been 49 convictions for carrying a firearm with intent to commit an offence. The average sentence is 2 years 6 months, while the maximum is 10 years. "This pattern is repeated through all the firearm offences," Mr. Farr says. "When the police do manage to convict somebody, he gets off far too lightly. I will press for a minimum sentence."

VETERANS DAY, 1971

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1918, just 53 years ago, the guns of World War I were stilled, marking the signing of the armistice which concluded hostilities on the Western front. On the first anniversary in the following year, President Wilson urged Americans to observe the occasion "with solemn pride . . . and with gratitude for the victory." In 1926, the Congress directed the President to proclaim an annual observance, and in 1938 Armistice Day became a National holiday. In 1954, recognizing that Americans had been deeply involved in two major conflicts since 1918—the Second World War and the Korean war Congress officially changed the title of the legal holiday from Armistice Day to Veterans Day, honoring all veterans who have served in all the wars of our National history.

Veterans Day is a time for remembrance, gratitude, hope, and prayer. Veterans Day, 1971, finds our Nation involved in conflict in Southeast Asia, a conflict which continues to call upon our young men and women to serve their country in battle.

We are especially mindful of their sacrifices—particularly the great unfinished burden being sustained by those Ameri-

cans still held captive as prisoners of war-missing in action. Our heartfelt prayers must go out for these men that they might soon be safely delivered from the hands of a cruel enemy and that their families can soon share with them the joys of a cherished reunion.

With grateful thanks we think of our young fighting men and women today and of the millions before them who have defended the frontiers of American freedom. On nine occasions since the founding of our Nation, Americans have had to shoulder arms in wartime defense of their country. The freedom and liberty which are our heritage today have been preserved only through the sacrifices of our veterans.

We must always remember that nearly a million of these defenders never returned from battle. Millions of others returned to their homes forever maimed or handicapped as a result of their war service. For those fortunate enough to return unscathed, we need to remember the war-caused disruption of their lives, their willing gamble with the hazards of conflict and the enforced separation from their loved ones at home.

The passage of time must never be allowed to obscure or minimize this Nation's eternal debt of gratitude to all our veterans, for the United States exists today—free, proud, and unafraid—because of their sacrifices in time of national peril.

Indeed, the contribution of our veterans to the national welfare is far from limited to wartime. Evidence of their leadership in time of peace is all about us. Veterans today are contributing to a stronger and better America through their efforts in every trade, every profession, and every form of human endeavor.

Let Veterans Day be a time for visiting the graves of our heroic dead and expressing, in some measure, our heartfelt gratitude to those who fought in the forces of freedom. May it be a day on which we remember with pride their courage, devotion, and sacrifice. May it be a day on which we reassert our dedication to the principles which have guided our Nation and reaffirm our determination to continue the struggle for freedom and lasting peace here in America and throughout the world.

NATIONAL ANIMAL WELFARE AND CONTROL

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform members of National Animal Welfare and Control, a nonprofit institution which was created to act as a catalyst between government administrators and private organizations at the local levels in helping to solve the problems of the control and welfare of the Nation's animal populations, which are approaching crisis proportions. This organization may make lasting contributions in this complex field which touches nearly every American in one or more ways.

National Animal Welfare and Control, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Marie A. Moore of Middleburg, Va., internationally known thoroughbred horse and dog breeder and judge, will help to create, through proper organizing at the State and local levels, animal welfare and control standards and procedures which will emerge—through common practice—as State and national policy.

The millions of pets, farm and domestic animals and wildlife being encountered by humane organizations, county and city animal pounds and shelters, animal welfare groups and concerned citizens across the Nation is staggering in total.

Inadequate administration in this field is compounding the problem and increasing the burden of environmental ills.

Foremost is a lack of uniform standards and procedures in animal welfare and control in some 24 basic categories ranging from cruelty laws and seizure regulations to spaying and adoption programs, laboratory and research animals, license fees and impoundment fines, and the local zoo.

And even a minimum of public eduaction by his local government fails to communicate properly to the American pet owner. This also must change.

A basic belief of this organization, as described to me, is that the control and welfare of these animals, including animal shelter management, long a problem to county and city officials, is an operation which should now be turned over to responsible and dedicated private organizations in their own communities.

To these ends National Animal Welfare and Control is committed. Through its dedicated and distinguished membership under the capable leadership and direction of Mr. Walker P. Buel, president, its program will help to establish on a national basis, animal welfare and control standards and procedures which will include the areas of:

Cruelty laws, spaying and neutering, research and laboratories, impoundment, fines, license fees, adoption procedures, care and training.

Wildlife, signs and speed limits, rabies and public health, shelter and control, seizure laws, farm and pet animals, pet shops.

Rodeos and circuses, Easter animals, zoos, leash and restraining laws, kennels and catteries, stables, quarantines, public education, and interstate shipment.

The conduct of animal welfare and control has created a national problem springing from the local level and is a growing concern in operations, budget and community service to local officials. The old dog pound and dogcatcher can no longer keep up. Local government is faced with a situation it has not, cannot, and seems to prefer not to meet.

This nationwide crisis will be met by the action program of National Animal Welfare and Control. It will relieve county and local executives of their increasing burden by providing superior service at less cost, operating through accredited professional and dedicated private personnel in cooperation with existing local humane organizations, and through public information programs aimed at solutions.

National Animal Welfare and Control's program is for all communities, their leaders and their animals populations in this decade of growth. This organization will provide animal welfare and control services for communities, for local governments, for the animals, for their owners, for their children, for their children's animals, and for all Americans.

It is indeed my pleasure, therefore, to bring to the House this brief notification of National Animal Welfare and Control and its major aims, aspirations, and activities.

OLD PRO LAIRD IS RIGHT MAN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it is often said, and I think with justification, that the toughest job in the country, next to the Presidency itself, is that of the Secretary of Defense. Certainly that has been the case in recent years as we have witnessed and listened to an unending stream of criticism and abuse heaped upon the entire Military Establishment and especially its leading officials.

There are few men today possessing the ability and the qualities of leadership demanded by the position of Secretary of Defense and thus I was pleased and proud to join in commending the President for his wise decision in naming our good friend and former colleague, Mel Laird, to fill this Cabinet post when the Nixon administration assumed office.

Those of us here in the House who know Mel and have had the pleasure of working closely with him felt confident that he had all the tools required to lead the Defense Establishment through a most difficult period.

An article appearing in today's issue of the Chicago Tribune written by Mr. Nick Thimmesch hits the nail right on the head in evaluating the stewardship of Secretary Laird and actually the headline of the article says it all when it asserts, "Old Pro Laird Is Right Man."

I commend Secretary Laird for an absolutely brilliant performance under the most trying and difficult circumstances. We have always expected excellence from him and he always come through.

I include the article from the Tribune in the RECORD at this point:

OLD PRO LAIRD IS RIGHT MAN

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—This is exactly the right moment in Amercian life for a skillful politician to be running the Pentagon, and that's what Melvin Laird, the old pro, is doing.

This is a time when our military must be reduced yet not made feeble, must keep respect in the face of popular disfavor and maintain proper strength around the world when the Nixon Doctrine calls for nations to fend for themselves.

It is time for a secretary of defense to be

cagey yet credible, restrained, but sometimes an arm twister, and buddy-buddy with generals, admirals, senators and congressmen. Laird uses all these tools and, lo, the Pentagon runs better, force reductions are made and all manner of castor oil is swallowed.

VIET IS BIG QUESTION

Laird now prepares for his upcoming trip to Viet Nam with Adm. Thomas Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a trip which presages President Nixon's Nov. 15 announcement on troop withdrawals. The big question is how many men will be left in Viet Nam next year, and tho the diviners proclaim the number is 50,000, Laird begs off.

"I discourage all speculation," he said in his office last week. "Since taking this job I have crusaded against forecasts and projections. That's what got the last administration in trouble. The President makes the announcements, and what he's said we'll do, we've done. We've kept our credibility.

"Vietnamization will succeed. When we were criticized on Laos last spring, I said wait and see what the results are six months or a year from now. The results are good. Casualties are way down and withdrawal is right on schedule.

"Critics claim the best way out is negotiation. Negotiation is the fastest way out of any problem, from labor contracts to wars. But the last administration couldn't succeed with negotiations in Paris, and that's why I say we can't have a one-track approach.

"We've got a lot going in negotiations—SALT talks, the European security conference, Moscow talks. We're going to be negotiating with the Soviets on levels of military assistance. Hanoi couldn't find long without Soviet and Chinese arms, equipment and fuel. There is an absolute relationship between the level of supply by the Soviets and the Chinese to North Viet Nam and the level of fighting. Hanoi must feel hemmed in now that the President is going to visit Peking and Moscow. The Soviet level of assistance to Hanoi is less now than in 1968.

"Even with all this, I won't project. We can't count on the effects. The war in Southeast Asia has gone on for 30 years, and won't be over in 18 months, even with our withdrawal."

Laird increasingly finds himself talking reduction and needs for new strength at the same time. Under his stewardship, military forces were cut by a million, there are 300,000 fewer civilian employes, and contracts involving 2 million workers have been canceled.

Yet the administration's 1972 budget, a request for $77.9 billion, is up $1.5 billion from 1971. It would take a summit conference of certified public accountants to sift out the arguments between congressional critics and the Pentagon over figures.

It appears, however, that while the cost of the Vietnamese war is sharply reduced, inflation and a $2.5 billion servicemen's pay raise keep the budget relatively high. Laird argues that the $77.9 billion gets only what $50.8 billion would buy in 1964, that its 32.1 per cent slice of the total federal budget is the lowest since 1950, that retirement programs, cost of terminating or stretching out procurement contracts are expensive items.

While the Soviets and the United States spend about the same on defense, 51 per cent of our spending is on people compared with the Soviet's 30 per cent. The Soviets put their money into new weapons.

Laird shuttles back and forth between Pentagon and Capitol Hill, keeping doves and hawks in line. "The intellectuals must know now that we're disengaging and also negotiating with our adversaries," he says. "This department is the department of peace. Some of our critics, those who thought 10 years ago that we could have a limited war in Viet Nam and settle it fast, suffer a guilt complex.

FIGURES INDICATE OPPOSITE

"They cry about everything and now claim we have made it a huge air war. The figures show different. This September we flew only one-fifth of the tactical air sorties we flew in Southeast Asia in 1968, and only one-third of the number for 1970."

Laird loves to sit for hours with the Pentagon's brass and congressional figures as well, puffing cigars, sipping tea and listening to them expound on what should be done and why. He can show good humor, a sharp needle, considerable common sense in working problems out. Laird can justifiably boast, as he does sometimes, that "morale is good here now, much better than when I came. No department in Washington has a better understanding of what's going on and what the realities are than defense.

"I say that without reflecting on Bob McNamara (former defense secretary). He's been terrific in helping me. I couldn't have asked for better cooperation. And to his great credit, you don't find him out sniping at the military like a lot of other people these days."

PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an editorial from the October 23, 1971, issue of America magazine, the National Catholic Weekly.

America magazine, which has been called the most influential Catholic periodical in the English speaking world, states its opposition to the prayer amendment on which the House of Representatives will vote on Monday, November 8.

The editorial in America, which is edited by the Jesuits of the United States, opposes the amendment to the Bill of Rights because there can really be no such thing as a nondenominational prayer.

The full text of this perceptive editorial follows:

PRAYER AMENDMENT: MISCONCEIVED MOVE

Sometime before it adjourns, the House of Representatives is expected to vote on proposing a "prayer amendment" to the Constitution. The bill proposing the amendment had been locked up in the House Judiciary Committee, but a discharge petition was successful last month in forcing it out on the House floor. As a result, the House will consider the measure without having had the benefit of the kind of hearings that usually precede House debate on a constitutional amendment. For this the liberals on the House Judiciary Committee have only themselves to thank. If they had not blocked full and open discussion of the amendment under the usual procedures, they would not now be faced with the prospect of House adoption of an ill-written, mischievous and misconceived proposal.

The text of the proposed amendment reads as follows: "Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds to participate in non-denominational prayer." To be adopted as part of our Constitution, the amendment needs a two-thirds vote in both the House and Senate and ratification by three-fourths of the states.

The amendment looks innocuous but it is not. The word "nondenominational" is a serious flaw, certain to provoke extensive litigation and to involve the Supreme Court in theological disputes far beyond its competence and patience. Moreover, the implication from the amendment is that "denominational" prayers in public buildings are forbidden. This is not the law today, and never has been. The Supreme Court's decisions banning official sponsorship of prayer in public schools do not forbid the renting of public buildings (including public schools) for religious services, the employment of chaplains by Congress and the state legislatures, or the celebration of Mass in the White House. Even the Supreme Court itself begins each public session with an invocation of God's help. Whether the prayer is "denominational" or not depends entirely upon your theological point of view.

Secondly, the proposed amendment does not include the important word "voluntarily" between "to participate" and "in prayer." Although this might seem like a quibble, since the proposal speaks of the "right" of persons to pray in public buildings, the word "voluntarily" should not have been omitted. It cannot be emphasized too much that the government must remain neutral in religious matters, and the right not to participate is just as important as the right to join one's heart and voice to the prayer being offered.

The most serious defect, however, of the proposed amendment is that it is sheer tokenism in an extremely important area. If passed, the amendment will be thought to have altered our Constitution with respect to religion in the public schools. The amendment, however, will do no such thing. It does not touch the question of government sponsorship of prayer, especially in the public schools during regular school hours. The amendment simply asserts what very few would deny, that there is no constitutional interdict on truly "private" prayer in public buildings.

Reconciling the right of all parents and students with respect to religion in the public schools is a serious, difficult problem. It should not be trifled with by passage of the "prayer amendment."

HARRY HOMEWOOD COMMENTS ON THE SOVIET UNION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have long maintained a special interest in developments in Eastern Europe. Therefore, it was with special interest that I noted an article by Harry Homewood in the October 10 edition of the Suburbanite Economist which, I believe, is a most accurate and penetrating analysis of the situation the Soviet Union faces in maintaining control over its Eastern European satellite governments.

The article follows:

HARRY HOMEWOOD COMMENTS

The visit of the Soviet Union's Leonid I. Brezhnev to Yugoslavia has been reason for a considerable amount of optimism on the part of some diplomatic observers in Europe. Brezhnev is the leader of the Communist party in Russia. He said, in Belgrade, that Yugoslavia had the right to "live its own life" under the banner of communism and he publicly renounced the "Brezhnev Doc-

trine," that of moving tanks and troops into a satellite nation to bring it back under Moscow's discipline.

Brezhnev went so far as to say, publicly, that there was no such thing as the "Brezhnev Doctrine," as if Russian tanks had never gone crashing into Czechoslovakia three years ago.

Brezhnev's statements make nice listening but it is doubtful there is any truth in them. The Soviet Union is apparently trying to put a new face on its role in Eastern Europe, using whatever cosmetic arts it can. But none of this changes the basic problems faced by the Soviet Union or the likelihood that if Russia is pushed too hard by one of its satellites that the Russians will not respond in the classic Soviet style, with a bootheel in the face.

The basic problem the Soviet Union faces in Eastern Europe is not hard to define. The Soviet Union's political and military role in that area is threatened by intellectual, social and economic forces that do not yield to the sort of controls that are effective within the Soviet Union itself.

Russia is thus faced with a serious problem: It can crush those forces with military power, as it did in Czechoslovakia, or it can try to roll with the punch as it did in the Polish slovakia, or it can try to roll with the punch as it did in the Polish food riots of last Christmas. Of the two choices, Russia feels safer and more comfortable with military power.

But neither method worked well in Czechoslovakia or in Poland. The economic and social problems of both nations are unsolved. Czechoslovakia is now a sullen nation resisting Soviet rule in hundreds of small but effective ways. Poland is suffering from economic ills that it cannot solve and Russia can ill afford to alleviate or end.

The cosmetics Brezhnev is trying to apply with so much effort to the frowning face of the Soviet Union are, without doubt, thought to be essential. But they are cosmetics only and less than skin deep.

Eastern Europe is entering into a new world and a new diplomatic area where change is the hallmark. It is a world where Western Europe is moving toward unity, where Japan is rising to take its place as one of the major world powers, where Red China is moving into the world community.

It is a world where there is the promise of prosperity and Eastern Europe desperately wants a part of that prosperity and the freedom it can bring. The challenge this presents to the leadership of the Soviet Union is more likely to reinforce the basic Soviet Communist instinct to exert more, rather than less repression over its satellite nations—all cosmetic applications to the contrary.

POSITIVE ACTION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, contrary to adverse propaganda, the American Medical Association has supported much progressive legislation in the field of medicine.

I submit for the perusal of the Members a list of a few of the many things the American Medical Association has supported:

POSITIVE ACTION

Some people interested in the health care problems of the nation have for many years made the American Medical Association a convenient whipping boy for everything that's wrong with health care in America.

The AMA, say these critics, is a reactionary organization, interested only in protecting the incomes of its members, not in improving health care.

Such statements are without foundation, and would appear to be based on either prejudice or a lack of information. Actually, the AMA is in the process of compiling an exceptional record of recognition of health care problems and action to solve them. Here are some examples:

The AMA has supported—in and out of Congress—increased federal appropriations for medical schools and medical students.

The AMA has taken the lead in encouraging experimentation to restructure medical education to produce more physicians faster.

The AMA has encouraged the increasing use of physician's assistants and other allied health personnel, including expanded roles for nurses in patient care.

The AMA has taken the lead in sponsoring seminars, training, and experiments in the use of computers by physicians.

The AMA has sponsored meetings on such diverse topics as air pollution, occupational health, medical ethics, and health care costs.

The AMA has sponsored a national health insurance program — Medicredit — which would provide government-paid health insurance for some 25 million Americans in the lowest economic category, and tax incentives for others to provide their own coverage.

The AMA has sponsored peer review organization legislation which requires a state medical society and subordinate societies to establish peer review and utilization review mechanisms.

The AMA's Education and Research Foundation has underwritten nearly 40,000 loans to medical students. These loans total more than $42 million.

The AMA's Volunteer Physicians for Vietnam program has provided more than 750 MDs to care for the civilian population of South Vietnam.

The AMA has supported a broad range of current federal programs, including Regional Medical Programs, comprehensive health planning, allied health professions training, Hill-Burton, anti-pollution measures, family planning, migrant workers' health program, assistance to schools of public health, and aid for medical libraries.

The AMA has agreed to publish pamphlets about oral contraceptives for physicians to give their patients.

The AMA has sponsored many programs to provide leadership and examples for state and county medical societies in the field of health care for the poor. Among them are proposed co-sponsorship of an inner-city neighborhood health center, donation of two mobile health care units to a Chicago ghetto area, financing of health care projects by the Student AMA, encouragement of innovation and experimentation in health care delivery in areas of need, and support of multi-year appropriations for neighborhood health centers in order to permit better planning and staffing.

This, of course, is not a complete list. Nor is presented in an effort to show that AMA's record in the past has been error-free. But it does show that despite the assertions of some of medicine's critics, the AMA is seriously and totally involved in responsive, responsible efforts to improve the health care received by the American public.

REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM IN COMMUNIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with the House Committee on Internal Security's investigation into subversion of our Armed Forces I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point part two of Dr. Robert E. Beerstecher's masterly thesis, "Revolutionary Antimilitarism in Communist Theory and Practice."

This portion of the study deals with the Communists' use of antimilitary techniques such as fraternization, propaganda, agitation, and the strike against the German forces toward the end of World War I and the Allied forces in 1918 and 1919. It also points out the prominent place given antimilitary work in the Communist program for world domination as put forth at the First Cominterm Congress in 1919.

Particular attention should be drawn to the detailed treatment given the mutiny of the French Black Sea Fleet in 1919. An interesting sidelight to this mutiny, not mentioned in the study, is that Ho Chin Minh, who was serving as a mess orderly on one of the ships, was tried and given a short sentence for his participation in this mutiny.

Part two of Dr. Beerstecher's study follows:

REVOLUTIONARY ANTIMILITARISM IN COMMUNIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

(By Robert E. Beerstecher, Ph.D.)

I. PEACE, INTERVENTION AND CIVIL WAR

For Lenin, as it had been for Marx, doctrine was always a guide to action. In September, 1914, he wrote in his theses on war of the necessity for conducting revolutionary propaganda "in all armies . . . in all language."[1] Throughout the war, however, bolshevisk experience with revolutionary antimilitarism was limited to disintegration work carried out in the traditional languages spoken in the Russian army. Not until 1917 did it begin to assume the international flavor which Lenin ascribed to it in his now famous theses.

In May, 1917, *Pravda*, the official organ of the bolshevik party, published the draft of a manifesto addressed to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries. The manifesto, which had been published in Russian, German and other languages for distribution at the front, recommended that revolutionary Soviets of workers and soldiers be formed in the warring countries to undertake a struggle to end the war. "Brother soldiers," it stated, "let us do everything in our power in order to hasten this and to achieve this aim. Let us not fear to make sacrifices——sacrifices on behalf of the workers' revolution will be not so hard to bear as sacrifices made in the war."[2]

When the manifesto came to Lenin's attention, he recommended that an appeal to the soldiers to fraternize also be published in all languages. Lenin wrote:

"We have information that fraternization is going on at the front, although still in a more or less haphazard form. What frater-

Footnotes at end of article.

nization lacks is a conscious political idea. The soldiers have come to feel instinctively that action must come from below; the class instinct of people in a revolutionary mood has suggested to them that this is the only true path, but this is not enough for revolution. We wish to give a clear-cut political answer. In order to end the war, the power must pass into the hands of the revolutionary class."[3]

Lenin believed that fraternization was indispensible. "It is absolutely necessary in all countries at war," he said, "to encourage all attempts at fraternization between the soldiers of both warring groups."[4]

Lenin's view was shared by Stalin. Mass fraternisation, Stalin held, was only a spontaneous manifestation of the desire for peace. "Nevertheless," he stated, "if carried out deliberately and in organized fashion, fraternization may become a mighty instrument of the working class for revolutionizing the situation in the warring countries."[5]

On October 17, 1917, the central organ of the Petrograd Soviet, *Rabochy i Soldat* (*The Worker and Soldier*), recommended the use of mass propaganda against the German troops:

The German Kaiser, covered with the blood of millions of dear people, wants to push his army against Petrograd. Let us call to the German workmen, soldiers, and peasants, who want peace no less than we do, to stand up against this damned war! This can be done only by a revolutionary government which would really speak for the workmen, soldiers, and peasants of Germany, and appeal over the heads of the diplomats directly to the German troops—fill the German trenches with proclamations in the German language . . . Our airmen would spread these proclamations all over Germany.[6]

Revolutionary antimilitarist propaganda and agitation against the troops of the Central Powers thereafter became the primary bolshevik weapon on the eastern front.

One of the first acts of the Lenin government after the bolshevik seizure of power in November, 1917, was the establishment of a special organization within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to monitor antimilitarist propaganda. The new organization was the "Bureau of the Press" which was headed by Karl Radek under the supervision of People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, Leon Trotsky Within Radek's bureau, the responsibility for foreign language propaganda was assigned to the Department of International Propaganda. This department was directed by an American, Boris Reinstein. Reinstein supervised the efforts of various foreign language committees and sections which translated into German and the other languages of the Central Powers the revolutionary propaganda which flowed from the bolshevik fountain of wisdom at No. 6 Dvortsovyn Ploshod, Petrograd.

The central theme in the hundreds of pamphlets and leaflets which flooded the troops of the Central Powers before the final conclusion of the Treaty of Brest-Litovak was the necessity for peace. On December 5, 1917, Lenin and Trotsky issued a proclamation to the German troops which stated that the immediate conclusion of peace was the foremost duty of the new government:

"We charge you soldiers to stand by us in the fight for peace and socialism, for socialism alone can give to the proletarist a lasting peace. . . . Brothers, if you support us, the cause of freedom is assured success. . . . Our soldiers have laid down their arms. It is now for you to follow this standard of peace.[7]

Bolshevik propaganda also called on the German troops to desert. In addition to an assurance that they would have nothing to fear from their Russian hosts, German soldiers were promised free land if they came over voluntarily.[8] On other occasions, they were promised the free land of a Russian grave if they didn't. For the bolsheviks, there could be no middle ground.

Another fundamental propaganda theme used by the bolsheviks was that right was on the side of the Russians, and that against force, right would eventually prevail. One example of the practical application of this theme was found in a leaflet left behind by the Twelfth Russian Army when it evacuated Riga in the face of advancing German forces:

"German soldiers! The Russian soldiers of the Twelfth Army call your attention to the fact that you are carrying on a war for autocracy against revolution, freedom, and justice! The victory of Wilhelm will be death to democracy and freedom. We withdrew from Riga, but we know that the forces of the Revolution will ultimately prove themselves more powerful than the force of cannons. We know that in the long run your conscience will overcome everything and that the German soldiers, with the Russian Revolutionary Army, will march to the victory of freedom. You are at present stronger than we are, but yours is only the victory of brute force. *The moral force is on our side.*"[9]

While armistice negotiations with the Central Powers were being carried on by the Soviets at Brest-Litovsk, the Department of International Propaganda was busily engaged in preparing for publication of a daily German newspaper. This paper was slated to be the first of a series of foreign language propaganda journals printed by the bolsheviks in their attempt to light the fire of revolution within the German and Austro-Hungarian troops. It was called *Die Fackel* (*The Torch*), and began making its appearance among the troops on the eastern front on December 8, 1917. The importance of mass propaganda in bolshevik antimilitarist doctrine is illustrated by the fact that *Die Fackel* was published for free distribution in an edition of half a million copies per day.[10]

Each edition of *Die Fackel* was sent by special trains from Petrograd to the major cities of Byelorussia where the central army committee divided the papers into smaller bundles for delivery by special trucks to various towns up and down the front.[11] A special courier system was established to make regular distribution from the towns to the front line trenches, the point of initial contact and distribution with the German soldiers on the opposite side of the lines. During the day, overt attempts to pass small bundles of *Die Fackel* to the German troops through the official fraternization point were invariably unsuccessful, resulting in their confiscation by the German officers. Such attempts were mere subterfuge, however, to cover the mass distribution work which occurred each night under the cover of darkness. Packages of *Die Fackel* and other propaganda material in pamphlet or leaflet form were left or buried in prearranged spots to be picked up by the German soldiers. Bolshevik agitators held secret meetings in the rear of the German lines at which *Die Fackel* and other revolutionary literature was handed directly to the soldiers. Whether because of its popular appeal, or the perennial shortage of printed matter so familiar to service life, bolshevik propaganda was eagerly sought after by the German soldiers.[12]

Die Fackel combined late news coverage with propaganda calculated to arouse the revolutionary spirit of its readers. To broaden its appeal, its name was changed after the first few editions to the somewhat less inflammatory title, *Der Voelkerfriede* (*The People's Peace*).[13] The Department of International Propaganda also printed daily newspapers in Hungarian, Rumanian and Croation for free distribution among the troops of the Central Powers. Each of these papers came from the presses in editions of several hundred thousand copies.[14]

The increasing flow of bolshevik propaganda among the German troops brought a protest from the Central Powers in December, 1917, that the terms of the armistice had been violated. From the soviets came a public apology and the assurance that propaganda activities would cease, but secret orders went out to redouble the effort.[15]

The Department of International Propaganda was later abolished. In its place appeared the Bureau of Foreign Political Literature. Commissar of the new bureau was another American revolutionary, Albert Rhys Williams. Although most of the work of the Bureau of Foreign Political Literature was directed against the Central Powers, plans were prepared for the printing of a weekly magazine in French, English and Italian. These plans were never realized. However, Williams, with the assistance of John Reed, one of the founding fathers of American communism whose body has been enshrined within the walls of the Kremlin in Moscow, published a four page, weekly illustrated newspaper, *Die Russische Revolution in Bildern* (*The Russian Revolution in Pictures*). This illustrated paper was designed to appeal to the more simple, less-educated German soldier. Each issue reproduced twelve to fifteen photographs illustrating recent revolutionary events. Under each illustration was printed in German a simple propaganda message. For example, a photograph showing the removal of the Imperial eagle from the roof of one of the Romanov palaces bore the explanatory caption:

"On the roof of a palace, a workingman is tearing down the hateful emblem of autocracy. At the foot of the building the crowd is burning the eagles. The soldier is explaining to the crowd that the overthrow of autocracy is only the first step in the march of social revolution. It is easy to overthrow autocracy. Autocracy rests on nothing but the blind obedience of soldiers. The Russian soldiers merely opened their eyes, and autocracy disappeared."[16]

Another photograph, showing a group of Russian soldiers inside a spacious palace ballroom, carried the caption:

"Socialists have often said, "Those who build the palaces should live in them!" Here in Russia for the first time you can see workmen-soldiers, whose sweat and labor built the palace, whose blood was shed defending it, enjoying a palace as their home."[17]

The caption for a picture of the former German Embassy in Petrograd drew attention to the soviet flag which flew above it:

"See the great banner. It is the word of a famous German. Was it Bismark? Was it Hindenberg? No, it is the call of immortal Karl Marx to the international brotherhood: "Proletariat of all lands, unite!" This is not only a pretty decoration of the German Embassy. In all seriousness the Russian workmen, soldiers and peasants have raised this banner, to you German people they hurl back the same words that your Karl Marx gave the whole world seventy years ago. At last a real proletarian republic has been founded. But this republic cannot be secure until the workers of all lands conquer the power of government."[18]

Special representatives of the Bureau of Foreign Political Literature, later known as the Bureau of International Revolutionary Propaganda, were stationed at prisoner reception centers along the eastern front to question German deserters for the purpose of determining how effective bolshevik propaganda had been and what subjects most interested the soldiers.[19] But bolshevik antimilitarist work was not limited to propaganda activities among the troops in the field. Recognizing that the day was fast approaching when German war prisoners would be exchanged or repatriated, the Bureau of War Prisoners of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs initiated a special agitation program in the prisoner-of-war camps throughout Russia.

Footnotes at end of article.

Bolshevik agitators who spoke German, Hungarian, Rumanian, Polish, Yiddish, Croatian, Bulgarian and other languages, were especially recruited into an organization which visited the prisoner-of-war camps to encourage the prisoners to form socialist organizations. Special propaganda newspapers, financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, were published for the prisoners in their own languages by their countrymen, planting the revolutionary seed which communist movements in Germany and eastern Europe harvested in later years.[20] Selected German prisoners-of-war were also brought to Petrograd for training as professional agitators and propagandists for eventual assignment in Germany.[21]

Initially, bolshevik revolutionary antimilitarist work against the troops of the Central Powers was carried on principally from within Russia. On December 23, 1917, however, Lenin, as chairman of the Council of People's Commissars, placed two million rubles at the disposal of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to carry out the struggle against war and imperialism on an international scale.[22] The sum which Lenin allotted would not have gone very far at their existing exchange rates, but it does serve to indicate the direction of soviet interest at the end of 1917.

Bolshevik propaganda aimed at disintegration of morale in the front lines; it also hit at the home front too. In proclamations to the German prolatariat, Lenin and Trotsky called upon the workers to join with the soldiers and emulate the Russian proletariat in raising the standard of revolution. Similar appeals were made by wireless. In a message dated February 15, 1918, the sailors of the German Baltic Fleet were asked:

"Do you hear our voice, and do you hear the cries and groans of our brothers, the soldiers who are drowning in their own blood, and the sailors who are meeting their death day by day in the misty sea and the cold depths of the seas and oceans? Do you hear the heart breaking lamentations and the despairing sobs of mothers, brothers and children throughout Europe which is drenched in blood? Do you not see the approaching shadow of the black spector of famine and his bony hand? If you hear and see all this, why do you keep silent? Give answer to our cry and to the appeals of your brothers. Follow the example of the Russian people. . . . Rise up like a hurricane, tear off the fetters of bondage, overthrow the thrones of tyrants, and free yourselves from the god you have created with your own hands—capitalism. . . . Therefore raise boldly the standard of revolt. Leave the sepulcher of the trenches; make an end of the despots.[23]"

While the bolsheviks had used wireless as a means of linking their widely scattered forces, it was not until after the establishment of Radek's "Bureau of the Press" in November, 1917, that an organized program for utilizing this media for mass propaganda dissemination was put into operation. From an occasional message directed to the German soldiers and sailors the wireless campaign grew in proportions until the airwaves were saturated with propaganda appeals and proclamations. Experience with this early tactical application of wireless permitted the bolsheviks to evolve specialized news reporting techniques which mixed fact with the fiction of propaganda. These techniques later proved even more effective against the Allied Powers during their occupation of Russia than they had against the Central Powers. Thus, the wireless key came to be ranked with the printing press as an indispensible tool of bolshevik agitation.

The bolshevik propaganda campaign against the troops of the Central Powers lasted about four months, with major emphasis occurring during the months of December, 1917 and January, 1918. Thereafter, it tended to taper off, coming to almost a complete halt as the result of German pressure by March, 1918, when the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was finally accepted.

How effective was the bolshevik propaganda? Maxim Litvinoff claimed in a speech while the campaign was still going on in January, 1918, that it was more effective than military victories because it "provoked" a strong peace movement in Germany and Austria.[24] Undoubtedly, it played a significant role in the subsequent military collapse of Germany. Some German troops withdrawn from the eastern front for duty on the western front in 1918 refused to fight, while others were rendered ineffective because of the dissension created by the agitators in their midst.[25] From the standpoint of the soviets, the campaign was a success. Although antimilitarist propaganda had been used neither for long nor on a wide scale, its extreme effectiveness had been proven. Revolutionary antimilitarism was thus assured a permanent place in the tactical arsenal of modern communist.

Allied intervention and the Civil War

Revolutionary antimilitarism was destined to play an important role in the civil war which followed the boleshevik seizure of power in November, 1917. Conclusion of a separate peace with the Central Powers at Brest-Litovsk permitted the soviets to withdraw from the war and devote their full attention and military resources to the consolidation of power within Russia. The unlateral action by Lenin's government resulted in a fundamental change in Russia's relationship with the Allied Powers. One consequence was the Allies' decision to intervene in Russia in 1918.

The details of the Allied intervention in Russia have been recorded by many historians. It is not the intent to retell them here, except as they relate to the development of the communist doctrine of revolutionary anti-militarism. According to soviet interpretation of history, the military intervention by the Allies was a failure. Numerous factors—political, social, economic and military—are recognized as having contributed to the Allied "defeat," but the communists reserve final credit for the disintegration campaign carried out by the bolsheviks against the combined forces of intervention and counter-revolution as the primary factor in forcing the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Russia and securing ultimate victory against the White Russians in the civil war: "If the fate of intervention had been dependent on the mathematical and technical relationship of strength, the Allies would have won, without the shadow of a doubt." [26]

Bolshevik antimilitarist activities against the Allied forces were carried out on three main fronts: in northern Russia, in the Far East, and in the Ukraine and Crimea. In their disintegration work against the White Russian counter-revolutionary forces, the front was virtually everywhere. All antimilitarist work was carried out through local bolshevik military organizations, supported and directed from Moscow which had replaced Petrograd as the seat of government. Even in those areas where bolshevik units were cut off by White Russian forces, regular contact through wireless and courier was maintained with Moscow.

In April, 1918, less than a month after Lenin signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, a small detachment of British marines landed at Murmansk. With this landing began the Allied intervention in northern Russia, the primary objectives of which were pinning down of German forces on the eastern front and stopping of further troop withdrawals for duty on the western front, prevention of the German army then operating in Finland from capturing the northern ports and using them as operational submarine bases against the Allies, safeguarding of the large stores of military supplies and equipment in the dock areas of Murmansk and Archangel, and preventing their use by rebellious prisoners-of-war in opening a new eastern front.

Intervention in the Far East

Even as the first elements of the Allied expeditionary force were landing at Murmansk, an episode was unfolding several thousand miles away which was to lead to Allied intervention in the Far East. The collapse of order which followed the bolshevik revolution had focused Japanese attention on the rich Russian maritime area. In Japanese military circles, serious consideration was given to the possibility of extending the Japanese empire into eastern Siberia. To probe Russian strength, a small Japanese force was landed on the Russian mainland on April 5, 1918. This act was immediately protested by the soviets who were otherwise powerless to do anything about it.

Japan's precipitous action was a matter of grave concern to the United States. Although American policy was against intervening in the Far East, Japanese insistence on pursuing such a course forced the issue. In July, 1918, the Supreme Allied War Council voted to undertake a joint intervention in Siberia using Japanese, American, British, French, Chinese and Italian forces.[27] The official reason given for ordering the joint intervention was the necessity to protect the so-called Czechoslovak Legion. The Legion consisted of some 70,000 men who, having been taken prisoner on the eastern front, were formed into a fighting organization in Russia under Allied control. After the signature of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the bolsheviks refused to permit the Czechoslovak Legion to fight against the Central Powers from Russian soil. Lenin, however, agreed to permit the orderly withdrawal of the Legion through Siberia to Vladivostok, so that it might be transported by sea to Europe for use by the Allies on the western front.

Allied landings at Vladivostok began early in August, 1918, with Japanese forces far outnumbering all the other Allied forces combined. Only token numbers of British, French, Italian and Chinese troops took part in the Allied intervention of the Far East. These forces received little attention from the bolsheviks who concentrated their antimilitarist activities against the Japanese and American troops. Within hours after the initial Allied landing, all frontal resistance ceased; the bolsheviks lacked both men and equipment which effective opposition to the Allied troops would have necessitated. Guerrilla warfare and military disintegration work became the bolshevik order of the day.

Vladivostok, Khabarovsk and Blagoveshchensk were the major centers of bolshevik antimilitarist activity. Most of the bolshevik work was carried on illegally in the rear of the intervention forces. Even before bolshevik organizations were successful in making contact with revolutionary elements in the Allied intervention forces and with the party nuclei in the armies of Admiral Kolchak, propaganda and agitation had begun on a large scale.[28] Clandestine printing centers were established which provided an almost unending river of pamphlets, leaflets and manifestos for circulation among the Allied troops. The bolsheviks organization at Blagoveshchensk set up its printing press in a dugout trench outside of town on the open *taiga* from where it printed a special antimilitary newspaper, the *Red Call*, together with other revolutionary propaganda and literature.[29]

The local bolshevik organizations in Siberia and the Far East were well equipped to carry on agitation and propaganda inside the Kolchak armies, for no language problems were involved, and they were completely conversant with the life and routine of the Russian soldiers. They were, however, ill prepared to meet the linquistic challenge which carrying out antimilitarist activities among

Footnotes at end of article.

the Japanese and English speaking soldiers created. But this problem did not prove to be insurmountable. The bolsheviks quickly formed local foreign sections staffed with party members having knowledge of either English or Japanese. Some assistance was furnished by Moscow, both in the form of pre-printed propaganda items and specially trained language personnel. Of the language experts furnished by Moscow, the most notorious was Koshi Simbo. Simbo was a native Japanese who produced some of the most effective propaganda disseminated to the Japanese troops. His career included training as a Japanese aviator, service in the French air force, internment by the Germans, escape to Russia, and service in the Red Army. Simbo's propaganda bore a stamp of authenticity which made it readily acceptable to many of his countrymen, for he spoke from first hand knowledge of the problems of the Japanese laborer, soldier and peasant. After the local foreign sections were consolidated into the foreign department of the Maritime Regional Committee of the Bolshevik Party, Simbo directed all Japanese and French language propaganda activities in eastern Siberia.[30]

By the end of 1918, the local bolshevik organizations in the Far East were reporting the establishment of contact with revolutionary elements inside the Japanese army. Agitation against the Japanese expeditionary force began in earnest. Leaflets and pamphlets published in Japanese began making their appearance in the barracks and messhalls; formerly they had been left along the streets or in the village taverns where the soldiers gathered for off-duty recreation. Bolshevik ideas penetrated into the Japanese forces and had considerable influence among the troops, so the communists claimed.[31]

Bolshevik activities in northern Russia

In the months which followed the first troop debarkation at Murmansk, the original force of 150 British marines in northern Russia grew into an international army of more than two divisions, a polyglot mixture of British, French and American units. By the end of the summer of 1918, Allied forces were scattered from Murmansk as far east as Archangel, the formal occupation of which began during the first week of August, 1918.

The collapse of the Central Powers in November, 1918, marked an end of fighting in Europe. For the men of the Allied expeditionary force in northern Russia, the news of the Armistice raised the hope of an early return home. Unlike the White Russian forces who were dedicated to the continued prosecution of the civil war, the British, French and American troops had little understanding and less sympathy for the political considerations which underlay the internal struggle still being pursued throughout Russia. The signing of the Armistice coincided with the beginning of the Arctic winter. When no plans were announced for the withdrawal of the Allied troops from northern Russia, a strong feeling of apprehension began to envelop the officers and men alike. Isolation, loneliness, inactivity and cold adversely affected over-all troop morale and lowered resistance to the disruptive influence of bolshevik propaganda.

Prior to the Armistice, only isolated contacts had been made between the bolsheviks and the Allies. Some propaganda leaflets calculated to win Allied sympathy for their cause had been produced by the bolsheviks, but their main effort was concentrated against the disintegration of the White Russian military forces of the provisional government of the northern region. However, the Armistice wrought a basic change in bolshevik strategy. The bolsheviks opened a mass propaganda campaign aimed at neutralizing Allied support to the provisional government. The bolsheviks also agitated for the early withdrawal of Allied troops from the northern region. After considerable uncertainty had manifested itself among their troops, the Allied representatives asked their governments when the forces might expect to be withdrawn. DeWitt Clinton Poole, the American charge d' affaires, cabled Washington about the serious situation which had developed among the American troops in northern Russia. In commenting on the situation, Poole pointed out that both officers and man had inquired why military operations were being carried out against the bolsheviks. Poole requested an early and authoritative statement of motives inasmuch as official reasons given for the presence of military forces no longer appeared valid, he said. His request went unanswered.[32] The situation became even more acute as the winter wore on and as armed clashes between the Allied forces and the bolsheviks became more frequent.

Hundreds of pamphlets, leaflets, manifestos, proclamations, appeals, announcements, circulars and posters printed in English, French and Russian were scattered for the soldiers to find. Much of the bolshevik propaganda was scattered in the frozen trenches and in the villages along the Dvina front.[33] The bolsheviks even brought it into Archangel, for there was no continuous line of defense between the bolshevik areas which would have prevented their passage. Although organized police patrols roamed the streets of Archangels at night, distributers of bolshevik propaganda were never apprehended. Nevertheless, every morning found mail boxes stuffed with trusts and pamphlets and walls pasted with posters which called to the Allied forces in their native languages to stop the war and go home.

Bolshevik propaganda was always issued in the name of either Lenin, Trotsky or the Foreign Minister, Grigori Chicherin. Well written, the pamphlets and leaflets carried indications of having been printed in Moscow.[34] The soviets also printed an English language newspaper in Moscow for distribution among the Allied troops in northern Russia. This was *The Call*, the editorials of which appealed to passion and prejudice, as illustrated by the following extract:

"You soldiers are fighting on the side of the employers against us, the working people of Russia. All this talk about intervention to "save" Russia amounts to this, that the capitalists of your countries are trying to take back from us what we won from their fellow capitalists in Russia. Can't you realize that this is the same war that you have been carrying on in England and America against the master class?

You hold the rifles, you work the guns to shoot us with. . . . You are kidding yourself that you are fighting for your country. The capitalist class places arms in your hands. Let the workers cease using these weapons against each other, and turn them on their masters. The capitalists themselves have given you the means to overthrow them, if you had but the sense and the courage to use them. There is only one thing you can do: Arrest your officers. Send a committee of your common soldiers to meet with your own workingman, and find out for yourselves what we stand for.

Kill your officers, then shoulder your rifles and come over to our lines which are your own." [35]

Over and over again the bolsheviks repeated these and similar themes in their propaganda. The influence of the foreign "experts" attached to Radek's Bureau of International Revolutionary Propaganda is apparent in much of the agitational material circulated among the Allied forces in northern Russia. The following paragraph is from the bolshevik pamphlets, *Say! What are You?* This pamphlet was alleged to have been published by "English speaking communists in Russia" for distribution among the Allied troops in the north:

"Say! American and British soldiers, what are you? . . . What are you waiting for? Do you think some deliverer from on high will come to your relief? If so, you wait in vain. 'Those who would be free, themselves must strike the blow.'

"But we ask you a much more serious question. Are you going to act as the gunmen, the hired bullies for international capitalist in the criminal task of crushing the attempt of your own class to free itself? The capitalist class of the Allied countries see quite clearly that the tide of revolution threatens to overwhelm them, too. They are straining every nerve to stem it, and they use you for the task. They feed you with lies to poison your minds against your fellow workers so that you will be the more willing to drown the workers revolution in a sea of blood.

"You have started on this criminal job already. What do you think you are doing here in Russia? In spite of all the lies you have been told, you are being used for the purpose of crushing the Russian Revolution, and restoring the land to the landlords and the factories and mines to the capitalists. Your capitalists know that if they can crush the Russian Revolution they will take the heart out of the revolutionary movements in other countries. Just think, you, who consider yourselves the citizens of "free" countries, have come to put us back into wage slavery. . . .

