

fore the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and the District of Columbia".

On page 17, line 7, of the House engrossed amendments, strike out "Sec. 2" and insert in lieu thereof: "Sec. 3".

On page 18, line 17, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "Sec. 3" and insert in lieu thereof: "Sec. 4".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to

concur in the House amendment with amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced S. 3023 and S. 3024 are printed in the Morning Business section of the RECORD under Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.)

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 15, 1971, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLEVELAND CITY COUNCIL ENDORSES EMERGENCY CRIME CONTROL ACT

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the fact that the crisis in crime which now confronts each of our large cities can be resolved only if substantial Federal assistance is provided directly to the cities, the City Council of Cleveland recently endorsed the Emergency Crime Control Act of 1971 introduced on November 16 by Congressman SEIBERLING and myself. I would like to commend to my colleagues the text of this resolution:

CLEVELAND CITY COUNCIL ENDORSES EMERGENCY CRIME CONTROL ACT

The following Resolution was adopted by the Council of the City of Cleveland December 6, 1971.

Res. No. 1866-71.

By Messrs. Garofoli and Sliwa.

An emergency resolution memorializing the House of Representatives to enact legislation to provide greater and more efficient Federal financial assistance to cities with a high incidence of crime.

Whereas, H.B. 11813 introduced in the Congress of the United States by the Hon. James V. Stanton, Congressman from the 29th District, proposes a revision of the method of the distribution of Federal funds to assist the cities in crime control; and

Whereas, the need in the larger urban communities is greatest for financial assistance for two reasons—there is a higher incidence of crime in the nation's major cities and there is also a decrease in the finances with which to abate this crime; and

Whereas, the proposed bill would allocate funds to the various communities based upon their needs properly substantiated and documented so that the funds allocated would be sufficient to fund a program strong enough to control the situation rather than merely delay it; and

Whereas, this resolution constitutes an emergency measure providing for the usual daily operation of a municipal department; now, therefore.

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of Cleveland:

Section 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact into law H.B. 11813 as proposed by Congressman James V. Stanton or any similar legislation which would incorporate the revenue sharing features of Mr. Stanton's proposal.

Section 2. That the Clerk of Council be and she hereby is directed to transmit a copy of

this resolution to Congressmen James V. Stanton, William Minshall, Louis B. Stokes and Charles Vanik.

Section 3. That this resolution is hereby declared to be an emergency measure and, provided it receives the affirmative vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to Council, it shall take effect and be in force immediately upon its adoption and approval by the Mayor; otherwise it shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

Adopted December 6, 1971.

Effective December 8, 1971.

LEGISLATION TO STEM THE PROLIFERATION OF DISEASED BLOOD

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill vitally needed to stem a rising health crisis in the United States: The proliferation of diseased blood.

Anyone involved in an injury requiring a transfusion today faces a good chance of contracting serum hepatitis. Last year alone there were over 50,000 cases reported, and estimates of those left unreported run as high as half a million. Transfusions for one out of every 150 patients over the age of 40 will result in death.

This last year has been over 2 million blood transfusions performed in the United States. And yet, we still do not have a comprehensive, effective Federal law regulating the source and handling of this precious, life-sustaining fluid.

Science has shown that the chief source of hepatitis is blood received from paid donors. The chances of their blood carrying the disease is 11 to 70 times greater than that of a volunteer. The paid donor is not screened carefully. Alcoholics, drug addicts, and others who live in conditions that invite hepatitis represent a great number of the persons who sell their blood to commercial blood banks.

Administration of these blood banks is often deplorable. Facilities are not inspected, health policies go unquestioned. One example has even been given where donors are paid in vouchers redeemable only at a local liquor store. It takes little imagination to determine the ultimate use for these proceeds.

This is not to say that all blood is bad. Many voluntary and commercial blood banks run perfectly respectable opera-

tions. Indeed, the good ones deserve our commendation for the invaluable service they provide. But, enough of the organizations supplying our doctors are so disreputable that stricter Government supervision is demanded.

At present, the medical profession depends much too heavily on the paid donor. Volunteers seldom lie about their past, they have little reason to. They are generally healthier. But the volunteer is also rare. People simply do not give enough to meet our great needs. Perhaps they do not realize the danger they face should they need wholesome blood some day.

Little is being done at present by the Government to remedy this situation. The National Institutes of Health licenses only 166 of the some 7,000 blood banks across our Nation. Moreover, most of the massive quantities of blood imported by this country every year go without any inspection or regulation at all.

NIH apparently is not the answer. What we need is a strong and enforceable law establishing stringent regulations, and a forceful organization to see them implemented.

This is the purpose of the bill I am today introducing. It would establish a national blood bank program within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare run by a program director with the authority to inspect, license, and regulate every blood bank in the country. He would be responsible for establishing standards for donor selection, for management of blood inventories aimed at minimizing the risk of disease and outdated, for setting limits on the number of paid donors within any banking system, and for establishing a national donor registry to allow cross-checking by blood banks for hepatitis carriers.

Regulation alone, however, is not the answer. The real key to a good, long-term blood bank program is to encourage more people to contribute. Those donors eliminated by stricter health standards must be replaced. This bill would commit \$9 million to a national campaign to recruit volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, the most tragic aspect of the current situation is that hepatitis is almost entirely preventable. I believe that a vigorous national effort to inform the public of the importance of donating blood, combined with adequate supervision of blood banking, could virtually wipe out transfusion hepatitis by 1980.

To be sure, it will take strong action such as this to stamp out serum hepatitis

once and for all. This bill provides the energy and strength needed, and I urge its early consideration. We must act to see that patients no longer suffer the threat of diseased blood.

ADDRESS OF MR. D. BRUCE
MANSFIELD

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. D. Bruce Mansfield, president of the Ohio Edison Co., addressed the Springfield Chapter of the Ohio Credit Union League. In his remarks Mr. Mansfield discussed several points that I feel can be of interest to some of my colleagues in the House. Therefore, at this time I insert this speech in the RECORD.

REMARKS BY DR. BRUCE MANSFIELD AT SPRINGFIELD CHAPTER OF THE OHIO CREDIT UNION LEAGUE, OCTOBER 15, 1971

I appreciate very much your inviting me to join you tonight and I am delighted to see so many of Ohio Edison people here. Considering the fact that all of you are "money minded" I think I should hasten to assure you that my fee for speaking to you is most modest, as your program chairman, Mr. Jacobs, can verify. This fact gives you two opportunities: (1) When you leave you can say that my remarks were worth exactly what they cost, or (2) you can consider yourself in the position of the women's organization whose chairman, after thanking the speaker for his voluntary appearance, suggested to the group that "next year we shall have twice as much money and can obtain a good speaker."

On the serious side, however, I feel amply rewarded simply in being able to chat with so many of you. Furthermore, I was most interested in learning that the father of the credit union movement in the United States was the great Boston merchant prince, Edward A. Filene, a fact of which I hadn't been aware. His interest in such a movement appears to be typical of his life's goal—the creation of a better economic and social life for men and women who toil for a living. Edward Filene and his brother Lincoln helped their employees establish one of the first organizations with power to arbitrate disputes. They set up one of the first employee health clinics, and developed one of the world's first profit sharing plans. Their store was one of the first to establish a minimum wage for women and girls. They inaugurated Saturday closings in summer months, and their store was the first to adopt a five-day 40-hour week.