"You have arms. You know how to use them. Will you like slaves to use them in defense of your master, or will you use them to help your class be free?" [36]

Fraternization also played a role in the bolshevik antimilitarist campaign. Whenever Allied or White Russian military personnel fell into bolshevik hands, they were assigned to special propaganda camps where their captors indoctrinated them with revolution ideology. After a brief period during which they were accorded good treatment, they were usually permitted to return to their own ranks to tell of bolshevik hospitality.[37] This technique later proved to be extremely effective in the Ukraine, but there is little evidence of its success in northern Russia.[38]

Marked similarities have been noted between the propaganda themes used against the English and American forces in northern Russia and those which appeared in the propaganda appeals circulated among the Allied troops in the Far East or printed in the communist press of the Allied countries. To muster world opinion and support against the intervention in Russia, the Lenin government set in motion an international propaganda and agitation campaign centered around the slogan "Hands off Russia." In the United States, soviet sympathizers, socialists and communist adherents demanded the immediate withdrawal of American soldiers and sailors from "the sovereign territories of the Russian republic." [39] Bolshevik propaganda circulated abroad attempted to educate the public as to the purpose and principles of the soviet form of government, the philosophy of internationalism, and the justification and necessity for class struggle; but greater emphasis was placed on swaying emotions than on persuasion.[40] Typcial of the heart-rending propaganda which began to make its appearance in the communist press in the United States is the following letter from the "Workingmen's Red Cross, Central Committee, Labor Unions, Vladivostok, Siberia," dated three days after Christmas, 1918:

"After the forceful invasion and overthrow of the Soviet Government by the Allies and under the false pretenses of the Czecho-Slovaks and the Russian capitalists in the city of Vladivostok and all over Siberia, began a terrible oppression of the Russian working class. Thousands upon thousands of working

Footnotes at end of article.

people, peasants and also the student class were shot. In one of the cities, named Khabarovak, having a population of about seventy thousand people, twelve hundred people were shot and slain by the Japanese and Tartars. . . . Thousands were killed in the city of Kraanoyarok with the help of the White Guard of Russians and also with the help of Italian regiments. English regiments have also participated in the massacring and suppressing tens of thousands of revolting peasants.

"Every day new cemeteries have sprung up, thousands of other comrades were thrown into jail and at present are rotting there without any charge against them. Their wives and children are suffering from hunger and cold because they have no means of assistance, except from the workingmen's organizations, which are in existence illegally. However, the need is great and the Russian organizations can be of little assistance with their meager means. . . .

"In this needy hour, when a part of the Russian workingmen and peasants are strangled between the armies of the international capitalists, while the other part on the other side of the Ural is bleeding to death in the uneven struggle with the enemies on all sides, in this hour we are turning to you with the following demands:

"Protest against the organized killing of your brothers.

"Demand the withdrawal of American troops from Russia.

"Answer the call of tens of thousands of imprisoned, and still the cries of orphan children and families with brotherly help." [41]

Intervention in the Ukraine

The Armistice of November, 1918, promised to have far reaching consequences for the bolsheviks. Under its terms, the German occupation troops in the Ukraine were to be withdrawn. Thus the stage was set for the expansion of bolshevik control into the occupied areas. The German withdrawal saw the renewal by the bolsheviks of the armed struggle which had begun in November, 1917, with the Ukrainians' declaration of their right of self-determination.[42] Bolshevik military operations against the Ukrainian People's Republic had been suspended in March, 1918, when, at German insistence, the bolsheviks reluctantly agreed in the Treaty of Brest-Litovak to conclude an immediate peace with it and to evacuate the Red Army from Ukrainian territory. The bolsheviks agreed to stop all agitation and propaganda in the Ukraine, but this provision of the treaty was never honored. With chameleonic ease, the bolshevik organization had again assumed the illegal character that it had perfected under Kerensky and resumed its illegal underground work. The price paid by the Ukrainians for their temporary victory over the bolsheviks was German occupation.

In their frantic search for allies in November, 1917, the Ukrainians had approached both the British and the French. During the negotiations which followed, an Anglo-French convention was drawn up in December, 1917, which delineated certain "spheres of action" for France and England in southern Russia. The French sphere included Bessarabia, the Ukraine and the Crimen; the British sphere, Transcaucasia. For France and England, the convention meant the possibility of continuing the war against the Central Powers on the eastern front in spite of the threatened bolshevik withdrawal from the war; for the Ukrainians, it was a promise of military assistance in maintaining their independence against Lenin's government. Events moved rapidly inside Russia, and before final negotiations had been completed, the Ukrainian People's Republic concluded a separate peace with the Central Powers. The German occupation of the Ukraine which followed Brest-Litovak made implementation of the Anglo-French convention temporarily impossible. On November 17, 1918, in accordance with the terms of the Armistices, British forces moved into Baku as the initial step in replacing the Ottoman troops which were being withdrawn from Transcaucasia to Turkey.[43] One month later, on December 18, 1918, French troops landed at the Black Sea port of Odesan to speed the withdrawal of the German occupational forces from the Ukraine. Thus began the ill-fated Allied intervention in southern Russia.

From the first, British forces in Transcaucasia encountered little overt resistance, notwithstanding the violent internal upheaval which was taking place all around them between the Georgians, Armenians and the Azerbaijanians who, in addition to fighting among themselves to maintain their national independence, were also fighting against both the bolsheviks and the Volunteer Army of General Denikin, the leader of the White Russian movement in southern Russia. Active organization of partisan resistance movements against the Volunteer Army and the spreading of anti-Denikin propaganda saturated bolshevik resources, leaving them only a limited capability locally to agitate against the British troops. Bolshevik propaganda circulated among the English soldiers emphasized four fundamental themes: that they had been brought to Russia to overthrow the workers and restore capitalism, tsarism and landlordism; that instead of allaying anarchy, they were creating it; that they were being used as the tools of reaction; and that instead of bringing order, they were commencing a new war.[44] Bolshevik appeals to the British troops to revolt against their officers and desert to the side of the workers and peasants fell on unresponsive ears and had little dissalutary effect on troop morale. British resistance to bolshevik penetration in Transcaucasia stood in sharp contrast to that of the French in the Black Sea area, where the bolsheviks inspired disintegration of the French military and naval forces.

Intervention required a fundamental reorientation of bolshevik activities in the Ukraine. Previously, their primary objectives had been to win the majority of the population to the cause of the soviets and to defeat the Ukrainian and White Russian counter-revolutionary forces. The presence of Allied forces in the Ukraine interjected a new dimension, for the bolsheviks recognized that it could be absolutely indispensable to their cause if the French troops could be won to the side of the revolution. Or, if this goal should prove unobtainable, at least to neutralize them, for the French army possessed the military strength to curb partisan uprisings and put down the general armed insurrection being prepared by the bolsheviks in the White Russian controlled areas which lay in the path of the advancing Red Army.[45]

To carry out disintegration on a wide scale would have been impossible without the type of illegal underground organization already developed by the bolsheviks in the Ukraine and Crimea. Word of the impending Allied intervention preceded the first landings at Odessa by several days, during which time the bolsheviks organized a special foreign section. This advanced preparation made it possible for them to print and distribute in Odessa within two hours of the first landings a propaganda leaflet calling upon the French servicemen to maintain close solidarity with the proletarian revolution by fraternizing with the Russian workers. This leaflet was the opening shot in the bolshevik battle for the minds of *poiln* and *marin* alike.

The *cafard* was a common complaint in the French Army of the Orient even before the first French soldier stepped ashore at Odessa. Morale had been at its lowest ebb in the autumn of 1918. Hope for early demobilization raised by the Armistice had quickly faded with the news that instead of being sent home they were being sent to Russia for occupation duty. Substandard living conditions, i.e., poor food, inadequate housing, insufficient clothing for the severe winter climate, absence of recreational facilities, and lack of contact with home, further weakened an already emotionally unstable force. Even without the penetrating bolshevik propaganda barrage which the bolsheviks unleashed against them, the will to fight of the French military forces in the Ukraine and Crimea would not have lasted through the winter.

French policy governing intervention in southern Russia lacked a clear definition of objective. An extremely confused political situation existed among the various Ukrainian and White Russian national groups which competed among themselves for French support further complicated the situation. The French soldiers who landed at Odessa on December 18, 1918, found themselves allied with the Volunteer Army of General Denikin against the Ukrainian nationalists who were forced to retreat from Odessa under fire. In the days that followed, the French forces moved northward out of the port area and had their initial contacts under fire with the Red Army. For the French occupation forces, the war had started again; but neither the officers nor common soldiers were able to fully comprehend what they were supposed to be fighting for. Little was generally known or understood of the ideological differences which existed between the Ukrainians, the White Russians and the bolsheviks. To the average French soldier, they were all Russians, unaccountably fighting one another in a battle royal in which *Pierre Peilu* was caught in the middle. Even the anti-bolshevik propaganda circulated by Denikin's forces accusing the bolsheviks of criminal acts was convincing only until the question was raised as to whether it was "a crime to defend the poor against the rich, the laborers against the capitalists, the peasants against the large landlords." [46] Resistance melted further when bolshevik agitators asked the French servicemen whether their own ancestors had been criminals for making the French Revolution.[47]

Two or three times a week, a special newspaper printed in French called *Le Communiste* (*The Communist*) was published by the clandestine bolshevik press at Odessa.[48] Like all written, printed or spoken bolshevik anti-militarist propaganda, the articles in *Le Communiste* combined both positive and indirect appeals, like the two heads of the Imperial Russian eagle. One emphasized those factors affecting individual morale, e.g., the lack of mail, crowded living conditions, the cancellation of leaves, and the hundred and one other *bêtes noires* which habitually afflict military men in war or peace. The other always counterbalanced the negative themes of bolshevik propaganda with direct orders to undertake specific, concrete action. These orders took many forms, but bolshevik determination to bring the French intervention to a rapid end never wavered: "Fraternize! Form soviets! Refuse to fight! Insist on demobilization now! Demand your immediate recall home!" [49] The paper also featured letters allegedly written by French sailors and soldiers decrying the war against Russia and calling upon their comrades to unite in the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat.

In addition to a wide range of French language propaganda, the foreign section of the bolshevik organization in the Ukraine published hundreds of pamphlets, leaflets, posters and proclamations in Greek, Polish, Rumanian, English, Ukrainian and Russian addressed to the soldiers of the polyglot forces and foreign missions attached to the Allied

Footnotes at end of article.

intervention army in the Black Sea area. Whenever printing facilities broke down, the bolsheviks turned to the typewriter or to the pen.[50] When regular paper supplies were temporarily exhausted, wrapping paper secured from local merchants served to fill the gap. Because they were forced to work under conditions of complete illegality, the bolsheviks recognized that their printing presses were their most effective, and consequently, their most valuable weapon. Maximum security precautions were initiated by the bolsheviks to safeguard their clandestine printing centers, many of which were located in the open country outside of the larger cities. Milk or produce carts smuggled the propaganda items into town to a central distribution center from which further dissemination was made. Sometimes direct distribution was made to the French servicemen in the streets. More often propaganda was left in places where the soldiers would be certain to find it. Children selling papers or cigarettes to the servicemen also doubled as purveyors of bolshevik propaganda. As the intervention continued, propaganda began to appear more frequently in the barracks, in the canteens and in the mess; French sympathizers among the troops had started assisting the bolsheviks in carrying out antimilitarist work.[51]

Dissension grows in the ranks

As winter wore on, a rash of incidents revealed the demoralized condition of the Allied forces in northern Russia. A mutiny broke out among the forces of the provisional government of the northern region, but was quickly put down.[52] In February, 1919, a company of British Yorkshire Infantry on their way to Murmansk refused to proceed to the front as ordered. [53] On March 1, 1919, the 21st Battalion of Colonial Troops, one of the token French forces in northern Russia, refused to relieve an American battalion in the line. An incident involving unrest within the American 339th regiment was also reported during the same period.[54] Although these incidents were of only minor consequences, they did not pass unnoticed by the bolsheviks who cited them as evidence of the growing revolutionary spirit. Bolshevik propaganda advanced the claim that these were actually very serious mutinies which had been suppressed by the Allied authorities only through the utmost brutality.[55] General Ironside, the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces in northern Russia denied that bolshevik propaganda was ever considered as anything more than a joke by his men. Of it, he wrote:

"Propaganda is always held to be a very effective weapon. But to my mind it is a very difficult one to employ, especially against troops on active service. It is a long-term weapon and like advertising it must be repeated over and over again to produce any effect. No soldier picks up a pamphlet and at once becomes infected by it. Soldiers can only be affected by whispering campaigns conducted from inside, and the Allies had no subversive elements in their ranks in Russia. I never found the British soldier touched by foreign-made propaganda. His kindly but marked contempt for all "foreigners" provides him with an armour which is difficult to pierce. The bolshevik propagandists certainly had no sort of idea how the ordinary Britisher lived and worked. And so it was with our men in Northern Russia.[56]

The first unmistakable signs of disintegration among the French forces in the Ukraine also occurred early in 1919. The French 58th Infantry Regiment was encamped at Bonder on the right bank of the Dniestr River across from Soviet-held Tiraspol. On February 1, 1919, a small detachment of French soldiers crossed the river to reconnoiter the town and were captured by the bolshevik partisans. After several hours of questioning, the soldiers were released, given their weapons, and sent back across the river to their own lines unharmed. Before their release, however, the bolsheviks pointedly told them:

"If your comrades had captured us, you would have shot us. But we say to you: You are free. We know what your chiefs are worth, who are your enemies as well as ours. Here are your weapons. You may go. And tell your comrades that we wish them no harm. We are even prepared to receive them as brothers, but on one condition—that they come without arms.[57]

As had been anticipated, the captives told their whole battalion what had happened and the treatment they had received. Three days later, when the orders came to march against Tiraspol, the French 58th Infantry Regiment advanced reluctantly. When machine-gun fire broke out, the 58th withdrew and returned to their camp in Bonder. Their withdrawal forced a general French retreat. The 58th was reassembled two days later, and ordered to advance against Tiraspol again. However, some of the troops refused to leave their camp, declaring that the war was over and a new one had not been declared against Russia. When efforts by their commanding officer failed to prevail upon the men to obey his orders, he placed them under arrest to be held for court-martial. Polish detachments were called up to replace the 58th. Tiraspol was taken after bloody fighting the following day. Several days later, the 58th was evacuated from southern Russia.[58]

The bolsheviks made certain that all allied personnel in southern Russia learned of the mutiny of the French 58th Infantry Regiment. A special propaganda leaflet was published calling upon the soldiers to follow the example of the 58th which "did not consent to be blind instruments of the bourgeois." [59] The leaflet also suggested that all Frenchmen fraternize with the bolsheviks:

"We know you desire peace and return to your homeland. But to gain peace you should not start a new war. It requires the boldness of those who carry upon their backs the burdens of war. You have destroyed Prussian militarism. Now destroy all militarism." [60]

Reaction in France grew against the intervention. Marcel Cachin, whose career was devoted to the communist cause, led the protest against Russian intervention in the *Chambre des deputes* with an address in the *Chambre* praising the refusal of the 58th to march.[61] Meanwhile, the bolsheviks in the Ukraine were intensifying their propaganda campaign and were calling for revolution from the ranks:

"It is now time for you to carry out the revolution in your own country, for you to turn your weapons against the avid capitalists, against your corrupt deputies and ministers and against the officers who are not on your side. But while you are here, fraternize with our Red Army of workers and peasants. Fight at the side of those against reactionary forces.[62]

On March 8, 1919, the French 176th Infantry Regiment refused to attack Kherson. The 176th was withdrawn from the line and sent to Odessa for evacuation.[63] A series of minor incidents in other military units followed, indicating how deep the disintegration had permeated into the French forces.

II. THE FIRST YEAR OF THE COMINTERN

If one day were to be singled out as the day on which the soviets embarked on their militant odyssey towards world domination, that day would be the day in 1919 when the Communist International was founded in Moscow. In his theses of April, 1917 on the tasks of the proletariat in the revolution, Lenin had stressed the necessity for the bolsheviks to seize the initiative in creating a third international, an international of deeds rather than words.[64] War and revolution had proven that the old socialist and social-democratic parties, and with them the Second International, were incapable of carrying on "positive" revolutionary action. *"The problem of war,"* Lenin asserted, "can be solved only in *a revolutionary way."* [65]

The first congress

Conditions in Russia had not been conducive to holding an international conference of socialist parties in either 1917 or 1918. There had been no sense of urgency attached to calling such a conference, for no less than Lenin himself had asserted that the new international was already established and working, and lacked only its public acknowledgement.[66] In January, 1919, however, the convening of the first congress of the new revolutionary international did become an urgent necessity for the soviets. On January 24, 1919, Leon Trotsky, at Lenin's insistence, hurriedly drafted an invitation to some thirty-nine different socialist, social-democrat, communist, revolutionary or leftist parties, groups or "trends" to come to Moscow for the first congress of a new revolutionary international to be known as the Third or Communist International. Behind the hastily contrived invitation was the knowledge that certain socialist groups hostile to bolshevism were planning an attempt to resurrect the Second International at a special congress to be held in Berne, Switzerland, in February, 1919.[67]

The text of the invitation to the first congress is significant for the light it sheds on the aims and tactics of the fledgling Third or Communist International. The immediate task of the proletariat, it revealed, was the seizure of state power: "The seizure of state power means the destruction of the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie and the organization of a new proletarian apparatus of power." [68]

It is essential, it continued, to arm the proletarist, for the "basic methods of struggle are mass actions of the proletariat right up to open armed conflict with the political power of capital." [69] Conversely, it was equally necessary to completely disarm "the bourgeoisie and their agents." [70] Inferred, if not clearly stated, was the necessity to disintegrate the organized military forces which Marxism defined as the central pillar on which state power and political control in a capitalist society rests. Revolutionary antimilitarism, then, was one of the fundamental doctrines around which the program of the Communist International was to be molded. Isolated as Moscow was from the outside world, the bolsheviks entertained little hope that their invitation, which was duly published in *Pravda* and entrusted to the air waves, would result in a truly representative congress, but the bid for leadership of the proletarian movement by the Second International could not pass unchallenged. However, with typical soviet efficiency, a number of the foreign communists and socialists already residing in Moscow were drafted by the bolsheviks as delegates to the first congress. Of the 54 delegates attending as "official" representatives of some 35 parties and organizations, only five actually came to Moscow from outside of Russia especially for the first congress.[71]

A small but determined group of men and women met in one of the cold, drafty halls of the Kremlin on March 2, 1919. Outside, on that wintry morning, a sharp, penetrating blast swept across Red Square; inside, a storm raged within the hearts of those who had assembled at Lenin's call. Like comrades of an earlier era who had gathered on another March day, they had come to bury, not to praise: their corpse, not Caesar, but the Second International.

Lenin presided at the opening session. In his welcoming speech, he declared that civil war had become a fact. The soviet system, Lenin said, had conquered not only in backward Russia but also in the most developed country of Europe, Germany, and in the oldest capitalist country, Great Britain.[72] The proletariats had begun their march to world

Footnotes at end of article.

revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

On March 4, 1919, the first congress adopted without discussion the theses on bourgeois democracy and proletarian dictatorship in which Lenin defined the role of the army in the bourgeois state as "an instrument of oppression." He explained:

"Only the soviet power, as the only established state organization of the very classes oppressed by the capitalists, is in a position to abolish the dependence of the military on the bourgeois command and really fuse the proletariat with the military, to arm the proletariat and disarm the bourgeoisie, without which the victory of socialism is impossible." [73]

In his theses, Lenin enumerated three main tasks for communist parties in countries where soviet power had not yet been established. These were:

1. To explain to the broad masses of the working class the historical meaning of the political and practical necessity of a new proletarian democracy which must replace the bourgeois democracy and parliamentarianism.

2. To extend and build up workers' councils in all branches of industry, in the army and navy, and also among agricultural workers and small peasants.

3. To win an assured, conscious communist majority in the councils.[74]

Lenin had obviously not forgotten the important role which the councils or soviets of soldiers' and sailors' deputies played in transferring allegiance of the armed forces from the Koronsky government to the indirect control of the bolsheviks in 1917.[75] Later in the congress, the soviets of workers', soldiers' and peasants' deputies were declared to represent "the greatest achievement and mightiest weapon of the proletariat of our time." [76]

On March 4, 1919, the first congress adopted a platform for the Comintern. The platform, which was drafted by Bukharin, was quite explicit on the point that the conquest of political power required the disintegration of the organized military forces of the state:

"The conquest of political power by the proletariat means the annihilation of the political power of the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie's most powerful means of exercising power is the bourgeois state machine *with its bourgeois army led by bourgeois-junker officers, its police and gendarmerie,* its prison governors and judges, its priests, officials, etc. The conquest of political power means not only a change in ministry personnel, but the annihilation of the enemy's state apparatus, the conquest of real strength, the disarming of the bourgeoisie, of the counter-revolutionary officers, of the white guards, and the arming of the proletariat, of the revolutionary soldiery, of the red workers' guards." [77]

According to the platform, victory for the proletariat was possible only *after* the destruction of the bourgeois state machine, i.e., the army, for then and only then could proletarian power be organized. In the lexicon of communism the disintegration of the army was an unconditional historical imperative.

Its first international antimilitarist campaign was launched by the Comintern on March 5, 1919, the day before the closing session of the first congress. The campaign began with a message appealing to the workers of all countries of the world to come to the assistance of their common fatherland by demanding that their governments renounce any further direct or indirect interference in soviet affairs. What distinguished this appeal from the many others which had emanated from Russia since the beginning of the intervention in 1918 was the precise, ten point action program which the Comintern outlined in it. Among the demands contained in the program which the workers were asked to carry out using "all means at their disposal" including "if necessary, revolutionary means," were non-intervention in soviet internal affairs; immediate recall of all Allied troops from soviet territory; abandonment of any direct or indirect policy of intervention, including the granting of material aid or moral support to the counter-revolutionary movements in Russia; recognition of the soviet government and the establishment of diplomatic relations; the cessation of the economic blockade and the resumption of normal trade relations.[78]

At its final session on March 6, 1919, the first congress unanimously adopted a new communist manifesto which Leon Trotsky had prepared for the Comintern. The manifesto generalized the revolutionary experience of the working class during the seventy-two years which had passed since Marx and Engels had given their own manifesto to the proletariat of the world. Of particular interest in the manifesto was the discussion of the revolutionary significance of the army:

"The collapse of the imperialist state, from the tsarist to the most democratic, is proceeding simultaneously with the collapse of the imperialist military system. The multi-millioned armies mobilized by imperialism could stand firm only so long as the proletariat remained obediently under the yoke of the bourgeoisie. *The breakdown of national unity means also an inevitable breakdown of the army.* This is what happened first in Russia, then in Austria-Hungary and Germany. The same thing may be expected to occur in other imperialist states. The revolt of the peasant against the Landlord, of the worker against the capitalist, and of both against the monachical or democratic bureaucracy, inevitably brings in its train the revolt of soldiers against the army command, and subsequently a sharp split between the proletarian and bourgeois elements of the army. The imperialist war, which pitted one nation against another, has passed and is passing over into civil war which pits one class against another." [79]

According to the manifesto, communist parties "never conjure up civil war *artificially.*" [80] *This should not be interpreted as a* renunciation of Lenin's slogan, "Turn the imperialist war into civil war" but only a reminder of the necessity for thorough preparation to insure victory:

"Hence arises the necessity of disarming the bourgeoisie *in time,* of arming the workers, of creating a communist army to defend the proletarian power and the inviolability of its socialist construction. . . . The soviet army is inseparable from the soviet state." [81]

After the first congress, Lenin outlined five steps which were to be undertaken by the Comintern "in order to defeat the opportunism which caused the shameful death of the Second International." These included emphasizing revolution rather than reform in all propaganda, combining legal work with illegal work, expelling the opportunists from the labor movement, waging a revolutionary struggle against imperialism in the colonies and dependent nations, and conducting mess action among the workers.[82] All agitation and propaganda, Lenin warned, must not deviate from the main task of training the party and the masses for revolution. Those who did not send both arms and literature to the revolutionary parties in the colonies were scoundrels and traitors. Mass actions must extend beyond the bounds of all legality, he said, citing as examples, "strikes, street demonstrations, protests by soldiers, meetings among the troops, the distribution of leaflets in barracks, camps, etc.[83] Only hypocrites and simpletons, Lenin concluded, could fail to recognize that the rapid success of the Russian revolution was due to the painstaking work by a revolutionary party:

"For years a systematic illegal apparatus was built up for the purpose of leading demonstrations and strikes, *for conducting work among the troops;* methods were studied in detail, illegal literature was issued which summed up experience and trained the whole party to the idea that revolution was necessary." [84]

Formation of workers', soldiers' and sailors' councils in Europe and America followed the closing of the congress by several months. In Great Britain, the Socialist Labor Party took the lead in setting up councils. Councils also appeared in Germany, Hungary, France and in the United States. In defining its function, the American Workers', Soldiers' and Sailors' council declared that the machinery of government, *including the armed forces of the nation,* exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, therefore the workers must organize consciously for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, *including these forces,* may be converted from an instrument of oppression into an instrument of emancipation.[85]

Active organization work was also initiated among the armed forces. It was during this period that communist pamphlets and leaflets calling upon the enlisted man to form sailors' soviets were introduced into various naval establishments in the United States.[86]

On March 21, 1919, a soviet government was established in Hungary. The new government came to power after Count Michael Karolyi, the provisional president of Hungary, resigned in protest against Allied territorial demands.[87] A coalition of communists and social democrats, soviet Hungary was under the premiership of Bela Kun. Power in the government was exercised through councils of workers, soldiers and peasants. One of the first acts of soviet Hungary was to form an alliance with soviet Russia.

On March 28, 1919, the executive committee of the Comintern issued a manifesto on the Hungarian revolution which asserted that the imperialists desired to wage war against soviet Russia across Hungarian territory. In part, it said: "Soldiers! Refuse obedience to those who send you against red Hungary. Rise, form your councils, and go over to the side of soviet Hungary." [88] Although the manifesto made a general appeal to the workers and soldiers of all countries to come to the aid of the working class and revolutionary soldiers of Hungary, it contained a special appeal to the French proletariat:

"French workers and soldiers, you are to be driven to act as hangmen, to strangle the Hungarian socialist revolution. The French bourgeoisie want to use your hands to strangle the proletarian revolution in Budapest, and Berlin, Paris, and London. After the four and a half years' war which you fought for the bankers' interests, they now want to force you to become international gendarmes, hangmen of the proletarian revolution. That will not happen. The French workers will not stain themselves with treachery, they will turn their bayonets against their own oppressors, against the French and all other imperialists.[89]

By the beginning of April, 1919, the French position in the southern Ukraine had become untenable. Dissension was widespread among the troops, public opinion in France was rapidly crystalizing against French intervention in Russia, and government policy continued to vacillate. Suddenly, on April 3, 1919, the French announced their determination to evacuate all military forces from Odessa. Their inability to supply Odessa, they said, had prompted the decision to withdraw their troops.

Chaos followed the French announcement. The French occupation had never had the popular support of the people of Odessa, but the prospect of being left to the mercy of the bolsheviks was not an attractive one. A general strike was called by the workers in Odessa to hamper the loading of the French troops. Bolshevik elements in the crews of

Footnotes at end of article.

some Russian vessels in the harbor resorted to sabotage to prevent the use of their ships in the evacuation. Space aboard outward bound vessels was at a premium, with White Russian civilians and Volunteer Army soldiers competing with the French for passage. Contemporary accounts of the evacuation of Odessa stress the complete lack of coordination in carrying it out. Although French warships of the Black Sea fleet effectively controlled the sea approaches, the French evacuation of Odessa relinquished their foothold in the Ukraine. A few days later, Odessa was "captured" by the bolsheviks. Allied forces, however, still occupied Sevastopol in the Crimea, and French warships still patrolled the Black Sea.

The Black Sea revolt

The same factors which brought disintegration to the French army in the Ukraine were also influential in raising the spirit of rebellion among the sailors of the French warships on patrol in the Black Sea. For sailors, occupation duty meant relative inactivity for prolonged periods, confinement to the limited shipboard living spaces, isolation from the rest of the world except for the infrequent wireless news. Some, like the crew of the battleship *France* which sailed from Toulon in October, 1916, had been away from their home ports for more than two years. Morale, never high, dipped to new lows. Discipline below decks all but disappeared. Dissidence increased, with even minor grievances being magnified out of all proportion to their actual significance. Bolshevik propaganda also took its toll.

It had been harder for the bolsheviks to get their propaganda aboard the French warships in the Black Sea, but whenever a leaflet or pamphlet did find its way on board, it usually had wide circulation among the men. Although it was contrary to regulations, wireless operators aboard French warships often passed the night watch recording the detailed bulletins sent out in French, German, English and Russian from Moscow every morning at three a.m. These bulletins always contained late news intermingled with propaganda appeals.[90]

Some among the French sailors became convinced of the truth of bolshevik assertions that they themselves held the power to bring the intervention to an end. One who believed was André Marty, the chief engineer aboard the French torpedo boat, *Protet*, anchored off Galats, Rumania. A few days after the evacuation of Odessa, a fantastic plan began to take shape in Marty's mind. Marty determined that the next time the *Protet* weighed anchor, he would take command after the ship's officers had been made prisoners by the crew. The *Protet* would then sail to Odessa or some other soviet port where it would proclaim its support to the proletarian revolution. Marty believed that this act would serve as an example for the other ships of the French fleet which would follow the *Protet* to the side of the revolution. According to Marty's plan, after a few days in port, in company with the other ships that had joined her, the *Protet* would sail for Marseilles. Upon arrival in Marseilles, they would demand an end to the war and the withdrawal of all Allied forces from Russia. Marty confided his plan to several other crew members who agreed to assist him; but before the plan could be implemented, word of it reached French naval authorities. Marty's arrest on April 16, 1919, followed.[91] Mutiny aboard the *Protet* was averted, but the ships that sailed the Black Sea sailed troubled waters.

Three days later, open revolt broke out aboard the French battleship *France* as it lay at anchor in the roadstead off Sevastopol. The following morning its sister ship, the *Jean-Bart*, and the cruiser, *Du Chavla*, joined in the revolt. The crews gathered on the dock singing the *Internationale*. Red flags were struck. All work ceased, and the men refused to turn to when ordered by their officers. The unrest spread to other ships of the fleet, including the *Waldeck-Rousacau*, the ship to which Marty had been transferred temporarily after his arrest. The crews threatened to take their ships into the dock unless they set sail for France immediately. Similar demonstrations and mutinies occurred on other ships in the Black Sea fleet in the days which followed, but they were swiftly put down.

On April 7, 1919, Bavaria was proclaimed a soviet republic. Zinoviev, in his capacity as president of the executive committee of the Comintern, sent a message of congratulations to the new soviet republic in which he prophetised that the time was not far distant when all of Germany would also be a soviet republic.[92] Inside Germany, bolshevik-trained agitators were working to undermine the government. Their activities extended to creating dissension among the British and American occupation troops. The investment which the soviets had made at the beginning of 1916 in training selected German prisoners-of-war as propagandists was beginning to pay off. Cologne and Dusseldorf were selected by the German comrades as the centers for their disintegration work among the Allied soldiers occupying the Rhenish districts. Finances for the work were controlled from Berlin, but a local headquarters in Cologne was established in the home of the female party members. To divert suspicion away from the agitational headquarters in Cologne, all propaganda printing was done on a clandestine press in Dusseldorf. By April, 1919, the German communists could report to party headquarters in Berlin that their work had developed important contacts among the soldiers. Moreover, they claimed some American and British sympathizers were helping to prepare the propaganda material being disseminated in leaflet and pamphlet form among the troops. Fraternization and support of the German proletariat were used as basic propaganda themes. Only the shortage of funds prevented the extension of their antimilitarist work among the Allied forces on a broader scale.[93]

Zinoviev's enthusiasm was practically boundless. In an article which he wrote for the May, 1919 issue of the *Communist International*, the official organ of the Comintern, Zinovie extended his original prediction on the immediate perspectives of the proletarian revolution:

"The movement is advancing so dizzyingly fast that one can say with certainty in a year's time we will already begin to forget that there was a struggle for communism in Europe, for in a year's time the whole of Europe will be communist. And the struggle will have spread to America, perhaps to Asia too, and the other continents." [94]

To celebrate its first May Day, the Comintern issued a special manifesto reiterating Zinoviev's prediction. The manifesto declared that the central slogan for the first of May would be directed against the imperialist war which "the Allied imperialists want to declare on the soviet republics of Russia and Hungary." [95] It appealed to the workers and soldiers of France, England, America, Italy, Serbia, Rumania and Poland, to stir up rebellion in the rear and to turn their weapons against their governments.[96]

Instead of a day of triumph for the soviets, May first was turned into a day of tragedy: the Bavarian soviet republic was overthrown.[97]

On June 18, 1919, the Comintern issued another manifesto on intervention in Russia. The fate of the world revolution was being decided in Russia, it claimed, calling on the masses to come to the defense of the revolution by arranging international demonstrations and protest strikes.[98]

In France, sympathy for the French sailors of the Black Sea developed on a wide scale. At the main naval base of Toulon, the home port of the battleship *France*, numerous sympathy meetings were held by the sailors and the workers. In June, 1919, the crew of the battleship *Provence* refused to sail for the Black Sea, demanding instead the release of the Black Sea mutineers who had been arrested, the end of the intervention in Russia, and their own immediate demobilization. Similar demonstrations occurred at Brest; at Biserte in North Africa where the crew of the battleship *Voltaire* refused to sail for the Black Sea; at Itea, Greece, where 900 troops destined for duty in Russia mutinied abroad the French troopship *Guichen;* and at Vladivostok, where the crew of the cruiser *d'Estrées* revolted.[99]

By the end of the summer of 1919, the last ships of the French fleet had been withdrawn from the Black Sea, mass demobilization of French military and naval forces was being carried out in France, and active French participation in the Allied intervention of Russia had been concluded. But the memory of the Black Sea revolt persisted.

The executive committee of the Comintern continued its war of manifestos and appeals against intervention in Russia and Hungary. The appeals were directed primarily at the soldiers in the Rumanian, Czech and Yugoslav forces which were advancing on Budapest; and the emphasis was on fraternization with the Hungarian soldiers and workers.[100] On August 1, 1919, the soviet power in Hungary collapsed. Once again soviet Russia stood alone, but its international antimilitarist campaign continued.

The allies withdraw from Archangel

Emphasis in bolshevik propaganda in the Northern Region had begun to shift away from the Allied forces and more towards the provisional government by the end of summer, 1919. The bolsheviks accepted that it would only be a matter of months before the Allied forces would be withdrawn. Their estimate of the situation was reinforced both by the public clamor in England and America to speed the return to normalcy by "getting the boys home," and by the news of the mutinies in the French military forces in the Ukraine, the evacuation of Odessa, and the revolt of the Black Sea fleet. The quality of propaganda which the native bolshevik agitators prepared for distribution to the White Russians improved. The primary agitational target was the conscript program of the provisional government. Village headmen were often addressed by name in bolshevik propaganda and threatened with dire consequences if recruiting were permitted to continue.[101] Bolshevik agitators fostered rumors concerning the impending withdrawal of the Allied forces and of the growing might of the bolshevik army. Such rumors were particularly effective against the conscript soldiers of the provisional government who lacked formal military training or experience.[102]

Time worked in favor of the bolsheviks. Conditions within the White Russian forces continued to deteriorate as the probability of an Allied withdrawal became more evident. Bolshevik propaganda paved the way for agitators to organize cells in the White Russian forces. Desertions by soldiers and non-commissioned officers became more frequent. Propaganda and espionage work in behalf of the bolsheviks was extended into the White Russian naval forces, where at least one naval radio operator became a bolshevik agent.[103] When the Allied evacuation of Archangel finally occurred in September, 1919, as the bolsheviks in their propaganda had predicted it would, their prestige increased considerably. For the bolsheviks, the end was almost in sight.

In the fall of 1919, the Comintern set up a western European bureau in Amsterdam, Holland. This move was made necessary by the relatively poor communications between

Footnotes at end of article.

Moscow and the rest of Europe; however, control of the Comintern was retained within the Kremlin walls in Moscow.

A new dimension in revolutionary antimilitarism work made its appearance in December, 1919, with the founding of the Young People's International, later renamed the Young Communist International. On it the soviets pinned their hopes of taking over the leadership of the socialist youth organizations which had previously been affiliated with the Second International. Lenin was primarily responsible for the founding of the Young Communist International. He conceived it as an organization for the conduct of special antimilitarist propaganda. As early as 1907, he had recognized the need for such an organization after observing the historical experience of the *Jeunes Gardes* (Young Guard) socialist groups which the Belgium Labor Party established in 1893. The *Jeunes Gardes* were organized into both district and national federations, headed by a general council. According to Lenin, the Young Communist International would perform the same function as the general council. In his writings, Lenin described how the *Jeunes Gardes* organized popular open air meetings in the principal cities every January and September, the months when new recruits were called into the army. Prominent speakers attended the meetings to explain the meaning of militarism to the young recruits. The antimilitarist activities of the *Jeunes Gardes* did not stop at the barracks door. Groups of socialist soldiers were formed for the purpose of carrying on their propaganda activities inside the armed forces. In addition, grievance committees were set up to collect information about injustices in service which was published daily in the central organ of the party under the title "From the Army." The work in Belgium served as the model for antimilitarist work carried out by socialist youth groups in France, Switzerland, Germany and Austria before the war.[104]

Numerous documents and letters purporting to contain official instructions from the executive committee of the Comintern became public during the early 1920's. These papers covered many subjects, including various aspects of the communist antimilitarist program. Authenticity of many such documents has been heatedly debated, vigorously affirmed by some, repeatedly denied by others, but seldom satisfactorily proven or disproven. Some, though not all, of these letters were false. However, their importance rests not on whether they were forgeries, as frequently claimed by the communists, but on the fidelity with which they interpreted the communist revolutionary doctrine actually promulgated in the theses and resolutions of the Comintern.

One of the first communications allegedly sent by the Comintern to American communists probably belongs in the spurious category. A copy of this document was turned over to American authorities in December, 1919, by officials of the Latvian Government. Together with a second Comintern directive signed by Zinoviev, it was alleged to have been found concealed under the boot soles of a Russian seaman. The sailor, who was acting as a communist courier, was one of a large group of persons arrested in December, 1919, for conspiring to overthrow the Latvian Government. In addition to the Comintern directives, a large sum of money and valuable jewels were allegedly found in his possession at the time of his arrest. His presence in Riga had been caused by his inability to find a ship on which to sail to the United States.

The document, which purports to be official instructions from the executive committee, was signed by Bukharin. It contained details on how communists in the United States could establish a communist party, an event which by September, 1919 had already occurred, not once but twice. That the Comintern had not learned of the American developments is possible but highly improbable. Considerable emphasis in the letter was placed on penetration of the armed forces, on formation of communist nuclei among the military, and on arming the American workers. "We firmly believe," the executive committee stated in the letter, "that one of the most important aims at present is the organization of small communist nucleus centers among the soldiers and sailors—as a fighting section to carry on energetic propaganda in organizing Soviets of soldiers and sailors, and in preaching fanatical hostility toward officers and generals." [105]

The letter also stated that "it is necessary to develop propaganda to instill in the minds of the workers the paramount necessity for arming. Revolutionary soldiers who are demobilized should not give up their rifles." [106] The organization of Soviets of soldiers' and sailors' Soviets was one of the three main tasks in Lenin's theses which were adopted by the first congress of the Comintern on March 4, 1919. The theses were widely publicized so it is considered doubtful that the executive committee would have felt a necessity to reiterate this point. The fact that there is nothing in this letter which could not have been derived from published documents adds support to the conclusion that it was fabricated to gain American support for the Latvian struggle against bolshevian.

Early in 1920, Lenin issued his pamphlet on *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*. In it he expressed his concern about the split within the socialist elements in Germany, which was delaying the revolution. This same theme was the subject of a letter dated February 5, 1920, which the executive committee of the Comintern addressed to the German Independent Social-Democratic Party. The letter appealed to it to cleanse its leadership and amalgamate with the Communist Party of Germany under a common banner. One of the major criticisms aimed at the independents in this letter was the fact that they had not created an organization for the purpose of conducting "agitation in the army in favor of entry into the army for the purpose of preparing it to go over to the side of the workers against the bourgeoisie." [107] This same criticism, it was noted, also applied to the right wing in France. Unless legal work were combined with illegal work, and legal organizations with illegal organizations, the letter warned, there could be no truly revolutionary party in Germany.[108]

Lenin devoted one chapter in his pamphlet *"Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder*, to the historical development of communism in England. Lenin pointed out that it was impossible to say how soon the proletarian revolution would "flare up" in England, adding that it was the duty of all communists to carry on preparatory work, especially widespread work among the masses:

"In England, also, it is necessary to organize in a new way (not in a socialist manner but in a communist manner, not in a reformist manner but in a revolutionary manner) the work of propaganda, agitation and organization among the armed forces and among the oppressed and disfranchised nationalities." [109]

There was little early recognition in communist antimilitarist doctrine on the positive values accrued to the world revolution as the result of intervention in any country. Many of the appeals and manifestos of the Comintern had been written to marshal resistance within individual countries against possible interference by their organized military forces in the affairs of other countries embroiled in civil war. Similarly, after intervention occurred, propaganda and agitational themes concentrated on creating dissension both at home and in the army to bring it to an early end; nothing was said, however, of the opportunities for spreading revolution which intervention afforded until the Comintern, in a manifesto on the civil war in Germany, on March 20, 1920, reported: "Intervention by the French and English capitalists will carry the communist wave like an echo to England and France and accelerate the ripening revolution in those countries.[110] There was, therefore, no call in the manifesto to resist intervention in Germany. However, the manifesto did carry instructions as to what action should be taken after intervention occurred.

"French, English and Belgian soldiers, if you are sent against your brothers, the insurrectionary German workers, if you are ordered to turn your bayonets against the starving German proletarians, their wives and mothers, turn these bayonets against your own bourgeois authorities; go over to the side of the rebels and fraternize with them. Remember that for an honest worker there is no greater crime than to stain his hands with the blood of the workers of another country. Remember that the German workers are fighting for bread, for peace, for freedom. Remember that there will be an end to war if with an iron hand we put an end to the power of the capitalists.[111]

By mid-1920, after all Allied troops had left western Russia, Kolchak's resistance collapsed. In addition, the withdrawal of the Allied forces from the Far East appeared imminent. The imperialist stranglehold on the October Revolution, soviet historians wrote, had at last been broken.[112] Lenin had a footnote to add to the official accounts of the bolshevik "victory" over the forces of intervention. "Weak and militarily important though we were," he wrote, "we won their own soldiers away from France and England." [113] This "miracle," Lenin explained, occurred "because we told the truth" about the reasons for the Allied intervention in Russia in the pamphlets and leaflets which were circulated among the soldiers and sailors.[114] "Never again will they dare to send French or English soldiers to Russia," he added, "for experience has shown that they would turn against those who sent them.[115]

The bolshevik disintegration of the Allied intervention forces in Russia is frequently cited by the communists as "a concrete example of how it is possible to conduct various currents of antimilitarism into one revolutionary channel." [116] For the communists, revolutionary antimilitarism had become the prime mover of modern military history.

FOOTNOTES

[1] *Investigation of Un-American Propaganda Activities in the United States*, p. 600.

[2] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, VI, 539.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 96–97.

[4] Louis C. Fraina (ed.), *The Proletarian Revolution in Russia* (New York: The Communist Press, 1918), p. 41.

[5] Stalin, "Lagging Behind the Revolution," *loc. cit.*, III, 63.

[6] John Reed, "How Soviet Russia Conquered Imperial Germany," *The Liberator*, I, No. 11 (January, 1919), 24.

[7] As quoted from the *Russian Daily News*, December 24, 1917, by George Brunts, *Allied Propaganda and the Collapse of the German Empire in 1918*, Hoover War Library Publication No. 13 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1938), p. 148. Brunts indicates that a copy of this message was found by American forces near Ancerviller, in April, 1918, evidently having overshot its target.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 140.

[9] Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Italics added.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 19.

[11] It is one of the ironies of modern history that President Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" translated into German for distribution among the troops on the eastern front by the American Committee on Public Information was printed in Petrograd on the

same presses as *Dis Fackal* and was distributed through the same channels. Edgar Sisson, *One Hundred Red Days* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1931), pp. 101–102.

[12] Reed, *loc. cit.*

[13] German pressure in connection with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk forced the soviets to stop publication and distribution of *Der Voelkerfrieds* early in 1918.

[14] Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 23.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 20; Albert Rhye Williams, *Through the Russian Revolution* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1921), p. 171.

[17] Reed, *loc. cit.*

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 20–21; Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

[19] Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 21.

[21] *The New York Times*, April 13, 1919, p. 20.

[22] According to John Reed, the Bureau of International Revolutionary Propaganda had on its payroll 68 agents in Austro-Hungary, and more than that number in Germany, France, Switzerland and Italy by September, 1968, all of whom were engaged in antimilitarist work. (Reed, *op. cit.*, p. 23).

[23] Quoted by Bruntz, *op. cit.*, p. 146, from the miscellaneous collection of "Fliegerabwurfe" in the Hoover War Library collection.

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 148–49.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[26] As quoted by Possony, *op. cit.*, p. 79, from L. Alfred J. Dupent, and Kurt Fischer, *Revolutionaerer Antimilitarismus, ans der Geschichte der antimilitaristischen Arbcit* (Mets: Imprimaris Populaire de Lerreine, 1929), p. 110.

[27] Dallin, *op. cit.*, pp. 156–59.

[28] Exact figures are not available of the numbers of pamphlets and proclamations issued by the bolsheviks in the Far East, but it is believed that the numbers were relatively high. Soviet figures are available for the propaganda output of the bolsheviks on the Ural-Siberian front during the counter-revolutionary withdrawal from Omsk towards Tyuman. In the week between July 3 and July 9, 1918, bolsheviks in the Ural district issued 21,770 pamphlets and 168,000 proclamations. In the preceding month, they had issued 51,273 pamphlets and 2,805,650 proclamations. (A. S. Bubnov, *et al* (eds.), *The Civil War of 1918–1921.* (Moscow: Soviet Military Publications Division, 1930), III, 85. The page reference is to the 1940 English translation by the Army War College).

[29] V. Parfenov, *The Intervention of Siberia* (New York: Workers' Library Publishers, 1941), pp. 26–27.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

[31] How effective bolshevik propaganda was among the Japanese soldiers is reflected by what the communists consider was an unwitting tribute paid to it by a Japanese field commander who, during peace negotiations in March, 1920, demanded the cessation of all bolshevik propaganda activity among the troops as one of the major conditions of the peace settlement. Bolshevik influence continued to be particularly strong in the Japanese forces in the Far East from 1920 on, and played an important part in disintegrating Japanese troop morale until the final withdrawal of Japanese forces in 1922. (*Ibid.*, pp. 48–49).

[32] Leonid I. Strakhovsky, *Intervention at Archangel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), pp. 104–105.

[33] *The New York Times*, October 17, 1918, p. 3.

[34] Field-Marshal Lord W. B. Ironside, *Archangel: 1918–1919* (London: T. and A. Constable, Ltd., 1953), p. 58.

[35] John Cudahy, *Archangel: The American War with Russia* (Chicago: A. C. McClure & Co., 1924), pp. 125–26.

[36] This was later republished as an eight-page pamphlet by the executive committee of the Communist International. (U.S. Department of Justice, *Red Radicalism as described by its own leaders*, Exhibits collected by A. Mitchell Palmer (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1920), p. 82).

[37] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

[38] Ironside, *loc. cit.*

[39] *The Liberator*, I, No. 11 (January, 1969), 6.

[40] Propaganda brochures printed in English of the type described were reportedly introduced on board the American Cruiser, *U.S.S. Brooklyn*, at Vladivostok. (*Ibid.*, II, No. 5, (May, 1919), 12).

[41] *Ibid.*

[42] John S. Reshetar, Jr., *The Ukranian Revolution, 1917–1920* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 89.

[43] Firus Kazensadeh, *The Struggle for Transcaucasia (1917–1291)* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1951), p. 165.

[44] Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 293–95, provides the full text of a typical bolshevik circular for British soldiers in which these themes are expanded.

[45] André Marty, *La révolte de la Mer Moire* (Paris: Éditions Sociales, 1949), pp. 184–85.

[46] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp. 180–81.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 187.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 188.

[52] Strakhovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 116–21.

[53] *Ibid.*, p. 162.

[54] *Ibid.*

[55] Ironside, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

[56] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

[57] Marty, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[58] Instead of being returned to France, they were sent to Morocco. (*Ibid.*, pp. 89–91).

[59] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

[60] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[61] *Ibid.*, pp. 352–54.

[62] *Ibid.*, p. 212.

[63] *Ibid.*, pp. 135–36.

[64] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, X, 11.

[65] *Ibid.*, p. 9. Italics in original.

[66] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

[67] Jane Degras (ed.), *The Communist International: 1919–1943, Vol. I: Documents, 1919–1922* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 1.

[68] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[69] *Ibid.* p. 3.

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] *Ibid.*, pp. 5–6.

[72] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, X, 26–27.

[73] Degras, *loc. cit.*, p. 14.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 16. Italics added.

[75] Vossony, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–32.

[76] Degras, "Manifesto of the Communist International," *loc cit.*, p. 44.

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 19. Italics added.

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 30.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 45. Italics added.

[80] *Ibid.* Italics in original.

[81] *Ibid.* Italics added.

[82] Lenin, "The Tasks of the Third International," *loc. cit.*, X, 45–46.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[84] *Ibid.* Italics added.

[85] *Industrial Freedom—1919* (Toledo: Workers', Soldiers' and Sailors' Council, n.d.), inside cover. Italics added. In addition to the title on the cover, the pamphlet carried *Industrial Democracy—1919* as the frontispiece title.

[86] *The New York Times*, January 16, 1920, p. 3.

[87] Degras, *loc cit.*, p. 48.

[88] "Manifesto of the EUCI to the Workers and Soldiers of all Countries on the Hungarian Revolution," *ibid.*, p. 49.

[89] *Ibid.*

[90] Marty, *op. cit.*, pp. 175–76

[91] *Ibid.*, pp. 235–65.

[92] Degras, *loc. cit.*, p. 50.

[93] *The New York Times*, July 6, 1919, p. 9.

[94] Degras, *loc. cit.*, p. 51.

[95] *Ibid.*, p. 53.

[96] *Ibid.*

[97] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[98] *Ibid.*, pp. 59–60.

[99] Maurice Pas, "Revolt of the French Fleet in the Black Sea," *Communist Review*, III, No. 1 (May, 1922), 10–2.

[100] Degras, *loc. cit.*, p. 61.

[101] Ironside, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

[102] *The New York Times*, February 18, 1919, p. 4.

[103] Strakhovsky, *op. cit.*, pp. 163–65.

[104] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, IV, 330–31.

[105] *The New York Times*, December 26, 1919, p. 1.

[106] *Ibid.*, p. 2. Italic in original.

[107] Degras, *loc. cit.*, p. 77.

[108] *Ibid.*

[109] Lenin, *loc. cit.*, X, 142.

[110] Degras, "Manifesto on the Civil War in Germany," *loc. cit.*, p. 84.

[111] *Ibid.*, p. 85.

[112] André Marty, *The Epic of the Black Sea Revolt* (New York: Workers' Library Publishers, 1941), p. 34.

[113] Marty, *La révolte de la Mer Noire*, p. 76.

[114] *Ibid.*

[115] *Ibid.*, p. 370.

[116] André Marty, "The Revolt of the French Black Sea Fleet," *International Press Correspondence*, VII, No. 63 (November 10, 1927), 1409.

"DIXIE," A REJECTED YANKEE WAR PRIZE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those liberals in our society who would ban the playing of "Dixie" by our public schools and colleges have forgotten their history—Lincoln himself is reported to have called "Dixie" "one of the best tunes I ever heard." Furthermore, he went on record as calling "Dixie" a Yankee war prize, saying "we had fairly captured it."

Our liberal friends have forgotten their history—either that, or they no longer wish to abide by the words of the "Great Emancipator." If they intend to reject "Dixie," a Yankee war prize, maybe they will also give up the other things they won in that war—they may even decide to give the South back to the Southerners, or release the "conquered provinces" from their colonial status.

I insert a related excerpt from a biography of President Lincoln in the RECORD at this point:

[From Lincoln Talks: A Biography in Anecdote, Collected, Collated, and Edited by Emanuel Hertz, Viking Press: New York 1939. pp. 367–368.]

"DIXIE"

On the night when the news reached Washington of Lee's surrender to Grant, the people of Washington flocked to the White House lawn to serenade the President. A band being there, Lincoln turned to it and said:

"I have always thought 'Dixie' one of the best tunes I ever heard. I insisted yesterday we had fairly captured it. I presented the question to the Attorney-General and he gave the opinion that it was our lawful prize. I have not heard the old tune for four years. Now let the band play Dixie!"—*Newport Mercury.*

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION FOR BRISTOL PRESS OF BRISTOL, CONN.

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, October 12 was centennial day at the Bristol Press.

However, it was much more than a reflection on past glory. It was also a day marking the completion of an enormous publishing challenge which chronologued the past and confronted the future.

After months—and years—of planning, writing, editing, and composing, using the full talents and energies of the highly competent Press staff, the newspaper grew to mammoth size for its 100th anniversary issue, with 12 anniversary sections totaling 168 pages.

This anniversary issue of the Bristol Press is a tribute to the fascinating history of this Connecticut industrial city. The entire edition would make most informative reading for my colleagues. I am including for their interest excerpts of the Press' 100th anniversary edition, which provide special highlights of Bristol memorabilia.

[From the Briston (Conn.) Press, Oct. 1, 1971]

WE ARE 100 YEARS OLD

(Editor's Note.—In view of the personal nature of this editorial, The Bristol Press departs from its time-honored tradition of unsigned editorials, and carries this centennial edition commentary as a signed editorial from the publisher.)

Today's centennial edition of The Bristol Press represents the most thrilling and challenging assignment we have ever undertaken here at The Press. The finished product was made possible through the cooperative efforts of many individuals in every department of our Bristol Press organization. Their dedication and devotion to what seemed like a monumental task (and it was for an organization our size) has been the key to the step by step progress towards today's publication date. We salute them one and all, as we become centenarians.

At the same time we gratefully acknowledge the important contributions to today's edition from a number of friends of The Bristol Press, both local residents and former Bristolites, who have retained their interest in Bristol over the years. Their articles and their photos have enabled us to present a much broader and more detailed historical review in numerous fields of interest that we would ever have been able to do on our own.

Marking an important milestone such as this is, we are especially mindful of our forebears at The Press. Elsewhere in this edition we have reprinted Vol. I, No. 1 in full, its entire four pages. We would have liked to have presented a better reproduction, but the early editions deteriorated over the years. At the same time we think our readers will find it rewarding to peruse that first edition, particularly what Editor and Founder Charles Hart Riggs, a Congregational minister, had to say in his "Salutation", his editorial on page 2. From this perspective of 100 years later, we salute Editor Riggs and his associates for their notable contributions to the launching and continuing efforts in those earlier years of The Bristol Press, through the latter decades of the 19th century.

The individual who had the greatest influence to the on-going of The Bristol Press in our lifetime was "The Boss" for over 50 years, the late Arthur Seth Barnes. We have chronicled in considerable detail in another section of this edition some of his many attributes and contributions to The Bristol Press' coming of age, moving from a weekly newspaper to a semi-weekly and then to a daily. The Press is the responsible community newspaper it is today, and we are proud of what it is, because of the standards set by Editor and Publisher Arthur Barnes and his associates for over half a century. He was directing head of The Press from the early 1900's until his death on Christmas Day of 1956. Those of us on the job today are deeply conscious of the heritage of Arthur Barnes and his era at The Press.

There is another important approach to our observance of this centennial milestone. That is the look ahead. Some of us who have maintained that Bristol has much to be proud of and has a bright future, have been tabbed recently by a Washington Post staff writer as partners to a kind of "conspiracy of optimism that runs counter to fact." This was in a special article reprinted in The Press on September 24, on the city's high unemployment. Well we are glad to join in a conspiracy of optimism on Bristol. Furthermore in this edition alone, in the host of messages from our advertisers on their "look ahead" for their business and for Bristol, we see an abundance of facts on which to base our optimism. We commend our advertisers for their positive approach to the years ahead. We share that approach all the way.

Ten years ago, in our editorial comment in The Press' 90th Anniversary edition, we said in part, "We look forward to an unusual decade of growth for Bristol. We intend to do our level best to have The Bristol Press keep pace with that growth, and point the way to further progress - - -. Then when we salute the achievements of the past (on our 100th anniversary) we would hope to point the way optimistically to the next 100 years."

Certainly Bristol has had an unusual decade of growth in the past ten years, as our banker friends pointed out most dramatically last month. And here at The Bristol Press we have experienced exciting changes in plant and in publishing equipment and facilities. Most emphatically we can say there is much we are proud of in Bristol, and quite a goodly number of the reasons are described in today's edition.

So we pledge ourselves anew to the challenging task ahead in endeavoring to maintain the highest standards of a responsible community newspaper in the days and years that are to come.

BART BARNES.

MESKILL, NORTON MESSAGES

DEAR MR. BARNES: I congratulate you on attaining a truly significant milestone in the life of The Bristol Press. A record of 100 years of newspaper publishing is one of which you can be truly proud and one which really needs no embellishment.

I think most people would agree that no part of a community is more closely scrutinized than its hometown newspaper. The fact that The Bristol Press has survived 100 years of such scrutiny is ample evidence of the high standards of quality it has maintained.

In its first 100 years, The Bristol Press has chronicled truly staggering changes in the American scene for the benefit of its readers. Its own field, communications, has been changed perhaps as much as any area of endeavor.

I am sure, however, that The Bristol Press can look forward to a future which promises even further changes in communications, secure in the belief that its standards, honesty, decency and fairness are enduring ones, indeed, and standards which will always be valued by the readers of hometown newspapers.

Sincerely,

THOMAS MESKILL,
Governor.

GENTLEMEN: As the Mayor of the City of Bristol, in which your newspaper was born 100 years ago and grew to be our local area's chief source of news and information today, it is my sincere pleasure and great honor to congratulate you on behalf of a grateful citizenry on this occasion of your centennial celebration.

The importance of a good newspaper to a community is hard to measure in words. Many people are dependent upon it for their very existence to know what is happening in the world around them, what is on sale today, what the weather may be, or what Peanuts is going to do next. If it serves nothing more than to give a tired father some moments of relaxation and interest after a tough day at work, its value is infinite.

For 100 years your company has operated its newspaper in the best interests of the citizens of Bristol and in true Yankee tradition. They have kept us informed and given us good advice. They have operated from right in the heart of the community, with the community at heart.

To the present publisher, Mr. E. Bartlett Barnes, and to his entire staff of workers at the Bristol Press, myself and the citizens of Bristol extend to you our heartiest congratulations for a job well done. May your newspaper continue to grow and prosper for another 100 years, serving a growing, prospering, Bristol along with it.

Sincerely,

J. HARWOOD NORTON, JR.,
Mayor.

CENTENNIAL CONGRATULATIONS

DEAR MR. BARNES: It has been said that a free press is not a privilege but a basic necessity of a great society. The publishing of a newspaper carries with it responsibility to report honestly and completely the day's events in a democratic society, and to comment in the evaluation of these events.

The Bristol Press which now celebrates one hundred years of publication, has chronicled the story of a people and the events which shaped the life of this community for the past century. Indeed, the Press family has gone beyond the tasks reporting news and has made distinctive and dedicated contributions to the development of the city of Bristol.

By combining the highest standard of journalism with compassionate concern for the people it serves, this outstanding daily newspaper has earned the admiration and respect of all who read its pages. The next 100 years in Bristol will certainly witness new initiatives and new responsibilities in community services by the Bristol Press.

It is my great pleasure during this anniversary celebration to salute the many achievements of the Press and wish bright years of community leadership in a new century of service.

Cordially,

ELLA T. GRASSO,
Member of Congress.

DEAR BART: Learning that the Bristol Press is celebrating its centennial anniversary this year, I was surprised. So integral a part of Bristol is The Press, I had assumed it went back in time further than 100 years. Frankly, it is difficult to imagine a Bristol without The Press or even a Connecticut without your fine newspaper.

The close association of the newspaper with the community it serves is an important tradition in America. It is a tradition we must preserve. A responsible local newspaper

serves as a forum for its readers, a place where issues of public concern are discussed and debated. In turn, the newspaper itself can provide guidance as the community seeks to solve its own problems and forge its own future.

For Bristol—for 100 years—the Press has been both debating platform and reporter of news and comment. A century of objective, comprehensive reporting, combined with an uncommon spirit of public service, has earned for the Press a richly deserved reputation for accurate, honest and responsible journalism. Congratulations on a century of good work. May the Bristol Press enjoy many more centennial anniversaries.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
U.S. Senator.

DEAR MR. BARNES: For the past one hundred years The Bristol Press has served its readers, community and state with honor and distinction.

Its fairness and truth in its news coverage and editorial comments made it a beacon among its news media and is a credit to the journalistic profession.

As you enter your second hundred years, I wish you and your fine staff of The Bristol Press continued success.

Sincerely,

LOWELL P. WEICKER, Jr.,
United States Senator.

DEAR BART: Congratulations to you and your associates as you celebrate 100 years of publication of The Bristol Press.

The Bristol Press has been a valued member of The Associated Press for more than half of that century of publication, joining the news cooperative in 1916. We look forward to many more years of this mutually beneficial association.

The leadership exerted by The Bristol Press in the Connecticut Valley and in all of Connecticut is in the time-honored tradition of progressive journalism.

Best wishes as you begin the next 100 years of publication.

Sincerely,

WES GALLAGHER,
General Manager.

DEAR MR. BARNES: The officers and 3,000 member companies of the Connecticut Business and Industry Association join me in sending our warmest good wishes to you and your staff as the Bristol Press celebrates its 100th birthday.

The first century of your paper's existence has been marked by an outstanding record of service to Bristol and its neighboring communities. I am sure that under your vigorous and progressive leadership the Press will continue this record of excellence in behalf of your community and the state at large.

The priceless traditions of a free and enlightened press have been upheld with proud integrity for 100 years by the Press and by the Barnes family and it is indeed heartwarming to know that people like yourself and your staff are maintaining those traditions with such zeal.

During the past 100 years the Press has shared with Bristol the twists and turns of prosperity and adversity alike and it has provided the community dispassionate and thoughtful leadership. I am certain that this magnificent record of service will continue and that 100 years from now the Press will still be contributing its vital support to the community.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR L. WOODS,
President,
Conn. Business & Industry Assoc.

DOWNTOWN WITH LOU BACHMAN

Downtown had a modest role in getting out this mammoth 100th anniversary issue of The Press and thus is reasonably well informed about the months, actually years, of planning, waiting, editing and composing that went into it. The talents and energies of many people are required for such an undertaking. The success of this edition is due to their collective abilities and dedication.

When we started out on this project, it was with the idea that it would include 10 12-page anniversary sections plus a regular edition of 20 pages. What you see today is 12 anniversary sections plus the regular run for 168 pages in all. If this writer had known a year ago, that we would be going that big, he would have fallen off the wagon right then.

Most of the people who had a hand in this production are generally recognized. Some are not, at least not adequately. In particular, the real "unsung heroes" were the guys out back, the mechanical gang who did an incredible job of discharging the herculean task assigned to them—getting the big paper out with a minimum of error and confusion and ahead of schedule! I still can't believe it. All those sections and all those pages added up to a tremendous potential for mistakes. But, there are few mistakes in the whole edition despite its size. There are days when Downtown finds more errors on the sports pages alone of my morning newspaper than you will find in this entire Bristol Press opus of Oct. 12, 1971.

Another angle, these capable boys and girls for many weeks had to put up with the pesty presence of old Downtown, looking over their shoulders and frequently offering advice they obviously did not need. And during that time, not one of them offered to take a swing at me. God bless all of them and may the rest of their days at The Press be happy exclamation points!!!

* * *

"Downtown" is 30 years and five months old—the column, that is, not I. It was started in May of 1941 shortly after I joined The Press following three years with The Waterbury Republican. At the time I was 26 years old, not very bright and I drank. I am now 57 years old, not very bright and, alas, I do not drink.

I quickly learned that most Press people were terribly afraid of The Boss, Publisher Arthur S. Barnes. Being young and brash, I was not and immediately took the attitude that like myself he had to put his pants on one leg at a time. But, I was polite and deferential because I was not entirely stupid even though I may have looked so. I wasn't with The Press a month when he chewed me out unmercifully in front of the whole news staff. I took it but when he left I followed him. I was scared but I told him that I respected his right to dress me down any time he felt like but if he did it center stage again I was leaving. From that day we never had a sharp difference of opinion again. In fact, I came to have a great affection for him and when he died on Christmas night of 1956 I felt that I had lost a wonderful friend.

There were times during those years that I was the reluctant buffer between the Boss and his two sons, Cluie and Bart, who took over as co-publishers upon his death. This was not an easy role but I got away with it by skillful use of mendacity, guile and stupidity as the occasion demanded. For instance, when "cheesecake" pictures appeared in The Press, I disclaimed involvement without actually putting the blame on the culprit, Cluie. Arthur Barnes belonged to the school that insisted the female form should be fully covered at all times even when she was taking a bath.

The present publisher, Bart Barnes, and I get along because when one disagrees with the other, he says so and we talk things out. He wins when he wants to win. I win when he doesn't want to win. A simple but effective arrangement.

I have met some great people in this business over these many years and, begging your pardon, I am going to comment on just a few of them: The most dedicated newspaper person I have ever known and the most loyal friend I have had at The Press is Ray Flynn, our mechanical superintendent, who is now making a good recovery from serious illness. During my time, nobody, and that includes management, has worked harder to make The Bristol Press a better newspaper . . . The best reporter Bristol ever had is Del Baker, also making a comeback after illness. There never was a story that Del could not dig out once he set his mind to it. I have admired him as a competitor and have loved him as a buddy in a friendship that dates back to 1928 when we sat in adjoining home room seats as BHS freshmen . . . The most prolific writer of my day was and is Bill Garrett, who was the No. 1 contributor to this anniversary issue. I am also grateful to Bill for being a wholesome influence on me years ago when I was a young, irresponsible reporter . . . The best writer in my memory is a current Press staffer—Dick Warner. Dick types cool with the most forceful collection of verbs I have ever read . . . The best news source I ever had: Freddie Beach, who once walked out of a meeting with then Governor Baldwin to respond to Downtown's plea for help in coming up with a Page 1 yarn for that day's issue . . . My favorite mayor: Need anybody ask? I still find myself grabbing the phone occasionally to call Jim Casey and then I bite down the lump when reality hits me . . . Actually, I have had good relations with all mayors from Dutton to Stretch although sometimes the incumbent bugs me when I can't reach him or can't budge him to move my way on an issue. But he's so honest that every night before he goes home he frisks himself to make sure that he isn't carrying away City Hall pencils.

All in all these thirty years plus have been happy ones even though there were moments the other way. I have been physically attacked and once I was threatened at gunpoint. I went through a harrowing month when a mysterious fiend called on the phone 13 times to threaten the lives of my kids . . . I suffered through the Jackie Fund campaigns when The Press raised the money to help one child cancer victim after another to die a little more easily. I knew most of these kids and when the end came in each case, it was like losing family.

But the good part of it all far outweighs the bad. I owe a lot to many people, a lot of them right here at The Press. There has also been a good wife, my McGoofty, who was 100 per cent loyal even when I was wrong and many's the time I was wrong. It was she who passed along that same loyalty to our two fine kids.

This loyalty now results in this situation: My family is dead set against Frank Longo because he once called Downtown "deceitful" in a communication to The Press.

But, I remind my family, and anybody else interested for that matter, that Frank Longo's letter did appear in The Press and that I was the guy who saw to it that it was published.

That's what freedom of the press is all about, Spiro Agnew notwithstanding. I certainly am no Voltaire but as long as I have a say about what appears in this paper, Frank Longo, or anybody else, will be given the opportunity to see his views in print no matter how much I may disagree with them. The day my attitude changes in this regard will be the day for me to quit!

GRABOWSKI CITY'S ONE CONGRESSMAN

(By Dick Warner)

In June of 1962 Bernard Francis Grabowski returned early from a Canadian vacation and decided to spend Saturday afternoon as a visitor to the State Democratic Convention in

Hartford. By the end of the day he was his party's candidate for Congressman-At-Large.

He went on to defeat John Lupton by more than 50,000 votes in November to become the only Bristol resident to serve in Congress.

Before the historic lightning struck at the stormy 1962 convention, Grabowski had been leading a quiet life of public service in Bristol.

EARLY CAREER

Grabowski was born in New Haven but his family moved to Bristol when he was three months old and he has lived here ever since. He was educated in Bristol schools and earned his law degree at the University of Connecticut.

In 1953 he was elected to the City Council and after serving one term was named a judge of the municipal court system, a position he held for five years.

During this period, at the urging of the Chamber of Commerce, he also accepted the position of redevelopment coordinator for the city and served in this capacity from 1957 through 1959.

In 1960, Grabowski was named chief prosecutor for the then new Circuit Court 17. He was serving in this post when he made the Saturday trip to the Hartford convention that changed his life.

Party leaders were having problems with Congressman Frank Kowalski and there was strong opposition to his nomination. The convention was delayed for several hours while the leadership tried to solve the internal split that threatened to wreck the convention.

CASEY MOVES

The late Mayor James P. Casey went to State Chairman John Bailey and Gov. Abraham Ribicoff and offered Grabowski's name as an alternative to Kowalski. He pointed out that Grabowski, a Catholic of Polish ancestry, met the ethnic and religious balance the leadership was seeking. The convention was delayed another hour or more while the word went out that Grabowski was their choice. Grabowski returned home that night the endorsed candidate for the Democratic nomination.

The Democrats swept the state in the November election and Grabowski was off to serve in the 88th Congress under President John F. Kennedy.

Grabowski's voting record followed the lead of the Kennedy Administration but the freshman congressman from Bristol gained recognition for his part in several pieces of progressive legislation. In 1963 he introduced a bill to require cigarette packages to carry a warning that cigarette smoking may be hazardous to health. This bill, however, had to wait several more years before being enacted.

He also sponsored water pollution control legislation and a free silver bill. He gained wide attention with several speeches critical of French President Charles deGaulle for his failure to sign the Atomic Test Ban Treaty.

During his first term Grabowski also cosponsored legislation which would have required firms doing work under war contracts with the federal government to prepare and submit plans for eventual conversion to peacetime production in order to qualify for those contracts. The legislation was never enacted.

1964 CAMPAIGN

In 1964 a special session of the state legislature abolished the office of Congressman-At-Large and replaced it with the new Sixth Congressional District, Grabowski announced for the new seat on April 30.

Grabowski was nominated for election to the Sixth District seat by Casey and received 107 of the 192 votes, defeating Atty. Robert P. Burns of Torrington. Melvin Hathaway of Watertown, and First Selectman Arthur Powers of Berlin for the nomination. His Republican opponent in the election was present Governor Thomas J. Meskill who had served as mayor of New Britain.

During the 1964 campaign Meskill campaigned against Grabowski's party line voting record, calling him a "rubber stamp" for the administration in Washington. Grabowski largely ignored Meskill and directed his campaign against the GOP presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

Grabowski's strategy paid off. President Lyndon B. Johnson carried all but 11 of the 169 Connecticut towns and Grabowski defeated Meskill by 115,802 to 81,105.

During his second term in Congress, Grabowski was a cosponsor of Medicare legislation and actively worked for the bills comprising President Johnson's "Great Society," program. During this period Grabowski feels he was valuable to Bristol in getting the new City Hall, Central Fire Headquarters, and Post Office included in redevelopment funding and in laying the groundwork for federal assistance for expansion of Bristol Hospital.

WAR POSITION

Throughout his two terms in Congress, Grabowski consistently supported the policies of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. But in October, 1965, Grabowski briefly broke with Johnson on the Vietnam War and urged a re-evaluation of American policy and a return to an advisory role for American forces in Vietnam. The split was a mild one, however and in later speeches he generally backed Johnson's policies on the war.

Grabowski's independence also came to public attention when he became the only New England Congressman to vote against a proposed $227 million federal hydroelectric power project in Maine known as the Dickey-Lincoln project. Grabowski stood by his conviction that the power plant should be privately constructed.

In 1966, Grabowski was again nominated and again his opponent was Meskill. But this time there was a third candidate in the race, Stephen Minot, a Trinity College professor who ran on the American Independent Movement ticket as a peace candidate.

While Grabowski was in Washington from 1964 to 1966, Meskill had been building alliances within the Sixth District. This, combined with the beginning of dissatisfaction with the Vietnam War policy and Minot's candidacy was to prove fatal to Grabowski's third term bid.

Gov. John N. Dempsey defeated Republican gubernatorial candidate E. Clayton Gengras by 114,000 votes, but Grabowski lost to Meskill by a vote of 81,973 to 79,458 with Minot picking up a crucial 5,560 votes.

Since 1966, Grabowski has been practicing law privately with the firm of Hanrahan, Grabowski, and Hayes. But he is still active, mostly behind the scenes, in Democratic politics and says he intends to remain active.

Grabowski, now 48, is still young enough and energetic enough to be ready if lightning should strike a second time.

Until then, he and his wife, the former Anne Gorski, are living as private citizens at 57 George St. They have two daughters, Carol Anne and Diane.

ELI TERRY'S SON MADE SEWING SILK

James Terry, son of Eli Jr., Terryville founder, began making sewing silk just 30 years before Bristol saw its first copy of The Press. He wound and twisted fiber with power equipment.

Young Terry bought the lock business of Lewis, McKee and Company, which eventually became the Eagle Lock Company. He didn't leave the company's presidency until just five years before The Press was established.

JOHN F. WADE WAS FIRST BRISTOL MAYOR

(By Rolfe E. Rowe)

John Franklin Wade was born on June 29, 1860 at Tallokas, Brooks County, Georgia. His early life was spent on a cotton farm, and he attended schools of the village.

In his twenty-first year, not being satisfied with the farm, he went to Florida to search for other employment, and for a time worked in the orange groves. In October, 1881, he entered the employ of the S. B. Hubbard Co. of Jacksonville, Florida, a large wholesale and retail hardware concern.

In February, 1884, he traveled to Texas, finally being located in Dallas. Unable to find employment there in the hardware business, he engaged in farming during the coming summer. He returned to Jacksonville where he again entered the employ of the S. B. Hubbard Co.

After a few months he accepted an offer with the Drew Hardware Co. in that city, where he remained until Oct., 1885, when he went with the Rockwell and Kinnie Co. in the same line.

FRIEND OF ROCKWELL

It was Bristol's famous Albert F. Rockwell and his brother, Edward D. Rockwell who were then with this business. Young Wade remained with this business until the business closed in Feb. of 1888.

It was in Jacksonville that Albert F. Rockwell evolved a house bell of a unique design, which was powered by a spring similar to those in the key-wound clocks, the kind primarily made in those days. The bell consisted a winding mechanism, and was activated by a push button. Rockwell had previously had it patented. He brought the pattern for this bell to Bristol in 1888. He may have been influenced in coming to Bristol because of the manufacture here of clock main springs.

The business started in a room sixty feet square in the end of the old H. C. Thompson clock factory on Federal Street (across the street from where Petit's store is now located). Adapting the business to bicycle bells as well as house bells, the business rapidly flourished and expanded and soon moved into the old Jones Factory on North Main Street. (Just north of where the New Departure plant is still standing.)

The bell which Rockwell started to manufacture was a "new departure" from any previous type of bell and it hereby made easy the name of the industry which had begun.

BRISTOL IN 1889

When Wade started with Rockwell in the bell manufacturing business, he worked as an ordinary laborer, taking in work that came in hand and with no experience in the manufacturing business.

As the business grew, Wade continued to grow in wisdom and experience and served as plant manager until 1904. In 1896 the name of the company was changed to the New Departure Manufacturing Company.

After being a part of the United Motors for a time, on January 1, 1934 the concern became the New Departure Division of the General Motors Corporation.

It was in 1904 that a German law was passed which gave notice that Germany would protect no foreign patents unless the goods were manufactured in Germany. This caused the company to establish a plant in that country. Wade was sent to Germany to take charge of the manufacturing of New Departure products in a plant at Weissener, a suburb of Berlin. He remained there until January of 1910, when he returned to Bristol and was again superintendent until October, 1915. At that time he became works manager of the Bristol Brass Corp., a position he held until his retirement.

Also, immediately after coming to Bristol, Wade started taking an active interest in public affairs.

He was first elected a member of the Board of Burgesses of the old Borough government in 1899.

In 1901, 1902, 1903, and 1904, he was elected warden of the Borough of Bristol. His 1904 term was interrupted by his assignment to Germany for the New Departure.

The office of Warden was to the Borough government what the office of Mayor is to the City government.

FIRST MAYOR

After his return from Germany in 1910, he was again elected Warden at the election for Borough officers in May of that year. He held this office until November of 1911 when the old Town and Borough governments were merged under the new City government and John Wade became the first Mayor of Bristol.

It was in the early nineteen hundreds, when the old Town of Bristol began to expand rapidly, that a reform movement in local politics was started. Changes were necessary if the system of the old town meetings was to be continued. Furthermore, the old Town Hall on lower Main Street was too small to accommodate the electors when they were called out on important issues. Many felt that a reform in the method of local government was in order and that it was time for Bristol to become a City.

THREE KEY ISSUES

Three big issues, advocated by the Socialists of that day, were to be included in a proposed new charter, viz., the Initiative, the Referendum, and the Recall. Bristol became embroiled in a real political campaign on a proposed new City Charter such as the city had not seen before and has seldom seen since.

SPECIAL TOWN MEETINGS

As a result of this campaign, a special town meeting was called on the matter of a proposed new charter and this meeting was held at the old Town Hall on lower Main Street early in 1910. At that meeting a committee was formed to draft a proposed City Charter along the lines of suggestions which had been made. It is interesting to note that the first item of business at this important meeting was to elect Arthur S. Barnes, publisher of The Bristol Press, as moderator to preside. The voters evidently felt that he could govern the meeting with fairness and good judgment.

At another special town meeting duly called and held on Dec. 9, 1910, with Thomas A. Tracy, city editor of The Bristol Press, as moderator, the committee previously appointed to prepare a proposed charter, submitted such a document on which they had worked diligently and well.

The meeting voted to submit this proposed charter to the state legislature at its January session in 1911. After due process and a hearing at which the eloquent George Hull spoke in favor, the legislature adopted the Charter, which merged the old borough government into city form of government, as a Special Act to become effective with a city election to be held on the first Monday of October next.

EXCITING ELECTION

The first election of the City of Bristol was a real humdinger which has not yet been forgotten to this day by some of the senior citizens. In accordance with the provisions of the new City Charter, a nonpartisan primary selection was held, with four candidates on the ballot for the mayorality. This primary reduced the number of the mayorality candidates to two for the final city election in October viz, John F. Wade and George W. Hull. A month's campaign between these two contenders rivaled in intensity anything which had been seen in Bristol up to that time. In the results of the election, the moderator declared that Wade had been elected by the scant majority of ten votes. Charges of election irregularities and even dishonesty and fraud were rampant regarding the counting of the old fashioned paper ballots which were in use at that time.

HIS FIRST MESSAGE

In Mayor Wade's first message to members of the City Council, he referred to the completing of the transition from the dual form of borough and town government to the more compact and flexible form of city government. He cited the principal reasons for adopting the new City Charter were to bring about eliminations of the needless expense resultant from the existence of two separate governments in charge of similar matters within the same geographical limits. He stressed the necessity of giving the utmost in service and efficiency at the least expense. "I believe," he said, "that an efficient government may be had and enjoyed at a reasonable expense. I believe we have a set of officials as we start this first year as the City of Bristol who will take pride in their part of administering this city with that idea in mind."

There were many other suggestions, including the construction of a bridge over the tracks at the Peacable Street (now Burlington Avenue) grade crossing, and additional protection at the Farmington Avenue-Maple Street, and the Center and the Federal Street crossings.

VOTING MACHINES USED

At the second city election on October 6, 1913, voting machines were used for the first time. Bristol was one of the first in the state and one of the few places in the country to adopt the use of voting machines instead of the old Australian ballot.

It was at this election that Wade was opposed by James C. Cray, a virile and energetic news reporter. Wade went down to defeat by the slim margin of 268 votes. George W. Hull, whom Wade had defeated for the mayoralty two years previously, was elected a councilman.

It was not until 1921 when Wade, after Joseph F. Dutton had served as mayor for three terms and, at the insistence of his many friends and supporters, decided to become once more a candidate for mayor. Mr. Dutton had declined reelection and James L. Murray, a Main Street news store owner, became his opponent. Mr. Wade easily won the election by a majority of 1200 votes.

The following city election in 1923 was another close one. Wade defeated Thomas A. Tracy of The Bristol Press, by a scant margin of less than 100 votes.

At the election in 1925, Wade has as his opponent, John Donnelly, a well-known popular citizen who had made a record for himself with his outstanding legislation as a member of the City Council. However, Wade had entrenched himself well and defeated the popular Donnelly by a majority of 603 votes to the surprise of many.

A very unique and unusual thing happened in Bristol politics in 1927. No one came forward to oppose Mayor Wade for reelection. As a result he was the only candidate on the ballot for the office of Mayor at the election on October 3, 1927, and he was unanimously reelected for a fifth term.

DIED IN 1927

On Nov. 7, 1927, about a month before he was to take office for his fifth term, Mayor Wade died suddenly at his home on Bellevue Avenue following a heart attack the preceding day. He was 67 years old. His death came as a shock to the city. Flags were placed at half mast throughout the city and a general period of mourning was observed. More than a thousand persons attended his funeral at the Prospect Methodist Church. Those attending included delegations from all walks of life in the city. City officials served as honorary bearers and city workers attended in a body as well as delegations from his business associates. The Rev. L. H. Dorchester, pastor of the church and the first president of the Bristol Hospital, as well as a personal friend of Mayor Wade, officiated, and gave the eulogy. Burial was in West Cemetery, following a committal service by Franklin Lodge of Masons.

At the Council meeting on Nov. 15, 1927, suitable resolutions on the death of Mayor Wade were adopted and W. Raymond Crumb was elected Mayor to fill the vacancy in accordance with charter provisions for the short remainder of Wade's fourth term.

VERY ACTIVE

In his business life, Wade was at one time a director of the Bristol Brass Corp. and of the Bryce Mfg. Co. He was also a director of the Bristol Trust Co., located where the Bristol Savings Bank building now stands, and which was later merged with the Bristol Bank and Trust Co., now a part of the United Bank and Trust Co.

His wife, Mrs. Virginia Edmonson Wade, outlived him. She died on March 21, 1962. A son, Edmund Wade of Harwinton, died about five years ago. A daughter, Virginia, who married William I. Treadway, now resides at 352 Brewster Rd.

GOLD STAR WIDOW SOLE LADY SOLON

Helen Wozenski Zbikowski Nawrocki won a unique place in Bristol history when she was elected to the state legislature in November of 1942. She was the first—and remains the only—woman ever to represent this city in the General Assembly.

Mrs. Nawrocki became a representative in the midst of tragic circumstances. Earlier that year her husband, Capt. Edmund (Eddie) P. Zbikowski ("Spee-koff-skee", as he used to tell his science classes) had become the first Bristol soldier to lose his life in World War II.

News of the death of the revered and respected high school teacher reached Bristol on April 7. He had succumbed April 2 due to wounds received March 24 in the battle for the Bataan Peninsula in the Philippines. That first and most shattering American defeat in the Pacific hit home with special force and sorrow for Mrs. Zbikowski and everyone who had known her husband.

CONTINUED ALONE

A gallant soldier, he had written his wife, "It's an honor to be the only Bristol boy right in the thick of it." His wife just as gallantly undertook to raise their 22-month-old daughter and continue her life alone.

That fall she was asked to seek the Democratic nomination for representative. She accepted and began the campaign that ended on Nov. 3 with her election.

The Press of that day records how "Democratic candidates were seen in smiling groups around the polling places . . . confidently listening to the heavy downfall of rain outside—sure sign of a day for the donkey."

It was hardly that. The Republicans swept the state and the nation. Edward Pierce and Mrs. Zbikowski, however, polled 4,543 votes, the largest total, to become Bristol's legislators. Helen was re-elected for another term two years later.

Following this term, she remarried and left Bristol for the west, gone but not forgotten. She now lives in Wenatchee, Wash. Her response to a letter from The Press will be of interest, we feel sure, to those in town who knew her. It runs as follows:

"And guess where I was when your letter of June 30 reached me! In top of a tree—really! I was perched in a Bing Cherry tree (in competition with the robins! from which I had picked numerous gallons of fruit, in hot sun—getting fruit and a tan at same time!

"Imagine! How heart-warming to be remembered after 25 years' absence from my home town of Bristol!

"And how have I been since leaving Bristol? Hmmm! Since being in the west, it just seemed a natural path for me to continue interest in the political scene; participating on

various community and church-oriented boards—and from dabbling in the arts to mopping the brow of a woman in labor. Listening. Helping to feed laborers in migrant centers who come to work in our valley orchards in this Apple Capital, has been a touching experience and a rewarding human involvement. PEOPLE—working on number of boards (YMCA, YWCA, United Fund, Chamber of Commerce teaching programs, etc.) to serving sandwiches and coffee to Mexican migrants, Blacks, Whites. Generally, I believe my niche has been found in the most humble of service to others. Do-Gooder, eh! Anyway, no need for a tranquilizer at end of a day!

"In view of shortness of time and fact that I'll be leaving shortly for Seattle for number of days, there'll not be time for brand new picture. Enclosed (neither old nor new) was used in my last campaign when I ran for office of mayor-City of Wenatchee!

"With five of us in the running for the office—I was the lone woman and won first place in primaries! So, then, 'Ho, Ho!" the menfolk became worried and began a fresh campaign—"You don't really want a WOMAN for Mayor, do you"? and on that point, I lost!

"So, you see how much more progressive and Lib-minded Bristol was 25–30 years ago than the west! Good old Bristol, can you blame me for saying it was great to me! I am to this day particularly grateful to those wonderful people of Bristol for their constructive solicitude of me when I needed help to consume a lonely void which has since served to pave my way of life.

"Again, many thanks for your letter and thought of me after all this time. Trust this trivia may contain some pertinent fact you are searching for.

"Tell Bart and Lou I hug them both in my heart!

"And thank you for writing me as you did!

Sincerely,

HELEN NAWROCKI (Mrs. W. E.).

MAYOR SIX TERMS, JAMES P. CASEY LAUNCHED POLITICAL LIFE AT AGE OF 23

(By Lou Bachman)

Jim Casey was elected to Bristol's City Council when he was only 23 and when he died 24 years later near the end of his sixth term as mayor he had compiled a record of political accomplishments that will probably never be surpassed.

His death on July 21, 1965 came just a day after he had been nominated by the Democraftic Town Committee to run for a seventh term as mayor.

Councilman at 23, legislator at 26, elected mayor at 29, this most astute of all Bristol politicians had many bright moments during his exciting 24 years in public life. It is likely that there would have been many more had not the brave heart, which had been a constant threat to his health throughout his adult life, failed him with such shattering suddeness on that fateful July day six years ago.

He had his unhappy times, too, most of which he weathered with a political stoicism characteristic of him. There were others that wounded him deeply and left scars he carried with him into death.

Many people disagreed with him for personal or political reasons. A few disliked him. Nobody hated him. And hundreds loved him, some with an ardor bordering on sheer fanaticism. The writer for one wept uncontrollably when hearing of his passing and was in shock for days afterward.

Be all that it may, he was the only one of his kind in Bristol's history.

BORN HERE IN 1917

It all began on Oct. 25, 1917 when James Patrick Casey was born in the then and still Casey homestead at 123 North Street to Daniel and Annie (Burzler) Casey. He was the fourth of the seven Casey children.

Jim had a happy childhood. His backyard was the mecca for a score of North Side kids and his mother was the second Mom to all of them. A gracious, fun-loving woman she fed the friends of the Casey kids, allowed them the run of her home, nursed their wounds after the inevitable fist fights and never fretted as a generation of small fry ran her lawn into a state of non-existence.

Years later, when Jim Casey had four childres of his own he once remarked in an attitude he surely inherited from his mother, "Show me a home with a beautiful, unmarked green lawn and I'll show you a house full of unhappy kids."

Casey, never personally a zealot in the cause for formal education, attended St. Joseph's School and after a couple of years at Bristol High School, chucked the books in favor of employment in his father's fish market. Thus began the close association between father and son that lasted until the former's death in 1960.

FATHER WAS BOSS

The mere fact that Jim was mayor never moved the father in regarding that was sufficient excuse for his young associate to neglect the fish market. Friends still fondly recall the night in 1947 when the younger Casey had just been elected mayor for the first time. A swinging celebration was in progress in the jammed North Street home. The hour was approaching midnight when old Dan with alarm clock ostentiously in hand said to the happy new "first citizen" of Bristol:

"Better start thinking of bed, Jim. You have to; be up at four to cut fish."

Jim voiced a good—natured protest but it was noticeable that he soon went about the business of ushering out the merrymakers in good time. Jim Casey may have been the man to run an entire city but his father ran the fish market.

Jim Casey had decided a career in politics was his cup of tea when still in his teens. He had fun—softball, pingpong, dates, dances and the rest—but his driving interest was municipal government. Along about the time he was 18 he began attending City Council and other public board meetings.

He also was quietly building up a personal political organization composed of lads his own age, all of them close friends. Headquarters was the Casey barn and here it was that local affairs of the day were discussed with a seriousness not usually expected of young males. The writer recalls visiting the barn as a young reporter to give the group an informal dissertation on Bristol's politics. It was obvious even in those early days that Jim Casey's political career was aborning.