Edward Filene's activities in other fields were just as outstanding. He was largely responsible for the beginning of the United States Chamber of Commerce. He fathered the present tourist class business in ocean travel, by suggesting that space be used for lower class fares for students and people of modest income. And he invented the first device for the immediate translation of foreign languages at international conferences.

Edward Filene typified the kind of ingenuity and creativeness that was responsible for making our nation the industrial and commercial power that it is today. Unfortunately for those of us in business and industry, today these vast contributions to our progress and to our exceptionally high standard of living are being downgraded and we are more and more being looked upon as villains. Instead of being recognized as bene-

factors for the many products we have developed and put on the market—the vast quantities of energy we have made available to relieve the burden of manual labor, the millions of jobs created by industrial exploration and growth—we are now looked upon by many as degraders of the environment and exploiters of defenseless consumers. In spite of the greatest communication system the world has ever known—again a product of our industrial system—we have failed miserably in selling our role as the moving force that makes all the wheels turn.

Factory chimneys belching smoke, that once were welcomed as a sign of prosperity, have become a symbol of all that is allegedly wrong with our system. The wonder drugs and medicines, the insecticides, the packaged foods, the automobiles—all products of industrial ingenuity—are daily being discredited and becoming suspect. The mood of the day is one of suspicion and distrust of the conduct and goals of business and industry—or, as someone stated recently, the greatest discovery of the 1960's is not a new star, or chemical element, or cure for the common cold, but the consumer!

There seems to be an almost reckless effort to convince the American people that these is a conspiracy on the part of business and industry to cheat them, deceive them and foist on them products or services that are unhealthy or unsafe. Increasingly, the integrity of all business is being subtly undermined by innuendo and suggestion. One of the most ingenious devices is the "truth gambit". We have "Truth-in-Lending", "Truth-in-Packaging", truth-in-this and truth-in-that—all suggesting that the element of honesty is completely foreign to our profit system.

In a way, we are again experiencing the loss of faith in our system that we went through in the depression years of the late 20's and early 30's. Then, the great economic machine that epitomized the American Dream collapsed without much warning. Visions of financial security for most families, which seemed so close to realization, lay broken and smashed.

Now, however, our fears seem to have grown out of distrust of our affluence, not the threat of starvation. Our consciences rather than our stomachs are giving us a hard time. We are dusting off all the old villains—condemning them this time for giving us what we demanded—more goods, more services, more conveniences at minimum cost.

Everywhere we hear that our system has let us down; industry is wrongheaded, worthless, and endlessly damaging to society; and we need to shift gears. Do away with growth, curb technology—they say—or our world will self-destruct in two generations.

Heretofore obscure scientists bask in front-page publicity by describing disasters that might occur; politicians hall themselves as defenders of the environment against industrial polluters and crafty consumer exploiters, even while the very government of which they are a part remains one of the most pervasive and immovable polluters of all; and the consumer, as taxpayer, is terribly exploited. Lawyers, acting in what they choose to call the public interest, indulge in a kind of publicity-rich legal guerrilla warfare to put a stop to anything anybody doesn't like, anything that makes a profit and smells of progress. As a result, the confused public is once again ready to believe anything that sounds reasonably logical, especially if it also sounds frightening. I am told that many students have been and are entering our Law schools with this kind of litigation as their principal objective.

It is widely held these days by many environmentalists that we've got to get off this growth kick—that's the new cliché,

"get off this growth kick" if we are to survive. We are told we've got to put a stop to "progress". No more power plants, especially nuclear power plants. No SST. No increase in the Gross National Product. No more great technological advances. Curtail the use of energy. If industrial plants pollute, shut them down. If they might present a problem, don't build them. If this throws men out of work, let them find other jobs. Let single-minded officials set ultimate anti-pollution standards and demand instant adherence, whether or not there are yet practical or feasible ways to do it. Put a stop to strip mining coal, prevent the drilling of oil wells, curtail highway construction. Go to court and delay anything that purports to be essential to growth of any description. This, they say, is the only way to upgrade and preserve the world in which we live.

It is a paradox that this loss of faith in our system comes at the very time when business is being marshalled as never before to help solve our many pressing problems. We are asked to assume new social responsibilities; our leadership is sought in attacking problems of education, taxes, crime, urban decay. The very same know-how that made our business system work is now being solicited to solve problems in other areas including our state government.

Somehow or other this know-how and our conviction that our system is the best yet devised and that it is working hasn't been transmitted as widely as it should have been to the public. In spite of the vast array of communication tools at our disposal, no one is listening to what we would like him to hear. Somehow, those of us in positions of leadership need to establish stronger contact with the world outside our immediate range of interest—we need to know firsthand what people think, what motivates them, what they really like and dislike about us.

Critical questions are facing our society. Where are we headed? What are the underlying trends in public opinion which will determine our future? Is even religious faith being endangered by the rising tide of skepticism sweeping over the world?

What do people really feel about the social, economic, and political trends of today?

Are we moving permanently away from the system of economic freedom and individual incentives, the system which has made this country great, and toward a system of outright socialism and dictatorship which has, again and again, demonstrated its inability to feed its own people.

One of the great questions also involves the part of leadership in guiding public opinion. Do the leaders actually lead, and in the new environment which voice will carry the most weight and have the greatest credibility? That of the scholar, the businessman, the politician, the consumer, the labor representative?

We can be particularly concerned about the younger generation, our future masters. The child of today has known nothing but the jet age. To those of us brought up in the horse and buggy days the blasé reaction of a boy to the astounding exploits of the Apollo astronauts is incredible. Today's child has lived a dozen years in experience and knowledge for each year of a child two generations ago.

We are living in an electronic age, in a world of circuits, of space travel, computers and satellite communications. Science has moved so rapidly that its full impact upon human outlook and attitudes has not been adequately calculated or measured, or even generally recognized.

We do know that our society is in a period of painful and momentous transition, that extensive social, economic and political

shifts are occurring and that tension and unrest are widespread.

But we need to know much more. Opinions and attitudes taking shape in the hearts and minds of people today, and especially in those of the younger generation, will determine the destiny of tomorrow. There is an urgent need to know how these opinions are being influenced by the new social environment we're living in.

The call goes out for extensive research efforts to interpret more clearly the human meaning of the new environment and to discover the key to the puzzle of public opinion in our world today.

It will not be easy to find that key. It is not as simple as calling upon a group of chemists or physicists to solve a basic scientific problem. It calls for specialists of a completely different kind—anthropologists, social psychologists, semanticists and others of similar skills in human relations. In other words, we need to reorder our priorities to be more knowledgeable of and responsive to the goals and ambitions of our people.

Perhaps we need to adopt more of the techniques and philosophies of successful politicians. No candidate for political office ever won an election without meeting the people he hoped would vote for him. No political candidate was ever successful who didn't read with some degree of skill the mood of his constituents. And no politician ever stayed in office long who didn't respond to those moods.

I have sat in offices of congressmen and watched their work routine with interest. First and foremost comes the task of answering the daily mail from constituents, and then a careful study of the day's newspapers. And, of course, there are very few congressmen who don't spend the weekends at home meeting their constituents.