COUNCILMAN IN 1941

Opportunity knocked in March of 1941. Casey's home Third District was without a councilman when the holder of the office, Charlie Sakowski, was called to active Army duty. His successor was to be named in a Third District Democratic caucus. The district organization was controlled by Bristol's then mayor, the redoubtable Jim Jennings. Two candiates were acceptable to Jennings and it was expected that this pair would fight it out. A third candidate, Jim Casey, was not even mentioned in the pre-caucus speculation.

As a result, it was a surprised group of Democrats who saw Casey march into the caucus with a platoon of his supporters and succeed in having his name placed in nomination. After several ballots. Third Ward had a new councilman in the person of James Patrick Casey. He was on his way!

Next day, pandemonium reigned at the fish market as several local and visiting news photographers came to "shoot" the smiling young victor. Of course, all of them wanted him to pose while cutting fish. And he did, too.

YOUNGEST IN NATION

The newspapers reported at the time that Casey at 23 was the youngest member of any municipal governing body in the nation.

Thus was launched a career that was to have many ups and downs with the ups usually prevailing.

In October of 1941, he was elected to a full term as councilman in an election in which Mayor Jennings lost the mayorality to Dan Davis.

Two years later, Casey tasted defeat for the first time when Mayor Davis was reelected in a landslide over the Democratic standard-bearer, Thomas P. O'Brien. The latter had won his party's nomination in a caucus battle with Jim Jennings. Casey had remained neutral in this and that cost him in the Third Ward on Election Day, Jennings still being a potent force in that district.

LEGISLATOR AT 25

In 1944, Casey went out for bigger game and was elected to the General Assembly. He led the entire Democratic ticket in the voting, even outpolling the party head man, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Jim was then 26 years old.

Casey had his first shot at a mayoral nomination in 1945 but lost in caucus to Councilman Frank Kirchgessner, who in turn was defeated by Republican Davis in the election proper.

By 1946, Casey was in the process of going all out in the building of his career. He won reelection to the legislature that year but his sights were trained on the mayorality. Returning veterans by the score lined up under his banner. Even so, Dan Davis was a three-time winner and generally regarded as unbeatable. It seems to be a situation in which the only person certain that Jim Casey would win was Jim Casey.

On the Saturday night before election in the writer's home, Casey quietly predicted that he would carry all six districts in the election on the following Monday. He did just that. His margin over Davis was 2,905 votes, his total being 7,007 to Dan's 4,102. Casey had captured 63.6 per cent of the total vote in a remarkable showing. Jim was three weeks short of his 30th birthday.

Casey had a good first term and it was at first expected that the Republicans would run the traditional "sacrificial lamb" against him in 1949. However, Casey had several brushes with the Finance Board and many felt that the board's then first and only chairman, Charles R. Anderson, could take the young mayor's measure at the polls.

Anderson had been a high ranking executive with General Motors' local New Departure plant here for many years. Furthermore, back in the days of nonpartisan city government he had been elected to several terms on the City Council by large margins.

Anderson's campaign strategists had decided that all-out attacks on the caliber of Casey appointments to city boards and commissions would help their man. Casey countered with a full page ad in The Bristol Press carrying names and pictures of all his appointees. Many of them were prominent Republicans and that was just about the end of the campaign. Final result: Casey 8,317, Anderson 5,598.

A LOSER IN 1951

The following two years were rough ones for Mayor Casey. After two straight wins, his machine was beginning to show signs of rust. Several of his key people were resting on their oars and he compounded the problem when he refused to reappoint long time tax collector, Francis B. Riley. Other mayors had toyed with the idea of sacking Riley. Casey did it. At the same time, rumors were flying that Casey would dump veteran Public Works Supt. Daniel J. Donovan.

As a consequence, an independent ticket with Donovan as the candidate for mayor was established. Gleeful Republicans endorsed Donovan and insured a Casey defeat. In the Republican-Democrat head to head voting Casey outpolled Donovan 6,759 to 6,197 but

1,573 Independent ballots for the challenger gave him a comfortable victory. The Riley firing was undoubtedly the largest factor in the Casey defeat.

In 1953 Bristol Democrats named Casey as their mayoral nominee for the fourth consecutive time. The Donovan regime had a rather unhappy two years largely due to squabbling between Republican and Independents were convinced that certain members of the GOP would "shaft" Donovan in the election and there is some evidence that there was reason for their fears.

The Casey organization was intact and waged a strong campaign. Jim piled up 8,395 to Donovan's 5,155 on the Republican ticket. Dan picked up 618 more Independents but it was far from enough. Totalwise, Casey was a winner by a handsome 2,622 votes.

SWEETEST WIN

Mayor Casey was later to call this his "sweetest" victory. He reasoned that he had beaten his conqueror in the previous election and the big margin of triumph had vindicated him of the charges that theoretically had led to his defeat in 1951.

Arithmetically, the biggest Casey success came two years later. The August 1955 Flood had devastated the city and the Mayor had been a heroic figure during its worst phases and in the days thereafter. He had exposed himself to personal danger on several occasions during the catastrophe to win grudging admiration even from his severest critics. The Flood in a sense undermined the hopes of Casey's GOP opponent. Councilman Willis Hart. Casey's total was 8,674 to only 3,977 for Hart. An earlier Democratic aspirant, Tom O'Brien, was a distant third with 1,632 votes on the Taxpayers ticket.

Casey's fourth term was marred by a city scandal over which he had no control but for which he was blamed in some quarters. As a result he knew he might be in for Election Day trouble. However, one move saved him. He came out in favor of a new high school on King Street (now Bristol Eastern). This question was on the voting machines in the election and carried overwhelmingly. His Republican opponent. Edwin P. Gustafson, declined to take a stand on the issue.

Because of Gustafson's intransigence and because they approved Casey's position on the high school issue, many Republicans voted for Casey in 1957. On election eve, Casey told the writer that he expected to get 7,000 votes next day with 5,000 for Gustafson and 3,000 for the Independent candidate, former State Rep. Mike McLaughlin.

The actual results: Casey 7,161, Gustafson 5,692, McLaughlin 1,978.

Later Casey said, "I didn't win that election. Eddie Gustafson blew it."

A TIRED MAYOR

During the next two years, time and failing health took its toll and the mayor seemed to be losing the "old pepper." (his phrase) that had characterized his earlier years in City Hall. Flashes of the old brilliance were occasionally in evidence but more often he seemed to be merely going through the motions.

In 1959, Casey's first cousin but a long time political foe, Walter Murphy Jr., switched to the Republican Party and was given the party's mayoral nomination. Murphy was also endorsed by the Independents. Walter picked up 7,661 GOP and 890 Independent votes, far more than enough to top the Casey total of 6,725. A comeback in hopes that he might repeat his 1953 return to power. He nearly pulled it off, too, losing to Murphy by only 233 votes. That was the election in which the late Emma Maynard lost by a single vote to Republican Mario Manna in the city treasurer contest. Casey felt badly about his own defeat by a narrow margin but worse over what had happened to his good friend, Mrs. Maynard.

HE CAME BACK IN 1965

Following Murphy's win in 1961, the GOP became embroiled in intraparty strife. Haggling over downtown redevelopment as well as political bickering destroyed the unity that had led to the undoing of Jim Casey in two straight elections. Murphy announced that he would not run again but would remain as redevelopment director, a post he had assumed while mayor.

This decision was a blow to Casey who was itching to take on his cousin again. Instead the GOP nominated Col. Ed Wozenski, a World War II hero with little political experience. Councilman Arthur Farrar, an erstwhile Murphy ally, ran on the Independent ticket. The final score was: Casey 6,833, Wozenski 5,460, and Farrar 3,622.

It was to be Casey's last term and last run for political office. In the months ahead, he was ill for long periods on several occasions and had to make the wrenching decisions attendant upon a major scandal in his Police Department. In addition, many exhaustive days and weeks were required of him to win the fight that eventually led to the decision whereby General Motors located its new ND-Hyatt plant here rather than go to another town.

TWENTY RED ROSES

The writer was in telephone contact with the Mayor several times on the afternoon of his death. It was his death. It was his 20th wedding anniversary and he reported that he had dispatched 20 red roses to his beloved Julie. He was very busy in his City Hall office all that afternoon and he was experiencing considerable frustration in getting work done in connection with the new ND plant on Chippens Hill.

He died suddenly at 5:40 p.m. at his home. He was only 47.

A PROUD MAN

Jim Casey was a proud man, proud of his city, his wife and four children, his party, his mother and father, sisters and brothers. And he was most proud in time of personal accomplishment. On the other side of the coin, he detested failure and when he felt that he had had a hand in a failure he brooded over it. At such times he would blame himself, never others.

Similarly, he refused to "hog" credit for achievement when it was not all his. Elsewhere in this edition there is a detailed report by Press Publisher Bart Barnes on the historic events of 1965 leading up to the location of the New Departure plant on Chippens Hill. Although Barnes himself was Casey's alter ego, his strong right arm, in the legislative fight in Hartford and in local negotiations for land needed for the new plant, he gives most of the credit at the local level to Mayor Casey.

However, Jim Casey went to great pains in the days immediately before his death to set the record straight. On several occasions he told this writer, "Without Bart Barnes there would be no New Departure in Bristol."

Casey naturally was proud of his role in the New Departure story because he knew that failure would have resulted in ultimate economic chaos for Bristol.

ORDNANCE PLANT CASE

Similarly, he was proud in the late 1940's of having led the fight to make the old ND Ordnance plant on Emmett Street available for industry. The state had arbitrarily decided to take over the federally owned building as a location for a National Guard supply depot. This would be a tax-free enterprise with few employes. Mayor Casey, the city government, the Chamber of Commerce, local labor unions and veterans groups banded together to battle against the move. After many months, President Harry S. Truman himself made the decision in favor of the city and the Hildreth Press plant eventually located on the premises. The fruits of this victory are readily obvious because Hildreth became a major industrial taxpayer and over the years has had a payroll accommodating 500 or 600 employes.

Casey could boast of other great deeds during his six terms but these two were the standouts because they affected the city's economic life in such a vital way. In each case, however, he knew that others had a hand in the successes achieved and he invariably went out of his way to see to it that such people were recognized.

THE POLICE SCANDAL

The event that caused the greatest personal sorrow for Jim Casey in his public life was the police scandal of 1964. Some 10 officers were involved in charges made to the State Police concerning alleged thefts from stores by police officers while on duty. Casey had to preside at the hearings for the accused men. This was especially difficult for him because several of the officers were close friends. Furthermore, for several months he had to bear in secret the terrible knowledge that the charges had been made until the State Police decided that a full disclosure would be made.

The writer and Mayor Casey attended the third game of the 1964 World Series in New York at the time of the scandal. The news about the charges against Bristol policemen had been carried across the nation on TV and in the public prints. Several times on Fifth Avenue and in Yankee Stadium the mayor was accosted by strangers who had recognized him from having seeing him on television in connection with the police case.

Casey took this hard and sorrowfully commented, "This is a helluva way to be recognized."

RATED A FULL PAGE

The day after Mayor Casey died, The Bristol Press devoted its front page to the news of his passing and to articles about his career. The Press staff felt that he rated this rare coverage.

His body lay in state at City Hall the day before his funeral and thousands passed his bier.

His funeral Mass before a huge crowd was celebrated by his boyhood friend, Father Ed Farrell M.S. of the LaSalette Order.

Father Farrell first decided to deliver a eulogy during the Mass and then changed his mind. He explained:

"I just would not have been able to control my own emotions."

Jim Casey affected many people that way!

PEACEABLE STREET TOOK NEW NAME

Coghill and Goose Corner, Peaceable Street and Shum's Path, Water Street and Bury-Ground Road—a hundred years ago any Bristolite could have given directions to these places.

The sites are still there: only the names have changed, through circumstances and passage of time.

Coghill, as some might still remember, referred to the present Wolcott Street. And Goose Corner? Where else but the corner of Wolcott and South Streets? Speculation as to the origin of "Goose Corner" * * * and a farmyard of long skirts and white aprons, of horses on dirt roads, of all that was early Bristol.

* * * name of what is now Burlington Avenue. The story goes that some of the immigrants who settled there in the early 1900's did not resemble its name and were occasionally brought into court. When that happened, there were apt to be headlines in The Bristol Press proclaiming, "All is not peaceable on Peaceable Street." The name was changed to Burlington Avenue.

Shum's Path, a designation carrying with it the savor of an earlier America whose deep woods were traced by Indian trails, was indeed named after a Tunxis Indian who lived

in that locality. Today it is known as Pinehurst Road.

Water Street is easier to place—it was the present Riverside Avenue.

Burying Ground Road has become Circle Street in Forestville, a street that loops off Washington Street and comes back to meet it again, and that borders the burying ground on its far side.

There was a Cemetery Road also—now Brightwood Road.

Market Street recalls the colonial days of unpaved roads, dusty and dry in the summer and muddy in the wet season, with one lone market for the residents. That became a street which is no longer in existence—South Elm Street, recently swallowed up in the expansion of the Wallace Barnes Division, Associated Spring.

* * * mental image of a road lined with tall hickory trees. Over the years, this has become the well-known Muzzy Street, with some half dozen of the proud trees still remaining at its far end.

Doolittle's Corner is a name still familiar to some Bristol people. It is now known as the Maple End Corner, and was originally named for a family who lived in the vicinity.

Silver Street, so called after the silver department of the Bristol Brass and Clock Company, is now Fenn Street; Curtiss Lane has become South Street Extension; Mine Street is Bradley Street; and part of the original Pond Street is now the northern section of North Main.

The changing names of Bristol's streets trace its development from pre-Revolutionary times, point up the comings and goings of some of its families, and—sometimes—serve as a reminder that mankind has not really changed, after all.

BRANDT'S APPEASEMENT AWARD

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the policies of West German Chancellor Willy Brandt toward Eastern Europe have not produced any positive results yet, and most probably never will bring any lasting, peaceful solutions at all. But the Nobel Prize committee has nevertheless found it fitting to award Brandt the peace prize in the middle of his political campaigns.

If the prize was awarded for appeasement, then it is quite clear that Willy Brandt deserved it fully. His hasty political gestures toward the Soviet Union and other Communist countries in Eastern Europe without solid previous consultations with his Western allies opened the door for increased Soviet influences in Western Europe and jeopardized the system of Western security built up throughout the entire post-World War II period by the United States and the other allies.

The road toward peace and security always was a very difficult and strenuous one. The spirit of international stability and peace cannot be assured by empty political gestures, beautiful phrases, or hastily arranged summit meetings. Practical steps toward peace are founded on much more solid foundation stones than anything which underlies the structure Brandt has set himself about erecting.

The consequences of Willy Brandt's political actions cannot be properly evaluated yet, and the award of the Nobel peace prize under these circumstances can scarcely be viewed as anything more than an expression of support from a committee whose sympathies lie with the Chancellor's desperate, politically motivated turn to the left.

For those of us who have observed and studied the political movement of the left for many years, this development did not come as a surprise. Brandt's "Ostpolitik" is currently undergoing a very critical examination by the Bundestag. Support for his policies seems to have diminished considerably in view of the Soviet initiatives in the Middle East, the Mediterranean Sea, and other parts of the world, and no doubt the award was seen as a means of bolstering that sagging support.

I sincerely hope the analysts and critics of Willy Brandt's policies will not allow themselves to be confused or influenced by the decision of the Nobel Prize committee when the political nature of that award is so clear.

THE ISSUE OF NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, on November 8, the House of Representatives will consider a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings. The substantive language of this joint resolution is as follows:

Section 1. Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled, in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in nondenominational prayer.

Unfortunately, a certain amount of misunderstanding has arisen concerning the word "nondenominational" which I believe needs clarification. An excellent sermon discussing the meaning of this term was recently given by the Reverend Donald L. Powers at the Bethany United Church of Christ in Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio. I commend Dr. Powers' timely remarks to my colleagues for their consideration:

THE ISSUE OF NONDENOMINATIONAL PRAYER

The sermon this morning is devoted to the plausability of nondenominational prayer in public meetings supported by public funds. I need not tell you, I am sure, that prayer is and has been common to all men throughout the age of man.

The early Christians—including that of Jesus—made no distinction between the sacred and the secular. It is true that Jesus urged that the things that belong to Caesar should be honored as well as the things that belong to God.

Among the Christians—the sacred was associated with the permanent and the secular with the impermanent. There was no separation of life into areas where prayer was acceptable and where it was unacceptable.

With the early Church and continuing through the Middle Ages—the sacred referred to that world of God which was unchangeable—the transcendent power of God—the absolutes which remain relevant to all ages—such as truth and justice and righteousness. The secular was of the changing world—the change of governments, the styles of life—eating, drinking and making merry. It did not mean that the sacred should not enter into the changing world—rather the sacred stood as watchman over the secular, which gave rise to the great prophetic movement of the Old Testament.

It is too simple a distinction but in today's world—especially that of the United States—the sacred is identified with the spiritual—usually the church or related religious bodies while the secular is identified with the temporal or the earthly.

As soon as these distinctions are made, the question arises of the rights and privileges of each and because of this division within our thinking, the problem arises of the place of religious practice in the secular realm and of the influence of the secular in the sacred. So we have compartmentalized our lives.

In the United States this distiction has been conceptualized as the doctrine of Church and State and considerable effort has been made to separate the two as if it were possible to divide man's mind into separate categories. Hence, is Mr. John Smith two different men? When he awakens in the morning and drives to the rubber plant—is he secular man; and on Sunday morning—when he awakens and drives—hopefully—to the church or temple of his choice—is he now a sacred man? Can Mr. Smith shift his mind that easily and be an earthly man on Monday and a spiritual man on Sunday? Is he two or more men—wrapped up in confusion—not sure which he is; or is he one man—with one personality and of one mind—incapable perhaps of fragmenting himself into two or more separate beings with no common ground between these separate compartments of his character? In the one case is he schizoid? In the other, is he centered in a common faith that remains constant whether in the rubber shop or in the church. This is the problem in the issue of prayer in public meetings. Interestingly enough, the issue is galvanized into whether or not the public meeting is tax-supported.

There has been no objection to praying at the Rotary Convention where Catholics, Mormans, Protestants, Jews, Moslems, Christian Scientists, atheists and agnostics come together. Usually such bodies find time during their meetings when a prayer is made to a higher being without objection from the diversified assemblage. Why then, if a similar group of citizens come together under the shelter of a school house and offer prayer to the same Creator—should it be regarded as the sacred interferring with the secular, thus causing a few to become so insufferable in their opinions that they appeal to the Supreme Court in behalf of the Separation of Church and State.

Interestingly enough too, though we are a country governed by law—the law in many or most of these cases is the divided opinion of nine rather elderly men. Often five of them rule one way and four of them rule the opposite way. In such cases, would nine different elderly jurists interpret the law in a dissimilar way? It is a matter of interpretation. This is what happened in the decision reached by the Supreme Court regarding prayer in public meetings. It turned out to be the infringement of the Church into the realm of the State and the infringement of the State into the realm of the Church.

It is this problem which is the issue of prayer in schools—supported by public funds. I say there is a greater issue, that of separating life into the spiritual and the temporal.

For one thing, I do not believe that when the founders of the United States drafted the Constitution and its Bill of Rights they were

attempting to separate the spiritual from the temporal when they developed the doctrine of the separation of Church and State.

Surely, they were not pleading for man to keep his religion out of his daily life. If so, such thinking is contrary to the highest concept of religion—the study of truth—for God is truth. Religion that stays home from work is no religion worthy of mention. We do not mean the fanatic who projects his sectarian doctrines upon others but the one who lives his moral faith of respect for God and man in his work and play as well as in his devotion to his church.

We are suffering today from this division of commitment. Shop keepers become paupers unless truthful operators are at the cash registers. Time and again I have been informed recently by concerned Akronites—that industry in Akron cannot compete and the large companies are going where they can get a good day's work for a good day's pay. I have been told it is not high wages that is forcing industry out of Akron, but the non-performance of the wage workers. If production remains high—wages can remain high; but wages cannot remain high unless results are commensurate. This is a religious issue. It is the problem of separating the sacred from the secular—an extension of the separation of church and state. If we are to divide men's loyalties at the church and state levels—mass man will not carry over his religious convictions into his work relationships. I am not aware that Jesus recognized divisions in life—that of the spiritual and that of the temporal. For him, life was all religious—whether cutting wood for his father or preaching sermons at the Sea of Galilee. A brick-layer is not more religious when building a church than he is when building a school-house. A school teacher that is less religious with a class of public school children than she is with a class of church school children is not likely to be respected by either group. The clergyman who proclaims from the pulpit what he does not personally represent is betraying the gospel to which he is committed.

So it is with prayer. Though it is not to be forced, prayer should be as natural in a biology class as in a Bible class and when foolish distinctions are made between church school and public school—children are confused. We shall continue to have the kind of problems that America is facing as long as we divide ourselves into the sacred and the secular. The separation should be a division of labor and not of commitment. The division should be of training and competence not that of religious commitment. It is just as important to be taught the history of the Christian Church by a competent church historian as it is to be taught the history of the United States by a competent student of American history. We have learned to our dismay that honesty has not been honored in the writing of American history books—for a large and significant part of American history was eliminated from the history books—until our black brothers demanded that justice be done to their history. The writers were evasive—non-moral. When commitment to the truth is lacking in the history books—society suffers. As you can see, I am for prayer—not forced but for prayer that speaks gratefully of the gift of life and acknowledges man's stewardship of the good earth. If not a unity, at least the secular and sacred are complimentary and prayer is an acknowledgement of that Union.

In the second place, prayer in public meetings—including that of tax supported institutions is a symbolic recognition of the religious heritage of the United States. I am not one who believes that prayer in public schools will greatly change the climate of morality in those schools; but I am convinced of the symbolic value of prayer. In many ways prayer is to our spiritual heritage what the American flag is to the republic of the United States.

And though the flag has been desecrated by duplicating its striped colors and its stars upon cloth and worn as sweat shirts, pants and neck ties; for most citizens of this country it is a revered symbol of what America stands for at its best. There is much that is wrong with America—permitting selfish people, power groups to use the freedoms of America as a pretext to do as they please at the expense of the general welfare of the republic; but at the heart of America is the freedom to do the right as God gives us to know the right and to extend that liberty in thought and action to the poor, downtrodden and all men of goodwill.

So it is with prayer and even more so. When a class of school children are called to bow their heads in recognition of the supreme authority of the Universe from which all their inalienable rights come—it is an act of thankfulness that teaches responsibility. One knows the little folks can pause in quiet for a moment as angels and then act like little demons on the playground—but consciously and sub-consciously there is the developing recognition of the source of life to whom they owe respect and reverence. And if adults give evidence in their lives of respect for the Creator, consideration for people and property is sure to improve.

Then too, more than half of the enrollment of our schools consist of students who have little if any church training. The average child in most protestant church schools is present on Sunday mornings less than half of the time. To me this is a serious moral situation. If parents were doing well at teaching the fundamentals of appreciation and responsibility in the home—one could find some solace but there is considerable evidence that the home for many is shockingly neglectful in training children to respect and honor the privileges of liberty which were won by blood, sweat and tears.

Thus, the average child whose parents are members of some protestant church has little formal religious training, and this, coupled with the greater number of families not identified with any religious body makes one wonder how the religious heritage of America can be perpetuated.

It seems to me that prayer in the schools could at least expose the masses of our children to a symbolic recognition of where their rights and privileges originated.

Now, in the third place—permitting prayer in the public schools—rather than violating the Constitution of the United States—from my point of view would be fulfilling the Constitution.

The framers of the Constitution were not legislating against religion but against a state religion that would discriminate against those of other Christian persuasions; and when the Constitution was adopted there was no issue of other non-Christian religions.

The early settlers were in large part of English background and Thomas Jefferson did not want the Anglican Church of England to become the established church of the United States and for this we can be and should be most grateful—not because of opposition to the Anglicans but because it "not only prevented the state from enforcing religious belief, but it kept the church from giving religious sanction to the acts of the state." (quote from Senator Mark Hatfield)

One of our cherished freedoms is freedom of religion and though I deplore some of the things that freedom permits in America, I am grateful that our forefathers insured the fulfillment of religious expression.

But the government of the United States is inconsistent in what it permits and does not permit regarding prayer in public meetings. Both Houses of Congress—the House of Representatives and the Senate open their sessions with prayer offered by chaplains appointed to these Houses; but presently, in the minds of many jurists it is unconstitutional for a class of school room children to open their day's exercises with a simple prayer. This is inconsistent.

It has been argued by some that the Supreme Court did not ban prayer from the school rooms nine years ago, but only prayers prescribed or written by school personnel. This cannot be so because The New Jersey Supreme Court last year held unconstitutional a brief "non-denominational prayer offered by a school principal in New Jersey that had been previously presented before the United States Senate." (from editorial in Akron Beacon Journal)

The only sure way this inconsistency can be cleared up is for an amendment to be added to the Constitution removing the present inconsistency.

Presently such an amendment is before the House of Representatives of the United States and will be voted upon November 8. Here it is:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), that the following Article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the United States.

Article, Section 1. Nothing contained in this constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in non-denominational prayer.

Section 2. This Article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America to which we subscribe states that our country is "one nation under God." Is it not inconsistent to ask boys and girls as well as adults to subscribe to a pledge that the nation is under God and not permit them to acknowledge that God in prayer?

It has been said quite correctly that we live in a pluralistic religious society, and therefore, we must be careful not to offend the religious sensitivity of the many. To me this is begging the question, for what we have in common can be emphasized and omit the particularisms that are not common to all. Even the Houses of Congress do not go this far, for I have read some of the prayers offered in the House and in the Senate and often those prayers close in the name of Jesus. This is unacceptable to many Jewish citizens. But the Article which I just read calls for non-denominational prayer—which means that the prayers should be directed only to God and not include references to Christ or the Virgin Mary, or to other expressions which are meaningful to a particular sect within the United States, but not generally common to all.

One cannot hope to please everyone, but let us try to find some common denominator that does justice to our American religious heritage.

It has been said, too, that to pray in the classroom may be offensive to those children whose parents are atheists. I, for one, respect the honest convictions of the atheist or agnostic, but the United States of America was founded by men who had some appreciation for the spiritual, and they wrote their beliefs into their declarations.

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life,

liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

We must not play down, ignore or denigrate the heritage which helped establish America as a foremost advocate of freedom. That stemmed from strong religious convictions that recognized that freedom is a gift from God and by obedience to that God—man protects and promotes life, liberty and happiness.

Life was built around the love of mankind and not the love of things. Now we are reversing the process and permitting economics and material success to become our idols, rather than our spiritual aspirations of life, liberty and happiness.

Last Thursday evening, Senator Mark Hatfield, the distinguished senator from Oregon, spoke at the University of Akron. The senator delivered a great address and answered many questions. One thing he said stands out clearly. He said, "It is not the enemy on the outside of America that is endangering its life but the enemy of weakness on the inside." Hatfield called for the practice of love—agape—and for all people to support the effort of America to remove the injustices of our society—recognizing the spiritual foundations upon which our country was established.

If you believe as I do that the non-denominational prayer amendment should be passed in the House of Representatives and in the Senate then so inform your congressman and senators. Senator Hatfield said that the people must make themselves heard loudly and clearly of what they think is best from America and he cited examples where Congress—in spite of selfish lobbyists—voted the will of the people when it became known that the people felt strongly about gut issues. Can we do less?

I close this sermon with a prayer that I think would meet the qualifications of a non-denominational prayer and when I have completed the reading of this prayer, I shall reveal its source.

Let us pray:

Heavenly Father, who hast graciously endowed mankind with reason and understanding, send us the light of Thy truth, that we may gain insight into the wisdom of Thy ways. Banish from our hearts every desire and thought of evil, that we may truly revere Thy holy name. Forgive our sins, pardon our failings, and remove from us suffering and sorrow. May the erring and the wayward be led to know Thy loving-kindness, and to serve Thee in newness of heart; and may those who love virtue and do the right, ever be glad of Thy favor. Bless our land with plenty and our nation with peace; may righteousness dwell in our midst and virtue reign among us.

Thou knowest our needs before we utter them, and ordainest all things for the best. Praised be Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer.

This prayer was copied from The Union Prayerbook for Jewish Worship, Part I, Cincinnati 1947, page 349.

OPPOSITION TO THE SO-CALLED PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary regarding the so-called prayer amendment.

The letter follows:

NEW ORLEANS BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New Orleans, La., October 19, 1971.

Hon. OTTO E. PASSMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PASSMAN: I note with keen interest that the House of Representatives will vote soon on H.J. R. 191, the so-called prayer amendment. I am writing to urge you to vote against this proposed amendment to the United States Constitution.

I am fully sympathetic to the desire of many people to preserve the right of all persons to engage in genuine prayer. It is unfortunate that many who have clamored for a prayer amendment such as H. J. R. 191 have been mistaken in their belief that the Supreme Court prohibited voluntary prayer in the public schools or other public buildings. As a matter of fact the Supreme Court was very careful to point out that it was only ruling against governmentally required recitation of an officially composed prayer.

The present prayer amendment is not needed to affirm the right to engage in voluntary prayer. That right is already adequately insured in the Bill of Rights in the first amendment. The present proposed amendment opens a pandora's box of constitutional questions which it will take generations to untangle. It would appear to establish a religion of "nondenominationalism" without defining what that is. It also puts the government in the position of deciding what is and what is not acceptable prayer in a public place. It is not in keeping with the long established tradition of religious liberty and the separation of church and state in America. It is not the business of any governmental official or agency to determine the place or content or leader for any form of prayer or other religious exercise. This is said with perfect clarity in the first amendment of the United States Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. . . ."

I am aware that you signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to the floor. I would hope that your signature on the petition was only for the purpose of bringing this bill to a vote and does not imply your support for it. I agree that Congress needs to face this issue and vote it down resolutely.

The people at the grass roots level who have clamored for the passage of this bill need to be told of the inherent dangers contained in it. I do not understand how anyone who has seen the potential danger of this bill could support it.

Sincerely,

J. TERRY YOUNG.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 20, 1971

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, discrimination and injustice continues in Northern Ireland against the Catholic minority.

No place in the civilized world are citizens seized and thrown into jail without any chance to be heard. In many cases these people have committed no crime, yet they are denied the opportunity to get a hearing of any kind. They are thrown into dungeons as in the Dark Ages. This is the pressure being exerted today upon the Irish patriots in Northern Ireland.

People throughout the world should unite in their efforts to protest against this inhuman treatment.

I urge that our State Department express the sense of this body and of the American people that fundamental civil rights should be guaranteed, and that all the people of Ireland be given the opportunity to decide for themselves on the unity of the entire nation.

THE SUPREME COURT: NO SOUTHERNERS WANTED

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, the President is once again faced with the task of appointing justices to the U.S. Supreme Court due to the death of Justice Black and the retirement of Justice Harlan.

I would like to share with my colleagues an interesting article which I read in a recent copy of Roll Call, concerning the U.S. Supreme Court.

The article follows:

THE SUPREME COURT: NO SOUTHERNERS WANTED

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The death of Hugo Black and the retirement of John Marshall Harlan provide President Nixon with the opportunity to appoint at least four Supreme Court Justices in his first term of office. This number has been equaled or surpassed only four times since George Washington appointed the first members of the high court.

Yet, the President has, in reality, been prevented from exercising his own choice. He was prevented from appointing two men of his choice earlier in his term because the Senate refused to confirm them. The appointments were, in many respects, undistinguished, but the reasons for opposing those appointments appear little better. Politics was clearly involved in both, and the stature of the Court has been seriously harmed. However much it may be said that the Court is "above politics." it is clearly both by nature of those appointed to the Court and the arguments marshalled by those who seek to prevent such appointments that politics is deeply involved. It may, in fact, be all that is involved. The fact that politics was the primary element in the opposition to the President's initial appointments is evidenced by the fact that the very Senators who refused to confirm Clement Haynsworth and Harold Carswell did confirm Abe Fortas and have defended the misconduct of William Douglas.

Now, the President sought to appoint Rep. Richard Poff of Virginia to one of the current vacancies. Mr. Poff met the President's requirements in a number of respects. He was a Southerner and, with Justice Black gone, no Southerner sits on the Supreme Court. Poff's philosophy of strict constructionism was precisely the philosophy which the President sought to enhance and strengthen and the Congressman was respected by fellow legislators, both Democrats and Republicans, both liberals and conservatives. He was endorsed for the Supreme Court seat by no less a Democratic liberal spokesman than Rep. Emanuel Celler, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. Cel-

ler, together with Republican William McColloch, an architect of civil rights legislation called Poff "exceptionally well qualified for the High Court."

From everything available to us at this time it appears that Mr. Poff wanted the Supreme Court seat and President Nixon wanted him to have it. But the President's will was once again thwarted by the very thing which is damaging the Supreme Court in the eyes of the American people: narrow, partisan politics.

George Meany said that he and organized labor would oppose Poff. Roy Wilkins said that the NAACP and the civil rights complex would oppose him, and presidential hopefuls such as Senator George McGovern announced that they would reject his confirmation. The reason: they did not agree with Mr. Poff's views. They condemned him and announced their unwillingness to support his confirmation only because of his vote on several civil rights bills. David Brinkley, in an editorial comment on NBC News, pointed out that Poff's record on civil liberties subjects, opposition to "no-knock" legislation, and a host of other subjects, would have pleased the very liberals who were quick to condemn him. But politics intruded, and politics, as we have seen, holds the center of the stage where Supreme Court appointments are concerned.

There is much reason to lament the fate of the Court. The passing of Hugo Black and John Marshall Harlan leaves a great void in scholarship, in dignity, in respect for the law. "I don't know where you're going to look for leadership," lamented Professor Philip Kurland of the University of Chicago Law School, surveying the seven men remaining on the high court. There are, in fact, no articulate spokesmen on the present Court for either the liberal or conservative approach to judicial problems.

The liberal bloc has been reduced to three: William O. Douglas, William J. Brennan, Jr., and Thurgood Marshall. *Newsweek Magazine* noted that "None of them is particularly noted for the distinction of his written opinions . . ." There is no conservative on the Court today to equal the stature of the late Felix Frankfurter, or the recently retired Justice Harlan. President Nixon must consider the fact that in order to turn the Court around, to restore judicial self-restraint, to cause the Court to interpret and apply law rather than make law, he must appoint conservative jurists of stature who will, in fact, take such initiatives. Instead, he has too often turned in other, more political, directions.

But for all that has been wrong with the President's approach to filling Supreme Court vacancies, the performance of self-proclaimed "liberals" in the Senate is far worse. For them, only justices of their own philosophical approach will do. They eagerly accept the notion that there should be a "Negro" or "Jewish" or "Catholic" seat on the Court, and now argue that there should be a seat for a "woman," indicating that almost any woman will do. Yet, when it comes to appointing a Southerner their feeling is quite different. There is, it seems, no room for a Southerner on the Court, and a few short years since Richard Nixon has come to the Presidency, three Southerners have been refused entrance to that august body. Judges Haynsworth and Carswell were rejected. Rep. Poff withdrew, preferring not to be the center of a battle which has nothing to do with his individual qualifications but which holds him out as a scapegoat for Northern Senators, and particularly for Democratic Presidential candidates.

The South, it seems, clearly has become the pariah of the nation. Anti-Southernism is, in effect, the anti-Semitism, the racism, and the anti-Catholicism of our political and intellectual liberal establishment. Despite the fact that violence has erupted in New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, Newark, and Cincinnati rather than Richmond, Atlanta, Charleston, or Charlotte, we are told that the South is the portion of the country most guilty of racism. It may be convenient for Northern liberal Senators to shift guilt and assign it to the South but this is clearly not the truth, and Negroes know better than anyone else how untrue it is. A recent "Ebony Magazine" article, for example, shows how many thousands of Southern blacks who went North have returned South precisely because life is better for them in their own native region.

The South has been misunderstood for a hundred years, and it has been politically profitable to misunderstand it. The industrialized North traditionally looked down upon the agrarian South. The North, with its mounting crime rate, slums, and impersonal society has for more than fifty years referred to the South as a provincial backwater. But life, for better or worse, is not that easy. In Gabriel Tolliver, the distinguished Southern writer Joel Chandler Harris notes that "In all ages of the world and in all places, there are men of restless and superficial minds who mistake repose and serenity for stagnation: no doubt then, as now, the most awful sentence to be passed on a community was to say that it was not progressive. But when you examine into the matter, what is called progress is nothing more or less than the multiplication of the resources of those who, by means of dicker and barter, are trying all the time, to overreach the public and their fellows, in one way and another. This sort of thing has now a double name; it is civilization, as well as progress, and those who take things as they find them in their morning newspaper, without going to the trouble to reflect for themselves, are no doubt duly impressed by terms large enough to fill both ear and mouth at one and the same time."

And so, in 1971, those who oppose parochialism, provincialism, prejudice and racism proclaim proudly that no Southerner of traditional views need apply for a vacancy on the Supreme Court. If this is "liberalism," someone will have to redefine the term. It sounds like something far different, and far less noble.

PENNSYLVANIA SENATE ADOPTS A RESOLUTION PROTECTING WILD HORSES IN OUR WESTERN STATES

HON. JAMES A. BYRNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Mark Gruell, Jr., Secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania, has advised me the Senate of Pennsylvania unanimously adopted on October 12, 1971, a resolution to protect the beautiful wild horses which roam freely in our Western States. Legislation to protect these horses passed the House on October 4 and should be going into conference very soon. Therefore, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues the Memorial from the Senate of Pennsylvania expressing interest in this important legislation:

MEMORIAL

SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,

Harrisburg, Pa., March 30, 1971.

Once again part of our American heritage is being destroyed. In ten of our Western states packs of wild horses roam freely; however, they are rapidly being killed and processed for dog food. Just a few years ago there were over two million of these animals and now there are less than twenty thousand. These horses are historically and esthetically valuable. We cannot allow them to be brought any closer to the brink of extinction. At this very time the Congress of the United States is considering legislation which would protect these animals;

Now therefore, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the Congress of the United States to pass the legislation now before it which would protect the valuable and beautiful wild horses which roam freely in the West so that this part of our ecology may stay with us;

And further directs that a copy of this resolution, Serial No. 20, sponsored by Senators Louis G. Hill, W. Louis Coppersmith, Henry C. Messinger, Henry J. Cianfrani, Thomas P. McCreesh, Patrick J. Stapleton, Joseph F. Smith and Thomas M. Nolan and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the twelfth day of October, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-one, be transmitted to the presiding officer of each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania serving in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.
Secretary of the Senate.

ANNE M. ROBERTS

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Nation lost a devoted and competent public servant when Anne M. Roberts was spent in performing arduous duties died on October 17. Her entire adult life that would meet public needs. She served with distinction as the New York Regional Deputy Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and its predecessor, the Housing and Home Finance Agency from 1962 to 1964 and from 1966 until her death. During the 2 years that she was away from the housing agency she served as director of New York City's Antipoverty Operations Board and subsequently as director of the city's economic opportunity committee.

Her career of public service started as a school teacher in Cincinnati after graduation from the University of Cincinnati. She joined the Federal service to work for the Office of Price Administration, and transferred to HHFA as a relocation officer in the urban renewal program in 1950. Her competence was recognized and she was given positions of higher responsibility, becoming Deputy Regional Administrator in 1962, a position that she filled during the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. In 1967 she was one of five women who received the annual Federal Woman's Award for outstanding Federal Service.

Throughout her HHFA–HUD career, Anne Roberts exercised great skill in key roles of administering programs to rebuild the slums, provide housing for the poor and eradicate poverty. Her ability to work with a large staff at HUD, with local officials and with citizen groups made her a most valuable and effective Federal

official. Her loss will be felt greatly in the New York region, in HUD and by all who have a concern with housing and urban problems.

GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION—RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

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

RARICK REPORTS TO HIS PEOPLE ON GUN CONTROL LEGISLATION

The programs to socialize every facet of American life continue and with great success. The drive for Federal gun control regulations continues, so I thought I'd make my report to you today about gun control legislation here in Congress.

Gun control legislation is a vital concern to all citizens. Anti-gun laws as proposed by some bills are designed to set up conditions needed for taking away the citizens' firearms—your guns. The law-abiding citizen would thus be denied his constitutional right to keep and bear arms, not only for his own and his family's protection, but even to the extent of using firearms as a sporting pleasure.

The anti-gun syndrome in Congress uses every appropriate emotional issue to renew a cry for control of firearms. With a well-organized team effort and favorable publicity in the communications media, the anti-gun lobby constantly bombards the public with a progapanda barrage designed to turn public opinion in favor of more anti-gun laws and more gun control legislation.

Most of us still remember the wave of hysteria which swept the country right after the assassinations of President Kennedy, Senator Kennedy, and Martin Luther King. Remember how Huntley, Brinkley, and Cronkite played up the gun fear issue on one-sided news programs. They screamed to high heaven that since a gun took the life of each of these public figures, then all guns were bad and all guns must go. They had citizens so brainwashed that some actually surrendered their firearms to the government.

This clever TV propaganda accomplished its purpose—it created a national guilt complex. It conditioned the minds of millions of Americans to believe that somehow America is a crime-infested society in which all the people are responsible for the actions of a few. As a consequence of this line of warped reasoning, all Americans should give up their guns to cleanse themselves of guilt. The TV propagandists never explained how taking away guns of law abiding citizens would stop criminals—nor did some citizens ask this of themselves.

The people were not told there are 20,000 laws in the U.S. dealing with gun control nor that a real cause for increased crime is failure to permit our policemen to enforce these existing laws against known and repeating criminals.

Another movement for federal gun control followed the Milton Eisenhower's Commission on Violence report which blamed crime not on criminals but on guns. Somehow it has been made to appear that if the government collected all the guns, the gun crimes would decrease.

The latest effort to outlaw guns by the anti-gun people is to blame the recent outbreak of shootings of police officers on guns. Again, many of the anti-gun people defend with crocodile tears the outlaw who pulls the trigger. According to this line of reasoning we should outlaw cars and airplanes because so many deaths have been caused by automobile wrecks and airplane crashes—or liquor because some crimes are committed by drunkards. But, we don't hear cries for rigid enforcement of the narcotics laws because of addict crimes. Instead the program is always rehabilitate the offender. In fact, some of the same people who call for outlawing guns advocate legalizing marijuana.

One of the many gun control bills introduced in Congress, H.R. 8828, would provide for registration of all firearms, including shotguns, with the U.S. Treasury Department by September 1, 1973, and is aimed at the eventual outlawing of private ownership of handguns entirely. It would require registration of all ammunition sales including rifle and shotgun ammunition sales which were eliminated from the 1968 Gun Control Act. While Congress exempted rifle and shotgun ammunition from registration, the requirement still applies on all .22 rimfire ammunition as well as handgun ammunition. The House of Representatives voted last year to delete the record-keeping requirement on 22's but the session ended before the Senate took action. H.R. 8828 calls for a two year imprisonment and a fine up to $2000 for every owner of any kind of gun whatsoever if he fails to register the firearm with the Treasury Department. Of course, registration would cost a fee and provide another means of tax revenue.

Another bill, H.R. 8501, would require national registration of all firearms and would establish licensing standards for the possession of firearms.

After a 3½ year study, which cost taxpayers an estimated $850,000, the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws recommended in its final report to Congress on January 7, 1971, the outlawing of private ownership of handguns except for the police and the military as well as the registration of all rifles and shotguns owned by private persons.

The Commission, like many other backers of federal gun control laws, concluded falsely that fewer firearms would result in fewer murders. One U.S. Senator has even proposed a law to register "every gun in America." Registration, as lessons of history prove, is the first step toward total confiscation.

Gun registration laws in New York and Washington, D.C. prove that laws do not prevent criminals from procuring guns. It is ridiculous to believe that a criminal who would violate the law to rob, rape and kill would obey gun control laws. But, for the sake of argument, let's suppose a criminal was unable to own a gun because of gun registration regulations. If he was determined to act, he need only steal a gun. The papers frequently report police stations or National Guard armories robbed of firearms. Or, if he couldn't find a gun to kill with, he'd use some other weapons. We read of murders by switchblade, razor and knife, but no one has suggested a switchblade control law.

The New York Daily News of August 1, 1971, estimated that in New York City there were 400,000 legally registered rifles and shotguns; and that since the registration of firearms, which began in February of 1968, no legally owned rifle or shotgun had been used in a homicide in New York City.

This is strong evidence that murders are caused by criminals not by guns just as automobile accidents are caused by careless motorists and not by automobiles. As it is the man behind the wheel of the auto, so it is the man pulling the trigger who needs controlling by law. Auto drivers we license, but none of the anti-gun people has yet suggested teaching firearm control and marksmanship to prevent carelessness. What needs to be done is to punish criminals—criminals need controlling, not the guns of law abiding citizens.

Another indication that registration of guns doesn't curtail crime is provided by a recent FBI crime report for the first quarter of 1971. Chicago, New York City, and Philadelphia registered 623 murders during the three months covered by the report as compared to only 531 for the similar period in 1970—This was in spite of the fact that these 3 cities also have the strictest gun control laws in the nation. If gun control laws were the answer to reducing crime, murders in these cities should have decreased rather than increased. Furthermore, where there are rigid gun laws, criminals with guns assume that their victims are likely to be unarmed making the criminal bolder and commission of the crime easier.

As I stated earlier, the current propaganda line being fed by anti-gun advocates to the American people in appealing for more rigid gun control laws is that more and more policemen are being killed with guns. No one reminds the people that most officers are under orders not to draw or shoot unless first shot at. The people are not told that of the arrested killers of policemen, 81% had been arrested previously and 57% had been convicted mainly of crimes of violence. This means, of course, that most of the cop shooters had guns illegally under Federal laws and many State or local laws. Most of the guns traced to Black Panthers, who during the past three years murdered nine law officers and wounded fifty-six more with gun shots, were found to have been acquired by theft. Registration of firearms wouldn't have helped these officers, but taking the handcuffs off the police officers might have prevented several deaths and woundings of our police.

The National Police Officers Association of America summarized the case against gun control laws in a resolution:

"Restrictive anti-gun laws do not succeed in disarming the criminal but do disarm the law-abiding citizen."

Concerned and informed Americans know that so long as local police forces are strong and independent and controlled by the people at the local level and so long as individual Americans have the right to own and possess firearms, there can be no takeover by criminals nor by totalitarian forces. And this would be so regardless of so-called U.N. treaties and disarmament deals including SALT. This would be so regardless of plans of regional planners to merge and centralize local police forces into ever larger metro and regional forces under control of appointed rather than elected officials, leading eventually to a national police force—the direct opposite of our local police. This being so, the full implementation of many of the present socialistic concentrations of power in Washington bureaucrats must be delayed until firearms are taken from the citizens.

History time and time again confirms that the confiscation of firearms inevitably leads to enslavement of people. One necessarily follows the other because only an apathetic people would ever surrender their firearms and after that, police state control comes rapidly.

Cuban gun laws under Batista were intended to prevent Castro guerrillas from obtaining firearms, but only the loyal Cubans registered their guns. Castro's revolutionaries did not abide by the law. So, Castro has all the guns and the Cubans do not even have Cuba.

In Czechoslovakia, a firearms registration and control law gave the Communist occupying forces a prepared list to locate guns and disarm citizens making them defenseless to the Communist takeover.

Increasing numbers of informed Americans are becoming aware of the approaching police state in the United States. The demonstrators and so-called civil rights activists are being exploited as a means to con-

centrate more and more power. The persistent drive for registration of firearms along with the promotion of a national police force should be warning enough. If gun laws are passed and the police state is established, the flame of individual liberty will have been extinguished. But, this need not and must not occur.

America is now in the process of disarming itself as well as its citizens. The Gun Control Act of 1968 allowed the federal government a foot in the door of the home of individual Americans to take away their guns just as the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 permits a federal foot in the door of the local police precinct. And, advocates of regional planning are working for the phasing out of the local sheriff, who has the vital function of the Posse Comitatus of deputizing every able-bodied citizen to protect his people if conditions should so warrant. Rioters, insurrectionists, and even federal authorities mut yield to parish or county law enforcement in the nuts and bolts enforcement of the law. Centralized tyranny cannot stand against the people power of approximately 3,000 parish and county governments in the United States, nor should it be allowed to.

The Second Amendment of the Bill of Rights to the U.S. Constitution provides that the "right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." To guarantee that our citizens retain this right, I have introduced H.R. 377, to exempt ammunition from Federal regulation under the Gun Control Act of 1968 and H.R. 378, to repeal in its entirety the Gun Control Act of 1968.

The price of our people keeping their guns is far less than the risk of taking the guns and chancing a police state.

MANIPULATING STATISTICS ON THE NATION'S ECONOMY

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press carried a startling announcement early this week which should be of grave concern to all of us.

After quoting a Labor Department report which shows that the jobless rate for black workers rose from 11.9 to 14.1 percent in the last quarter, the Department announced it will not keep those statistics in 1973.

I am placing in the RECORD today the AP story which shows an effort to conceal vital facts on the economy.

I hope the Labor Committee will investigate this new procedure.

The AP article follows:

JOBLESS RATE UP FOR POOR BLACKS

The unemployment rate for Negroes in poor neighborhoods increased by more than 2 percent during the third quarter of 1971, while decreasing more than 1 percent for whites living in the same areas, the Labor Department says.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics report, issued yesterday, said the overall jobless rate for poverty neighborhoods in the 100 largest cities edged up from 10.1 percent to 10.4 during three months ending in September.

The jobless rate for black workers rose from 11.9 to 14.1 percent, while it dropped from 9.1 to 8 percent for whites. Nationally, unemployment was about 6 percent of the work force.

The bureau said that after one more report, for the last quarter, the reports will be discontinued until about 1973 because the formula on which the figures are compiled will be updated with information from the 1970 census.

ADDRESS OF HON. SILVIO CONTE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the statement of Congressman SILVIO CONTE before the Small Business Subcommittee of the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee in Boston, Mass., last week regarding the critical oil situation in New England and the financial burden it places on all American consumers.

As Mr. CONTE states, the "unprecedented privileges and protection" extended to the domestic oil industry, the continuation of the archaic and oppressive oil import quota policy and the present administration's disregard of the unique oil problems of New England form a picture of favoritism to the majors which allows them to insulate themselves from domestic competition and mercilessly squeeze the American consumers' pocketbooks.

Mr. CONTE points up the immediate need for some realistic changes in Government oil policy for relief of New England and the rest of the country. As he puts it, it is "for all of us to carry the message beyond New England so that all Americans will realize the pervasive adverse effects they suffer" because of present oil policy.

I commend Mr. CONTE's speech to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE SILVIO O. CONTE

Mr. Chairman, it is a great pleasure for me to appear before you again to discuss government oil policy and what can be done to alleviate, if not eliminate, the terrible burden which it has placed on all American consumers, especially those of us in New England.

I also want to commend both you and Senator Brooke for your outstanding leadership in this effort. Reluctantly, let me also commend you for your good judgment in recruiting one of the most valued staff members of the House Small Business Committee on which I serve as ranking Republican, your able new counsel T. J. Oden.

It is especially fitting that you have brought these hearings to the capital of the Commonwealth, New England's largest city. Nowhere are our citizens more adversely affected by government oil policy—except, I might add, in my own area of Western Massachusetts. Since October 1 of this year the new low-sulphur residual oil requirements in my area are lower than comparable standards, not only in New York State but also in Vermont and New Hampshire. And the bulk of residual coming to these areas, as well as to Western Massachusetts, is shipped out of Albany. With no area but Western Massachusetts requiring such low sulphur oil out of Albany we face an acute supply problem there, to say nothing of price.

It is, of course, critical that we as New England representatives in the Congress pay attention to this and other special problems affecting our region. As of the time of the writing of this statement, we still have had no word on the pending decision on our request for an expanded No. 2 oil import program for 1972. I need not belabor our vital requirements in this area. They are familiar to all of us. But there is simply no excuse for further delay. Every day that goes by without a decision is precious time lost in the effort to secure commitments of lower cost foreign oil, especially from Europe where we hope to be able to secure some of that supply.

Another immediate problem to our region is the movement by the Interior Department in the ominous direction of reimposing quotas on residual oil. All of us here worked far too long in the early sixties to get the burden of those quotas lifted to see their return. Recently I drafted a letter of comment to Interior Department's Oil Import Administration, signed by all of my New England House colleagues and over half of the New York delegation, in opposition to this dangerous step and calling for public hearings. And I know that you led a similar effort, Mr. Chairman, in the Senate.

I presume the response you received was similar to mine: this is allegedly not a change in policy, so hearings are not required. I also sent a copy of the letter of comment to General Lincoln, Chairman of the Oil Policy Committee, and his reply may be worth noting. While repeating the same line about no change in policy, General Lincoln did assure me that—and I quote—"no decision . . . to modify substantively controls over the importation of residual fuels into District 1" will be made "without the full and careful consideration of the Oil Policy Committee."

In view of the track record of the OPC this is small comfort—but it is some assurance that this move will not be made hastily. On the question of whether Interior will actually adopt the proposed amendments, the answer is anyone's guess. Perhaps, however, the massive opposition to it we have helped to generate might have the effect of postponing it indefinitely. While we all hope so, we must keep close watch on developments in this field.

But, while we must remain vigilant about New England's special problems, I am convinced it is essential for all of us to carry the message beyond New England, so that all Americans will realize the pervasive adverse effects they suffer, not only as a result of the oil import quotas system, but also as a result of a vast array of both federal and state laws extending unprecedented privileges and protection to the domestic oil industry.

Before turning to one major aspect of this network of privileges, I must make one more comment on the regional aspect of this national problem. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to examine the testimony of the Humble Oil witness who recently appeared before you in Washington. In opposing the No. 2 oil import program this gentlemen had the colossal arrogance to say that he and Humble were against special privileges to any—and I quote—"special interest group," referring to those of us in the Northeast. Such monumental hyprocrisy is absolutely staggering. No industry in the world has had more "special interest" legislation adopted than has his own.

And, while I am on the subject of regional disparities, all of us should remember that the States of Texas and Louisiana both have severance taxes, so their state revenues depend heavily on the profits which the major oil companies generate. Moreover, Texas does not even have an income tax. Why on earth should we in New England be forced to subsidize Texas and Louisiana taxpayers through the payment of unconscionably high oil prices?

But I am not here simply to rage against the power these few major oil companies have acquired, I believe it is more important for us to seek to understand where that power is derived. Rather than simply seeking temporary relief from the immediate situation through the granting of a small additional amount of foreign oil, I am convinced we must instead identify the causes why domestic oil and gas are *not* actively competitive and then publicize the record as widely as possible. If we can tell that story effectively, we should be able to produce an unprecedented consumers and taxpayers revolt.

We in New England and all U.S. Consumers are at the end of a long supply line for energy. Oil, produced domestically or abroad, is the largest single energy component. Out of that commodity, we must draw the basic energy requirements for home heating and electricity, for industrial power, and for transportation. Every product of a New England factory bears a heavy penalty for this energy cost, a penalty heavier for this area than for any other part of the United States.

The length of the physical supply line is equalled by the length and complexity of the chain of industrial organization which must operate to bring us the basic energy supply. That industrial organization, highly protected and enormously profitable, functions without active competition. Over the past 40 years, although actual costs of producing energy raw materials and processing it into raw materials have been nearly level, if not actually lower, because of vast technological advances, the prices we pay have continually increased. And what was then, 40 years ago, an aggressively competitive industry, with independents at all levels competing intensively to furnish the basic needs at low prices, has now become a highly integrated, non-competitive operation, in which giant individual companies act jointly, in close combination, in exploration, production, transportation, refining, and even, in some instances, in marketing, the individual products.

The concentration in the petroleum industry, aided by an ineffective antitrust enforcement policy, in combination with a series of special interest legislation has given the majors the ability to set prices free of the burdens of competitive forces. This has not only caused hardships in New England but throughout the country. To cite just two examples, residual oil prices are much higher outside the east coast where it is still under quota, and, as the Task Force noted, *all* Americans pay something in the order of three to four cents a gallon more for gasoline because of quotas. Import quotas are not the whole story, of course. Some basic questions must be raised about the entire scheme of government oil policy to explain why we in New England, and all Americans, are in this predicament.

One of many ways to begin is to ask why must heating oil in New England be so much more expensive than it is just across the border in Canada? We all know the consumer's agony of witnessing cheap foreign oil being landed in Portland, and piped right up to Montreal where it is sold for far less than we pay. The obvious answer, the cause of this discrimination, is the oil import quota system.

But this "answer" only gives rise to another question: why are import quotas so important? To "protect National Security" is the high-sounding reason we are given. We protect our energy future by most heavily using our domestic energy base now. I submit that as much "National Security" lies in New England's homes and factories as in Texas oil fields. But even if I'm wrong, it is clear that the system of governmental laws and regulations does not insure, but in fact threatens that very security.

A principal reason for the existence of quotas is to guarantee the effectiveness of state production controls, or prorationing. Without the quotas, as President Nixon's Task Force noted in urging their replacement by a tariff, prorationing would fall like a house of cards. Its purpose, to artificially hold down production to keep up demand and prices—would be defeated by unlimited imports.

While an end to quotas is therefore the most obvious route to ending prorationing, more than a decade of fighting quotas has shown us all what a tremendous challenge that is. There is reason to expect over the next several years a great increase in imports. Even some of the majors concede this must come. Perhaps, as this develops, the obvious logic of lifting quotas completely may prevail.

But for the short run, our best chance to break up the combination of government fortifications against competition and price and supply relief may well be to try and defeat prorationing more directly.

As we all know, state production controls interfere with interstate commerce which, under our Constitution, lies solely in the federal domain. Such conduct would be prohibited without the express delegation of this authority contained in the Connally Hot Oil Act of 1935.

The Connally Act, which bans the interstate shipment of "hot oil," that is, oil produced in violation of state production controls, is quite a contradictory document. While prorationing has been supported by the theory that it is strictly a conservation practice, even the state regulatory agencies, as well as the President's Task Force, have admitted this is a charade. Indeed the Connally Act itself, while ostensibly designed solely to prevent waste, expressly recognized the danger of price fixing through unduly restrictive production controls. Section 4 of the Act (15 U.S.C. Section 715c) directs the President to suspend the Act whenever he finds production so limited that it produces such a gap between supply and demand that it results in an undue burden on interstate commerce.

In December, 1970, when the President removed federal offshore oil production from *voluntarily* complying with state prorationing, he said that these controls are not needed for national security and—and here I am quoting—that these controls "actually interfere with the freedom of our domestic market system."

Mr. Chairman, I don't know what could be a clearer indication that the President had, in fact, found there is an undue burden or interstate commerce here. When I called this to his attention, and urged him to suspend the Act, I was unsuccessful.

The President's failure here, of course, is not unique. No President has ever suspended the Connally Act. What is more shocking, however, is that no President has ever even complied with another provision of the Act, Section 5 (15 U.S.C. Section 715d), that requires the careful gathering of data on which to make an informed judgment whether or not there is an undue burden on commerce.

It is one thing for critics like us to claim that suspension is called for. It is quite another for any Chief Executive to flatly refuse to perform his duty and study the question.

This sad history of non-enforcement is why I am convinced that the Connally Act must be repealed. Ninety of my House colleagues have joined me in co-sponsoring a bill to do this. Senator Proxmire has also introduced this legislation, and I commend its support to this Committee.

I have stressed the Connally Act here not only because it is such a key element in the price and control system, but also, because it fortunately falls within the jurisdiction of the House Commerce Subcommittee on Communications and Power. We in New England are indeed fortunate that its Chairman is Torbert Macdonald of Massachusetts. Moreover, its ranking minority member is Hastings Keith, also of Massachusetts, and Congressman Robert Tiernan of Rhode Island is also a member. All three are co-sponsors of my bill to repeal the Connally Act.

There is also legislation pending in the Macdonald subcommittee to renew what is called the Interstate Oil Compact. The Compact bill merely authorizes the convening of an Interstate Oil Compact Commission made up of state officials from all oil-producing states. Such a Commission does not appear to require any federal approval. The best evidence of this is that the Executive Committee of the Compact Commission has *already* held another meeting *since* the Compact expired in September, 1971.

While it is essentially an *unnecessary* body, *without any power whatsoever*, the major oil companies have attached great symbolic importance to its re-enactment. My own view is that the Compact serves chiefly to divert our attention from the real evil done to the consumer by state prorationing.

Despite what I am sure has been intense industry pressure, Chairman Macdonald has resisted acting on the Compact, and is still considering holding expanded hearings on the bill to repeal the Connally Act.

It has long seemed to me ridiculous that, despite the so-called concern for national security, the mechanisms for controlling oil price and supply—import quotas and prorationing, are responsibilities divided between the federal government and the states. The obvious need for a coherent, single, national energy policy, which all of us now recognize, convinces me that we should end this dual system of government controls.

In any event, quotas and prorationing are so interrelated, I am hopeful that the Macdonald subcommittee might examine this whole structure. If this entire scheme is exposed to close scrutiny, all of us, at the least, will be in a better position to increase the ranks of those who understand, and will hopefully oppose, the entire price-supply control machinery or quotas and prorationing.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this discussion of somewhat familiar territory has not only helped to put the dimensions of our problem in perspective, but also perhaps suggested a strategy of opposing the present system which all of us might find useful.

Before closing, I'd like to return to the subject of quotas, to note one further inconsistency relating to the result it produces.

The more complete rationale for quotas is that higher prices through quotas are needed to produce sufficient profits to encourage further domestic exploration and development. Isn't it interesting, though, that the majors are eager to spend tremendous sums to drill for and produce oil in the North Sea, in the Atlantic off Canadian shores, and elsewhere—all to be sold on the world market at prices far cheaper than domestic prices. Why don't we see similar serious exploration efforts in the lower forty-eight?

We all know the real answer to that—the answer is that the majors have a beautiful system, insulating themselves from competition here at home. They are able to squeeze the most they can from the American consumers, and, at the same time, do very well abroad.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank you for bringing these hearings to New England, which is indeed the area most adversely affected by government oil policy. But I know you share my view that it is we in New England who must carry the message throughout the nation. It is a pleasure for me to join you in that effort.

KILLER

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 5 weeks the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment has worked on fashioning the best possible legislation designed to give this Nation an effective program to fight cancer.

The committee has now reported the bill, H.R. 10681 and the work of the Honorable DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III of Virginia played an important part in this bill.

The Richmond Times-Dispatch carried a very concise editorial on the Cancer Attack Act of 1971 and recommends its passage. I would like to include the editorial into the RECORD at this time for the information of my colleagues:

KILLER

The federal government is intensifying its fight against a deadly enemy—cancer.

President Nixon is expected to announce at Ft. Detrick, Md., today that this biological warfare research center will be converted to cancer research.

In Congress, a House subcommittee, of which Virginia's Third District Rep. David E. Satterfield III is a member, has just produced an alternative to the President's anti-cancer bill which passed the Senate 79-to-1.

Each of these developments could significantly aid mankind in its war against the most dreaded of all diseases.

Ft. Detrick's sophisticated research facilities are no longer fully needed for biological warfare work, since the nation is turning away from biological weapons, at least for offense. So Ft. Detrick, which heretofore has helped scientists produce means of destruction, henceforth will aid in the search for ways to save life. Chalk one up for humanity.

Regrettably, the overall plan for the federal role in combatting cancer has become involved in controversy. Nobody is for cancer, but, unfortunately, there is disagreement over how the war against this scourge should be waged.

Some months ago, Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, on recommendation of a citizens advisory panel to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, introduced a bill to create a new conquest of cancer agency which would report directly to the President.

Up to now, governmental disease-fighting programs have come under the National Institutes of Health and many medical authorities deplored the proposal to remove the cancer unit from NIH and make it autonomous. The argument was that disease research of all kinds should be coordinated because it is interrelated, in that discoveries in one field often have application in others. Also, it was contended that if a separate autonomous agency were established for cancer, soon there would be demands for similar status for research in the war against heart disease and other human ailments, with different groups fighting politically for the available federal funds.

So the Kennedy bill was modified to create a strange creature, a cancer agency ostensibly a part of NIH but which would have a separate budget and would report directly to the President. It was this curious setup endorsed by the Nixon administration, which the Senate approved with only one dissenting vote, that of Sen. Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat.

The near-unanimous vote in the Senate was due at least in part to the fact that no politician wants to appear to be against cancer research. But Rep. Satterfield and his colleagues on the subcommittee have taken a more logical view of the whole problem and have come forth with a bill which would keep the anti-cancer agency in the NIH but would authorize the President to appoint a three-member panel to monitor cancer research efforts for the White House and thus keep the President fully informed and closely involved in the battle against the great killer.

The American Cancer Society wants autonomous or semi-autonomous status for the anticancer governmental agency, but the American Medical Association and the majority of the medical experts who have spoken on the subject favor the NIH approach. The House bill, which carries a three-year $1.5 billion appropriation for a conquest of cancer effort through the NIH, should be approved as providing the best means of intensifying the war against the most terrible of all human physical maladies.

DEATH OF MARY E. SWITZER

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the handicapped of the United States and the world lost a great champion with the tragic death, from cancer, this past weekend of Mary E. Switzer, who for 20 years directed the great Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation services for the handicapped. Miss Switzer, who had retired from Federal service in 1970 after a 48-year career, served from 1950 to 1967 as administrator of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration. With the reorganization of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1967, she became administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, a post she held until her retirement.

Mary Switzer's contribution to the vocational rehabilitation effort in the United States cannot be summarized easily. In 1950, when she became Director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in the Federal Security Administration, the number of handicapped persons rehabilitated for useful work was 56,000. By 1970, the year she retired, the number had increased to over 240,000. In her first year as Director, the yearly budget of the program was only $20.5 million; by 1970, the annual budget had increased to more than half a billion.

During her tenure as Administrator of this great program for the handicapped, Mary Switzer saw and played a major role in the enactment of several pieces of landmark legislation to transform the program from a single grant system to a multiprogram approach to disability and rehabilitation. The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954 amended the program to better meet the changing needs of a changing nation. In addition to the basic program of grants to the States for providing vocational rehabilitation services to disabled people, there was, as a result of the 1954 amendments, a separate system of grants for research in rehabilitation, another for training rehabilitation personnel, another for helping the States to extend and improve their programs of services, another for projects to help both public and private organizations expand their rehabilitation services. Other improvements included a broadening of the Randolph-Sheppard program of vending stands for the blind, the use of basic grant funds to improve and expand rehabilitation facilities, and a new system of financing the basic grants-to-States program, ending the financial crisis that had plagued the program for years.

Miss Switzer also made an immeasurable contribution to the passage of additional important amendments in 1965. These amendments provided further opportunities for the handicapped to become productive citizens of our society. The 1965 amendments contained a long list of improvements for the program that Miss Switzer was administering so capably—the construction of new rehabilitation facilities, grants to speed improvement of workshops for the handicapped, a new method of allotting Federal funds among the State vocational rehabilitation agencies and a uniform Federal share of 75 percent of the program costs, funding for statewide planning in rehabilitation in each State, elimination of economic need as a requirement for obtaining rehabilitation services, and creation of a National Commission on Architectural Barriers.

Additional amendments in 1967 and 1968 included support for a new National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, a special program for disabled migrants, additional provisions for help in constructing facilities, and a new grant program of vocational evaluation and work adjustment.

The creation of the Social and Rehabilitation Service in 1967 with Miss Switzer as Administrator was designed to realine the service-giving agencies into a new approach to the problems of disadvantaged people. It brought together the rehabilitation agency—redesignated the Rehabilitation Services Administration—the welfare agency, the Children's Bureau, and the Administration on Aging. The welfare functions were reconstituted into units, the Assistance Payments Administration—in charge of welfare payment activities—and the Medical Services Administration—in charge of Medicaid and related medical services. In her position as Administrator of this great agency, Miss Switzer assumed what was described as the largest administrative responsibility of any woman in government, presiding over an annual budget exceeding $8 billion.

Describing her lifelong devotion to the needs of the handicapped, Mary Switzer said:

My life with rehabilitation has been a continuous renewal of acts of faith by myself and thousands of others who have joined in writing the rehabilitation story.

She said:

The success of vocational rehabilitation owes much—perhaps all that is distinctive in the program—to the principle that the serving person gives himself to the served; he thinks first of the disabled person as a human being in need of something and, in the giving, the giver receives even more, to store up for the next cycle of sharing.

Mary E. Switzer was one serving person who certainly gave herself to the served. She always thought first of the disabled person as a human being with human needs that could be met if only everyone put forth a little more effort. She certainly did more than her share and we are the poorer for her loss.

THE UNITED STATES MUST USE ITS INFLUENCE WITH GREAT BRITAIN ON BEHALF OF THE IRISH PEOPLE

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise without hesitation to support and add my name to the resolution before us, which urges an end to "political, social, economic, and religious discrimination" in Northern Ireland and, as a means of achieving this goal, demands withdrawal of British troops from a foreign territory where the British presence has brought only misery and tragedy to the people. I fully agree with my colleagues—the Honorable HUGH L. CAREY in the House and the Honorable EDWARD M. KENNEDY and ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF in the Senate—that the time has come for our Government to assert itself through diplomatic channels, making it clear to the British that they ought to pull back across the Irish Sea and give the people of what is called Ulster the full responsibility for resolving themselves the differences that exist between them.

I most decidedly do not agree with those who object that we ought not to "interfere" in the internal affairs of another nation. Have we been silent in this Chamber when people elsewhere were denied their rights? Many of us have spoken out against the suppression of liberty in Communist puppet nations behind the Iron Curtain, against anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union, against colonialism in Africa and Asia—indeed against some of the actions of our own Government in South Vietnam. To the extent that Great Britain is an allied nation, we have an obligation to speak out even more forcefully, and to use our influence and good offices to see to it that justice is done, that suffering is stopped on an island that has given so many of its sons and daughters to our own Nation, helping to make us great.

There is no point in continuing to believe that British troops are required in Ulster to maintain order. There has been no order under British rule, and certainly no justice, and the situation keeps deteriorating and grows ever more ominous. The British must leave, but I am not insisting that the withdrawal be precipitate. I have said before, in a resolution I introduced March 17, that the road to peace and justice in Ireland is through an election that would be held under United Nations supervision. And, on September 30, when I joined a group of my colleagues in a letter to President Nixon, I proposed that—

A bipartisan commission of Protestants and Catholics, apportioned by population, be set up to reach a solution to the problems confronting the people of Northern Ireland.

I join now in offering the current resolution, the text of which follows:

RESOLUTION ON ULSTER

Calling for peace in Northern Ireland and the establishment of a united Ireland

Whereas, the continuing violence and bloodshed in Northern Ireland is a cause of the deepest concern to Americans of all faiths and political persuasions;

Whereas, the causes of the present conflict may be traced to the systematic and deliberate discrimination in housing, employment, political representation and educational opportunities practiced by the governmental authorities of Northern Ireland against the minority there;

Whereas, the governments of the United Kingdom, and of Northern Ireland have failed to end the bloodshed and have failed to establish measures to meet the legitimate grievances of this minority;

Whereas, continued repression and lack of fundamental reforms in Northern Ireland threaten to prolong and escalate the conflict and the denial of civil liberties:

Resolved that the House expresses its deepest concern over the present situation in Northern Ireland and in accord with the fundamental concepts of nondiscrimination, fairness, democracy, self-determination and justice requests the United States government at the highest levels to urge the immediate implementation of the following actions:

1. Termination of the current internment policy and simultaneous release of all persons detained thereunder.

2. Full respect for the civil rights of all the people of Northern Ireland and the termination of all political, social, economic and religious discrimination.

3. Implementation of the reforms promised by the Government of the United Kingdom since 1968 including those reforms in the fields of law enforcement, housing, employment and voting rights.

4. Dissolution of the Parliament of Northern Ireland.

5. Withdrawal of all British forces from Northern Ireland, and the institution of law enforcement and criminal justice under local control acceptable to all parties.

6. Convening of all interested parties for the purpose of accomplishing the unification of Ireland.

METHODISTS OPPOSE PRAYER AMENDMENT

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as evidenced by the following statement, the Methodists of this country are opposed to the proposed constitutional amendment regarding prayer in public buildings:

A STATEMENT CONCERNING CHURCH-GOVERNMENT RELATIONS AND EDUCATION

(Adopted by the General Conference of the United Methodist Church, May 1968)

1

"The fundamental purpose of universal public education at the elementary and secondary level is to provide equal and adequate educational opportunities for all children and young people, and thereby insure the nation an enlightened citizenry.

"We believe in the principle of universal public education and we reaffirm our support of public educational institutions. At the same time, we recognize and pledge our continued allegiance to the U.S. constitutional principle that citizens have a right to establish and maintain private schools from private resources so long as such schools meet public standards of quality. Such schools have made a genuine contribution to society. We do not support the expansion or the strengthening of private schools with public funds. Furthermore, we oppose the establishment or strengthening or private schools that jeopardize the public school system or thwart valid public policy.

"To fulfill the government's responsibility in education, sometimes it and non-public educational institutions need to enter a cooperative relationship. When public funds are utilized, it should be only when it is in the best interests of the whole society. Extreme caution must be exercised to see that religious institutions do not receive any aid directly or indirectly for the maintenance of their religous expression or the expanding of their institutional resources. Such funds must be for the expressed purpose of fulfilling a strictly public responsibility subject to public accountability.

"Public schools have often been an important unifying force in modern pluralistic society by providing a setting for contact at an early age between children of vastly different backgrounds. We recognize in particular that persons of all religious backgrounds may have insight into the nature of ultimate reality which will help to enrich the common life. It is therefore essential that the public schools take seriously the religious integrity of each of the children entrusted to their care. Public schools may not properly establish any preferred form of religion for common exercises of worship or religious observance or study. At the same time, however, education should provide opportunity for the examination of the religious traditions of mankind in the normal course of study.

2

"We believe that every person has a right to an education, including higher education, commensurate with his ability. It is society's responsibility to enable every person to enjoy this right. Public and private institutions should cooperate to provide for these educational opportunities.

3

"Freedom of inquiry poses a risk for established ideas, beliefs, programs and institutions. We accept that risk in the faith that all truth is of God. Colleges and universities can best perform their vital tasks of adding to knowledge and to the perception of truth in an atmosphere of genuine academic freedom.

"We affirm the principle that freedom to inquire, to discuss, and to teach should be regulated by the self-discipline of scholarship and the critical examination of ideas in the context of free public dialogue, rather than by supervision, censorship, or any control imposed by churches, governments, or other organizations. In the educational process, the individual has the right freely to appropriate for himself what he believes is real, important, useful and satisfying.

4

"Experience has demonstrated that freedom to inquire, to discuss, and to teach is best preserved when colleges and universities are not dependent upon a single base or a few sources of support. When an educational institution relies upon multiple sources of financial support, and where those sources tend to balance each other, the institution is in position to resist undue pressures toward control exerted from any one source of support. In the case of church-related

colleges and universities, we believe that tuitions, scholarships, investment returns, bequests, payments for services rendered, loans, government grants, and gifts from individuals, business corporations, foundations, and churches should be sought and accepted in as great a variety as possible. Care must be exercised to insure that all support from any of these sources is free from conditions which hinder the college or university in the maintenance of freedom of inquiry and expression for its faculty and students.

"We recognize that the freedom necessary to the existence of a college or university in the classical sense may be threatened by forces other than those which are involved in the nature and source of the institution's financial support. Institutional freedom may be adversely affected by governmental requirements of loyalty oaths from teachers and students; by public interference with the free flow of information; or by accreditation and certification procedures and requirements aimed at dictating the content of college and university curricula.

"With respect to church-related institutions of higher education, we deplore any ecclesiastical attempts to manipulate inquiry or the dissemination of knowledge; to use the academic community for the promotion of any particular point of view; to require ecclesiastical 'loyalty oaths' designed to protect cherished truth claims; or to inhibit the social action activities of members of the academic community. We call upon all members of The United Methodist Church, in whatever capacity they may serve, to be especially sensitive to the need to protect individual and institutional freedom and responsibility in the context of the academic community.

5

"We are persuaded that there may be circumstances or conditions in which the traditional forms of tax immunities granted to colleges and universities may be a necessary requirement for their freedom. Therefore, we urge a continuation of the public policy of granting reasonable and non-discriminatory tax immunities to all private colleges and universities, including those which are related to churches.

"We believe that colleges and universities should consider the benefits, services, and protections which they receive from the community and its governmental agencies, and examine their obligations to the community in the light of this support. We believe it is imperative that all church-related institutions of higher education determine on their own initiative what benefits, services, and opportunities they ought to provide for the community as a whole as distinct from their usual campus constituencies.

"In situations where the continued existence of church-related colleges and universities seems dependent upon the availability of direct public grants, those responsible for the administration of such institutions—including the judicatories of the church to which they are related—may have to give serious consideration to several possibilities:

"1. Merger with similarly threatened institutions in order to produce a stronger united institution.

"2. Relinquishing church ownership or control to become public or nonsectarian private institutions.

"3. Establishing schools, departments or chairs of religion adjacent to the public or non-sectarian institutions permitting interchangeable credits.

"In making provision for church-related educational institutions, churches should avoid spreading their resources so thinly that their ability to maintain the integrity of their mission in higher education may be undermined.

"The hazards which confront church-related institutions of higher education in becoming involved in programs supported by government are that such participation may:

"1. compromise academic freedom or divert the institution from its basic philosophy of education;

"2. develop into dependence or lead to adaptation of program in order to insure continued government support;

"3. inhibit the right and responsibility of social criticism, including criticism of governments;

"4. create imbalances in program that will make of education a narrowing rather than a liberalizing experience;

"5. interfere with the right of the institution to be innovative and experimental in program, method, and procedures;

"6. require secrecy with respect to the development, reporting, or proposed application of results of research, which secrecy violates the scholarly norm of free search for and sharing of knowledge;

"7. deny the right to emphasize those values and commitments which it shares with its sponsoring religious body."

FREDERICK COUNTY YOUTHS TESTIFY IN FAVOR OF ENLARGING THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week two young constituents from the Sixth District testified before the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee supporting the expansion of the Youth Conservation Corps. Nancy Croghan of Frederick and Richard Love of Thurmont worked in this program last summer at the Catoctin National Park. They both praised the program and urged its expansion.

I recently cosponsored H.R. 10860 to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 to extend the pilot program. I would like to commend these two youngsters for their testimony and to share the article from the Hagerstown Morning Herald covering their appearance before the committee:

[From the Hagerstown (Md.) Morning Herald, Oct. 19, 1971]

FREDERICK COUNTY YOUTHS ASK LARGER CONSERVATION CORPS

(By Ann Penny)

WASHINGTON.—Two Maryland youths, Nancy Croghan of Frederick and Richard Love of Thurmont, testified before a Senate interior and insular affairs committee Thursday in favor of expanding the Youth Conservation Corps program from 2,600 to 100,000 youths aged 15 to 18.

Legislation pending before the committee, introduced by Sen. Henry M. Jackson, D-Wash., would increase the budget of the corps from $2.5 million to $150 million. The money is for a three-year pilot program to preserve "the nation's environment and heritage."

Both youths participated in an eight-week summer camp in the Catoctin mountain park, responsible for reconstructing a pre-Civil War water-powered sawmill, piecing together artifacts discovered at the sawmill excavation, cutting out miles of snowmobile and nature trails, and talking with oldtimers to prepare an oral history of Catoctin.

Miss Croghan, 17, who worked at the archaelogical digs and conducted geological research, said the programs should be continued to provide "an educational and rewarding experience" for young people.

Love, 15, who worked with a team to clear streams and build a 14-mile snowmobile track, said the program should be expanded "to allow more kids to learn how to work for themselves."

Youths in the 108 pilot programs in 36 states, selected by local public school officials on their general willingness to cooperate and good academic and civic performance, represented a cross section of the population, Sen. Jackson siad.

"This isn't just program for underprivileged youths. We think a program like this can be most effective when it involves youths from all backgrounds."

Miss Croghan, who worked with 48 other youths at Catoctin, said campers were so involved with working together that they didn't notice economic or age distinctions between workers.

Outlining the accomplishments of the program, Sen. Jackson said the corps: allowed youths to make a valuable contribution in vitally needed environmental projects; gave youths from diverse backgrounds the opportunity to work together toward a common goal; provided jobs for teenagers, who comprise 18 percent of the country's unemployment; and built up a reserve of environmentally training young people, knowledgeable about the country's natural and historic resources.

In addition, the value of the projects completed equaled 75 percent of the total $2.5 million costs of operation, including a $800 summer salary for each youth.

Reaction among youths to the program has been overwhelming, according to Sen. Jackson. Over 120,000 youths applied for the 2,600 summer positions, and the dropout rate was less than four percent. Approximately 80 youths from Catoctin, Camp Wood in Charleston, W. Va., and the Washington national parks program, filled the Senate hearing room.

Despite this enthusiasm, Richard S. Bodman, assistant secretary of management and budget, said the interior department was not in favor of expanding the program until "it can be properly examined over a three year period."

However, Bodman promised $3.5 million, a $1-million increase over last summer, to continue the program in 1972. The appropriation will be introduced as a supplementary budget request in January.

In explaining the expansion, Sen. Jackson said the legislation would send youths out into more camps, rather than increase the size of pilot camps, which directors have recommended be held at a maximum of 60.

When asked how the program could be improved, Love's answer brought a laugh from the crowd: "the food."

Catoctin camp director, Paul Lambertson, teacher at Thurmont High School, testified that the program's greatest merit was in "giving young people a chance to achieve for their nation."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 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?

"CHARLES W. MORGAN"—THE LAST WOODEN WHALER

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, on October 29, four new "historic preservation" stamps will be issued by the U.S. Postal Service. These special jumbo-size stamps will honor four outstanding historic landmarks: Decatur House, the house-museum and headquarters of the National Trust here in Washington; the San Xavier del Bac Mission, near Tucson, Ariz., one of the finest surviving Spanish colonial churches; the San Francisco cable cars, the only ones still operating in this country, and, I am proud to report, the *Charles W. Morgan*, last of the 19th-century wooden whalers, now on display at Mystic, Conn., in my district. The majestic *Morgan* last of the mighty wooden whalers, can be seen at the Seaport, a recreated New England 19th-century coastal village in Mystic, home of Connecticut's No. 1 tourist attraction.

The keel of the *Charles W. Morgan* was laid in early February 1841, and the ship was launched on the morning of July 21, 1841. Named after its principal owner, who was a whaling merchant, the *Morgan* was berthed at New Bedford, Conn., for all but 20 of her 80 years as a whaler. At that time, New Bedford was the largest whaling port in the world, with a fleet of 228 vessels. From these vessels and almost 600 other American whalers that sailed the seven seas during the 19th century, only one was eventually to survive, and that one was the *Charles W. Morgan*.

The *Morgan* sailed on her first voyage September 6, 1841, and returned to New Bedford on January 2, 1845. For the next 80 years she ranged the seven seas in search of whales.

On May 28, 1921, the *Morgan*'s whaling career came to an end. During those 80 years, the ship had survived hurricanes and typhoons and weathered ice-packs; eluded capture by South Sea savages and avoided destruction by fire; escaped shipwreck on the rocky shores of the Arctic and coral reefs in tropic seas; and brought back wealth in oily cargoes for a dozen owners. The *Morgan* had also sailed more miles and caught more whales than any American whaler in history.

During the next 15 years the *Morgan* was saved from oblivion and destruction by people who wanted the whaler preserved as a symbol of the whaling industry. In 1938, when it appeared that the *Morgan* was going to be allowed to slowly disintegrate because there were no more funds for her upkeep, the Marine Historical Association offered to purchase the ship, tow it to Mystic, Conn., and accept the responsibility for preserving it. This was agreed to and in 1941 the *Morgan* was towed to Mystic and her final resting place.

After a half a decade of work, the *Charles W. Morgan* was finally restored to her former sturdy appearance. Today she has the distinction of being the last wooden whale ship to still be in existence, and she is one of the many sailing ships preserved at Mystic Seaport, Conn. She stands as a reminder of the part whaling played in our history, and will now grace one of our newest historic preservation stamps.

EQUAL PARTICIPANTS: SPECTATOR AND CREW

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the New York Times of July 27, 1971.

I enclose it not only because it reports on an important subject, but also because it is an example of the very best in news analysis which reaches beyond the event into the meaning of it and the feeling behind it. Whether or not one believes that the space program should be continued on the same priority basis that it has held over the last decade, I think that this article reflects a feeling that we have all had as we have watched, either live or on television, our moon shots. What is remarkable at such times is the unity between men on earth even with the crew of a spacecraft thousands of miles away; it is this unity which is so magnificently captured by A. M. Rosenthal in "Equal Participants: Spectator and Crew."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

EQUAL PARTICIPANTS: SPECTATOR AND CREW

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

CAPE KENNEDY.—The special meaning of the launch to the millions who come to the beach—the true mystery—becomes clear and part of the mind forever—in the merest unmeasurable part of a split second.

Until then it is a spectacle, something to observe from the outside—with interest, with admiration, with wonderment at the simple fact that this whole great technological world created here and the work of scores of thousands of specialists all are built for and around just three men. It is something to see and think about, from a physical and emotional distance.

It all changes that instant when the rocket begins to move, when the whole sky is one flame and the ground trembles and there is a roar even louder than silence.

At that moment in time it all ceases to be a spectacle, something to watch. It becomes one's own experience and sensation and each person watching, for the first time or tenth, is himself a participant in the launch.

You are conscious of nothing, feel nothing and are aware of nothing but the launch; a total feeling of sharing and participation. The body stretches and feels itself in motion upward, enveloped in light and heat. You don't so much hear the roar as become part of the roar, built into it, enveloped by it.

Nothing at all intrudes. You don't really think much at all but there is the sensation that something is happening that happens very seldom—that you have become a part of the life experience of other men and they part of yours.

Then something does intrude—the great platinum sun. It comes between you and the rocket and it cuts you off because in the midst of a totally new sensation it brings a known sensation—pain, pain to the eyes—and this is the reminder of and the return to remembered reality. The sun brings you back to earth.

You come back to earth and look around and it takes a few seconds until people come back into focus. Your hands and knees tremble for a moment but there is no emptiness of letdown because you know that for a while you have been a part of a piece of living poetry.

There is no written poetry that compares but a while later a line does dimly come back. Prospero saying in astonishment to Ariel, Why you are nothing but air and yet you feel.

It seems that just a minute or two has gone by since the sun intruded and the Apollo vanished but you ask somebody the time and it's been an hour gone by. Where are they? They are over Australia, somebody says. Over Australia! Now you realize that you have separated from them, truly.

There's a particular and extremely rare journalistic sensation about the Apollo missions and going to the moon. It is a good story about good.

Most good stories are about bad things—wars, earthquakes, assassinations, famine; almost always the copy editor has to say tragedy one way or another as he counts out the headline.

But almost always this has been a good good story—the telling of a story that grew out of the individual brains and talents of thousands of talented men, the meshing of those brains into the great achievement that was a summation and expansion of all of man's accumulated technological knowledge.

It's been a story of accomplishment and of another happy thing—openness. Just about everything that has been done and just about everything that became known has been shared and made available—not in grudging driblets but by the pound, by the ream.

And yet there is at the Kennedy Space Center and at Cocoa Beach a quite poignant feeling of sadness. In one way or another, the men of great ability whose brains have fashioned the Apollo mission keep asking—"Why don't they love us anymore?"

There is an unease, a feeling that Americans don't care as much any more, are yawning a bit and that when the American public yawns, leaders yawn and funds disappear.

A man with enormous responsibility in the Apollo program, whose fine brain is as much a part of the project as any computer, and more important, is bewildered. He knows there is much talk about reordering of national priorities and he and his colleagues sometimes try, a little awkwardly, to fit their tongues around sociological jargon to show they are thinking of those things and really in sympathy—you know, poverty programs and rebuilding ghettos.

But over and over they ask—are *we* preventing those things? Weren't we taught in school that America's greatness came in large part from her technological progress? Aren't we contributing to that progress as much as any group of Americans? Don't people believe in progress and science and achievement and adventure anymore? What's happened?

They talk about their worries for the future of the space program constantly—except on launch days. Then they seem to feel fulfilled and total and understood and secure in their achievements.

Walter J. Kapryan, the launch director, talks to the press at 1:08:55 after launch—minutes without seconds suddenly seem gross and dull—and says:

"It was the most uneventful countdown we've ever had.'"

Very laconic and very proud.

FOREIGN STEEL IMPORTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the latest issue of U.S. Steel News contains a most interesting article dealing with the importation of foreign made steel products and the exportation of American jobs.

As the writer so aptly points out, the dollar value of the nearly 11 million tons of steel imported for the first 7 months of 1971 was more than $1.5 billion. However, he poses an intriguing question when he asks what is the value of the 78,000 full time and supporting jobs lost as a result of the import tidal wave.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the complete article into the RECORD, for I believe it will prove of great interest to my colleagues:

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN'T HURT YOU

What you don't know CAN hurt you. Take foreign steel imports, for example. A lot of people who don't know that foreign steel imports reached an all-time high for the first seven months of 1971 have been hurt . . . like in the pay check. Some are still hurting.

As a steelworker, you should be interested in some of the facts behind the story of foreign steel imports. If you are, stay with us for a while as we take a look at some of the key factors in the rise of foreign steel imports.

The fact that more foreign steel entered the United States during the first seven months of 1971 than during the same period of any other year in history is based on government figures supplied to American Iron and Steel Institute.

While July was high, June just missed matching the all-time one-month steel import record, and marked only the second time in history that more than 2 million tons of foreign steel arrived in the United States in a single month. A total of 2,112,000 tons of imported steel mill products landed in this country during the 30 days of June. This was just 26,000 tons short of the single-month import mark of 2,138,000 tons in August 1968—a 31-day month.

July's tonnage lifted steel mill products imported through the first seven months of 1971 to a record-breaking 10,744,000 tons. This is more than 1,000,000 tons higher than the seven-month total for 1968, the year 18 million tons of foreign steel arrived in the United States.

These steel mill product figures don't include other steel products such as fabricated structurals, fasteners, wire rope, mesh, etc., which amounted to almost 371,000 tons for the first seven months of 1971.