I sometimes think that those of us who are charged with the responsibility of running a business have kept ourselves too remote from the people we are trying to serve and the agencies that regulate and control our business. We have delegated these responsibilities to our associates and their subordinates—most of whom we think are highly qualified—and have depended upon them to relay to us the playback from their contacts. But something gets lost in the translation and we fall to get that "gut" feeling that comes with personal exposure.

A not uncommon complaint by elected officials and governmental regulators besieged by our critics is that we fail to present our case adequately to the public. On the other hand, our critics speak loudly, long and convincingly—and their voice becomes the voice of the people—the voice to which any astute politician listens. Our voice is heard too late, or not at all, and in this day of increasing governmental control and direction this failure can be fatal. Too often business news originates in the offices of some governmental agency, and when it does it is seldom complimentary. In one year, for instance, the Department of Commerce put out 1,802 news releases, and the Department of Agriculture 3,600.

We are all aware of the mounting concern over the high cost of political campaigning and the threats that soon political office can be "bought" by the best-heeled candidate. It's somewhat ironic that a good share of those funds for campaigning come from people in business and industry and are used to conduct clever, sophisticated and effective communications programs while those same people in businesses and industries fall completely to use the same techniques for presenting their own cause.

We might be well advised to ask ourselves, "What are we going to do about it? What can we do?" Continue to lament and wring our hands? Fight back? Or what?

I think there is a great deal that business can do—on the positive side. It can take

stock of its values and demerits. It can project the first and correct the second. It can be sure that the public knows its side of every subject of criticism and attack. It can organize, mobilize and make self-policing a still more meaningful course of action. It can show how it is taking the lead in exposing the gyps and misleaders in goods and services—at worst a small minority but the ones who make all business vulnerable.

Businessmen can raise their voices on TV, radio and in print. They have the facts to present and a right and responsibility to present them.

They will need the open-minded and fair-minded cooperation of the media in getting their story told. And you don't make the top of the news quite so easily with stories of good behavior and vigilant attention to consumer and public interest—not nearly so readily as with sensational half-truths, oversimplification or adverse exaggeration. Some of the white knights will tell you there's no real harm in taking chances with the truth if it's only commercial interest, not the consumer, who will be hurt. We must make it clear that the damage they do by their half-truths is often damage to the consumer's own interest and needs to be so revealed and so treated.

The typical industrialist spends his life developing technologies and perfecting methods to bring down the cost of what he makes to the point where more and more people can afford to buy, and in buying contribute to the flow of funds that creates more jobs and makes higher pay levels possible. Whether anybody likes it or not, that is what our economy is all about. That is why the number of poverty-level people has shrunk from 350 per thousand population in President Franklin Roosevelt's time to about 125 today. That is how poor people get bailed out. In the end, it is the only way—and they know it.

Can we demonstrate that the American tradition of progress, of moving ahead, of aspiring, is not really all that incompatible with lofty social aims and realistic concern over our environment? It is immensely difficult, of course, to present a voice of calm assurance in the storm center of an emotional upheaval.

In times like these there is a district of all the old faces and all the old worlds. It would appear that only the pallbearers of the apparently expired American Dream can get a responsive audience.

Yet a spark of that Dream still exists in the minds of most Americans. What we have known in our hearts for nearly three hundred years, we still know, and we are not likely to forget for long. That spark needs only to be fanned into a flame.

In the vernacular of our youth, we need to tell it like it really is—loud and often. Thank you.

VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I introduced H.R. 11827, a bill that would ban compulsory unionism. At that time I stated:

This bill is not anti-labor but pro-workers.

In substantiation of my remark, I would like to call to my colleagues attention a letter to the editor that appeared in the December 5 issue of the Chicago Tribune. The writer concludes by stating:

Voluntary unionism is the goal of the modern blue collar work.

The text of the letter follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 5, 1971]

VOLUNTARY UNIONISM

CHICAGO.—Protesting the boorish actions of George Meany at the AFL-CIO convention in Miami by writing to a newspaper is fine. However, real constructive action can only come with thousands of citizens bombarding their congressmen with letters urging them to pass a bill written by Rep. Sam Steiger of Arizona. This is the bill to amend the 1935 Labor Relations Act so that there will be an end to compulsory unionism. If rank-and-file union people are given their constitutional right to join unions of their own choice, they will no longer have to contribute to the support of characters like George Meany. Voluntary unionism is the goal of the modern blue collar worker.

BLUE COLLAR WORKER.

AMTRAK

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the whole Amtrak experiment may be dumped when funds run out July 1, 1973—leaving most of the Nation without passenger trains. Still running would be commuter trains and profitable longer runs, notably along the Washington-New York corridor—not noticeably helpful to people in northern and eastern Missouri.

Senator VANCE HARTKE, Democrat, of Indiana, who spearheaded establishment of Amtrak in the first place, says one basic problem is that the system does not actually operate its own trains. It has no engineers, conductors, or maintenance men. To make its trains run, Amtrak pays railroads to operate them.

These are the same railroads which by and large Congress considered to be doing such a poor job of running their passenger trains that it established Amtrak to oversee the running. If these railroads could not run their own trains right, why should anybody think they can run Amtrak's properly?

During recent hearings on the Amtrak funding request, Senator HARTKE said flatly that—

Congress should insist that Amtrak run its own trains with its own people as a condition to receiving additional funds.

There is another kind of employee Amtrak should hire: Auditors, accountants, and others in the financial field. For years critics have accused railroad companies of saying it cost more to run passenger trains than it actually did—thus making passenger trains look more unprofitable than they really were.

There is much distress over the present accounting procedure: Railroads, using their own figures, tell Amtrak how much it owes them for running passenger trains. There is considerable questioning of the railroad figures. How accurate are they?

Under the present contract arrangement "the railroads may be paid on what

amounts to a cost-plus basis for operating the trains." Amtrak will be self-sufficient and responsive to customer needs only when "its full-time employees are receiving Amtrak paychecks and are directly accountable to Amtrak supervisors."

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE JUDGE
ARCHIBALD M. AIKEN

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, the city of Danville and its citizens lost a dedicated and conscientious servant and friend, when Archibald M. Aiken, judge of the Corporation Court of Danville, passed away.

Judge Aiken was 82 when he died; an age when most men have long since retired to the rocking chair, to muse on past accomplishments and to mentally dwell in some far-off time. Not so the judge. His life was in the present, his interests were contemporary.

When a public figure of his age who has served his community so honestly and capably passes on, there are usually anecdotes related, stories of exploits and escapades. Judge Aiken was not this kind of man. He was a man of fierce dedication to law and to the rights and responsibilities of man. One of the Danville newspapers which often found itself at loggerheads with the judge summed up the feeling of many when it stated editorially:

That was the kind of man Judge Aiken was—a man you noticed. A man you listened to. A man you respected.

A man can have no finer eulogy.

I insert the accounts of Judge Aiken's passing and the editorial commentary in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Danville (Va.) Register, Nov. 28, 1971]

JUDGE A. M. AIKEN DEAD AT 82; FUNERAL SET TOMORROW AFTERNOON

Archibald M. Aiken, judge of the Corporation Court of Danville since 1950 died last night at Memorial Hospital. He was 82.