The figures supplied AISI also fail to include the thousands and thousands of tons of foreign steel masquerading as autos, appliances, machinery, and other hard goods imported from overseas.

Getting back to the almost 11 million tons of steel imports for the first seven months of 1971, the declared value was $1,533,000,000. That was declared dollar value. What about undeclared job value?

According to AISI, one million tons of imported steel mill products represent the export of 6,000 full-time job opportunities in the production and sale of steel and another 1,200 jobs in supporting activities.

So, the almost 11 million tons of imported steel represented the export of about 65,000 full-time job opportunities in the production and sale of steel and about 13,000 jobs in supporting activities for a total of 78,000 jobs. Makes you stop to think, doesn't it?

THE REASONS BEHIND THE HIGH LEVEL OF IMPORTS

Three things account for this unhappy record of high steel imports.

First, foreign steel costs the American buyer less than steel made right here. It costs less mainly because foreign steel labor costs are lower than they are in the United States. That's hard to beat.

It also costs less because, in many cases, foreign governments subsidize or tax their steelmakers in a way that helps make it possible to ship steel out of their own country and sell it for less than they do in their own homeland. That's hard to beat, too.

Second, the quality of foreign steel, in many cases, is just as good as American-made steels. Low cost and good quality make a combination that's even harder to beat.

Finally, what happened in 1968, the last prior labor negotiations year in steel, happened all over again in 1971 . . only more so.

Consumers stockpiled steel against the possibility of an industry shutdown that never came. The heavy influx of foreign steel in the first half of 1971, as well as high domestic steel shipments, resulted in part from this stockpiling. Consumer stockpiling of foreign steel, as well as domestic steel, became the hardest of all to beat.

With this larger than normal inventory of steel in the hands of customers, and with the generally flat level of the economy as a whole, new orders for domestic steel fell off early in the summer. With the low level of orders, furnaces were banked and operations put on a standby basis in preparation for a possible shutdown on July 31. Some of these facilities have been slow to start up again because of the continued scarcity of orders. And, of course, most American steel companies and many of their employees and suppliers felt the effect.

WHAT ABOUT THE FUTURE

The question now is "What can be done to prevent foreign steel imports from hurting the American steel industry and American steelworkers in the future?"

One way to help improve this situation would be to establish realistic quotas on imported steel. As Mr. Gott has said, ". . . imports of steel products, and consumer products made of steel, have taken the cream—and some of the 'milk' as well—out of our markets."

(Two favorable developments have taken place as this article was being written. President Nixon applied a 10 per cent surtax on many imported products, and this should have a beneficial effect on the majority of steel items. At about the same time the Japanese steel industry reportedly indicated to our State Department a willingness to extend voluntary quotas for three years and strengthen the informal arrangements on steel exports to the United States.)

Another step that would help smooth out the peaks and valleys that occur every three years would be to find a better answer to labor negotiations than crisis bargaining.

Several other things are definitely important factors to U.S. Steel and its people:

Continuing improvement in the quality of our products.

Prompt delivery at the time specified by the customer.

The continuation of U.S. Steel's outstanding service to customers in helping them get the most value for their money out of our products.

And then, of course, a concerted, cooperative effort to improve productivity could be the clincher.

Taken all together—realistic import quotas, a better way to negotiate labor contracts, improved quality, prompt delivery, outstanding customer service, and improved productivity—these could cut the strangling noose of steel imports.

Figure it this way. U.S. Steel, and all the people of U.S. Steel, have much to gain and nothing to lose if they do everything they can to help make these things happen.

What you don't do can hurt you, too.

CRONKITE WRONG

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Cronkite Wrong," appearing in the Detroit, Mich., West Side Courier, a fine newspaper published in Detroit by its distinguished editor and publisher, Mr. Harry Weinbaum.

This well done editorial points out the reason why reasonable and intelligent controls now in being over behavior of broadcast licensees should be continued and affords an excellent answer to those who would seek to emasculate the FCC in its limited power to protect the public interest through the fairness rule, the equal time provisions, and a number of other devices needed to protect the public from slanted and biased reporting and from improper behavior by licensees of this important public resource:

CRONKITE WRONG

Walter Cronkite, one of the best television newsmen and generally conceded to be more fair in news selection than some, is nevertheless wrong in his proposal to strip the Federal Communications Commission of its authority to review a station's program content and its balancing of news presentation.

He is wrong because broadcasting stations use the public airwaves. (Newspapers use no public property in publishing and enjoy no federally-granted license or semimonopoly, which broadcasting licenses, in fact, are.) Thus the people's elected government has not only the right but the duty to see that broadcasting is not used contrary to the public interest and the general welfare of the country.

Cronkite's words, of course, will please the three giant television networks, one of which is his employer. In other words, they would like to have their three groups of New York news executives, rather than the federal government's FCC, decide what television news the electorate gets.

The television networks, already to blame according to many experts for much of the rising violence and crime in America because of the shockingly low level of degradation and violence in their programs, have also been guilty of slanting news, by selection and other means.

It will be a sad day for Americans when three groups of news executives in New York, working for television networks with commercial interests paramount, not the public welfare, wiggle out from under FCC supervision under the phony claim that television stations are in the same boat as newspapers. They are not. They enjoy government favor in the form of license.

Newspapers also use news services but they have a host of other news sources, free and independent columnists, editorial and feature services, editorial writers, often their own correspondents, etc., and they print so much news the wire services don't enjoy exclusive national and international reporting.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND SITUATION: REPORT NO. 12

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, since I have been speaking out on the problems of the beleaguered people in Northern Ireland for almost 2 years now, I receive letters from many people commenting on the situation there. Today I received a letter from a Silver Spring, Md., woman forwarding to me a letter she had received from a person interned under the infamous Special Powers Act.

Nothing could more graphically describe the injustice perpetrated on the minority of Northern Irish than this Irish gentleman's letter. Nothing could speak more plainly for reunification of that divided country. Nothing could more soundly condemn the British Government for its continued denial of basic human rights in Northern Ireland.

So that my colleagues may know of the cruel and unfair treatment afforded the citizens in Northern Ireland by the occupation British forces, I am including the letter in the RECORD at this point:

THE LETTER

I am sorry I have been rambling away on history which I'm sure is of no interest to you so I will try to explain the position here today.

On Monday, August 9th at 5 AM my wife and I were raffed up by the British army and two soldiers came into our bedroom and informed me that they were arresting me under the Civil Rights Act and I told him that there was no such act of parliament but he said. "Under the Civil f . . . ing Act you have now five minutes to get dressed." I was not allowed breakfast but was taken and was not told where I was being taken or why and I had asked both questions and I told my wife to contact my solicitor and he tried to find out where I had been taken without any success.

We were brought to an interrogation camp at Bellykinler Co. Down and made to do tortuous exercises there by Military Police all day and night and all day on Tuesday until evening, when we were transferred to a prison ship. Mardstone, in Belfast Lough. In the ship we had two dormitories and two canteens and that was the only part of the ship we had. It had artificial light all the time since very little light came through the small portholes and there was no space for exercise.

After about six weeks we were transferred to the camp where we have at least fresh air and daylight, but still the space is very limited. I am writing this sitting on top of a two tier bunk because theire is forty men in this hut which measures sixty feet by twenty feet with twenty double bunks and forty wardrobes so you can imagine how much space or privacy each man has.

As far as appealing the case is concerned, there is no procedure for appealing during the first month of detention. Then after we are officially interned we are told we have the right to an advisory tribunal who are appointed by the minister of home affairs who is the same man responsible for my internment and who had stated on television interviews that everyone whom he has interned has been thoroughly investigated by him and is guilty. If the advisory tribunal were to decide that I should not have been interned they have no power to release me, nor would I be informed of their decision, but they would recommend to the same minister of home affairs who has "proved" me guilty that he was wrong and it would be up to him whether to release me or not.

We were informed that we would be allowed to have our solicitors to present our submissions to this tribunal but now we are only allowed the advice of our solicitor to prepare our written submission but will have to appear alone before the tribune and our solicitors cannot receive any clue from the authorities as to what suspicion might be against us so how can they help us prove our innocence?

All I know is that the minister of home affairs considers that I am a person who might be about to think or act in a manner prejudicial to the peace, while anyone who knows me would swear that I am the most peaceful man in my parish and I have always been so, but I have dared to speak in favour of a United Ireland and I have worked for the republican candidates at elections and this is why I am now interned. I do not believe in secterianism. I have very good friends both Catholic and Protestant and I claim that one is as good as the other and I insist on this principle in anything I am associated with and that is not popular with Unionists.

I have a wife and son who is six years and a daughter who is three years and we live in a farm house on a small farm which was my father's and I worked as a television service engineer but as a result of this internment I will not be able to get work when I am released. We depend entirely on the pressure put on the British Government by the situation here and more especially by world opinion so our friends in America should ask their Senators to put this pressure on the British Parliament and it may also be helpful to write directly to Mr. Heath at 10 Downing St., London.

Hoping to hear from you again soon.

——— ———.

VETERANS DAY

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to know the history of the special homage we pay to our veterans.

On November 4, 1921, Congress authorized the President to proclaim November 11—of that year only—a legal public holiday in honor of the burial of the Unkown Soldier at the Arlington National Cemetery.

On June 4, 1926, a concurrent resolution was approved by the Congress which stated:

Whereas the 11th of November 1918, marked the cessation of the most destructive, sanguinary, and far-reaching war in human annals and the resumption by the people of the United States of peaceful relations with other nations, which we hope may never again be severed; and whereas it is fitting the recurring anniversary of this date should be commemorated with thanksgiving and prayer and exercises designed to perpetuate peace through good will and mutual understanding between nations; and whereas the legislatures of twenty-seven of our States have already declared November 11 to be a legal holiday; therefore be it resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), that the President of the United States is requested to issue a proclamation calling upon officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on November 11 and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day in schools and churches, or other suitable places, with appropriate ceremonies expressive of our gratitude for peace and our desire for the continuance of friendly relations with all other peoples.

The optimism of this resolution was attenuated by 1938 when Congress declared November 11 a permanent legal public holiday in much more brief and businesslike language:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That the 11th day of November in each year, a day to be dedicated to the cause of world peace and to be hereafter celebrated and known as Armistice Day, is hereby made a legal public holiday.

After World War II and the Korean conflict, the inappropriateness of confining the holiday to the commemoration of ending the First World War was apparent. Congress, therefore, changed the day from Armistice Day to Veterans Day, and November 11 became a day of commemoration of all those who sacrificed to preserve our Nation.

This year, under the provisions of the Monday Holiday Act, Veterans Day will be observed on the fourth Monday in October. For those who were fortunate enough to return unscathed, we must remember the war-caused disruption of their lives. To those who laid the supreme sacrifice on the altar of this country's freedom, we must pay special tribute. Our country exists today, proud, free, and unafraid, because of their sacrifices in times of national danger.

Let us therefore observe Veterans Day in the proper spirit of humble thanksgiving for the gift of freedom bestowed upon us by our American fighting men.

LET'S STOP KILLING WHALES NOW

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in a few weeks, the House will consider House Concurrent Resolution 387, which requests the Secretary of State to call for an international moratorium of 10 years on the killing for commercial purposes of all species of whales.

Concern for the whale is mounting among organizations dedicated to the preservation of our wildlife. In the November edition of Not Man Apart, the publication of the Friends of the Earth, support for the 10-year moratorium was announced. Also, in the same publication, appears a review of a recent book by George L. Small entitled "The Blue Whale," which details the poignant story of whales and reinforces the need for the moratorium on killing of this species. The text of these articles follows:

FOE LEADS INTERNATIONAL CAMPAIGN FOR WHALING MORATORIUM

(By Joan McIntyre)

The following statement was presented to the 23rd annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission, which met in Washington, D.C. last June. It marks the first public act in what will be a principal FOE-JMI campaign to educate and inform the people of the world of the desperate plight of the remaining whales, and to bring about an international ten-year moratorium on all commercial hunting. Major international actions planned for next year include forcing the Whaling Commission to hold open meetings (at present they are closed to the press and public), informing, through newspaper advertising and public events, the people of Europe and Asia of the problem and its solution, and holding a major public whale ceremony in Japan.

AN INTERNATIONAL CETACEAN DECADE

Whatever the fine and intricate force that wove sea and cells together to produce the great whales of the deep: whales that sing, that play, that court, love and nurse each other—whatever that ancient special chemistry of gentle change that produced great whales—will never be duplicated in the lifetime of this planet. Once we allow the extinction of whales we, and they, will never have another chance.

Yet by and large our efforts to prevent extinction are impoverished and shortsighted. We wait until a population attracts our attention because of its rarity, then make elaborate and often futile efforts to preserve some pitiful remnants: animals which are doomed to be zoological curiosities or museum pieces, but who have already lost their strong and rightful place in the integrity of a diverse ecosystem. We may have prevented biological extinction—for a while—but all too often ecological extinction has already taken place.

And that is what we seem to be fated to do about the world's whales. When it is too late; when the stocks are reduced to numbers so low that hunting becomes uneconomical then there will be a great scientific and humanitarian outcry and men and women throughout the globe will rush to the aid of the whales. By then it will be too late. So let us act now when the result of our actions will not be self-serving propaganda, but substantial events in the world of nature.

We the undersigned propose a ten year moratorium on world wide commercial whaling. We feel this, and no less than this, can guarantee man the company of whales for his long term future.

If we allow the present shortsighted and ruthless pattern of hunting to continue we will not have a whale fishery in ten years, and we will not have whales. We will have nothing but more people, fewer resources, and a planet that is less productive and interesting. While we admire and commend efforts to set decent quotas, to eliminate the Blue Whale Unit and to establish and fund an observer program, we feel that these efforts are not adequate to solve the problem. Only a ten year total ban on all commercial hunting can provide the time necessary to properly assess the situation and arrive at workable long range solutions. Of course this will mean hardships and difficulties for the whaling industry. It will require developing short term alternatives for whale products. But these alternatives exist. If we do not find them now we will have to find them later. And if the industry persists in its present patterns it will have to face identical hardships and relocations once the whales are hunted out. The experience of the past has taught us that we cannot rely on an industry with an economic investment to police itself. The whaling will not stop until the industry finds it is no longer economically feasible to continue. By that time it will be too late. The whales will be gone, or so reduced in numbers that they will be evolutionary ghosts, swimming vainly through the worlds vast oceans, unable to find each other, unable to reproduce sufficiently to regain their ecological integrity, great shadowy reminders of our greed, and of our lack of intelligence.

SIGNATURES

David Amram, Composer, Conductor.
George N. Appell, Ed. Borneo Research Bulletin.
Herve Bazin, Academie Concur.
The Duke of Bedford, Woburn Abbey, England.
Candice Bergen, Actress.
Leonard Bernstein, Conductor, Composer.
Harrison Brown, Calif. Institute of Technology.
Dave Brubeck, Musician.
John Cage, Composer.
Jacques Cousteau, Pres., Living Sea Corp.
Ian McTaggart Cowan, Dean, Univ. of Brit. Columbia.
Steele Curry, Triarch Corp. Ltd., Canada.
T. Dobzhansky, Geneticist, Rockefeller Univ.
Jean Dorst, Mus. D'Hist. Naturelle, Paris.
Rene Dubos, Bacteriologist, Rockefeller U.
Freeman J. Dyson, Prof. of Physics, Princeton.
Richard Eberhardt, Poet.
Mia Farrow, Actress.
Maurice Friedman, Prof. Relig., Temple Univ.
R. Buckminster Fuller, Engineer.
Pierce Gascar, Writer.
Arthur Godfrey, Entertainer.
Mike Gravel, Senator, Alaska.
Alan Gussow, America the Beautiful Fund.
Lord Harlech, Diplomat, London.
Joel W. Hedgpeth, Marine Science Center.
Walter J. Hickel, Former Sec. of the Interior.
Jack Hogan, V.P., I.L.W.U.
Thomas Hoving, Metropolitan Museum of Art.
Sally Kent, Au Sable Forks, New York.
Everett Kleinjans, Chancellor, East West Center.
Claude Levi-Strauss, Anthropologist, Col. of France.
George E. Lindsay, Calif. Acad. of Sciences.
Chauncey C. Loomis, Jr., Dartmouth College.
Dwight Macdonald, Critic, Author.
Ali MacGraw, Actress.
Joan McIntyre, Bolinas, California.
Rollo May, Psychologist, Author.
Michael McClure, Poet.
Karl Menninger, Psychiatrist, Menninger Found.
Darius Milhaud, Composer.
Richard G. Miller, Foresta Institute.
Bernard Moitessier, Cape Horn Sailor.
Farley Mowat, Writer, Naturalist.
Mike Nichols, Director.
Prince Ivan Obolensky, New York.
Seji Osawa, Cond., Dir., S.F. Symphony.
Mrs. Lester B. Pearson, Ottawa, Canada.
Andre Previn, Composer, Conductor.
Theodora Kroeber Quinn, Writer.
Gaston Rebuffat, Pavillon de Loubassane.
Sir Michael Redgrave, Actor.
Edwin O. Reischauer, Former Ambassador to Japan.
Jean Rostand, Ville d'Avray, Acad. Francaise.
Peter Seeger, Musician.
Jack Shepard, Playwright, BBC, London.
Mark Schorer, Writer.
Anatole Shub, Foreign Correspondent.
William Shurcliff, Physicist, Harvard.
Lord Snow, Writer, Scientist.
Gary S. Snyder, Poet.
Barbara Streisand, Singer.
Reuben Tam, Artist.
Marie Tolstoy, Translator.
G. T. Towers, Former Gov., Bank of Canada.
Alain Vidal, F.A.O., U.N.
George Wald, Higgins Prof. Biol., Harvard.
Edward Wenk Jr., Former Presidential Sci. Adv.

THE BLUE WHALE

(By George L. Small)

Quite often, in bombarding friends or strangers with wild speeches on the plight and intelligence of whales, I am asked the question—"Well, if whales are so smart, why do they let us kill them?" My answer has been to return the question and mention Viet Nam, or Dachau, or Angola—the odds are wrong, it's not a matter of intelligence. The answer serves, at least conceptually, but it doesn't explain the horrendous history of our war on whales; an 800-year war waged with all the armor man could muster.

George Small has written an exceedingly valuabe book about that war. Although *The Blue Whale* is specifically a history of the assault on the greatest of the baleen whales, the blue, it is also a history of the whole conflict, not just a single engagement.

From the 12th century, when Basque whalers discovered herds of hundreds of Biscayne Right whales—and brought them to commercial extinction in about one century—to today, when eight species of whales are listed as endangered by the U.S. government, the war has been relentless, and the odds haven't changed. What Professor Small has done is carefully and painfully assemble the evidence. The story of the blue whale is ultimately the story of all the whales. It is perhaps more poignant because the blue is the biggest animal ever to have breathed the air of this planet. It might also be the most intelligent, but it seems that we will not give ourselves a chance to find out.

One of the most moving and disturbing aspects of the story of the slaughter of the blue whale, was an account of the difference between what we knew and what we did. George Small writes:

"(In) 1952 it was clear to nearly everyone concerned with the industry that the whale population was declining rapidly. It should have been logical therefore, indeed obligatory, for the International Whaling Commission to give the species increased protection. It did not. The Commission in that year increased the length of the whaling season, a move that virtually guaranteed that more rather than fewer blue whales would be killed! The point to be emphasized here is the length of time it took man to determine one simple but important biographical fact about the blue whale. (The age at which the animal could reproduce.) The animal was so remote and so unmanageable that it could not be studied by direct observation during any stage of its life cycle. Only in death could man examine it effectively. If one takes the first reliable records of the blue-whale catch in 1909 as the beginning of its commercial life, and 1965 as its end, the specific knowledge of age at sexual maturity was attained when its commercial life was 95.2 percent over. In other words, by the time the Japanese scientists confirmed Ruud's findings 95.2 percent of all the blue whales taken in the history of the Antarctic whaling had already been killed. . . . In essence therefore, the blue whale was on the verge of commercial extinction before man could learn one of the most elemental facts about its life cycle."

In describing the events, the technologies, the attitudes and the economics that have contributed to the commercial extinction of the blues (and by extrapolation the rights, the bowheads, and the humpbacks), George Small has performed a priceless service to those of us who are interested in the cause of the whales, and who believe that something can still be done. The book was many years in the making. The author hired his own Japanese researcher and interviewer and taught himself Norwegian in order to study

official documents. The failure of the International Whaling Commission to adequately protect the whales is carefully recorded. There is detailed and fascinating information on the economics of whaling, the politics of whaling nations, the technology of the kill and of the slaughter.

But in a funny way this is an easy book to read. It is easy because it sustains a tone which makes it possible to stay with and assimilate a mass of factual material. A tone which does not cop out, but which restrains the pain. His account is clear, and his careful scholarship is enhanced by an ability to take responsibility—to admit his love for the creatures he chronicles.

We seem to be the kind of animal that can easily kill without knowing. But the corollary may be that the more we know, the more restrained we might become. The hope for the whales, and finally for all of us, still lies in the direction of knowledge—and love. George Small has brought both qualities to work in this book, and I recommend it. Knowing the history it describes can be our first step in changing the future.

SPEAKER ALBERT ADDRESSES OKLAHOMANS AT McALESTER

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma has no more illustrious son than our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable CARL ALBERT. He holds the highest public office ever occupied by an Oklahoman.

On September 17, 1971, the Speaker was guest speaker at a luncheon meeting of a great and growing civic organization, the Oklahoma Waters Users Association, at McAlester, Okla. His address on that occasion, which received a standing ovation, was climaxed by a dramatic and moving account of the history of Oklahoma, ranging back to the tragedy of the Indian migrations and the trail of tears. The Speaker's remarks movingly told the later drama of a pioneer State which struggled valiantly, and ultimately successfully, with tragic problems of drought, depression, and flood.

It is a drama of which all Oklahomans are extremely proud and conscious, and which is being climaxed today by one of the Nation's most spectacular success stories in the field of economic development.

Here is the text of the Speaker's address, as delivered in his hometown of McAlester, Okla.:

SPEECH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARL ALBERT

Mr. Chairman, Bob Kerr, Mr. Edmondson, Mr. Speaker, distinguished guests, and my friend Bruce Carter, I appreciate the kind introduction you have given me.

It's wonderful to be here, not only within my home town and in the temple of whose consistory I have been a member for a number of years, but also across the street from the high school that gave me my chances in life. My secretary this morning, just as I came in, gave me a copy of my high school commencement program. I hadn't seen it since 1927, but such mementoes bring back happy memories.

We drove down from Tulsa this morning—rained all the way. Water was the subject that I was to discuss. In talking over this subject with members of my staff before we decided to put the thing together, we got out the mail that we had—particularly from the western part of my district—of how the wheat crop had been burned out, of the ruinous effects of locusts and plague, and how Southwestern Oklahoma and West Texas had suffered some of the worst drought since the 1930's.

And I thought then, and I am reminded now, that as a boy who was living out here 7 miles away from town, in a community called Bug Tussle, on a farm on Buckluxey Creek, how every other year the crop burned up and every other year it was bugged out. My sister still lives out there on the banks of what is now Lake Eufaula; my homestead too, is out there and I am mighty proud of it. I spent the happiest days of my life there, and I'm happy that my sister—who was the first of us to build a home on the old place—went back there till the lake was filled and she was able to build her home in the very area where she herself was born.

The Lake Eufaula area was frequently the scene of those twin disasters, drought and floods, which have often brought havoc to Oklahoma. This dam and reservoir dramatizes what a great Oklahoman used to make the theme song of every political speech, and almost every act in Congress:

Water. Bob Kerr.

I'm happy to acknowledge here and now that the development of water resources in Oklahoma could not have been possible had we not had the benefit of the life and the genius of Bob Kerr and Ed Edmondson.

Those of you who live in other parts of the state and who travel the Arkansas Basin or the Red River will understand how much has been done in the way of developing the two major watersheds of our state. Oklahoma not only had been the number one state in Corps of Engineering activity during the development of the Arkansas River Basin, but it has been far out in front in the use of the various programs of the Department of Agriculture to develop land and water resources.

The Washita Valley was the first of the great eleven origin projects really to get underway. Public Law 566 has gone further in Oklahoma than any other state in the union. There are more projects in this state in these upstream flood control programs per square mile than in any other state in the union. We are grateful to the Bureau of Reclamation for the strides it has made in Western Oklahoma where the need for water for many specific purposes has been greater than it has been in Eastern Oklahoma.

Since the Legislature had to redistrict the State of Oklahoma on the basis of the one-man, one-vote proposition laid down by the Supreme Court, I have had to represent both the short-grass and the long-grass country, the prairies of Oklahoma and the timberland of Oklahoma, and I know the needs of all.

I think my District is the site of more oil wells than the District of any Congressman in the United States. Twenty-one of the twenty-two counties that I now represent produce either oil, gas, or coal. I don't think any other Congressman with that many counties can say that in Texas, Louisiana, California, or anywhere else. At the end of the road, oil is a depletable resource. Oil must be found, and when found it almost immediately begins to be depleted. But the things that come through soil and water will last as long as mankind takes proper care of them.

If you will take a census map of my district, you will see that every county but one east of Highway 69 gained in population, and these were considered the poorest counties in my whole District. The great oil counties—Seminole, Carter, Pontotoc, Stephens, and the other important oil counties—all lost population. The same is true in Ed Edmondson's district. The gaining districts were those districts geared to the development of water resources in Oklahoma, and the gains have just begun.

The great forests of McCurtain and LeFlore Counties and the Washita Region are bringing to Oklahoma—because we have developed the water resources—the largest paper and pulp mill in the entire world.

Ever since civilization began, man has tended to settle where there was water; where there were streams; where there were rivers; where he could barge produce from his neighbors or from far away. All of the great metropolitan cities of the world are located near or on navigable rivers on the ocean front. I think this is true without a single exception. I know of no city in the world of more than a million population that is not located on either a navigable stream or on the sea coast. There are certainly very few, if any.

Oklahoma's history is replete with the progress and difficulties connected with water. Our pioneering ancestors came in here and settled close to the creeks when they could; near the springs when they could; they led hard lives. They had to depend on water often a capricious resource—whether too much or too little.

Water affects us in so many ways. Too much of it will destroy us and our property, and too little of it will kill us as individuals. We have got to have water or we die. We have seen this particularly in Oklahoma.

We have gone a long way but we have just begun. We think too much is terms of the fact that we had to get the big reservoirs built on the Red River Basin and the Arkansas River Basin. We've got to get water and supplies to develop the water resources in every section of the state.

We have, after years of trying, commenced the construction of a watershed at Waurika, which is almost indispensable to the very dynamic part of Oklahoma—the Duncan and Lawton areas, all the way back to Waurika and that whole section of South Central and Southwestern Oklahoma.

The Bureau of Reclamation built a fine lake at Sulphur which we call the Lake of the Arbuckles, and it has revitalized the area. We built one of the finest tire and rubber plants of the country near Ardmore, Oklahoma. We couldn't have done it without enough water. We couldn't have done it if the water hadn't been available there. We could not have brought into McCurtain County, Oklahoma, the great paper mill that they are getting ready to build. We couldn't have done it without water!

And you watch the population of McCurtain County. You watch the population of Carter County. I represent small towns and rural areas, but you watch them grow because the things that water does in the way of furnishing a needed resource for industry has just begun, and that basin on the Arkansas is just in its infancy.

There is so much more to be done. A lot of people think we have done the job. But we have just started to get all these things on the books.

We had the Arkansas River development project on the books for years but it took money, and Ed was the one who saw a vote one day in the House that got the first money for Eufaula. He asked me whether to make it Keystone or Eufaula. I am not the least bit parochial, but I suggested that Eufaula would be the best one to start with. So Ed put in his dollars for Eufaula which Senator Thomas and Senator Kerr had been putting money in for years, though the House had always thrown it out. But we won the battle.

Then we had the reservoir program, and it had been geared only to lower Texas, lower Arkansas, and Louisiana and we had to completely reorganize and rewrite the program or we wouldn't have had Broken Bow; we wouldn't have had Pine Creek; we wouldn't have had the Kiamichi Reservoir, or any other reservoir below Dennison Dam on the

Red River. Believe you me, we faced a man size job.

When I say we have just begun, I cite statistics that Don McBride, our Oklahoman TVA Commissioner furnished me. The Tennessee Valley Authority has made a statistical study of the savings paid to industry and passed along to consumers because of the rivers that are navigable in the Tennessee System. It's $50 million per year, and that was geared primarily to the development of rural electricity. It was the laboratory to determine whether the cost to benefits ratio of great water projects could be measured through the use of electricity.

Well, Don tells me that it has done more than that, that it has also brought in new industries and cut down the cost of transportation. We are now where the Tennessee Valley was about twenty years ago, and we can forge ahead of the Tennessee Valley, in my opinion, twenty years from now because we are far ahead of them in resources both under ground and above ground.

We have the finest wheat and agricultural areas in Western Oklahoma, and in the great river valleys of this state, in this part of the country, we have enough coal to supply the world. The coal taken out of Howe, Oklahoma, is loaded on ships and towed into Japanese ports; every pound of it loaded right out of the boat, into the steel mills that have been built right by the harbors—the finest modern mills in the world.

The Japanese have learned the value of location, of transportation, and they have the fastest growing economy of any great nation in the world today. They are challenging us and one British economist, I am told, has said to a group of Congressmen, "Watch out. By the year 2000 the average income of the average Japanese will be higher than that of the average person in the United States." So we've just begun.

Bob, I think I've told you this story before, but it's a true story. The November before your father died, he and I (and I think Ed was with us at Sallisaw) made a speech to a gathering at Sallisaw. We drove from Sallisaw to Spiro and to Poteau, but we stopped at the bridge on the Arkansas River. Senator Kerr wanted to stop to scan the upstream of the river and he said, "There's where we're going to have the lock and dam." He didn't know at that time it was going to be called the Kerr Lock and Dam. "That has got to be finished, but," he said, "Carl, I don't know how long I'm going to be here, but I know this job has got to be finished here and that this is just the beginning of the development of water resources in Oklahoma for all of their multiple uses—domestic, industrial, municipal, flood control, hydroelectric power, navigation. If we're going to be a great state," he said, "we're going to have to develop those resources. And I've been in the oil business for a long time, but I know there is more future wealth, and there will be more future jobs for Oklahomans out of its water resources than there ever have been out of its oil and gas resources." He told me that within just a matter of weeks, if not days, before he passed on. And that is a true story and it is an accurate story.

I want to say to you what Bob Kerr said to me, "Now we and every generation, must fight our own battles, but we must also lay the groundwork for the generations to come." We have seen the effects of water-drought and floods right here in Pittsburg County. Time and time again—since I was born here 63 years ago—you've seen them over and over. Oklahoma has had a dramatic history. It has had an appeal to people from the east side of the Mississippi River that probably few other states have had.

Remember when Franklin Roosevelt spoke in Oklahoma City in 1938. He said, "As a boy I was enchanted by the Indian Country called Oklahoma, where the Plains Tribes and the Civilized Tribes met head on; where the civilization that the Five Tribes had brought with them from the East located here in Eastern Oklahoma and the buffalo hunters were still riding up and down and following the buffalo herds from Texas to North Dakota."

And it's been a chronicle of history. It's been a dramatic history. Think of the great dramas that have been celebrated in story and song. The great land rushes such as no other state has even seen—we have built our state on this great drama. The story of the migration of the Indians, the forced migration, from the land of their forebears. A sad story, a harsh beginning, but moving steadily toward a great future and continuous progress.

All of the great romance that went with the spread of oil—as it left Ohio and Pennsylvania and came here, so that Oklahoma, from executives to roughnecks, became the leaders of the oil industry world wide. You can see them in Pennsylvania—you can see them even in Texas. Oklahoma's oil brains developed East Texas fields and Oklahoma leadership in the oil industry is still there. Two successive presidents of the Humble Oil Company were born and raised and educated in Oklahoma institutions. That's a great romantic story.

But, you know, drama is classified in two ways—there are tragedies and there are comedies. And I remember perhaps as dramatic a chapter in Oklahoma history as has ever been written by the people of this state.

That was in the middle 1930's when I drove to Boise City. Only two stores were left open and I couldn't see the horizon in that land where there were neither trees nor grass. I couldn't see the horizon 300 yards away for the dust that was settling down upon me. I saw the pathetic children of parents who were trying to hang on. A little boy in a filling station about 11 years old said his dad had gone to California, trying to get work, and he was there and he and his mother taking care of the filling station. He said, "It looks like it's pretty hopeless for us."

The Great Exodus. The Okie Trail, The Second Trail of Tears. We lost more population per capita than any state in the union. Why? Because we didn't have water. We had to have water. And those who lived then, even in this part of the state, realized that without water, tame water, pure water, mankind could not survive.

I went out over this district then, campaigning for one of my friends, and I went into one town in his district in which the mayor told me (and I was just out of college), he said, "Carl," he said, "everybody in this town either works on WPA or sells to it." That was the story of the 1930's. The whole nation was hit, but Oklahoma was hit twice as hard because we had the dual disasters of drought and depression.

Now we've started doing something about it. If we take advantage of the water resources that we have, if we nurture what God has given us—and He's given us all the water He will ever give us; it's here and it will never be substantially added to—if we take care of it, we can paint a new picture; we can write a new drama.

But it will be a drama of thriving industries, of happy and confident people, because there is nothing, nothing—and the history of Oklahoma ought to prove it—more basic, more vital to the stability of our population and prosperity, than the abundance of manageable, pure, usable water.

PROFESSOR MYERS SPEAKS OUT

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, with public hearings concerning health care beginning soon, I find it timely to have Prof. Robert J. Myers' authoritative dissertation," The Spectrum of Governmental Health-Care Proposals," made a matter of public record. Mr. Myers was a member of the Social Security Board from 1934 until 1946 after which he moved on to an actuarial position with the Social Security Administration. One year later he became the Chief Actuary of the Agency until June of last year. He has served as an actuary consultant to various congressional committees and the governments of Colombia, Peru, Panama, Nicaragua, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia. He has also been a member of various actuarial societies in Great Britain and the United States. Mr. Myers is the 1956 recipient of the distinguished service award from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He holds a masters degree from the University of Iowa and is presently a professor of actuarial science at Temple University.

I call the attention of my colleagues to the following statement by this acknowledged authority on health care insurance:

THE SPECTRUM OF GOVERNMENTAL HEALTH-CARE PROPOSALS

(By Robert J. Myers)

Currently, great interest is being expressed about both health care delivery and its financing by professionals in this field and by many laymen. The former seem to be more concerned about the delivery methods, while the latter are probably concerned almost entirely with financing problems. Some professionals are taking advantage of the existence of financing problems to support their efforts to change the delivery system.

Many individuals are disturbed by the rapidly rising health care costs which have occurred in the past 5 or 6 years. Those professionals who, for many years, have sought to change the delivery system are now seeking to take advantage of this discontent to attain their objectives.

This paper examines the financial problems of various current proposals in the governmental health-care field from three viewpoints—from the overall national standpoint, from the standpoint of individuals, and from the standpoint of suppliers of services. First, however, as background, a general discussion of several basic issues will be given.

BASIC ISSUES

Many eminent people have asserted that there is currently a health care crisis in the United States. Apparently, this has been said by some persons in an effort to scare the country into supporting a drastic change in the delivery system. If there actually were a crisis in the true sense of the term, then it seems to me that people would be waiting in queues for days to see physicians, to get into hospitals, and to obtain medicines—as they do to a much greater extent in most other countries than here.

Why this cry of crisis, which appears to be convincing to some? Primarily, it is based on the rising costs of health care in the past few years. But when this trend is examined

relative to other economic factors, we find that there has really been no undue or unexpected increase. Health care costs have increased since 1965 more rapidly than prices of most other consumer goods and services. But this was also the case for many years previously, although it was not as noticeable because of the lower magnitudes involved. What is really important, however, is that health care costs have, in recent years, risen at about the same rate as earnings in general—again, paralleling trends in previous years.

The difficulty, then, is that especially in inflationary times, people like to see their own salaries rise, but they are unhappy with the corresponding (and related) increases in prices. This is particularly true for such items as health care, since these do not give the immediate satisfaction and pleasure that cars, television sets, vacations, and entertainment do.

For many years, a small group of persons active in the social security and health-care economics fields have sincerely believed that virtually full economic security should be provided through governmental programs. Such programs would protect against the risks of retirement, disability, death of the worker, unemployment, sickness and health care. This position is a simplistic one—namely, that, in essence, full economic security is a desirable thing, so why not provide it in an efficient manner completely through governmental programs, rather than to accomplish only a partial job through a diversity of governmental and private group and individual efforts. As a definition, I shall term this approach the expansionist one, since it seeks to expand the role of the government sector in the economic security area so that it will occupy the entire field. In this manner, the role of the private sector will be greatly decreased or even virtually eliminated.

The foregoing remarks should not be taken to mean that I oppose governmental activities in the Social Security field. Quite the converse! I strongly believe in social insurance or other governmental programs as a floor of protection on which the private sector—through individual and group efforts—can and should build.

Up to a certain point, the growth of governmental programs can encourage the growth of private efforts. With the "floor" of a governmental program being present, there is the much greater assurance of receiving the results of private efforts, rather than losing them if the total income otherwise available is less than needed, and public assistance is necessary (with it fully offsetting other income against its payments). But beyond that point, expansion of governmental programs inevitably means contraction, and ultimate extinction, of private-sector programs.

I believe that the expansionist approach is undesirable because, as a result, there will be complete reliance of all non-working individuals on the Government for their economic support. The character and productivity of the populace of a nation will thereby be irretrievably weakened. The same also occurs if full health care is provided for both working and non-working populations by the Government under a uniform, monolithic system. The question might well be raised at this point as to why, if it is desirable for the Government to provide, or at least assure, full health care of the highest quality for all, then should not the Government likewise assure to all the provision of the highest quality of other economic elements involving health, such as food, housing, and clothing. Then, having done so, should not the Government require that what has been provided is properly utilized and that nothing is done which would have a counteracting, disruptive effect?

The foregoing remarks are not intended to say that all who favor significant changes in the health care delivery system have the expansionist or government-do-it-all philosophy. The danger, however, is that, if some proposed changes are made, this would create, in chemistry terms, an unstable compound which would inevitably change (some would say "deteriorate") into another form—namely, the expansionist goal.

Expansionists often take the gradualist or ratchet approach and argue for only a few steps now in the direction of having all health care provided by the Government—a system that can truly be called socialized medicine. They say that future generations can decide for themselves how health care should be provided, and yet they set the conditions in such an unstable manner that inevitably socialized medicine will result (like the domino theory). Realistically, these expansionists recognize that the immediate achievement of their goal would be impossible, both from the legislative likelihoods and from the standpoint of obtaining the cooperation of those who would be needed to provide the necessary services. They hope, however, to "educate" the providers and the public and to establish the conditions so that the movement to socialized medicine is inevitable, even though deferred for some years.

The floor-of-protection concept is much easier to define and to apply in the Social Security cash-benefits area than in the health care one. It is relatively simple for the private sector to build additional cash benefits on top of the Social Security floor in a reasonable, equitable and efficient manner, but it is not so easy to do this in the health-care field, since the fracturing of services or coverage can be undesirable or inefficient. It is possible, however, to have the floor-of-protection approach on a stable basis in the health-care field if this is properly done—for example, by covering only high-cost groups such as the aged or by insuring against catastrophic risks.

GOVERNMENTAL FINANCING PROBLEMS UNDER VARIOUS HEALTH-CARE PROPOSALS

Many governmental health care proposals at the Federal level have been put forward since this session of Congress began in January. The financial involvement of the Federal Government would vary widely under these proposals. In some, the Government would meet the entire cost (out of general revenues), while in others it would collect part of the cost through payroll taxes, and the remainder would come from general-revenue financing. In still other plans, the entire cost would be met from payroll taxes. The following discussion will refer to the most important proposals without describing them, in the belief that the reader is already reasonably familiar with them.

The term "national health insurance" is often used to describe or refer to these varied proposals. In my opinion, this is a misuse of the term, because national health insurance really only means a program under which the financing of the vast majority of health-care costs of virtually the entire population is under governmental auspices. (Socialized medicine is one form of national health insurance, but it goes further than other forms by having the Government also supply the medical services through its own employees and facilities.) For example, if Medicare were extended to all Social Security beneficiaries and to all covered workers and their dependents, it could truly be referred to as national health insurance.

Proposals involving Federal financing only from general revenues include the following:

(1) AMA Medicredit plan, which is of a broad, comprehensive nature in providing income tax credits for the premiums of qualified health insurance plans (ranging from paying the entire cost for persons with very low incomes to paying only a small part for those with moderately high incomes, or in effect not really being applicable to such persons because of other tax elements).

(2) Hall Bill (introduced by Congressman Durwood Hall of Missouri, a physician), which would provide general catastrophic coverage for all and a basic health insurance policy for public assistance recipients.

(3) Health Insurance Association of America (HIAA) plan, which would encourage private employers to provide qualified health insurance plans and would purchase private health insurance policies for low-income and indigent persons, using general-revenues funds therefor.

Medicredit would have an initial cost of about $14 billion per year, a sizable amount, despite much uninformed criticism about its nigardliness! The Hall Bill would cost only about one-fourth as much as Medicredit insofar as Federal funds are concerned. The HIAA plan would have new Federal costs of the same general magnitude as the Hall Bill, although sizable additional costs would also be involved for employers in paying for the private health insurance encouraged thereunder.

The Javits and Kennedy bills would involve very large governmental expenditures and thus very large amounts of payroll taxes and general-revenue funds. The Javits bill calls for one-third of the cost to come from general revenues, while the Kennedy bill ups the proportion to one-half. The Kennedy bill would initially involve almost $60 billion per year in legislated revenue, or about $30 billion from general revenues and $25 billion from new payroll taxes (i.e. in excess of the present Medicare payroll taxes). The Javits bill, after its initial period of phasing-in, would require total revenue of about $45 billion per year, so that about $15 billion annually would be required from general revenues.

The Nixon Administration proposal would involve both additional general-revenues funds (to purchase health insurance policies for low-income families) and additional payroll taxes (to pay the cost that is now met by the enrollee premium under the Supplementary Medical Insurance portion of Medicare). The additional general general-revenues cost would be somewhat under $5 billion per year, and the additional payroll taxes would be about $1 billion per year. This plan would also involve sizable added costs for employers, who would be required to purchase health insurance policies for their employees. The AHA Ameriplan would also involve additional general-revenues costs, payroll taxes, and employer costs, but its provisions are not yet specific enough for any cost estimates to be developed.

The Catastrophic Illness plan proposed by Senator Long would be financed entirely by additional Social Security payroll taxes, amounting initially to about $2 billion per year.

Where is the money coming from to pay the additional taxes required for these plans, especially those such as the Kennedy bill involving large amounts of general-revenues funds. The proponents say that all that is really involved is a transfer of funds already being spent privately to the public domain. This is reminiscent of the popular political saying of the 1930's—"tax and tax and tax; spend and spend and spend; and elect and elect and elect."

What about the actuarial soundness of the various proposals which depend, at least in part, on payroll taxes for their financing. In my opinion, all such plans are reasonably adequately financed. Curiously enough, the

Kennedy bill is the only one that, in essence, is "guaranteed" to be actuarially sound. This is accomplished by the simple procedure of limiting outgo to the amount of money collected under the program. On the other hand, the other proposals promise certain benefits and provide for certain income; if experience turns out to be unfavorable, financing difficulties occur. But this does not mean that there are no problems under the Kennedy bill, since thereunder the financial difficulties occur for the providers of services and not for the Government (as will be described subsequently).

FINANCING PROBLEMS OF THE INDIVIDUAL UNDER VARIOUS HEALTH-CARE PROPOSALS

In the long run, the individual is really the one who pays for any governmental program. This truism is usually ignored by the advocates of expanded governmental activities. There is a noteworthy statement in the January 1970 issue of the *Social Security Bulletin* which joyously announces that consumer spending for health care has decreased relatively since the advent of Medicare and Medicaid, so that the populace thus has more money available for other purposes, presumably more enjoyable. What is so blithely ignored there is that such "savings" to the consumer must actually be used by him to pay the larger taxes required by the Government for its financing operations.

The added tax burdens involved in the various proposals—whether direct employee payroll taxes, employer payroll taxes (which are passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices and/or lower wages), or general-revenues taxes—will be met by the taxpayers in the aggregate. These, of course, are not *new* consumer costs, but will, on the whole, be replacements of existing health-care costs (including insurance premium costs). The incidence as between different persons will be somewhat different than now, but not greatly so, since we have such a broad distribution of income that financing of new governmental expenditures cannot be accomplished solely by "soaking the rich".

The real dangers and disadvantages involved in the plans that involve very high Federal expenditures, such as the Kennedy and Javits Bills, are not so much in the portion of any high taxes involved which represents net additional consumer costs, as in the turning over of vastly more personal expenditures to the Government. Then too, there is the deception involved in making people think that they are getting something for nothing or are reducing their previous costs for medical care. For example, under the Kennedy Bill, the direct employee payroll-tax contribution meets only 10 percent of the cost, so that the worker generally seems to be reducing his out-of-pocket costs for health care by paying a dime to get a dollar's worth of protection. Actually, in the aggregate, workers will also be paying the other 90 cents too.