His death ended a career as a lawyer, municipal attorney and jurist that spanned over a half a century.

Judge Archibald M. Aiken was the son of the late Judge A. M. Aiken and Mary Ella Yates.

He received his undergraduate degree from VMI and his law degree from the University of Virginia.

After service with the Coast Artillery during World War I, he returned to Danville and was named attorney for the City.

During that time he was a strong advocate of public power and negotiated with state and federal agencies for construction of the city's Pinnacles hydroelectric dam in Patrick County which still serves Danville's electrical system.

In his earliest years of his tenure as City Attorney, he briefly served as the judge of the now-abolished Circuit Court which embraced the city of Danville and Pittsylvania, Henry, Patrick and Franklin counties.

He left the office of City Attorney in 1939 and returned to the private practice of law.

In 1950 he was appointed judge of the

Corporation Court to serve the unexpired term of the late Judge Henry Leigh. (Judge Aiken's father held the same post from 1888 until shortly after the turn of the Century.)

He was appointed to his first full eight-year term in 1952 and won successive nominations. His present term was to expire in 1976.

Judge Aiken caught the attention of the national media during the City's civil rights demonstrations in 1963 when he was criticized by U.S. Justice Department officials for wearing a gun.

He was quickly dubbed the "pistol-packing judge" by the national press.

He admitted to wearing the gun for self-protection but said he never wore it while on the bench.

Two years ago he again gained national prominence when he handed down a 20-year prison sentence to a University of Virginia dropout who pleaded guilty to possession of marijuana.

Former Gov. Mills E. Godwin later reduced the sentence and agreed to place the youth under supervision of probation authorities in his home state of Tennessee.

In 1970 City Council honored the jurist by naming the \$4.5 million Broad St.-U.S. 86 bridge complex in his honor.

Judge Aiken is survived by his wife, the former Mary Mickley of the residence, and one son, A. M. Aiken Jr., of Leesburg.

Funeral services will be conducted tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock from Episcopal Church of the Epiphany by the Rev. Douglas Girardeau.

The body is at Swicegood Funeral Home. The family will be at the residence, 904 Main Street.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, Nov. 29, 1971]

JUDGE AIKEN DIES AT 82; RITES TODAY

Last rites for 82-year-old Corporation Court Judge Archibald M. Aiken were conducted at 2 p.m. today at the Episcopal Church of the Epiphany. Burial was in Green Hill Cemetery.

His death Saturday night in Memorial Hospital ended a judgeship that started in 1950 after prior years of service as city attorney.

A tribute to his long service to the community was the 1970 decision of City Council to name the new multi-lane bridge across Dan River in his honor.

He was born in Danville Feb. 12, 1889, a son of the late Mary Ella Yates Aiken and Judge A. M. Aiken who occupied the same Corporation Court bench from 1888 until shortly after the turn of the century, and was graduated from Virginia Military Institute and from the University of Virginia Law School.

It was following his return to Danville after service with the Coast Artillery during World War I that the jurist was named city attorney, a post which he held until 1939 when he returned to the private practice of law.

During this early period he also served briefly as judge of a now-abolished Circuit Court which embraced Danville and Pittsylvania, Henry, Patrick and Franklin counties.

In 1950 he was appointed to the Corporation Court bench to fill the unexpired term of the late Judge Henry Leigh, and two years later was named to his first full eight-year term. Successive renominations followed, and his present term was to have expired in 1976.

In recent years, as the workload of the court increased, Judge Aiken was joined on the bench by Judge Stuart Craig, who announced that the court and its clerk's office would be closed today out of respect for the senior judge.

Judge Aiken's survivors include his wife, the former Mary Mickley, of the residence at 904 Main St., and a son, A. M. Aiken Jr. of Leesburg.

[From the Danville (Va.) Bee, Nov. 29, 1971]

ARCHIBALD M. AIKEN

Archibald M. Aiken, 1889-1971, judge of Danville Corporation Court, 1950-1971, public servant all his adult life. A life compounded of contrasts and contradictions—as seen by some—but one always filled and fueled by deep compassion for his fellow man, no matter at what level.

The deeds and past actions of Judge Aiken are so well imbued into this 20th century of the life of Danville that they need no retelling here. Yet the inner—and less known—man should be revealed at this late date.

He was a law and order man, yet one of deep feelings. He knew the law and enforced it . . . according to the constitution and prescribed by its interpreters. Yet many a time he was not happy, or even in accord, with what the law said he had to do.

Sure he "packed a pistol" when his life was threatened during the 1963 racial inflammation. And he did what the law said he had to do—as then prescribed—in sentencing a young drug courier. But there was that morning, after a sleepless night, with tears welling from red eyes, that he handed down harsh punishment to a youthful bank robber . . . as prescribed by law.

Of course, some of his verdicts were appealed. But seldom were they reversed or even remanded.

Yet, aside from his family and a very few close friends, Judge Aiken was a lonely man . . . almost an isolated man. Members of the bar held him in such deep respect that they dared not give any occasion of currying favor by an even casual conversation.

To the average man, he was The Judge—to be addressed with respect, but not to be engaged with in idle conversation. The weather, maybe . . . but little else.

Among his greatest moments of joy were those occasions when one of those earlier sentenced by him would approach cautiously and, with hat in hand, thank him "for setting me straight."

Reporters, like others, were reluctant to invade the judge's chambers. But when they had to, the conversation would get around to The Judge's favorite team, the Giants. Even having departed from New York, they remained The Judge's team.

The Giants almost made it this year. And with Judge Aiken joined by and with so many who wanted to come closer to him in the past, this vast new section of fans might pull the San Francisco Giants through next year.

At any rate, Judge Aiken will have a grandstand seat for every game.

[From the Danville (Va.) Commercial Appeal, Nov. 29, 1971]

JUDGE AIKEN: A MAN TO RESPECT

No matter what anyone might have thought of Judge A. M. Aiken politically, his death represents the passage of a chapter of Danville's history which was colorful, eventful and full of turmoil.

His judgments, such as his sentencing a young man to 20 years in prison on marijuana possession charges, his treatment of protestors during the 1963 demonstrations and his general hard-line stand where the law was concerned, earned him a state-wide reputation.

Nobody fooled with Judge Aiken.

There will always be some who disagree when anyone takes a hard stand on anything. So there were some who disparaged Judge Aiken and his methods. He was called a pistol-packing judge by members of the federal department of justice.

Others will always try to model themselves after a man of strong convictions.

That was the kind of man Judge Aiken was—a man you noticed. A man you listened to. A man you respected.

Funeral services for Judge Aiken will be held today at 2 p.m. at the Episcopal Church of the Epiphany.

THE DANGERS OF TRADE RESTRICTIONS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, no one wins a trade war. The United States is the largest trading nation in the world and could wield a big stick in a battle of national trade barriers. Should the United States slide into such a battle, however, the costs would be enormous. Such action would spur inflation, damage the economy, and prompt foreign retaliation.

AID INFLATION AND HURT ECONOMY

Trade barriers are damaging to our efforts to control inflation and detrimental to the strength of our economy.

Restrictive devices such as the 10-percent import surcharge reduce the competitive effect of imports and thereby increase the monopoly power of domestic firms. The result is a seller's market where higher prices can prevail. Economist Edward Fried estimates that present U.S. tariffs and quotas cost consumers \$10 to \$15 billion a year, a figure equivalent to a 3-percent rise in the cost of living. Additional barriers would greatly increase these costs and would operate in direct opposition to policies attempting to achieve price stability.

The costs of primary materials and components needed by U.S. industry are also increased by trade barriers, thus impairing its ability to compete in export markets. For example, import quotas on petroleum push up fuel costs for our manufacturing industries and the "voluntary" quotas on steel have enabled increases in steel prices to occur which, in turn, raise input costs for our machinery-producing firms. These firms, which are so important to our export trade, are competing at a disadvantage with foreign producers who are able to buy fuel and steel at world market prices. As our firms become priced out of export markets, export sales are affected and domestic income and consumption decline. Thus, trade barriers instituted to protect our economy have the unintended effect of slowing our economic growth.

As the American economy goes, so goes the job market. Trade restrictions can result in a loss of high-productivity, high-paying jobs that will not be offset by a possible increase in low-income jobs. Moreover, since a dollar of increased exports is calculated to create more jobs than a dollar of foregone imports, a decline of even 1 percent in our export trade could offset any employment gain generated by a restrictive device such as the import surcharge.

PROMPT RETALIATION

A big stick trade policy on our part invites retaliation from affected foreign

governments. A trade war could be set off with economic and political consequences that would leave all trading nations worse off. The trading gains of the past two decades, including a tripling of American exports from 1948 to 1969, could be reversed and free trade replaced by economic nationalism.

Foreign reaction to a trade barrier like the surcharge could be quite detrimental. Many countries may take, and are certainly able to take, measures directed against U.S. capital. They could tamper with the repatriation of dividends earned by U.S. subsidiaries. Foreign central banks could simply refuse to provide dollars in exchange for local currency profits. Actions like these would hit us in a very soft spot, since our capital account is in a strong deficit position. Our balance of payments would suffer considerably from such moves.

Foreign reaction could affect our merchandise trade account as well. Prime candidates for retaliation by other nations would be those products which now contribute heavily to our export earnings, including chemicals, farm equipment, industrial machinery, feed grains, and soybeans. The last two are mainstays of Indiana's economy and provide income to many of the State's farmers.

Foreign reaction could take the form of substituting markets. European Common Market nations could replace American wheat and soybean exports with those from Canada or Australia.

Alternatively, if the United States buys fewer foreign products, nations like Japan will not have the purchasing power to buy our exports, agricultural commodities included. Not only would this hurt our farmers, but the costs to the American taxpayer for storing agricultural surpluses would increase. The result would be economic losses to both sides.

An effort now to increase the level of our trade barriers would be most untimely since it would jeopardize the goals of realigning exchange rates and eliminating discriminatory measures by trade blocs that are being so actively pursued by the administration in cooperation with our trading partners. Loss of these goals because of unilateral American protectionist moves would greatly inhibit improvement in our weak balance-of-payments position.

Mr. Speaker, I have briefly sketched some of the disadvantages to the use of trade barriers. At this point, I would like to insert an article by Sanford Rose in the November 1971, issue of *Fortune* which discusses this issue in greater detail:

OUR STRANGE NEW HARD LINE ON TRADE

(By Sanford Rose)

When President Nixon exploded his international economic bombshell last August, it appeared for a while that his objective was simply to persuade other nations to help end the chronic U.S. balance-of-payments deficit. In the weeks since then, however, it has often seemed as though the U.S. were seeking a good deal more. We have appeared to be aiming not merely to end a deficit but to assure ourselves a surplus. If that is indeed our aim—if our ambitious demands represent more than a bargaining tactic—then the U.S. may well bring about a new age of mercantilism in the international economy.

The notion that we might be encouraging any such trend would doubtless astound the millions of Americans who have been taught, in elementary economic courses, that mercantilism is a primitive and thoroughly discredited approach to national economic health. Mercantilist doctrine holds that a healthy nation is one with a large trade surplus—one that by selling abroad more than it buys, accumulates substantial hoards of money. Modern economists have generally insisted that mercantilist nations are actually worse off than their customers. Individual producers may benefit from mercantilist policies, but for society as a whole it involves deprivation. The ultimate aim of economic activity, after all, is consumption, not production.

Not that mercantilism is unknown in modern times—or that the U.S. would be alone in bringing it back. In the 1930's there was a rash of competitive currency devaluations as nations strove vainly and unheroically to preserve favorable balances of trade at the expense of their neighbors. Since 1966, another pattern of competitive devaluation has emerged. This time, however, the mechanism has been somewhat different: some nations have devalued, but others have reached a desired state of undervaluation by simply declining to revalue (or not revaluing enough).

The major trading nations of the world have vied with each other to see which could retain the cheapest currency and, therefore, the largest trade surplus. But this was a competition from which the U.S. was excluded. Other nations had control over their exchange rates, while, under the Bretton Woods agreement, the U.S. did not. The value of the dollar was determined by the movement of other exchange rates. This meant that other nations could use the U.S. as a residual market for their products; their undervalued currencies were the equivalent of a subsidy for their exports (and the overvalued dollar was in effect a subsidy for U.S. imports).

All this changed, of course, on August 15. President Nixon's new international program, in one dramatic stroke, changed the rules of world trade. It severed the link between the dollar and gold, imposed a 10 percent surcharge on U.S. imports, and proposed a buy-American policy for capital goods. These actions were designed to force the Japanese and the major European nations to revalue their currencies by undetermined amounts, to remove manifold barriers to U.S. trade, and to share the cost of U.S. military forces stationed abroad.

WHERE THAT \$13 BILLION COMES FROM

It soon became apparent that the U.S. was asking for larger currency and trade concessions than the major industrial nations were prepared to grant. The demands have been justified by calculations purporting to show an emerging crisis in the U.S. trade balance. Walther Lederer, an economist and balance-of-payments specialist at the Treasury Department, has produced figures showing that, under conditions of relatively full employment, the U.S. trade deficit could reach \$5 billion in 1972. Lederer argues that the U.S. would not only have to eliminate this deficit but would have to generate a trade surplus of about \$6 billion to cover other outflows—e.g., for overseas military expenditures, foreign aid, and capital investment. When Treasury officials received this \$11-billion estimate they added on an extra \$2 billion, presumably as a margin of safety. The result was the much-publicized demand for a \$13-billion turnaround on trade.

It is certainly possible that this extreme demand is only a bargaining counter and that it will be modified in exchange for reasonable concessions by other nations. In that case, the hard-line U.S. policy the U.S. has been articulating would have served to end the post-1966 drift to mercantilism. But it is

also possible that the demand is real, and that it represents a bold new bid by the U.S., not to end the mercantilist game, but to compete in it.