FINANCING EFFECTS ON SUPPLIERS OF SERVICES

Some proposals would have relatively little effect on the health care delivery system. On the other hand, some proposals would change it greatly, whether intentionally or unintentionally. A number of proposals emphasize the approach of group practice prepayment plans (or, as it is now called, the health maintenance organization). Much is to be said for the advantages of this particular approach, at least as a competitive element. I believe, however, that it should not be the sole vehicle for providing health care for the country. It is interesting to note that some of the strongest advocates of HMO's do not belong to them themselves, even though they could do so!

The proposals other than the Javits and Kennedy Bills and the AHA Ameriplan would not greatly change the existing patterns of health care delivery and so would not create financial problems for physicians and other providers of services. It is difficult, however, to assess the financial effects of the AHA Ameriplan on physicians, although it would certainly have a significant impact, because of its emphasis on physician services being centered around hospital-related organizations.

The Javits Bill would probably create financial problems for both physicians and hospitals because of its universality of coverage. Almost all patients of a hospital would be under the program, so that full Federal control of costs, and perhaps thus eventually of operations, would be present. Then too, since physicians would have few non-program patients, no yard-stick against which to measure customary or prevailing charges for program reimbursement purposes would be possible. But in this connection, it is most significant to note that, in accordance with Administration recommendations, Medicare reimbursement of physicians is now being changed by legislation so as to move away from the customary-charges basis of the initial law to a flat fee schedule in each geographic area.

The Kennedy Bill would be rapidly disruptive in the area of physician reimbursement, as a result of the self-contained financing approach mentioned earlier—namely, to divide the tax proceeds up so as to pay the providers what is possible, rather than what their costs or charges are. In particular, physicians who are not in HMO's are at the end of the payment line and would likely not be paid at all, since the money would run out before it would be their turn. Certainly, utter chaos would be created in the health-care field if the Kennedy Bill were enacted as now written!

Specifically, the Kennedy Bill would produce revenue of about $60 billion in its first year of operation, and yet the health services it promises to provide have a much greater cost on present cost bases. Such costs projected to the first year of operation proposed by the bill, at likely rates of cost increase, yield a figure of about $77 billion. One could argue—although I doubt the validity of the argument—that the same $77 billion could provide more adequate health care to more people under the revised delivery system envisaged by the advocates of the Kennedy Bill. But the cold facts are that the reduced dollar outgo of about $60 billion per year developing under the bill can only mean significantly lower incomes for the suppliers of health services. The vital questions then are how will this work out, who will be the ones adversely affected, and how will they react insofar as the amount of services which they will provide and the work which they will do?

CERTAIN ASPECTS OF CHANGES IN THE HEALTH-CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM

Proponents of National Health Insurance—i.e., the advocates of the Javits and Kennedy Bills—argue that much more health services of a higher quality can be provided to more people if the delivery system is changed, as their proposals would do. It seems impossible to accept this sweeping conclusion, when we consider that the practice of medicine is not an impersonal matter like an assembly line and that when people are forced to do things against their wills and desires, less will be accomplished than when there is voluntary cooperation and compliance. Certainly, the members of the labor unions supporting the Kennedy Bill would rebel at working under the conditions and controls imposed on physicians by that bill.

This is not to say that real improvements in the health-care delivery system—with possible resultant lessening of financing problems—cannot be achieved. Instead, I believe that the current national interest and discussion—assuming that no more than moderate proposals will be enacted—will have a beneficial effect. The improvements that have been occurring over the years in the health-care delivery system will likely be continued, and perhaps even accelerated.

LIKELY LEGISLATIVE PROSPECTS

And now we come to the difficult part of my assignment—predicting what the likely legislative prospects are for the future. It seems almost a virtual certainty that no legislation in the health-care field will be enacted this year, other than probably the significant Medicare changes contained in the House-passed Social Security bill, H.R. 1, which is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

These changes include the controls on physician fees for Medicare reimbursement purposes mentioned previously, a number of provisions to tighten up reimbursement provisions for hospitals and other providers, increases in the cost-sharing provisions, a revision in the method of determining the enrollee premium rate under SMI (Part B) so that a greater proportion of the cost is borne by the Federal Government, the establishment of a voluntary HI (Part A) system for those not insured by Social Security coverage, and last, but by no means least, extending Medicare to Social Security disability beneficiaries who have been on the roll for at least 2 years.

It is, of course, possible that Senator Long, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, will add a catastrophic health insurance provision to the pending Social Security bill, as he did in 1970 (when the legislation died in conference). What will be the fate of such a provision when the bill goes to conference with the House is hard to predict. It is said that Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee—and many of his committee, too—favor such a provision. Perhaps, as a result of the extensive hearings on all health-care proposals to be held by the Ways and Means Committee in September, some sort of a catastrophic-insurance proposal will emerge from that side of the Capitol in time to fit in with Senate action.

I see no likelihood of a far-ranging bill like the Javits or Kennedy Bills being enacted in 1971 or 1972—or even in the next few years following. And I do not believe that my predictive vision is being blinded by my beliefs as to what is best for the nation. I think that the Congressional leaders who are most closely connected with legislation in this area can well see the dangers involved in a monolithic structuring of the health-care delivery system and its financing which would inevitably result in tight Federal controls, not only of financing, but also of delivery.

What I do see as likely to happen in the next few years, possibly before 1973, is some sort of catastrophic health insurance plan for persons of all ages and the providing of formalized health insurance for persons with very low incomes and persons who are not commercially insurable. The big questions are how low or how high will be the limits defining what are catastrophic costs and whether the health insurance for the low-income category will be provided through a government organization or through the existing insuring organizations (Blue Cross-Blue Shield and insurance companies).

Certainly, it makes much more sense to build on our present diverse, pluralistic health-care delivery and financing system, which is doing such a good job for the vast majority of the populace, than to tear it down and start over again with a monolithic governmental program to provide health services. As Abraham Lincoln so sagely said—"You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men

permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

NIXON PUTS A CHALLENGE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in its lead editorial in the Saturday-Sunday October 9–10 edition of the Chicago Daily News, that publication in its traditional independent fashion analyzed phase II of the President's economic program.

The article very properly points to the role being played by AFL–CIO President Meany and is, I believe, a very accurate commentary on the anti-inflation struggle:

NIXON PUTS A CHALLENGE

In prescribing a largely voluntary program for Phase Two of his anti-inflation campaign, President Nixon left the chances for success or failure mainly in the hands of labor, management and the public. For this he is already drawing criticism from those who remark a certain pusillanimous withdrawal from the tougher position he took in proclaming Phase One.

While Mr. Nixon is necessarily playing a chancy game, we do not believe he is culpable on that score The cautious approach doubtless coincides with the President's political instincts, but it also squares with common sense.

Already—and reluctantly—the President has moved the country nearer to the condition of a controlled economy than it has ever been in peacetime.

Rigid controls in the past have proved no real cure for inflation—they have merely bottled up the pressure, which (as after World War II) exploded violently when the controls went off.

Now he is deliberately trying a new tack. By keeping government out of the principal wage and price boards he is inviting labor and management to pick up the major responsibility for controlling the wage-price spiral.

True, he is keeping the Cost of Living Council—with its final authority to mandate controls—in a position to exercise some kind of broad review authority. But he is obviously pinning his hopes on the vision and good sense of leadership in the private sector.

Whether the gamble will pay off should soon be clear.

Predictably, the boss of the AFL–CIO George Meany, is dragging his feet, even though the designated wage board is not only all-civilian, but has a great deal of autonomy. Meany obviously likes this, but objects to similar latitude being granted a board that will be free within broad limits to sanction price rises. Doubtless some on management's side will be similarly skeptical of the wage board's considerable freedom.

The President obviously expects confusion and wrangling as these two bodies try, first, to reach policies in their own right; second, to make wage and price policies dovetail and, finally to maintain an over-all braking force that will help pull the inflation rate down to the President's objective of 2 or 3 per cent by the end of 1972. But just as obviously he hopes that order and progress will emerge from the confusion.

So there is in prospect a unique test of the free enterprise system to justify its workability in the stringent circumstances of the 1970s.

If it fails, the government will have no option but to put the economy in a much tighter straitjacket. If it succeeds, there can be prosperity for all and a splendid vindication of this free system. These are high stakes, indeed. It will be, as Mr Nixon says, an exciting year.

CONGRESSMAN PELLY'S RECORD

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished radio and television commentator Joseph McCaffrey, who covers the Nation's Capital, recently cited our colleague from Washington (Mr. PELLY) in his "Meet the Member" broadcast. I know that those Members of Congress who did not hear this program would like to read Mr. McCaffrey's comments. The article follows at this point in the RECORD:

MEET THE MEMBER

Big, ambling Thomas Pelly of Washington State's First District is deeply troubled by the heavy unemployment which has infected his state. He was one of those who backed the Public Works Acceleration Act, and during the debate on this bill, he told the House about the problems facing his own district and the state.

Said Pelly, "'The impact of the loss of work in the aerospace industry cannot be overlooked. In the last year alone, the airplane business in the Seattle region dropped 41.7 percent. Building permits for residences were off 24.7 percent in the last year, and building permits for public construction dropped 70.3 percent in the last 12 months. The total construction industry in the Seattle area is off 20.2 percent since this time last year.

"To help such a situation, of course, is the purpose of the Public Works Acceleration Act. While it is not the total answer to our problems, at least it would provide a speedy curb in the rate of increase in unemployment. The Washington State Unemployment Department is addied with a roll that is rising daily. The Boeing Company alone had to discharge 7,000 employees because of the loss of the SST, in addition to a steady decline of about 2,000 a month.

"With the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Seattle area, as well as other qualifying regions of our country, would receive 80 percent grants-in-aid to assist local public projects and provide jobs in the process. Local areas could construct long-needed facilities such as sewer plants and municipal buildings without burdening the local tax rate, and at the same time take the pressure off the unemployment rolls."

Pelly then pointed out, "We are not talking about training workers. We are talking about putting trained men back to work in other jobs. Laborers, carpenters, bricklayers and others in the building trades would receive immediate assistance from this legislation, and I strongly urge support for it."

Not only does the Congressman have heavy unemployment among highly trained scientists in his district, but 20 percent of all the building trade workers are unemployed.

Pelly is also in the forefront in the Congressional effort to halt foreign seizure of American fishing boats. He has introduced legislation to close the loophole being used by the State Department to escape deducting from foreign aid illegal fines which some Latin American countries impose on United States fisherman. The Pelly Amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act states that the fines will be deducted from foreign aid, if payment is not made in 120 days after demand.

Pelly told the House, "The State Department has not made any such demand and Ecuador alone has seized 25 American fishing vessels this year and fines have totalled more than $1.2 million." The bill which the Washington State Republician is pushing would require the Secretary of State to notify the offending country that the amount of the fines is due just as soon as the vessel owner is reimbursed by a special revolving fund. In addition, the legislation establishes the fund out of which vessel owners will be reimbursed for any fines, fees or other direct charges paid to obtain release of their vessels that are illegally seized.

Pelly has also introduced a joint resolution providing for the protection of United States fishermen from unlawful harassment on the high seas, seeking to protect American vessels from what he called "malicious destruction by fishermen of foreign countries who refuse to abide by international law and custom.

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. MURPHY ON A PROPOSED RESOLUTION CALLING FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF THE ARMS BALANCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for Members in both Houses who are concerned over the increasing gap in firepower between Egypt and Israel, a gap that is pushing the world headlong into a cataclysmic eruption in the Middle East.

Even though they were outgunned in previous years, Israel could—and did—defeat aggression by preemptive strikes as they did so brilliantly in the 1967 6-day war.

But the Israeli situation has deteriorated rapidly.

The increase in size and effectiveness of Egyptian weaponry including the acquisition of numbers of the best fighter plane in the world far outweighs the admitted higher morale and superior training of the Israeli defenders.

The elements of surprise and advantage inherent in a preemptive strike have been minimized by the incorporation into the Egyptian defense system of sophisticated warning and detection equipment.

Given the distances involved and the modern weapons now available, military leaders I have talked to feel it would be impossible to conclude that a sudden attack by the Arabs could be successfully resisted. In short, Israel is now in a military position where in a head to head confrontation there is serious doubt that they could win.

Given this situation the issues are quite clear.

The American Government is, of course, committed to pursuing an active diplomatic policy of negotiation between all sides in the continuing Mideast crisis.

This is as it should be.

But we should not be put in the position of negotiating from a position of weakness—nor should Israel.

The U.S. Government has through the years given Israel a guarantee of security, from the personal guarantee of President Dwight D. Eisenhower through the words and actions of each succeeding President. That is why I cannot endorse the present "carrot and stick" policy of this administration as far as the jets for Israel question goes. The administration position is that there now exists a balance of power in the Middle East, the reasoning being that Israeli "esprit" and training makes up for the numerical difference in Arab equipment. In effect, our Government is saying we are willing to gamble by trading the lives of Israeli soldiers for Russian planes, missiles, and tanks. I for one can understand the hesitancy on the part of Israeli leaders to sacrifice young lives in order to overcome the enemy's numerical superiority in combat divisions and destructive weapons.

It is now recognized by just about everyone that there has been an accelerated Russian military buildup in Egypt with some of the most advanced weapons in the Soviet arsenal. This is in addition to 20,000 military personnel including combat pilots expert in handling the Mig–23. Russia's super fighter plane. This means that not only is the Israeli Air Force outnumbered 5 to 1, but in any future conflict it would be pitted against perhaps the world's best fighter plane.

I am convinced that Egypt's leaders should know, Soviet leaders should know, indeed, the leaders of the entire Arab world should know that we do not intend to allow the defensive and deterrent capabilities of Israel to be weakened or overpowered by a continued massive Soviet infusion of military hardware under the new U.S.S.R.-United Arab Republic arms agreement.

These leaders should also know that we do not intend to abandon Israel by default; that this country will maintain Israel's deterrent strength even while we negotiate; that the American Government and the American people are committed to this course of action; and, to assume anything less would be a fatal miscalculation on their part.

If we are to achieve the goals of peace in the Middle East we must demonstrate to the Arabs and the Soviet Union the danger of armed aggression and the futility of hoping to overwhelm Israel by brute force.

We must demonstrate to them that the necessary course—the inevitable course—is a negotiated settlement recognizing the rights of Israel. And the way to do this is to make it clear beyond doubt that there can be no quick military victory over Israel, that any such action would be met with not only the same fury and the same resolve as in 1967, but with the military muscle needed to guarantee a mortal blow to the aggressor.

That is why there is an urgent need for the Congress to make clear to the world in no uncertain terms this country's support for maintaining a balance of firepower in the Middle East and an unequivocal commitment to not only the spirit but the letter of Security Council Resolution 242 of November 1967.

That is why I have sponsored resolutions to sustain the U.S. support of this doctrine since 1967 when I first introduced such a proposal. In 1968 I visited Israel and studied the military configuration developing there. And while I marvelled at the brilliant success of the 6-day war, I also took into account the staggering losses that Israel sustained in order to achieve that victory. The losses of first-line combat troops on the Golan Heights were astronomical for a country of her size. Yet, they now face a better equipped foe with no hope of the stunning surprise that contributed to their 1967 sweep. This leads me to conclude that they could in no way repeat such a victory in the future without help from their American allies. That is why in each succeeding year I have restated my desire for U.S. support of the right of the Israeli nation to exist free from the depredations of those whose goal it is to bury these heroic people.

That is why I support the proposed resolution of Speaker CARL ALBERT, Minority Leader GERALD R. FORD, and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER which calls for—

First, the sale to Israel of F–4 Phantom fighters and the necessary support, equipment, and assistance;

Second, the opposition of the Government of the United States to any attempts to alter the meaning and effect of Security Council Resolution 242 of November 22, 1967; and,

Third, a reaffirmation of the necessity of secure and defensible borders to maintain the peace.

The longer this Government delays in sending the Phantoms to Israel the more reassured the Russians are that they can continue to move a mountain of missiles, planes, equipment, and men into Egypt and Syria. Our reluctance to help Israel in this hour of peril is convincing the Russian and Arab Governments that they can push us to the wall without fear of forcing a firm stand. This reluctance is not in the interests of peace in the Middle East. It can only foment aggression that threatens to demolish Israel and U.S. interests not only in the Middle East, but the world as well.

We must show that we can be firm.

We must let Israel have the arms it needs.

We must make this small investment for the great return of peace in the Middle East.

NATIONAL SYMPOSIUM ON ANIMAL WASTE MANAGEMENT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my pleasure to act as chairman for the National Symposium on Animal Waste Management, which was jointly sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Council of State Governments, and the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges.

The purpose of the symposium was to study problems presently being faced by livestock and poultry producers as they seek to comply with new laws and regulations on animal waste management, and to develop ideas and proposals to better cope with these dislocations.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the symposium addressed itself to an issue of great importance to all Americans as we continue to grow more conscious of our need to guard and protect the environment. It is for this reason that I include in the RECORD at this time the final report of the symposium so that the recommendations developed can receive the widest possible exposure.

The report follows:

WORK GROUP "E"—ACTION PROGRAMS

This is the final report for Work Group E. The charge as given to the Work Group by Congressman Price was to evaluate current technical and financial assistance programs and extension services available to farmers, ranchers, and feedlot operators as they face economic and technical problems in adjusting to animal waste management regulations and waste disposal requirements. In addition, the group was asked to consider needed support for research, educational and information needs and ways to better coordinate action programs and research results for maximum benefit to animal producers. Recommendations on any or all of these subject areas were to be prepared as determined by group deliberations and agreements.

The group was divided into two sections to maximize opportunity for discussion. In both sections a common theme emerged; that existing state and federal action and educational agencies could provide the necessary services to producers without creation of new agencies. However, the public interest demands that animal waste management problems be solved on a timely and equitable basis, with fair treatment to all producers. If this is to be done, existing action programs must be broadened in scope and receive increased funding.

INVENTORY OF ANIMAL WASTE POLLUTION PROBLEMS

Definitive information does not exist for locating, describing, measuring, and determining the solution costs of animal waste management problems in the U.S. This information is *essential* for long-range future planning, funding, and operating technical assistance, cost-share, loan, educational and research programs. Such an inventory is currently under study.

Recommendation

A national agricultural-related pollution problem inventory be adequately funded and carried out through existing agencies. Such an inventory should receive the highest priority with a recommended target completion date of July 1973. We recommend that the inventory include data on animal waste pollution problems from all producer sources and that comprehensive data be obtained and correlated at local, state and national levels and be made available to all interested agencies and public and private groups.

COORDINATION OF EFFORTS TO SOLVE ANIMAL WASTE MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

The producer has a problem in complying with regulations since he may not know the solution to the problems, or if he decides to

attempt to solve the problems, he has no assurance that his investment will bring adequate solutions on a continuing basis. There is often a lack of coordination and of agreement between enforcement and advisory agencies, operating at all levels of government, as to solutions and guidelines that will solve the problem. Several instances were cited where a producer acted in good faith and later had his operation shut down.

It appears that this progress has been speeded up in states where an Ad Hoc state committee of state agricultural and pollution-control leaders has been formed. The group commended this approach and encouraged the establishment of such groups in all states.

There was complete agreement that recent research results should be better incorporated into regulations.

Recommendation

An Ad Hoc animal waste coordinating committee of recognized leaders should be appointed in each state. Representatives of state regulatory agencies, state and federal educational, research, technical, and financial resource agencies, industry and producer groups should be members of the coordinating committee. This committee should be charged with the responsibility for improving coordination and cooperation among all groups in the state involved with animal waste problems. It should develop, with well defined goals, a unified approach toward assisting producers in complying with regulations and with waste management problem solving, and in assisting regulatory officials in establishing and updating regulations. State agency and farm organization members should be appointed by the governor and federal agency representatives by the respective agency heads.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Programs of technical assistance to help producers solve animal waste management problems are currently available through the Soil Conservation Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Extension Service, and, to a limited extent, through state government agencies in some states. The SCS provides technical assistance to farmers and ranchers locally through organized soil and water conservation districts in almost all of the agricultural counties of the United States. Technical assistance through EPA consists of providing technical expertise on animal waste matters at the required level, and conducting farm and feedlot demonstration projects. Technical assistance through the Extension Service is in the form of structure and waste handling systems design, plans and construction.

It was agreed that while the *quality* of this technical assistance is generally high, technical assistance programs for the most part are available to and directed at the smaller farm, ranch or farm-feedlot operation. In many instances, however, the demand for technical assistance by smaller operators exceeds the supply available. This problem will become more acute in the future as farmers and ranchers attempt to comply with environmental control regulations.

Technical assistance for the design of individual systems is not usually available to the large beef, dairy, swine and poultry producers. Technical assistance in solving animal waste management problems is a vital part of any comprehensive program of assistance to producers. Private consulting engineers are not generally available for animal waste management design.

Recommendation

Technical assistance programs should be expanded and accelerated to make such assistance available to *all* types of animal producer operations on a sustained and readily available basis. This will require increased funding for ongoing technical assistance programs as carried out by Federal and State agencies. Technical personnel, competent in animal waste management, should be made available at the regional level for coordination within Federal regional jurisdictions.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

It was agreed that certain types of financial incentives must be provided producers in order to: (1) Assist with timely solutions of environmental problems caused by animal waste; () Prevent unnecessary producer business terminations and resulting economic dislocations; (3) Afford producers a better opportunity, as compared to other sectors of the economy, in meeting pollution control standards and regulations.

Producers of animal products are unable to pass on the cost of animal waste pollution abatement practices through the market price mechanism. For example, a feedlot operator, forced by regulations to install a waste disposal system, must absorb the cost within his income. He cannot add and obtain two or three cents to the unit price of his product to cover his pollution abatement investment such as can the manufacturer of business and industrial products. Numerous cases were cited where financially sound producer operations had been forced out of business because of pollution abatement regulations and inability of the producer to absorb improvement costs through business income.

Current financial incentives to animal producers for solving animal waste management problems are not adequate to meet present and future needs. Limited financial assistance is now provided producers through federal programs offering cost-sharing and loans. These programs are operated through the USDA and the Farm Credit Administration and are available in most agricultural counties in the Nation. However, limitations and gaps in these programs deprive producers of the full opportunity needed to meet total waste management costs. For example, the REAP cost-share program limitation of $2,500 is not a sufficient incentive in many cases to induce farmers to proceed with high-cost animal waste control projects. The Farmers Home Administration soil and water conservation lending authority does not include specific provision for loans for pollution abatement measures. Generally, funding for the loans to producers through government agencies is inadequate or is too restricted for many producers.

Federal and state tax credits for installation of pollution abatement measures are not provided for within existing legislation. Depreciation allowances for animal waste handling equipment are unrealistic in view of the high cost of such equipment.

In many cases, public domain actions, expanding urban areas, or new laws are forcing producers out of business. Adequate private financing for relocation of the operators' business often is not available.

Recommendations

1. Federal and state legislation be passed to afford animal producers tax credits and realistic equipment depreciation allowances for installation of pollution abatement measures.

2. Financial relocation assistance be made available through existing federal loan programs to producers forced to move their operation because of pollution abatement laws and regulations, expanding urban development, or public domain actions.

3. Present federal cost-share programs should be revised to include authority for:

(a) Cost-sharing for *field testing* researched animal waste disposal systems and facilities on privately owned farms to demonstrate acceptable pollution abatement practices or procedures.

(b) Increased statutory producer payment limitation for cost-sharing programs for implementing animal waste pollution abatement practices.

(c) Long-term cost-sharing contracts based on comprehensive environmental improvement plans to secure adequate funding at the time needed and to encourage complete farm pollution abatement system development over a period of years.

4. Obtain legislative authority and funding for an *animal waste pollution prevention program* which would utilize existing federal action and research programs and delivery systems. The need is visualized as being in excess of $40 million for technical assistance and research and $160 million annually for cost-sharing for the next five years.

5. Expand Farmers Home Administration legislative authority to include loans for animal waste pollution abatement measures. The authority should be broadened to include all producers, and with limitations raised to reflect current costs, and a low interest rate incentive considered.

6. The *construction grant program* (EPA) should be expanded and broadened to include animal waste handling systems.

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION

The group recognized several major deficiencies in educational programs and information situations dealing with animal waste management problems.

It was agreed that an information or communication exchange center on animal waste management is needed at the national level to expedite the dissemination of different types of information to sources with needs for animal waste problem solving information. The center should deal with needs of farmers as well as the general public and would concern itself with information on available technology, present or proposed regulations, and direct advisory assistance for problem solving as well as general information on animal waste problem situations. It was agreed that there is an especially critical need to identify for farmers the sources of accurate information regarding animal waste technology.

Extension programs, generally, are not placing sufficient emphasis on animal waste management. More emphasis on demonstrations and tours in extension programs showing animal waste problem solutions would shorten the time span between research results and application to problems.

The lack of technical in-service training programs dealing with this problem was reported as well as the need for college curricula changes to provide a greater supply of competent environmental scientists. The operation of an Ad Hoc committee in Michigan was discussed as a possible method (state level) for disseminating information to farmers. This committee produced a booklet on animal waste management and has held regional meetings of farmer and federal, state, and county agency people on how to utilize the book.

Recommendations

1. A national animal waste management communication task force should be established as soon as possible. Membership should be drawn from all federal and state government agencies concerned with this problem as well as land grant colleges and universities, agri-business and farm organizations, and the farm press. The task force goal should be to develop a system to provide animal waste management information to farmers and to the public. Task force functions would include:

(a) Development of a national animal waste management information exchange center.

(b) Reviewing and determining available information sources.

(c) Recommending improvements in sources of information on animal waste technology.

(d) Determining methods of information dissemination.

(e) Determining sources in need of different types of information.

(f) Working with public information service from EPA to assist farm press in informing farmers on regulations regarding animal waste.

2. Extension programs at national, state and local levels should receive additional resources (financial and staffing) to provide additional emphasis on animal waste management. This would include greater emphasis on demonstration and tour programs.

3. The extension service should place more emphasis on and give more support to the public affairs aspects of its animal waste management programs to increase tolerance, understanding, and change attitude of both producers and the public.

4. There should be more emphasis on training programs and college curricula involving solutions. Recognition should be given to those institutions which are adjusting their curricula to provide well-trained environmental scientists with expertise to assist the animal and poultry industries to solve their pollution problems.

5. In-service training programs on animal waste management should be expanded for personnel in all Federal and State agencies working with the animal industries. Such programs should be coordinated within and among State and Federal agencies.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Several research areas were identified as needing support through changes in legislative authorities, financing, better coordination of research efforts, coordination of research with action programs, or increased emphasis on particular problems of animal waste management.

There was concern that some duplication of animal waste research programs may be taking place and that coordination of research efforts on animal waste management between all public and private entities engaged in this research is needed. It should be noted that the complexity of the subject may make some research activities appear to be duplication when they are actually aimed at a meaning differing geographical, climatic, etc., conditions.

Farmers and farm organizations should become more involved in determinations of the general direction of animal waste management research

There was unanimous agreement on the desirability of expanded and continuous support for animal waste management research. The heaviest emphasis was placed on the need for research on the suppression of odors arising from animal producer enterprises. There was also an expressed need for further research on land application technology and alternative recycling techniques.

Particular attention was paid to the need for on-farm research and field testing systems and the limitations expressed in this area. For example, farmers are sometimes reluctant to agree to installation of research or field testing facilities because of damages to farm resources, liability problems or legal rights to ownership of the facility installed. Measures to overcome these limitations should be obtained to increase the effectiveness of this phase of research and development of animal waste management systems.

Recommendations

1. A research review and advisory committee on animal waste management should be established to provide guidance to EPA and USDA for related research programs. Members should be appointed jointly by the Secretary of Agriculture and the administrator of EPA. Membership should be drawn from producers, farm organizations, and from the Federal, State, and private research community.

2. EPA's present demonstration program to develop and prove new technology should be provided with increased funding to accelerate research and development and implement technology transfer.

3. On-farm, field research on animal waste management should be increased and supported by direct financial assistance to the farmer as well as liability protection for the farmer and the sponsoring research agency.

4. Legislation should be obtained to provide authority and funding to indemnify farmers for damages incurred by the farmer as a result of on-farm field research or field testing of animal waste management systems.

5. Legislative authority should be obtained to permit farmers to assume ownership of field scale research facilities which have been installed on privately owned farms.

6. Increased emphasis should be placed on animal waste management research programs involving:

(a) Odor control

(b) Recycling of animal waste for feed and other uses.

(c) Criteria for land application and the promulgation of guidelines for application of animal waste to agricultural land.

ARKANSAS COLLEGE STUDENTS PUTTING INTEREST IN THEIR FELLOW MEN

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the picture many of us receive of youth, through the various news media, most often is focused on one of the more disturbing aspects of their behavior. We hear, read, and view stories of drug addiction, immorality, violence, and destructive dissent.

But, many of the young, and growing numbers of us at all ages are increasing our concentration on personal contact with, lending an attentive ear, giving aid to, and understanding our fellow men and women.

During the past three summers groups of Arkansas college students have been putting their interest in their fellow men to work in a practical way. Recently, the Arkansas Gazette, told the story of what some of these youths have been doing. Their story is heartwarming. It is an excellent example of the kind of human concern I find among today's youth as I meet and talk with them in my district and elsewhere.

Because I believe my colleagues will find encouragement in the story of what these Arkansas young people are doing, I wish to make their story a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The news story follows:

ARKANSAS STUDENTS SEE HOPE

(By Erwin L. McDonald)

There is a lot of talk about "how the other half lives"—that is, of course, if it's the lower half, economically speaking. But to paraphrase the old saying, few but the experts really explore it.

This summer, however, a dozen Arkansas college students decided to make such a study of their own—and they chose the area of the migrant farm worker, who since *The Grapes of Wrath* on to the real Grape Strike in California has been portrayed as the victim of the most abject poverty of all.

They found poverty all right. But they also found something else—a relation and an understanding to other human beings who had been cast in another mold. They went out to the West Coast bean and berry harvest in the area spreading around a town in Oregon called Aumsville and, as Ellen Gates of Crossett, a Sociology major at the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, put it:

"We went to help the migrant workers, but the experience has helped us more than we helped them.

"Each one of us relating to the other people in the migrant camp was the highlight for me."

"I can see how we must let our lives be examples to other people but still learn from other people," said Joe Rhodes of Bentonville, who majored in Science last year at Arkansas College at Batesville.

Several of the students felt that having to face up to their own foibles and, indeed, prejudices, was a part of the summer package. "I found I had made a lot of snap judgments about people that later turned out to be wrong," said Mike McCulley, a senior in Accounting at Arkansas State University. "I have known a lot of poor people in my home town that I have not really related to in the past. Now I will be able to understand their way of life and communicate with them better."

"Learning what it takes to walk with another person in a path you have not walked before" was one of the highlights of the experience for Bill Briant of Pine Bluff, a recent graduate of Hendrix. "When I went to the migrant camp. I had an idea the people there would be asking for our help. But I found the migrants to be much like the people I have known in school. More than being helped, they want to be listened to."

Group living over a period of weeks constantly subjects individuals to the decision of whether just to be yourself or subordinate to the pattern of the group, Briant maintained.

Martha Croxton, a student from Wheaton (Illinois) College, whose major is English Literature, found the instability of life for the migrant farm worker frustrating for her as a volunteer missionary to the migrants. "They moved on so fast that you didn't have a chance to get to know many of them," she said. "And many of them would not know where they were going when they left."

Several of the group agreed with David Humble of Walnut Ridge, who indicates he will now have a greater appreciation for running water and indoor, flush toilets. "But I got used to outdoor toilets and going to outdoor water spigots," he grinned. "And I learned to like people. Before this summer I did not have much desire to meet people. People are great! And I have found out a lot I had not known before about myself."

Randy Harbour, who will be a sophomore this year at Southern State, acquired a new pet, a puppy one of the farm work families gave him. "He's supposed to be half Pekingese and half Poodle," he said, holding the pooch tenderly in his arms, "but he's got something else in him. He's the first dog I ever saw sleep on his back with his paws up in the air."

Harbour feels that the hard life the students have had to live this summer, "having to put up with ourselves and with other people," will have a lasting value for them.

C. W. Martin of Watson, who is majoring in Agricultural vocational education at Arkansas State served as group leader, under the sponsorship of the Student Department of the Arkansas Baptist State Convention. Dr. Tom Logue is the departmental director.

The summer assignment actually got under way in June when the students, most of whom had never met before, started in two

cars from the Baptist Student Center at the UA Medical Center in Little Rock.

They made their first camp, at Pampas, Tex. But after trying for two hours to sleep in a 30-mile-an-hour gale, they struck camp and resumed their journey. They were not to have a full night's sleep till they reached Colorado.

On June 12 they reached Portland, Ore. There Baptist missionary-pastor Harold Hitt, their adviser for the summer, conducted a three-day orientation that helped to bolster their drooping spirits.

They began working on the Ben Belden farm on Route 1, Aumsville, as strawberry pickers on June 17. They continued here until their "retirement," at the end of the day on August 10. By then they were veteran bean pickers.

"They weren't the fastest in the fields, but they were among the best," according to Belden. "The produce they picked was in top condition, and they were good for the morale of everybody."

This was the third year a group of Arkansas college students had worked as summer missionaries in the West under the direction of Dr. Longue's department.

The students this year, as did those in former years, lived in the simple work camp cabins occupied by the farm migrants. They cooked their own meals and put in full days in the fields along with the migrants.

They received the same pay as the migrants. The first of the season they worked in the raspberry and strawberry harvest. For this they received 60 cents a carrier (or box) of raspberries and 40 cents for strawberries. Their greatest prosperity came in the strawberry harvest: In two different days they earned a total of $85. In the bean harvest, during which they received three cents a pound, they earned from $30 to $40 a day.

All funds went into a common treasury from which their common bills were paid. At first they were spending $100 a week for groceries. But by the end of the season, when I visited them, they had arbitrarily put a $50-a-week limit on the grocery allowance. Eating with them, I found myself taking two or three helpings of spaghetti and meat balls, or pinto beans, whichever happened to be the main dish, and liking it. They also had a lot of jello: few persons have ever seen as much jello at one time as it takes for dessert for a dozen hungry, working kids!

The lot of the students was improved considerably, however, through contributions from a number of churches and Sunday School classes from the various home communities of the volunteers. Central Baptist Church of Magnolia gave cash donations, as did the First Baptist at Crossett, and there were further cash gifts from church in the Jonesboro area. Several, including some in the Monticello area, contributed canned foods. The kids had more than enough canned fruit to mix with their jello all summer. And four days before completing their stint, they were still well supplied with canned bean soup.

"We're going to come out all right," Martin assured me. "And we are going to have enough for all of us to spend a day or two in San Francisco on the way back."

Despite the fact that many of the 300 or so different workers who came to the camp moved on after a short stay, there were enough staying long enough to get to know "the college kids," as the workers called the Arkansas students. And the migrants loved them.

Said one migrant grandfather, "My family and I were pretty blue when we checked in here, moving into this makeshift, one-room cabin full of cracks and spiderwebs. But learning that the college kids were here living and working the same way as us, pepped us up."

Besides their part in the harvest, the college kids operated a free day-care "center" in the girls' cabin, taking care of small children. Children who were 6 or older were themselves bean pickers, and many of the families preferred to take even their babies to the field. Usually about half a dozen little ones stayed in the day-care room.

A one-week vacation Bible school conducted by members of the student group attracted 40 children for Bible study and handiwork. Religious services were conducted outdoors at the camp on Sundays and on Thursday nights, but these did not attract large numbers. The main religious impact of the group missionaries seemed to come from their daily contacts with the migrants as fellow human beings.

Most of the people who came to pick beans came because they desperately needed to earn money for immediate living expenses. But some came just for kicks. Among these was a local businessman and his wife, an executive secretary employed by an agency of the State of Oregon. They had been bean pickers in their youth and picked a few days just for old time's sake.

Belden said that he regretted not being able to pay higher wages for the harvest, but claimed he is making less now on 200 acres of beans than he made 10 years ago on 50 acres. A number of years ago, he said, he cleared as much as $27,000 a year. Last year, because of the greatly reduced prices he receives for his produce and the increasing costs of production, he netted a profit of only $8,000. "My foreman cleared more than I did," he said.

Belden has a rather dim view of prospects for the farmer in the years ahead. With land and taxes skyrocketing and prices the farmers receives keeping to near cost or below, the amount of land required to make a living continues to grow.

"I know 20 farmers in this area, all of them middle-aged, and only five of them have sons interested in farming as a career," he said.

One part of the farmer's problem affects directly the migrant workers—that is the necessity of mechanizing the farming operation to cut down on labor costs. For example, the bean growers are fast switching from pole beans to bunch beans because mechanical pickers can be used to harvest the bunch variety—at much less expense to the farmer than hiring pickers.

There is no current government subsidy for fresh-market crops such as berries, green beans, and fresh corn. Belden feels that the government may have to provide subsidies for crops such as his to assure the future of this phase of the farming industry. But he would prefer to see all subsidies from the government discontinued, including not only those on cotton, soybeans, rice, tobacco and the like, but also those to railroads, steamship lines, airlines, etc. He would rather see the farm problem solved through better market prices for farm produce.

"Now seven per cent of the farmers get 90 per cent of government subsidies," he said. If subsidies are to be provided, he feels there should be a limit of $5,000 to any one farmer, instead of the present $55,000 limit on any one crop.

FREEZE ON REA FUNDS AN APPALLING INJUSTICE BY NIXON ADMINSTRATION

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in what has become an appalling ritual, the Congress is once again seeking the release of frozen appropriations for rural electric loans.

Despite the clear intent of the Congress that this program of such proven value and necessity be given funding imperative for its growth, the Office of Management and Budget has presumed to set policy and deny these appropriations.

I can only view with alarm the fact that the $85 million allocated for rural electric loans in the first quarter of this fiscal year was only one-fourth of the $329 million which the President requested for this purpose and was considerably less than one-fourth of the funds approved by Congress.

If this rate of allocation continues, an estimated $216 million will be frozen, the entire amount of the increase Congress approved. What we have is a virtual veto of that increased appropriation, a clear threat to the powers of the legislative branch, a serious blow to rural electric cooperatives across the Nation and a so-called economy measure which is contrary to the President's expressed desire for more capital expansion and production.

Beyond the obvious constitutional questions raised by this circumvention of the will of Congress, the failure to schedule allocation of the total $545 million in appropriations for fiscal 1972 retards efforts to revitalize rural America.

Those of us who have participated in the Farm Day forums and are sponsoring legislation to stem the outmigration from rural counties are especially despairing of the continuing neglect of this vital contributing factor.

One of the key factors in revitalizing rural America is the availability of adequate electric power at reasonable rates. Without it, the annual outmigration of 500,000 persons will continue, aggravating the wasting away of countless small communities and the attending burden on the cities which receive the displaced residents.

We Representatives of States with primarily nonmetropolitan populations are asking our counterparts from urban America to join in the realization that our problems are interrelated.

The problems of the city cannot be solved by continuing neglect of the countryside. The disastrous imbalance in population distribution cannot be resolved unless we can make rural America a more attractive place to reside.

If the $216 million in REA funds remains frozen, the mounting backlog of loan applications will soar, contributing to the economic handicap of these rural areas.

To prevent this, some 80 Members of the House joined in a letter to the President asking him to direct the Office of Management and Budget and the REA Administrator David Hamil to cooperate in drawing an orderly schedule for allocation of the entire fiscal 1972 appropriation.

I hope that the Representatives of urban areas will support this effort, confident that its beneficial consequences

will contribute meaningfully to the resolution of problems which affect, ultimately, all constituencies.

CITIZEN ACTION AGAINST POLLUTERS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, increasing numbers of our citizens—people of all ages, from diverse backgrounds and occupations—are helping to stem the tide of environmental degradation which has been engulfing our Nation, like the two youngsters who are tracking polluters of the Lackawanna River, whom I mentioned on October 7—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 35565. Another recent example of effective citizen action against polluters is the vigilance shown by Mrs. Sylvia Gregory of San Bruno, Calif., who—while laid up in the hospital with a broken leg, and with the aid of a pair of toy binoculars given to her by her daughter—helped to halt an illegal bayfill being perpetrated at the San Francisco International Airport.

Mrs. Gregory had a long-distance hunch that a Corps of Engineers' permit had not been obtained for the fill, as required by the Refuse Act. And her hunch proved to be correct.

Mrs. Gregory's story is a heartening one, as is the role of the Corps of Engineers' San Francisco district office.

I include in the RECORD articles from the San Francisco Examiner and the Redwood City Tribune about "the vigilant Mrs. Gregory."

The articles follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Oct. 13, 1971]

OBSERVANT PATIENT: ILLEGAL FILL SPOTTED FROM A HOSPITAL

(By Robert Hollis)

Chagrined San Francisco International Airport officials today ordered tons of dirt scooped from the bay after a curious conservationist, flat on her back in a hospital with a broken leg, brought a massive, illegal bay fill project contracted by the airport to a grinding halt.

Mrs. Sylvia Gregory, 48, a San Bruno housewife, was confined to a fourth floor room at Peninsula Hospital last month when she spotted a large number of dirt-hauling trucks dumping huge quantities of earth near the south end of the airport.

BAYWATCHER

By coincidence, Mrs. Gregory, who suffered her broken right leg in an auto accident, is a member of Baywatchers, a conservation organization which monitors bay fill projects and water pollution. She also regularly attends Bay Conservation and Development Commission meetings.

"I counted 12 big double rigs one morning," she said in her home yesterday with her full leg cast propped on a pillow. "I should have heard about this fill if it were legal."

Her suspicions grew after her 19 year old daughter brought her a pair of toy binoculars. She noticed the trucks were dumping on the shoreline at the foot of Millbrae Ave.

PHONE CALLS

She hastily called some friends at the Peninsula Conservation Center in Menlo Park who, in turn, called the Army Corps of Engineers in San Francisco with a complaint on the mysterious bay fill.

"On October 4, we went out to inspect the site," said Hans Lamm, of the Army Corps of Engineers. The construction office at the airport advised Lamm the land fill was designed to protect the shoreline from settling and wave action.

"The amount of dirt was far more than necessary to protect the shore," Lamm said. "It was a great amount."

In many spots the fill had covered "virgin marshland," he added.

RUNWAY END

Mitchell Baugh, the airport's associate construction engineer, told Lamm he thought the fill was being done on dry land around the end of one of the runways which extends into the bay.

Lamm estimates the trucks had dumped upwards of 1000 cubic yards of dirt in the area, not all of it in the bay.

"I advised them (airport officials) to stay away from the shore and to discontinue further fill operations until they obtained a permit from the Corps," said Lamm.

Airport officials have now ordered the contractor, Lowrie Paving Co., S. J. Swindle and Arndt Construction Co., of South San Francisco, to remove all the dirt that was poured on the marshland.

TOO MUCH IN BAY

"I inspected it today," said R. T. Lee, the airport's chief engineer. "They did push too much material into the bay." He estimated the dirt would be out in the "next couple of days."

Meanwhile Mrs. Gregory is at home now somewhat hampered by a heavy plaster cast. But she is as vigilant as ever, she said.

"We're keeping an eye on that area. It's up to us. We've got more manpower and eyepower than anyone else," she added.

Inspector Lamm confirmed Mrs. Gregory's statement. "We are continuously running around (checking bay shoreline), he said. "We only have two people who go out on a part time basis and there are miles and miles of shore."

[From the Redwood City Tribune, Oct. 6, 1971]

ROOM WITH A VIEW: PATIENT STOPS ILLEGAL FILL FROM HER BED

(By Ken Rowe)

A massive, illegal bayfill operation at San Francisco International Airport has been quashed as the result of some never-say-die ecological-snooping by a San Bruno conservationist—who spotted the project while flat on her back in Peninsula Hospital, Burlingame.

Mrs. Silvia Gregory of 141 Madison Ave., San Bruno, was confined to the hospital after suffering a broken leg in a traffic accident.

At the hospital, she was given a window with a view of the airport. "Then I started to actually look at what I was looking at," said the 48-year-old member of the Baywatchers, "and what I saw were dirt-hauling trucks and graders . . . We're organizing all around the Bay, to prevent just such things as these illegal fills. So, I called some of my friends."

Her friends called the Peninsula Conservation Center in Menlo Park. The center relayed the complaint to the Army's Corps of Engineers in San Francisco. The Corps yesterday sent investigator Hans Lamm to check on the complaint.

Inspector Lamm contacted Mitchell Baugh, the airport's associate construction engineer. Baugh "thought the fill was being done on dry land," Lamm said. Lamm had Baugh accompany him to the area where SFIA runways extend out into the Bay.

Lamm said he determined that private contractors working for the airport had dumped fill, excavated from a construction site near the main terminals, into the Bay marshlands.

"I told him (Baugh) it's not good doing anything without permission, especially in the marshlands," Inspector Lamm said.

Lamm estimated the contractors had dumped "as a guess, ohh . . . quite a few hundred truckloads" of fill.

The inspector said he was told the fill was intended only as support for the shoreline. "My opinion was that it was much more than needed to support the shoreline . . . it was a great amount," Lamm said.