There should at least be no doubt that our demands represent a very hard line. Even setting aside that gratuitous \$2-billion addition, it is questionable whether Lederer's figures should be used to support the demands. C. Fred Bergsten, a former economic adviser to Presidential Assistant Henry Kissinger, feels that the figures underestimate the improvement that should take place in U.S. exports as nations like Japan, the U.K., and Canada start to recover from their own business slowdowns. Bergsten and many other economists also criticize Lederer for not taking into account an anticipated decline in U.S. interest payments to foreigners. As other countries revalue their currencies, those U.S. speculators who originally exchanged domestic dollar balances for foreign assets will reverse these transactions in order to take their profits. This will reduce the dollar holdings of foreign central banks in the U.S., and the resulting decline in overseas interest payments will reduce the size of the trade surplus we will require.

Most businessmen and government officials are, of course, unconcerned about, if not unaware of, Lederer's highly sophisticated calculations. They have, however, registered intense concern about the all-too-obvious deterioration in the current trade figures: a trade deficit of about \$1 billion to \$2 billion is now expected for this year, versus a \$2.1-billion surplus in 1970. But it would be a serious error to base any generalizations about the trend on this year's trade performance.

Trade flows during the first eight months of 1971 were seriously distorted by the effects of three potential strikes, the threat of legislative curbs on imports, and, finally, the prospect of exchange-rate changes themselves. Anticipating first a West Coast dock strike, next a steel strike, and then a shutdown of east-coast ports, importers frantically stepped up their buying, lest they be caught short later in the year. For example, during the spring quarter, the U.S. imported 36 percent more textiles than it did in the comparable period of 1970. Hendrik Houthakker, a professor of economics at Harvard University and formerly a member of the Council of Economic Advisers, commented recently that "the trade deficit from April through August reflects many temporary factors, of which the potential dock strikes were the most significant." He added: "I have personal knowledge of the situation in two commodities. Beyond doubt, imports of steel and of meat were substantially accelerated in the first half of the year." And Frank Vargo, a trade expert at the Commerce Department, estimates that U.S. businessmen bought between \$1 billion and \$1.5 billion more than they normally would have in the first seven to eight months of 1971 solely as a hedge against the two dock strikes.

This process, moreover, led to another kind of hedge buying by importers. As the trade data turned ominously bad, beginning April, foreign producers and U.S. importers became persuaded that import controls or exchange-rate changes were inevitable. Since these would raise the price of foreign goods in the U.S. market, importers hurried to make still more purchases, which, under normal circumstances, would have been spaced out over a year or more. In short, the fear of strikes stimulated imports, and inflated imports begat more imports.

WAITING FOR AN UPTURN

Meanwhile, the prospect of exchange-rate adjustments also hurt U.S. exports. Foreign buyers slowed down purchases in the expectation that later they would be able to buy U.S. goods cheaper (because their own currencies would be worth more in dollars).

In turn, U.S. exporters may have delayed shipments in anticipation of exchange-rate changes: after a devaluation of the dollar, they would be able to raise the dollar price of their goods somewhat and still expand overseas sales (because the price in foreign currencies would be falling).

Thus imports were being artificially stimulated while exports were being artificially inhibited. It is likely that the trade balance will eventually turn up once hedge buying slackens and exchange-rate changes are made. Jack J. Bame, head of the balance-of-payments section of the Commerce Department, thinks the merchandise-trade figures for the final quarter of the year should show a substantial improvement over the figures for last spring.

The trade picture, though worrisome, hardly justifies the hand wringing and lamentations emanating from Washington. The international position of the U.S. is basically quite healthy. Our net assets abroad have risen from \$26.8 billion in 1960 to around \$60 billion, primarily because of increases in the book value of our overseas direct investments. The return flow of dividends, fees, and royalties on these investments is beginning to assume very large proportions; last year the total was \$7.9 billion. In fact, this income might shortly be large enough to wipe out our balance-of-payments problems once and for all.

The problems have been centered, of course, in the large deficits we traditionally run in certain parts of our international accounts—e.g., from exporting private capital, foreign aid, tourism. Despite these deficits, the Council of Economic Advisers recently projected an \$800-million over-all balance-of-payments surplus by 1975. This projection, admittedly tentative, assumed only a \$1-billion positive balance on merchandise trade. The primary reason for the Council's optimism is the flow of those dividends, fees and royalties, which are expected to rise to \$17 billion by 1975.

ARE WE IMPORTING UNEMPLOYMENT?

But the Administration seems to have its eye on 1972, not 1975. It seems to feel that it needs a large trade surplus as soon as possible, not only for reasons of external balance but, more important, to stimulate the domestic economy. An excess of exports over imports withdraws goods and services from the domestic market while pumping in foreign money. As Americans spend this money, they generate income for other Americans; thus trade surpluses, whether derived from increases in exports or reductions in imports, have a multiplier effect on U.S. income and jobs, much like an increase in business investment. The C.E.A. estimates that every \$1 of additional net exports increases the G.N.P. by \$2.54 within one year and \$3.29 within two years. Conversely, a trade deficit tends to have a depressing effect on income and jobs. Indeed, many Americans feel that other countries have been exporting unemployment to the U.S. by rigging their trade policies or exchange rates in order to produce favorable trade balances with this country.

But, here again, there are reasons to believe that the Administration is misreading the data, and that the employment effect of our trade problems has been much exaggerated. From 1964 to 1969, the U.S. trade surplus dropped from \$6.8 billion to \$700 million, but unemployment also declined—from 5.2 percent to 3.5 percent. Though the trade balance did exercise a depressing influence, the economy was buoyant enough not merely to absorb any workers displaced by the growth of imports but also to provide jobs for new entrants into the labor force. Since 1969, of course, the economy has been slack and the jobs allegedly lost because of foreign trade have become the focus of unusual attention.

How much unemployment has the U.S. actually been importing? Lawrence Krause, an

economist with the Brookings Institution who is regarded as one of the most knowledgeable foreign-trade specialists, has attempted to measure the amount for the period from the first quarter of 1970 through the first quarter of 1971. His analysis, based on detailed data for specific industries, concludes that very little of our unemployment is related to foreign trade. During this period imports increased at an annual rate of about \$4.1 billion, while exports rose by only about \$3.1 billion. Yet this \$1-billion difference did not cause any direct loss of jobs to the economy as a whole. While the rise in imports and the decline in certain categories of exports wiped out 182,200 jobs, the increase in other exports and the decline in a few categories of imports created 182,700 jobs.

Adding in the indirect job effects—that is, the impact on industries that supply parts or intermediate goods either to the export industries or to those that compete with imports—Krause found that the aggregate job loss for the year was a mere 17,000. He notes: "If unemployment had increased only because of trade dislocations, the unemployment rate would have risen from 4.16 percent at the beginning of the period to only 4.18 at the end, rather than to the actual 5.93 percent."

The reason for this minuscule job loss is that many U.S. exports have a higher labor content than the production displaced by U.S. imports. For example, capital goods—which account for about 35 percent of U.S. exports—generally use a far higher ratio of labor to capital than do autos and many other types of consumer goods that represent a large part of U.S. imports.

Having overestimated the problem, the Administration is overreacting in its proposed solution. Perhaps the major reason for being concerned about our reinforcing a trend to mercantilism lies in the weapon we have employed in our attack on trade problems. The weapon, the 10 percent surcharge on imports, will not in fact cut out many imports or create many new jobs in the short run. And as long as it remains in effect, it will certainly delay, or even frustrate, the efforts to achieve a reasonable long-term solution to the international monetary crisis. There are many encouraging signs that the Administration is becoming aware of this fact. And so we can hope the tax may not be around for too much longer.

If the surcharge remains, its impact during the rest of 1971 will probably be minimal. U.S. importers or distributors who have been relying on a foreign source of supply will not find it easy to shift quickly to a domestic source without experiencing unacceptable delays in the delivery of merchandise. The importer will continue to buy foreign merchandise and will try to pass the tax on to his U.S. customer. If the customer's demand for imports is relatively insensitive to price changes—because, for example, the merchandise is desperately needed—most, if not all, of the tax can be passed on. But if the customer is acutely sensitive to price changes, the importer will either have to reduce his own profit margin or ask the foreign producer to absorb part of the tax. Whether the foreign producer will agree depends on how interested he is in retaining his share of the U.S. market. And that, in turn, depends on how quickly he can expand sales in his home market or in third markets.

SOME CUSTOMERS ARE INSENSITIVE

For many kinds of imported industrial supplies, customers are relatively insensitive to changes in price. Metals, fibers, and building materials, for example, cannot readily be supplied by domestic producers in large enough quantities to displace imports; thus the customers will continue to buy imported supplies despite the surcharge, which applies to some, though not all, of such items. Therefore the quantity of these imports will fall only

marginally, and buyers will end up paying nearly the full amount of the import duty to the U.S. Treasury.

In theory, buyers are much more sensitive to changes in the price of finished manufactures; after all, domestic substitutes for these goods can usually be obtained in sufficient quantities. Thus, one might expect imports of finished manufactures to fall substantially as the surcharge pushes up their prices. But foreign suppliers of these goods will obviously fight to maintain their stake in the U.S. market; indeed, in the very short run—three to six months, say—they may be more interested in preserving market shares than in maintaining profit margins. If so, they will reduce prices, thereby sharing the tax burden with the U.S. customer.

For a while, then, the domestic price of these imports may not change very much, and the quantity of imports will not fall by much. According to an analysis made by the Federal Reserve Board, imports in the last half of 1971 are apt to drop only by \$300 million to \$600 million as a result of the surcharge. One of the Fed's calculations has imports of industrial supplies declining by only \$88 million, those of finished manufactures by somewhere between \$278 million and \$552 million. On the other hand, imports of foreign cars may actually rise: a modest decline in the sale of Japanese and European cars might be more than offset by a rise in imports of Canadian vehicles, which are exempt from the surcharge and benefit from the abolition of the 7 percent U.S. excise tax.

The surcharge will have a somewhat larger impact in 1972 and, in the unlikely event that it is still with us, a still greater effect in 1973. Foreign suppliers will be increasingly reluctant to absorb any part of the import duty. Japan and Canada, which account for more than 40 percent of the U.S. imports, may be recovering from their own business slowdowns, and so they may use more of their own output domestically and earmark less for export. Producers in these countries will therefore be in a better position to resist pressures to cut prices for the U.S. market. At the same time, suppliers in all countries will have begun lining up alternative market outlets, which means that they will be competing more aggressively with U.S. producers in third markets.

As foreign producers become more reluctant to absorb any appreciable part of the surcharge, there might well be sharp declines of U.S. imports in product categories where demand is highly sensitive to price increases. According to the Fed, the total value of 1972 imports could drop by something like \$2.25 billion to \$3 billion below previously estimated levels.

A BOON TO THE TREASURY, NOT THE ECONOMY

Those figures sound as though retaining the surcharge might do a lot to stimulate the U.S. economy. Actually, the stimulus would not be particularly great—at least, not in 1972. Although Americans would be cutting down on imports, they would also be paying higher prices for goods they continued to buy. Payments to foreigners would drop by about \$2.6 billion, but payments to the U.S. Treasury (i.e., for the surcharge) would rise by an estimated \$2 billion. So the private economy could conceivably benefit by only about \$600 million. This injection into the domestic income stream would probably create no more than 30,000 or 35,000 new jobs, according to data prepared by the Department of Labor. And even this gain could be jeopardized if rougher competition in foreign markets—which the surcharge itself stimulates—inhibited U.S. export sales. Since a dollar of increased exports creates more jobs than a dollar of forgone imports, a decline of only a bit more than 1 percent in U.S. exports could wipe out the entire 1972 employment gain generated by the import surcharge.

Actually, there is a danger, if the surcharge

is retained, that it will be stimulating the economy at a time when things are booming anyway. Frank Vargo of the Commerce Department has calculated that the surcharge will reduce imports by about \$2.3 billion in this fiscal year, by \$4.4 billion in fiscal 1973, and by \$6.7 billion in fiscal 1974. By that time, we may be trying to restrain the economy.

THE POOR WILL GET POORER

And while the surcharge cannot provide much immediate benefit to the U.S. economy, it may have a devastating effect on other countries. Its impact could fall with particular severity on the smaller, less-developed countries rather than on the major industrial powers—at whom it was ostensibly aimed. When countries were ranked according to the proportion of their world exports affected by the surcharge, some of the biggest losers turned out to be Mexico, Korea, Taiwan, Haiti, Hong Kong, Iceland, Israel, Philippines, and Barbados. With the exception of Japan and China, most of the countries the U.S. is trying to pressure into revaluing their currencies are not seriously affected by the import surcharge. For example, only 4 percent of France's global exports will be subject to it.

The major industrial countries, including Japan and Canada, should have no difficulty in "sterilizing" the depressive effect of the surcharge on their own economies. They can use monetary and fiscal policies to restimulate internal demand. Of course, such policies would increase their imports at a time when their exports were declining. But, for the most part, these countries have sufficient international reserves to finance any potential trade deficits. The less-developed countries, on the other hand, have little or no reserves. If they attempt to offset the impact of the U.S. surcharge by expansionary domestic policies, they will fall into acute balance-of-payments crises. They will have to either devalue their currencies or else impose additional controls on imports. Either way, U.S. exports will suffer.

Many countries—both industrial powers and less-developed countries—are likely to react to the surcharge with measures directed against U.S. capital rather than U.S. trade. There is the worrisome prospect that countries will try to tamper with the repatriation of dividends earned by U.S. subsidiaries. Central banks could simply refuse to provide dollars in exchange for local currency profits, or they could provide them at discriminatory rates.

Right now, there is a real hope that the U.S. might shortly earn enough on its overseas investments to solve its international payments problems. But concerted action by foreign countries against U.S. investment income would obviously change matters. The U.S. may not need a large trade surplus by 1975. But if we persist in trying to create too large a surplus in the short run, we may so imperil the earning power of our overseas assets that we would, in effect, "manufacture" the need for the surplus. The Administration would have made a classic self-fulfilling prophecy.

The surcharge has had one possibly beneficial effect. Since August 15, most major countries have allowed their currencies to float upward in relation to the dollar. They might never have agreed to float if the import surcharge had not been imposed—though it is also conceivable that the suspension of gold convertibility alone would have exerted enough pressure to get a float going. Yet even if the surcharge was an essential prod, it should have been removed once the float got under way, both as a gesture of good will and simply for the sake of good economic sense.