Lamm said the hauling and dumping equipment was operated by Lowrie Paving Co., S. J. Swindle, and Arndt Construction Co.

The airport's officials will be "officially notified by letter that one has to apply for a permit for bayfill projects," Lamm said.

Mrs. Gregory, who normally attends all the meetings of the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, said, "I knew the BCDC hadn't issued a permit" for the work.

Meanwhile, the dumping has stopped . . . at least temporarily.

GINOLFIS HELP RETARDED—EVERY YEAR

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great deal of pride that I added my name to the growing list of cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 406. As you know, this measure, advanced by our colleagues—Mr. GUDE, of Maryland, Mr. BLACKBURN, of Georgia, Mr. PRYOR, of Arkansas, and Mr. SCHEUER, of New York—expresses congressional recognition of a declaration of general and special rights of the mentally retarded.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution has as its premise the basic good which is inherent in most Americans and it speaks to the awakening of that good in an area of desperate need.

Many Americans are unaware of not only the special problems of the mentally retarded but of the fact that those afflicted are denied many rights and privileges which most of us take for granted. My colleagues have more than adequately chronicled this concern and I will not attempt to add to their very thorough discussion today.

What I would like to do is to bring to the attention of this House the efforts of two people in Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District who are not unaware and who have adopted as their special interest, the needs of the mentally retarded.

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Ginolfis, of Stamford, have contributed more hours than could be counted over many years to the needs of the mentally retarded. This contribution has not only been made

willingly but happily, and, as Stamford's director of the aid for retarded children has said:

There would be a lot less problems in the community if others would do what he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, the Ginolfis long ago grasped the spirit of House Concurrent Resolution 406. I do not think I need say what I feel its passage would accomplish.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, Brendan Fitzsimons, a reporter for the Stamford Advocate, wrote a splendid account of some of the Ginolfis' activities. It not only looks at what they have done, but it gives some insight into two people who have a deep understanding of their fellow man. It can say much more than I can and I would like to share that account with my colleagues now.

The article follows:

[From the Stamford (Conn.) Advocate, Oct. 15, 1971]

GINOLFIS HELP RETARDED—EVERY YEAR

(By Brendan Fitzsimons)

"There would be a lot less problems in the community if others would do what he is doing," Paul Littlefield, director of the Aid For Retarded Children, said.

Who is he?

Michael Ginolfi, that's who!

Mike, as he is known by his friends, has helped contribute about $2,500 a year for the past 12 years to send retarded children to summer camps, according to Mr. Littlefield.

As the result of a 1959 family reunion, Mike and his attractive wife, Kay, decided to start an annual Christmas party. With their deep interest in aiding retarded children, the couple decided to support the efforts of the Aid For Retarded Children fund, and with their initial party helped send three children to camp.

This summer, according to Mr. Littlefield, Mike made it possible for 17 children to attend 98 weeks of summer camp at Camp Jaysee in Stamford.

"Each child spent a minimum of four weeks at the camp," Mr. Littlefield added.

The Ginolfi Christmas party is unique, as a host of Stamfordites will testify. Their support each year has increased so Mikes faces a new dilemma.

"I cannot find tickets for everyone who wants to attend," he glumly said. "Some people will be very disappointed this year."

This year's party is slated for Saturday, Nov. 20, at St. Benedict's Social Hall on Soundview Ave.

As per custom, the Ginolfi party follows a theme. This year it will be "The Roaring 20s."

In past years, diners and dancers found themselves in settings reminiscent of Rome, Venice, Paris, Spain and Japan.

"Mike has an excellent touch of showmanship," Mr. Littlefield said, adding:

"It is a delight to go to his parties and the people enjoy themselves and have a good time, especially when they know they are doing something charitable."

Every cent Mike has collected in the past 12 years has gone to the Aid For Retarded Children fund, except for the expenditure involved in the parties.

"I have boxes full of receipts from each event," he said. "If anyone thinks I am making money out of this, he is welcome to come by and check the paperwork and receipts."

A native of Naples, Italy, Mike told us that most of the people who attend the parties contribute from $10 to $50.

"Last year, one table dropped $500 in the basket as we passed it around," he said.

His slogan, which paraphrases a saying of the late President John F. Kennedy, is, "It is not what the community can do for us, it is what we can do for our community."

The son of a shoemaker, Mike declares Connecticut is the leading state in the country regarding programs concerning aid to the retarded.

"I know people who have moved to the state to take advantage of our relief programs," he added.

He feels the parties successes are due to his friends who not only contribute funds but also lend a helping hand.

As Mike said, "Without my friends, I could not do it."

"Thank God for all of them," he continued.

And his friends have kind words to say about Mike and his efforts.

They praise Mike for his enthusiasm and one said, "He knocks himself out doing this job."

"There are not enough people who put themselves out to work for such an organization," another added.

The Ginolfi family pitches in to help regularly with the arrangements for parties.

"I have a wonderful family who understands human kindness," Mike said softly.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA STUDENT LOBBY

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, a distressing bit of information has crossed my desk concerning the political power we gave the young people of this Nation by accepting the 18-year-old vote. By passing that constitutional amendment, we not only enfranchised the young voter, but gave them the same political power possessed by every other voter in this Nation.

The University of California student legislators, 6 months ago, organized a legislative lobbying program to represent them at the California State Legislature in Sacramento. The lobby, supported solely by student funds and controlled private contributions, is delegated to represent student views to the legislature and support or oppose legislation of student interest. The lobbyist is 21-year-old Kati Perry, a political science graduate from the University of California at Santa Barbara, who receives a salary of $625 a month to conduct her entire legislative effort.

Eventually, the legislative program of the University of California campuses is expected to expand, providing information to students, polling campuses to gain information on what students believe to be the critical issues, and sending groups of government interns to Sacramento to work in the legislature. Once developed, this entire program will cost the students approximately $70,000 a year.

This lobby effort has devoted itself, so far, to such radical measures as faculty pay raises and tougher environmental legislation to protect the California coastline. All information I have received indicates this effort is a mature response to the need for better laws and representation.

The problem? Mr. Speaker, the problem is really no surprise. When this program was proposed, the regents who direct the University of California system patted the little kiddies on the head and told them to have fun—as long as it was not political. Now, those same benevolent regents are negotiating with the student governments over the continuation of the plan. They oppose it because the lobby works actively in Sacramento.

If the student governments had sponsored a rock concert with a loud band that cost them $50,000, the regents probably would not have objected—after all, the concert kept the kiddies off the the street. But, when students organize to actively seek needed change and improvement in our systems and lives, then the regents stand opposed.

So, Mr. Speaker, we come to the fundamental question of this entire debate: Was passage of the 18-year-old vote amendment just ritual on our part, to keep the students happy and quiet; or did we really intend to give these young people a voice in shaping the laws of this society?

At every commencement exercise at every college in the Nation, an esteemed speaker, sometimes a Member of this body, tells graduating college students that they are the light of the future. They will carry the torch of a new generation of Americans. They will be the men and women that determine the final destiny of this great Nation. Many speakers congratulate these students on being the best educated and most prepared of any preceding generation of graduating students. They hear themselves called capable of taking over the reins of government and bringing about a generation of peace and love.

Yet, when these same students devote their own time and their own money to become responsible citizens of this country, we tell them, "fine, but do not be political; do not go to the source of the problems nor to the arena where solutions are found."

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable to me that the regents of the University of California propose to tell student governments they do not have a right to have their views represented in the Capitol. Here we have a case of young people working within the system to make it better, while a body of men, represented by paid lobyists both at the State Legislature in Sacramento and the Congress in Washington, tells these students they cannot continue their activities because they are spending their own money for political purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article by Noel Greenwood of the Los Angeles Times for inclusion in the RECORD, so that my colleagues can get a clear picture of the unique student efforts to properly represent the right of 106,000 students before the legislative bodies of the State:

UC'S NEW STUDENT LOBBYISTS: AMATEURS IN A PRO'S WORLD

(By Noel Greenwood)

Kati Perry, a 21-year-old June graduate in political science from UC Santa Barbara, does not look much like a lobbyist.

The $625 she earns each month does not sound like a lobbyist's salary.

And while other Sacramento lobbyists are wining and dining their guests at posh restaurants, Miss Perry is more likely to go dutch-treat with hers at a nearby delicatessen.

Nonetheless, she is a lobbyist—paid by the 106,000 University of California students to argue their cause in the halls of the Legislature.

The UC Student Lobby, first of its kind in California, was launched six months ago.

UNDERGOES REORGANIZATION

Now it is undergoing its first reorganization, signaled in large part by the arrival of Miss Perry and a fellow Santa Barbara graduate, Paul Gassaway, 22, to take over operation of the lobby.

For UC student leaders have junked their original decision to employ a professional lobbyist, and parted company with the young attorney they hired to fill that job when the lobby opened for business last March.

They are going to an all-student (or, at least, recent graduates) operation—convinced that will carry more weight with legislators.

At the same time, they are setting out to build an even bigger lobby of inviting students at state colleges, community colleges and private colleges and universities to join them.

The young lobbyists operate out of a crowded, sometimes cluttered, office less than a block from the Capitol. Large charts tracking the progress of legislation they are trying to influence cover one wall.

Their successes have not been spectacular, but they do seem to have at least gained a toehold in Sacramento.

This assessment of their progress by a veteran education lobbyist is typical:

"There's just one thing that counts around here—do you win or do you lose. They haven't won very many. But to make a fair evaluation of what they've been doing—given the fact they're new, they're not pros, they don't have at their command all the tools that a great many other lobbyists have—I think they've been a positive force in Sacramento."

Legislative aides who watch education bills give the student lobby mixed marks.

"Legislators in general were refreshed to discover they were pretty level-headed people," said one. "I've seen some legislators who were personally turned around on an issue by students."

But the same aide finds the young lobbyists lacking in a real understanding of what makes the Capitol tick, and faults them for "viewing a lot of things as conspiratorial and tending to jump on issues too quickly."

TALKS WITH STAFF MEN

"The fact that students are here and are around the halls talking to legislators makes a number of other people involved in the legislative process—staff people, lobbyists and so on—take more into account the student view," said another.

* * * * *

tackled with vigor was funding for the Educational Opportunity program (EOP) that aids low income and minority students on the nine UC campuses.

"They were quite instrumental in keeping the EOP appropriations in the budget while the budget was under consideration by the Legislature," said one side.

After the EOP appropriation was cut from the budget by Gov. Reagan, the student lobby persuaded Assemblyman William T. Bagley (R-San Rafael) to carry a new EOP money bill.

The bill appears dead, but an aide to Bagley credited students with building a good case for the bill and working hard to round up legislative support.

"They were very good with the background information. They came in with justification for over $6 million," he said

Whether the switch to an all-student operation, without a professional lobbyist to head the office, will pay off is an unanswered question.

Some legislative observers are frankly dubious.

"They'd be better off with a professional who knows the system," said one.

But others think it might work, given enough time.

"It's a question of the kind of people they have," said another. "It just takes an awful lot of thrashing around and much more than an understanding of the formal processes of government to be effective in this kind of job. People have to come to trust you, and it takes a long time to develop that kind of confidence."

As to the student lobbyists, they are optimistic about their venture but admit to some letdowns.

"Although you read about vote-trading, it's just disappointing," said Miss Perry. "Particularly when they're legislators you've talked to, and who seem like OK people."

She faults legislators for sometimes exhibiting a dismal lack of knowledge about students.

Some, she said, complain loudly over the troubles at neighboring Isla Vista when they find she is from UC Santa Barbara, "but aren't aware of all the things the students did the following year in the community to try and rebuild it."

ON CREDIT SIDE

Yet she also credits legislators for taking the student lobby seriously, and said approvingly of her first encounters with law makers:

"Most of them first off want to know about the lobby. I think there's a basic desire of legislators whether they agree or not to try to understand what the students are doing."

Whether the lobby can build itself into an organization with real political clout by taking state college, community college and private college and university students under its wing is uncertain.

Miss Perry said negotiations look promising.

But at least one important segment, the state college students, are running into resistance from the college administration and trustees.

Current state college regulations prohibit student funds from being spent for lobbying according to a legal adviser to Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke.

And state college officials are refusing to support pending legislation promoted by students that would wipe out that prohibition.

Students see an irony in all of this, for the state college system itself maintains a lobbyist in Sacramento who is paid out of general state college funds.

STATE COLLEGE LOBBY

An even further irony is that state college students already have a loosely organized lobby at work—run mainly by student leaders from Sacramento State—and some legislators credit it with having more impact thus far than the UC lobby.

The UC Student Lobby is expected to be a $70,000 a year operation when it moves into full gear starting this fall, with the money appropriated by the student governments on the UC campuses.

It apparently has succeeded in overcoming early objections to the lobby by some UC Regents.

One pitfall that Miss Perry believes the lobby has successfully avoided is taking on a partisan label. There were suspicions from the outset that it would tie itself exclusively to Democratic lawmakers, but Miss Perry said this has not happened.

"We avoid being associated with the one party or the other," she declared.

The lobby has also been under pressure to restrict its efforts to education bills that directly affect students, but the young lobbists have found this a difficult restriction.

They have, for instance, lobbied for faculty pay raises, for environmental and coastline legislation, and were ready to campaign against an anti-hitchhiking measure.

They would also like to jump into consumer issues.

Their argument is that all of these things are of prime importance to students.

Of the environmental and coastline legislation, for instance, Miss Perry said: "We will continue pushing both of these. They (legislators) all seemed to think it was a natural thing for students to be involved in."

As part of the lobby's reorganization, it will set up branch offices on each UC campus this fall. And it will likely conduct a referendum on all campuses soon to gather student opinion on what causes it should fight hardest for.

All this is an attempt to bring the lobby closer to its constituents.

Last summer, the lobby brought 16 student interns from five campuses to Sacramento to track legislation through committee hearings and buttonhole hometown legislators, among other chores.

This part of the operation is due to expand, and the lobby also hopes to shuttle legislators back to campuses from time to time for talks with students.

"A lot of legislators haven't been on a campus for 10 years," Miss Perry said.

The young lobbyists are also banking on the 18-year-old vote to give them added bargaining power, especially with lawmakers from districts with heavy concentrations of student voters who could make the difference in a close election.

Legislators like Assemblyman W. Don MacGillivray, a Santa Barbara Republican who barely won reelection and within whose district Isla Vista is located, might listen more closely to the student lobby if the lobby can pull together the student vote, the theory goes.

Through it all, Miss Perry remains cheerful about the lobby's prospects.

"I'm very optimistic about the lobby," she said. "I think it has more potential than any other student program I've seen, and I've seen a lot in Isla Vista."

HOGAN SUPPORTS SHIPMENT OF PHANTOM AIRCRAFT TO ISRAEL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Israel was born as a tiny island in a sea of enemies and now, after more than two decades of statehood, it is still a tiny island in a sea of enemies—a nation of 2.5 million people surrounded by 100 million Arabs.

Yet, against this backdrop, Israel has built a political, social, and economic system that is the envy of the Middle East.

That success has been built at a cost which includes two wars and a time when 40 percent of its gross national product was going for defense and its people were sustaining 20 deaths per month, a figure

equivalent to 1,500 deaths a month in the United States on the basis of comparative populations.

To this day every Israeli man must spend 3 years active duty in the military and then faces reserve duty until the age of 55.

The sacrifices, courage, dedication, and resourcefulness of the Israeli people have played the major role in the nation's success.

But the Israelis have still had to depend heavily on the United States to supply arms and equipment in order to maintain their military strength and preserve the balance of power in the Middle East.

And today that balance of power and the strength of the Israeli military position are in jeopardy because the Soviet Union has escalated its military support of Egypt.

Prior to October 14 the Soviet Union had provided a steady supply of advanced weaponry to Egypt and there were some 20,000 Soviet personnel, including combat pilots, in the country.

Then, on October 14, Egypt and the Soviet Union announced a new weaponry agreement which commits the U.S.S.R. to increased military aid and poses a greater threat to Israel's security.

Of greatest concern to the Israelis at this time is the presence in Egypt of the new Soviet Mig 23, the Foxbat, which is the most modern fighter plane in the world today.

In the past the administration argued that, although Egypt had a numerical superiority in warplanes, there was a satisfactory military balance between Egypt and Israel because of the high morale and superior training of the Israeli forces.

But that was before the introduction of the Foxbat and the new Soviet-Egyptian military aid agreement. And now we must ask ourselves, "If the balance of power was right prior to these new developments, how can the balance still be right today?"

Because of these new developments I believe we must now supply Israel with sufficient additional weapons to deter Soviet or Arab miscalculations that could lead to renewed hostilities.

To that end, I am today joining many of my colleagues in sponsoring a resolution which is identical to a measure sponsored by 78 Members of the other body last week.

The resolution calls for two vital steps. First, the quick approval of Israel's pending request for more F–4 phantom aircraft.

And second, the commitment of the United States to stand by the basic principles of United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which was passed on November 22, 1967, and reaffirmed the importance of secure borders in a peace settlement negotiated by the Arabs and Israelis.

I believe we must take steps if we are to insure a lasting peace in the Middle East.

There can be no peace in the Middle East unless Israel operates from a strength that does not invite attack and unless the Arabs and Israelis themselves have negotiated a peace among themselves and provided secure borders as part of the peace agreement.

In my view we must take this action not only to preserve a free nation which is in jeopardy, but because the Soviets have taken such an intense interest in helping the Arabs to destroy Israel.

Our own self-interest in that oil-rich area dictates that we do whatever we can to insure the survival of Israel.

A HELPFUL POSTMORTEM ON THE SST

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 21, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the October issue of Astronautics & Aeronautics, a publication of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, contains a helpful postmortem examination of the SST issue.

The article is "SST—Implications of a Political Decision," by Edward Wenk, Jr., professor of engineering and public affairs at the University of Washington, and former executive secretary of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

Finding plenty of fault on both sides of the issue, Professor Wenk hands out demerits to all of us—winners and losers alike—and suggests ways of improving our performance in the future. His suggestions are especially useful for these two reasons:

First. They provide an answer to the question that W. M. Magruder, Director of SST Development, put to me in a recent letter. Now that Congress has voted to keep the SST in its chocks, Mr. Magruder asked, how should very large projects of technological research and development be conducted in the future?

Second. They serve as an effective counter to this sort of intemperate statement appearing in the October newsletter of the National Aeronautic Association:

> The current trend isn't merely to ignore technological development. There are elements in the country that have organized actively to campaign against it—the battle over the SST is a case in point—the weapons used to defeat the program were hysteria, misinformation and illogic—and unfortunately, this is the message youngsters everywhere have received loud and clear.

Professor Wenk's article should be read in its entirety, but I should like to call attention to this paragraph—

> Both politicians and industry must listen more attentively to the dissenters. The environmental warnings, especially as to noise and sonic boom, had been sounded repeatedly but brushed aside until too late; thus the opportunities for a technological fix were wasted. As part of this attention to dissent, when one sector of government becomes a promoter it tends to behave so as to enhance its relative influence and minimize adverse factors inimical to its development. Another must play watchdog, a role now shared by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency. Their performance thus bears watching.

And to this one—

> In short, the proponents of new technological change and innovation must consider the socially desirable as well as technically feasible. Every participant in the technological process needs to be better prepared by technological assessment, with anticipatory rather than reaction analysis. Timing is of the essence—to elicit light rather than heat. This places an obligation on government, on industry, and on the professions. It also places an obligation on the public. But where will they find expertise?

Professor Wenk's proposed answer appears within reach. This is his article:

SST—IMPLICATIONS OF A POLITICAL DECISION

(By Edward Wenk, Jr.)

With the dust settled and the battle cries stilled, a postmortem search for clues to the demise of the late-lamented SST may help prepare us for the future. Similar issues will likely be examined in a public forum on the beneficient application of technology to meet national goals and on new opportunities for partnership between the governmental and the private sectors to create and manage large new enterprises.

In retrospect, both sides would probably agree on a number of points concerning the SST:

Among the contending parties there was confusion both about the nature of the key issues and how to resolve them. Judging by the public record at the moment of truth, one might have supposed the SST decision was largely an environmental issue. In fact, this was only one among perhaps a dozen in a web of complex and unprecedented questions involving technology for which familiar patterns of decision-making and planks of national policy were conspicuously lacking.

The magnitude of the project and its risks called for supportive efforts by both government and industry, but a balanced relationship never matured.

Insufficient homework was done on both sides in winnowing from the plethora of information and guesses a meaningful array of verifiable facts. In the absence of a convincing rationale, the last-minute, belated burst of lobbying by both sides proved naive and even counterproductive.

The SST cutoff was a political decision—not economic, social, technological, or environmental—but political. Politically determined issues inevitably tend to be accompanied by as much heat as light, and, sadly, the very word "political" has come to have negative connotations for much of the public.

Future technological issues may suffer the same fate in a deluge of rhetoric because of inadequate or belated technological assessment.

Case History of the Patient: First, a brief chronology.

Early 1950s—Faint stirring of the concept of a civilian supersonic transport.

1956—Feasibility study launched by NACA of requisite powerplants for supersonic flight.

1958—B–70 bomber, prelude to SST, contracted for with North American Aviation. Program soon scrapped after $330 million of research, on grounds that ICBM rendered manned bombers obsolete. Federal Aviation Act created Federal Aviation Agency and authorized development of civil aeronautics. The aerospace industry began independent studies of a privately financed SST, but found a prototype development necessary to solve key technical problems and the cost of this beyond its borrowing capacity.

1960—General Elwood R. Quesada, chief of the new FAA, undertook studies of an SST, contending the U.S. could not neglect the competition in market, prestige, and leadership from the USSR and the Anglo-French consortium. His request for funds was trimmed by Budget Bureau. Quesada's successor, Najeeb Halaby, assumed SST advocacy, urging through "Project Horizon"

and the Supersonic Transport Advisory Group that development of a commercial SST with governmental assistance be deemed a national objective.

1961—Appropriated for supersonic-transport development: $11 million.

1962—Appropriated: $20 million.

1963—British-French decision announced to proceed with Concorde. June 5, President Kennedy announced U.S. commitment to supersonic plane (with an additional $60-million appropriation). He said, "Neither the economics nor the politics of international air competition permit us to stand still in this area. . . . An open preliminary design competition will be initiated. . . . If these initial phases do not produce an aircraft capable of transporting people and goods safely, swiftly, and at prices the traveler can afford and the airlines find profitable, we shall not go further. . . ."

1964—First Congressional debate on issue; cutoff rejected by the House of Representatives, 109 to 26. Early in a long series of special feasibility studies by various parties, one by Stanford Research Institute concluded that there was "no economic justification for an SST program."

1965—President Johnson called for 18 months of additional research before construction.

1966—Intensive opposition developing in Congress, especially from Representative MacGregor and Senator Proxmire, leading to cuts in every subsequent appropriation bill. Studies by NASA and OST raised questions about noise. December 31, Boeing and GE announced as winners of design competition.

1968—Johnson Administration continued support for SST, including explicit assignment of project to newly hatched Department of Transportation. In autumn, Boeing announced its swing-wing design would be scrapped, resulting in a technological setback of 18 months.

1969—*Ad hoc* committee chaired by Under Secretary of Transportation James M. Beggs appointed by President Nixon to review the SST Resultant report not released until October 31, under severe Congressional pressure. Final draft of committee report apparently watered down members' criticisms and exaggerated positive findings, bringing sharp and bitter comment from other government officials representing the Council of Economic Advisors, Department of Interior, Surgeon General's Office, etc. Confidential study undertaken by outside experts, through office of the President's Science Advisor, recommended withdrawal from SST prototype on various grounds, detailed later. Report not accepted by President, but rather held under executive privilege until court action compelled its release late in 1971.

1970—SST debate caught fire, with full parliamentary maneuvering in Congress. National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 adopted in response to newly aroused public concern. Environmental implications of SST began to emerge staccato. In May, DOT appropriations request of $290 million for SST squeaked by House by 102-to-86 vote on an amendment to delete all SST funding. Test vote of 176 to 162 shut off debate. In Senate, amendment by Senator Proxmire used environmental issue to cut off SST (vote of 52 to 41). Conference committee met to reconcile controversy; their resolution favoring SST was backed by House 205 to 185 but opposed in the Senate by a filibuster which overrode two attempts at cloture. With time running out on the 91st Congress, a compromise was reached to continue to fund at the $210-million level until next Congress.

1971—March, House reversed earlier position and acted twice to delete SST funding (217 to 203, and 215 to 204). March 24, Senate gave the *coup de grace*, 51 to 46. May, House attempted to revive issue with $85.3-million appropriation passing House twice (201 to 195, and 201 to 197) but failing in the Senate (58 to 37). The conference committee then agreed with Senate position.

The patient expired, but it is clear that the SST had suffered for a long time from a series of ailments in the course of its early maturation.

Background: Behind these events lurked other causative situations evolving at different rates and in different forums.

In the land of free enterprise, we have a strong and proven tradition of responding to the call of the marketplace with goods and services targeted on a consumer body of some predictable characteristics. Where only the private sector is involved and profit is a clear motive, perceptive market analysis usually can determine whether a project should be undertaken. But the case of SST was complicated by a mix of public and private goals which neither government nor industry could (or should) be expected to satisfy independently, further clouded by the project's sheer magnitude and high risk, attended by market and technological uncertainties. Unique characteristics of each partner, it was hoped, would promote a profitable collaboration. But in the development, cooperation seems to have burned out in the fever of jurisdictional precedence and misunderstanding: The industry began to assume a subsidy that was initially thought unnecessary, and the government assumed a design state of the art that had not been achieved.

On this latter point, sight had been lost of the large number of technical unknowns confronting the project. Symptomatic of the design problems was the fact that the movable-wing design had to be hastily changed to a fixed wing. The gaps might have been filled if the fallout from B–70 development had been available, as expected when the SST fuse was lit in 1963. But when the B–70 was phased out, the full burden of development fell on industry, which had largely grown accustomed to dependence on governmental support when undertaking research. (Some of Boeing's SST research proposals, however, were rejected by the government.) Moreover, the government itself was seriously remiss in allowing space exploration absorb almost all aerospace research talents and funds. As far back as 1963, Congress had been calling for a re-balance of goals, which only now, in 1971, is perhaps being effected.

During the SST development, the airlines never demonstrated great enthusiasm over the big new contender for their favor. They were experiencing low load-factors along with increased costs, and were having difficulty even honoring their commitments for jumbo jets. None of the lines was in a position to pay the cost in a free market. In a psychologically ho-hum mood, they seem to have been nudged into orders mainly by the threat of their competition moving to SST, although FAA and CAB support of SST was also a gentle spur.

Baffled by indifference of the future employers of the SST, the public had its confidence further shaken by the F–111, C–5A, and repeated criticism by the GAO as to the validity of predictions about cost and performance.

Simultaneously, the new ethic of environmental conservatism was taking root, reflecting a major shift in social values.

The body politic came to realize that a closed environmental system can absorb only so much abuse. The new awareness had been forced largely by burgeoning technologies powerful enough to produce conspicuous damage to the biosphere or the social environment, usually in the form of unwanted and unpredicted consequences of some technological initiative which succeeded admirably in its primary purpose. To this mood was added the political counterpart of consumerism—more citizens wanting a piece of the action. Responding, the Congress made preservation of the environment a political issue and enacted sweeping new legislation.

Concurrently, the House Science and Astronautics Committee introduced the notion of an "early warning system" by inquiries of technology assessment—processes of study to foresee the socio-economic impact of technological initiatives and then, from the stand point of public interest, to identify and evaluate alternatives which could avoid or reduce unfavorable consequences.

As to the SST, its vulnerability had been pointed out in 1969 in the two adverse reports submitted, respectively, by the in-house Beggs Committee and by the outside experts assembled by the President's Science Advisor.

The first report reached the damaging conclusions that—

1. Regarding balance of payments, "an adverse impact of speed-induced supersonic travel on the U.S. travel account is likely to be greater than the estimated beneficial impact of supersonic aircraft sales."

2. On economics, there was uncertainty because of "unverifiable matters of judgment" of experts, coupled with military experience that "production costs have often been more than three times what they were predicted to be."

3. As to demand, estimates varied from 200 to 500 units, involving conflict between corporate profits and return of government subsidy, since cost recovery to the government would not be possible at the smaller total of 350 planes at $48 million each, at which point profits to the manufacturer would be maximized.

The second report, in recommending unequivocal withdrawal from the SST prototype program, cited among other items that The Boeing Co. had defaulted because the required takeoff and landing runs were 50% greater and speeds substantially higher than specified in the contract (not an unusual problem with untried technology); that the balance-of-payments effects were likely to be small; that returns to the government on its projected $1.3-billion investment would come only after the 300th aircraft, whereas the market was probably fewer than 250; that air-traffic delays in major airports would reduce interest in flights except for a small group of international businessmen; and that public reaction to the sonic boom in both the U.S. and Europe could be expected to lead to prohibition of operation over land.

The first report, toned down and built up, was not released until severe Congressional pressure brought it out in 1969. The second report was never unwound from the wraps of executive privilege until long after the demise of the patient. A suit brought by the American Civil Liberties Union, Friends of the Earth, and the Sierra Club under the Freedom of Information Act of 1966, and fought to the U.S. Court of Appeals, finally brought the report to light in August 1971, with an accompanying press release by Presidential Science Advisor Edward E. David seeking to dispel "certain impressions which have arisen depicting the government as attempting to conceal hitherto undisclosed factual data."

Postmortem Diagnosis: Both proponents and opponents of the SST failed in critical ways to serve their cause through wise use of the political process. Indeed, it seems to have gone almost unnoticed that a key element of political decision making is the capacity to sway opinion by a clear, reasoned, and sophisticated presentation of facts. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon were each motivated by a separate vision, but none of them seems to have had the benefit of unadulterated objective analysis.

The issues involved were patently complex

and interrelated; some were without precedent. Yet there was inadequate effort by governmental and industrial participants to lay out all the isues at the beginning, before political trends were accelerated by massive vested interests or psychological commitment. Had the issues been raised early enough and satisfied, the debate would have been more constructive.

On the side of the proponents, the arguments included maintenance of national prestige and technological superiority; the historical role of speed as a positive advance in transportation; underutilization of a brilliant aerospace capability; market requirements for travel in the 1980s; a desirable liaison of government and industry in promoting public social goals; and the side benefits to be expected for balance of payments and for employment.

The opponents talked of worthier alternatives for national priorities, of environmental hazards, of the effect of further governmental expenditures in firing up inflation, of general hostility to uncontrolled technology, and whether the fast craft was really needed.

National prestige has two sides. As a desirable alternative to force, in a world that continues to be jarred by nationalism, prestige remains a critically important goal in its own right. Historically, different aspects of our national prestige have earned durable respect in the world community—our spirit of independence and love for freedom; our willingness to accept, even to promote, change; our open society and technological prowess. But there can be honest differences of opinion as to what steps taken in the 1970s may be respected in a 1980 world. The widely admired manned lunar landing might not gain in the 1980 world acclaim that could be accorded a breakthrough in cancer research, effective alternatives to DDT for malaria control, and automobiles free of exhaust emissions. When proponents pointed out that SST could aid the nation in efforts to maintain world order and economic growth, a responsibility undertaken by the U.S. after WW II, they may not have considered such adverse effects as the sonic boom, which could prove an embarrassing environmental albatross. And certainly it was unjustified to question the patriortism of SST opponents (as was done in debate) on grounds of their undermining national prestige.

As the decision came closer to the wire, other levels of prestige came into view; the prestige of executive-branch departments and even of the individual protagonists themselves. At the end, the loftiest possible level of prestige was involved—the Presidential office itself. Although the White House staff usually proves cautious about leaving open an escape hatch of Presidential options when defeat appears likely, alternative exists here were closed. Further concerned by growing unemployment, the President's only reasonable tactic left was to fight hard for victory. In the frantic scramble to mount a last-minute blitz, the office of the President's Science Advisor entered the campaigning, five major airlines were enlisted to support the SST in some contradiction to their earlier coolness toward SST in reaction to the Beggs Committee 1969 study and a governmentally facilitated lobby of industry and labor raised $350,000 for full-page ads and a campaign of high-pressure tactics.

At the end, proponents raised two important economic issues. The development of SST, they contended, would support the national objective of full employment and would improve the balance-of-payments picture. Yet, it is a matter of record that almost all nationally known economists opposed the SST. They disagreed sharply with proponents, as to whether SST production would actually generate jobs or would simply divert the labor force from subsonic jumbo jets. And on the question of gold flow, many felt that the effect might actually be adverse in that more Americans would be stimulated by the SST to travel abroad and spend far more than would be recaptured.

A more cogent argument involving employment was the contention that a powerful, talented aerospace capability had been assembled as a public investment over a period of 25 years to protect our national security, but in the face of military cutbacks together with that of the SST this capability would be dismantled and lost. Moreover, unemployment in the Seattle area was then at a peak of 15 percent, and the loss of the contract to Boeing would compound the regional short-term depression that was affecting many, many families.

Both considerations reflected a deeper problem: *the almost complete lack of a national policy as a frame of reference on utilization of our nation's scientific and engineering talents.* How much was the capability worth? How could the surplus capability be converted to other socially viable goals? How could a problem of regional unemployment be met on a longer-term basis? The SST argument represented a makeshift effort of a single program to fill a vacuum of policy without solving fundamental questions. Seattle unemployment thus joined prestige as a somewhat masked but powerful issue in the final incandescent moments.

Simultaneously, the opponents were scattering their shots over a wide range of targets not propped up too firmly by carefully reasoned arguments. Pointing out that the Vietnam conflict had already drained off any surplus of the nation's productive free-enterprise system, they asserted that a whole bevy of desirable programs and social ambitions should be ranked ahead of SST development. Urban sprawl, traffic congestion, growing medical costs, a disadvantaged one-third of the population deprived of effective citizenship—these were of far more crucial importance than what was alleged as a plaything for the elite who could afford to pay the premium for fast travel—even assuming some beneficial economic fallout from the project. Realistically, however, tradeoffs with SST were unlikely.

The issues of environmental hazards were advanced more with fervor than facts; each newly issued and unevaluated scientific observation was rushed nervously into the public forum if it undercut the SST. Some old-fashioned demagoguery was practiced with the cancer scare. As to economics, a map was produced showing that only seven states could be expected to benefit directly from the SST; that at a time state and local governments were hoping to receive fruits of a new Federalism, 43 would lay out in taxes more than they would receive. This latter meat-and-potatoes exercise may have been far more potent than the environmental issue to a Congress impatient with White House priorities that pushed "citizen concerns" further and further back.

With such a variety of issues swirling in the political brew, the main one seemed almost lost. Was the SST really needed?

Very little was said either by carriers or by the government about the results of market studies. The traffic was at first forecast as though the faster and more frequent shuttling of SSTs could replace subsonic jets of any size. Such questions as water versus land routes, suitable airport runways, and intercity flight patterns received only belated attention. When cost estimates were given by proponents, they were based on a 500-craft fleet, thus unfortunately fuzzing up the real issue of the feasibility and wisdom of constructing two prototypes. Only toward the end did proponents mention that, once those two had been flown, a review might determine the wisdom of proceeding in light of an objective evaluation then of costs and environmental effects. By then, dismayed by the momentum of the advocates' lobby, opponents had doubts whether the enterprise could be stopped by some future review after $1.3 billion were invested. As a matter of plain common sense, a projected technological development should include a built-in checkpoint where cool appraisal can determine whether to go forward or to terminate because priorities have changed, serious impediments have arisen, or cost estimates have proved dangerously faulty.

All parties, moreover, failed to predetermine the share of the cost burden to be borne respectively by industry and by government. *The Wall Street Journal* in opposing SST wanted to reduce the argument to a private-enterprise marketplace issue; but clearly public as well as private goals were at stake. All components of our national transportation system have depended on governmental partnership in funding—e.g., for roads, seaports and channels, ship construction, and passenger-train operation. Hinged as it was on nascent technology, the SST issue had few precedents. Peaceful application of nuclear energy to electrical power generation was perhaps the only analogue; but lacking the military muscle which hurled us into the nuclear age, the SST was without a strong precursor. An earlier Kennedy proposal would have limited government investment to $750 million, leaving the greater burden to industry. How much government support should buoy up new technology if industry is unwilling or unable to share the risk remains a moot question in the wake of the SST debate.

Finally, it should simply be noted that neither side lobbied reasonably and logically for the same reason: neither had a base of consistent, well-knit judgments to back up its position on an issue of such high technological content wherein the decision depended critically upon scientific fact. The role of objective expert was sadly confused with those of politician and advocate.

While SST proponents charged the environmentalists with uninformed emotionalism, they had egg on their own faces. As much as six years earlier, in 1966, both NASA and OST had issued pessimistic reports about noise.

As late as 1969, the President apparently received a staff report that filtered out the uncertainties, over objections by officials who raised questions. Congress approached the issue with both sides having their minds made up and not necessarily wanting to be bothered by facts. The Congressional Research Service—a research arm of the Congress—had made valiant efforts to assemble an objective analysis of the situation; but while their study dealt effectively with environmental issues, it did not consider policy, economic, and administrative questions.

It being thus incomplete, the report was marketed by SST supporters as evidence that the opposition was overwrought. Between that missed congressional opportunity and the executive privilege that was exerted over expert opinion available to the President (justifiable in this author's mind), *nowhere in the process was there an objective, authoritative, fact-gathering, and analytical body, adequately protected by prestige and position so that it could lay out for the public as well as clients the facts, implications, gaps, and alternatives without fear of retaliation.*

The public witnessed the whole contest, dismayed but no better informed.

The inevitable result, in an argument confused by legitimate differences in expert interpretation of facts: the process of decorous lobbying, which is part and parcel of the American political system, was violated on

both sides by naivete and by assertion of unproven claims. The last-ditch appeals by affected industry, the coalition between private and governmental vested interests, and the frantic scrambling by all parties left a bitter taste with everyone who emerged from debate—even those who "won."

The Senators and Congressmen from the intimately affected State of Washington did their best, but at what political cost is hard to tell. The aggregate of congressional energies invested on both sides squeezed out for months other major issues which might better have been acted upon. And the horse-trading implicit in such efforts to mobilize votes may still cost dearly in future sessions.

Prognosis for Technology-Management Issues: On the basis of this diagnosis, a few major prescriptions emerge for those complex and fascinating "children of the future"—issues which involve the utilization of technology to serve jointly public and private goals and which are likely to require administrative reforms in new coalitions of government and industry.

First and foremost, any such issue can be resolved in one way and one way only: by frank acknowledgement that it is a political decision. Approving substantial public funds is one way of setting national priorities. Where else can such action legitimately take place but at the highest political levels in the land?

This means, first, that the issue involves several factors of our social-economic framework, and the outcome of any decision may affect each differently. Very likey some will win and some lose. What is "good for the country" is difficult to assess in a pluralistic society where a whole spectrum of public and private interests are in competition, and perhaps in disagreement about what constitutes the public good. The political process is the melting pot for different points of view and the essential arena for compromise, bargaining, and accommodation. Congressmen are obliged to consider the local constituency in a given issue—be it geographical, some vested interest related to his sponsoring state, or a committee under his jurisdiction. Scholars consider only the President to have a universal constituency, but in practical terms his concern is likely to oscillate between interest groups—depending on all the other issues on his agenda, on his political equilibrium, current strength, and opportunities for future reelection.

Next, a political decision means that the issue seldom heats up in isolation. It may be intricately bound up with questions ostensibly unrelated in content or in time, so that in dealing with a number of decisions within the same time frame, domino effects occur as each in a sequence of separate decisions nudges its neighbor. In turn, the substantive issues may be colored by political ambitions, partisan polarity, and relations of the Congress with the President.

Third, a certain onus attaches to the concept of political decision-making. Certainly the hysteria attending the last days of the SST did nothing to allay this feeling in the mind of public or participants. The clumsy tactics that accompanied the public act of making one of the most important technological decisions of our history left the contenders exhausted and the system shaken. They surely reinforced a public anxiety that some elements of the political process are inimical to our national interest in that powerful lobbies thwart the will of the majority.

This anxiety can be dealt with only by a more informed, reasonable, and sophisticated approach to such problems. (Perhaps the only reasonable, conservative statement in the final moments came from Boeing's president when he reestimated costs to restart—only to infuriate the executive branch and congressmen who wanted a different reappraisal to support their commitment.)

If there is a single lesson to be learned from the SST debacle, it is that none of the advocates was prepared from the beginning to deal with the issue in exactly this way as a political decision.

New Homework for Political Decisions: Homework for future political decisions of this magnitude must include sound analysis in advance of public debate, not only of the issues but of the very process of political decision-making. The environmental policy signed into law January 1, 1970, for which both President Nixon and the Congress proudly took a bow, imposed on all future technological initiatives involving the federal government a requirement for published assessment to identify possible adverse environmental effects, their external social and economic costs, and alternatives considered and rejected. The SST escaped that public review until congressional debate, and then, under pressure, harsh tactics developed.

In the open forum of such decision-making, the aerospace industry and it governmental sponsors are not used to the rough-and-tumble adversary proceedings of a political system that depends on public consensus. In the future, industry, technologists, and participants in the political process must all come to the forum armed with facts and garrisoned with virtue—the virtue of acknowledging a common obligation to protect the planet we live on and to meet the needs and claims of the citizen. It is a travesty on our technological age that our institutions are so slow that we find a single Ralph Nader as major institutional critic.

Both politicians and industry must listen more attentively to the dissenters. The environmental warnings, especially as to noise and sonic boom, had been sounded repeatedly but brushed aside until too late; thus the opportunities for a technological fix were wasted. As part of this attention to dissent, when one sector of government becomes a promoter it tends to behave so as to enhance its relative influence and minimize adverse factors inimical to its development. Another must play watchdog, a role now shared by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Environmental Protection Agency. Their performance thus bears watching.

A new factor is the growing public hostility to science and technology. To be sure, a small and articulate group of environmentalists wants to turn off technology entirely. Some in this group intemperately ignore what technology has contributed to a society increasingly freed from hunger, ignorance, disease, and disability. But others concerned with our social well-being look more analytically at the overbalancing adverse potential of a new phenomenon: the power of technology to affect the natural and social environment, the pace of change, the evolving concern for quality of life, and the sheer size of technological creations spawned by a military-industrial-scientific complex essential to our post-war national security. At what critical size, they ask, will such behemoths become immune to social control—their rampant energies unleashed from any purposeful goals and beyond the reach of any destruct button?

In seeking civilian applications of their know-how, the aerospace industry may have to take a new approach to market analysis and include in their reckoning the continuous advice of nontechnical disciplines to examine socio-economic implications. Such technological assessment by the private sector necessarily assumes a heightened sense of social responsibility, with special attention to social priorities and second-order consequences when goals are jointly public and private.

Failure of proponents to meet such requirements simply hands an ammunition train to those who would gun down all technological innovation. In the SST debate, proponents were obliged to compensate by a hasty lobby for their procrastination over five years during which questions about the environment and costs were avoided. If comparable decisions are to be handled that crudely in the future, technology faces serious danger indeed.

The concern for proper utilization of underemployed talent should be treated as a separate issue, to overcome the default in national policy. The conservationists concerned with waste avoidance may recognize, for instance, problems with human as well as natural resources.

In short, the proponents of new technological change and innovation must consider the socially desirable as well as technically feasible. Every participant in the technological process needs to be better prepared by technological assessment, with anticipatory rather than reaction analysis. Timing is of the essence—to elicit light rather than heat. This places an obligation on government, on industry, and on the professions. It also places an obligation on the public. But where will they find expertise?

Some authoritative, sophisticated body, perhaps independent of both branches of government and better sheltered from winds of interest and gales of emotion, should be available to examine both human values and technological opportunities, lay out the facts with objectivity and candor, and illuminate alternatives. This could be in effect a technological ombudsman, as I proposed in the form of a future-oriented "Commission on Social Management of Technology" to collect, evaluate, asd publicize such information. (Proceedings of October 1970 National Conference on Goals, Policies, and Programs in Federal and State Governments.) Such steps would maximize room for maneuver and assist the decision-maker with evaluated options; it would also give the affected but unrepresented some opportunity for an informed voice in the political process. This concept has been picked up by Senators Warren Magnuson and Philip Hart in S–1800, introduced May 6, 1971.

A bill to create a Congressional Office of Technology Assessment has progressed much farther through the legislative mill. The House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development chaired by John W. Davis has recently reported out the House version, H.R. 10243, and the Senate Rules and Administration Committee under B. Everett Jordan has the Senate variant, S–2302, under consideration. If enacted, the bill would take a major step toward reinforcing congressional access to expert analysis.

The industry that mobilized American genius to meet threats to the Free World in the 1940s and 1950s is challenged by new opportunities of dealing with peaceful applications of technology. The aerospace industry, which distinctively excels in systems analysis, will be called upon to translate its skills to a broader scheme of people, their concerns, asd institutions. Since the process involves a curious blend of science, economics, law, and politics, a new dimension of industrial capability must be developed to meet a full range of social needs and human values to make our constitutional system more rational in a technological age.

Technological prowess might then be better matched by political wisdom. The SST trial illustrates why we should all hope it will be.