AN IMPORT TAX IS AN EXPORT TAX

Although the Administration has hinted that it may remove the surcharge, it has said

nothing about another of its proposals that also has a mercantilist look to it: the proposal to attach a buy-American provision to the investment tax credit. The buy-American clause is even more bitterly resented by other countries than the surcharge itself. According to the pending legislation, when a U.S. company buys a piece of equipment that is more than 50 percent of American origin, the company can deduct 7 percent of the cost of the equipment from its corporate tax liability.

Thus a U.S.-made machine that sold for \$100,000 might cost the buyer only \$93,000. But the buyer gets to take his depreciation deduction as if the equipment had cost \$100,000. This would typically reduce the effective cost of the machine to something like \$90,000. Meanwhile, if the import surcharge is retained, the price of a \$100,000 foreign-made machine could rise to \$110,000. Taken together, then, the buy-American clause and the surcharge could give the domestic seller of machinery a theoretical 18 percent price advantage over the foreign supplier (the difference between \$110,000 and \$90,000).

In practice, the advantage would not be quite that high because the surcharge is imposed on what amounts to the wholesale value of the machine, rather than the higher retail price. In addition, the U.S. company probably would not have considered buying the foreign machine in the first place unless it had been either cheaper or of better quality. Still, the kind of price advantage provided by the surcharge and the buy-American clause could conceivably cut imports of capital goods by about \$750 million.

As long as they remain in effect, the surcharge and the buy-American clause work to prevent foreign currencies from appreciating by as much as they otherwise might. For example, a drop in British exports to the U.S. (resulting from the surcharge or the buy-American clause) will inevitably cause a floating pound to decline in value, or, what amounts to the same thing, prevent it from rising in value. This process will raise prices of U.S. goods in pounds, relative to what they would have been. Thus in the last analysis a tax on British exports to the U.S. ends up as a tax on U.S. exports to Britain. Some industries in the U.S. will be more effectively insulated from British competition, but only at the expense of other industries that will find it harder than ever to penetrate the British market.

Meanwhile, it is unrealistic to suppose that the surcharge and the buy-American clause will ensure the continued floating of other currencies. It is highly unlikely, in fact, that the major currencies will continue to float for any sustained period of time. Economists tend to favor fluctuating exchange rates, but practical men abhor them. Since practical men make policy, the return to some sort of par-value system—one with perhaps a little more flexibility—seems assured. Besides, most economists have always said that the transition from a system of fixed rates to one of fluctuating rates will probably be a painful one.

The pain is being aggravated now because acceptance of fluctuating rates is only half-hearted. International traders have no confidence in currently prevailing exchange rates, and many expect that new par values, differing materially from the current exchange rates, will shortly be set. As a result, international business has been seriously affected. In turn, this has reinforced the poor opinion that most businessmen hold of fluctuating rates and has increased the pressure for a quick settlement of currency problems.

THE KICK FROM REVALUATION

The U.S. may have already won all or most of the currency changes that it needs. The changes that have already taken place will powerfully influence the U.S. trade balance and, therefore, domestic income. As of mid-

October, the German mark had appreciated a total of more than 10 percent since the beginning of the year. The Canadian dollar had appreciated by about 7.5 percent since 1970. The Japanese yen had appreciated by close to 10 percent since August 15. The Belgians had gone up by over 7 percent, the British by close to 4 percent, and the Swiss had gone up by about 10 percent.

The effect of exchange-rate changes like these on U.S. exports depends on, among other things, the foreign customer's response to price changes. Estimates of this response—in technical language, the price elasticity of demand for U.S. exports—vary quite substantially. One of the most systematic efforts to calculate these elasticities has been made by Professor Stephen Magee (see the box on page 138). Magee has computed the effects on U.S. trade with the fifteen major trading countries of the world, and also with a sixteenth bloc that includes most of the less-developed countries. He concludes that world demand for U.S. exports is far more sensitive to price changes than most people suppose.

For every 1 percent decline in the price of U.S. goods, expressed in foreign currencies, the dollar value of U.S. exports could rise by as much as 2.74 percent, provided the price of exports in dollars did not change. Thus if the fifteen industrial countries simultaneously revalued by 10 percent, the value of U.S. exports to these countries might rise by over 27 percent. In practice, however, this is most unlikely to happen. In the first place, U.S. producers may be taking advantage of the increased demand for U.S. exports to raise their prices in dollars. As a result, the price of U.S. exports in foreign currencies may not fall by the full amount of the currency revaluations, and this may greatly offset the initial increase in the demand for U.S. products.

Increased demand for U.S. exports will be partially offset in other ways too. When Japan, for example, revalues, its imports will cost less in yen and its exports will become more expensive in dollars. However, as Japanese producers encounter overseas resistance to the higher dollar prices, they will reduce prices of their goods in yen—though perhaps only slightly—in an effort to overcome the resistance. The drop in the domestic prices of both imports and exportable goods, Magee calculates, will lower the Japanese wholesale price index significantly: a 10 percent revaluation would lower it by close to 1 percent. In turn, this fall in domestic prices will gradually moderate wage pressures and increase the competitiveness of Japanese-made goods, thus tending to offset the initial rise in the demand for U.S. exports.

Finally, real income in other countries will tend to fall in the wake of their revaluations. A rise in imports and a decline in exports means that foreign goods are being pumped in while local money is being sent out. In these circumstances, foreigners will buy fewer U.S. goods than would otherwise have been expected. Magee has calculated the initial decline in real income, but he has assumed that the fifteen countries will prevent any multiplier effects.

Adjusting for all the forces that would tend to offset the rise in U.S. exports, Magee nevertheless concludes that a revaluation of these fifteen currencies by 10 percent, or even 5 percent, would give U.S. exporters quite a sizable sales advantage. A revaluation of 10 percent in the industrialized countries will increase the value of global U.S. exports by about 13 percent. On Magee's estimates of final 1971 exports, that would represent an increase of about \$5.8 billion. (Based on the tentative projection of 1971 exports made by Walther Lederer, of the U.S. Treasury, the 13 percent rise would represent \$5.2 billion.) In turn, a 5 percent revaluation of these currencies would increase U.S. exports by about 6 percent, or between \$2.4 billion and \$2.7 billion.

The revaluation of foreign currencies will naturally reduce U.S. imports. But, according to Magee's research, a 1 percent rise in the dollar price of U.S. imports will probably reduce their physical volume by only 1.34 percent and their value by only 0.34 percent. Apparently, U.S. demand for foreign goods is less sensitive to changes in price than is foreign demand for U.S. goods. Magee believes that a 5 percent currency appreciation in the fifteen countries would cut U.S. imports from these areas by only \$700 million to \$800 million. A 10 percent change would cut imports by \$1.3 billion to \$1.6 billion.

To be sure, the full impact of the currency changes, like those of the surcharge, will not be felt within the first year. Some drop in imports and rise in exports can be expected in 1972, but the full benefits won't be felt before 1973 or 1974.

THE PENDULUM EFFECT

If Magee's findings are accurate—there are, admittedly, many who disagree with them—they suggest a curious paradox. Although the deterioration in U.S. foreign trade in the last few years has been caused by rising imports, the easiest way to arrest this deterioration is not to attack imports per se, but rather to concentrate on increasing our exports. Imports cannot be easily reduced—short of severe measures that engender considerable foreign hostility—whereas exports can be readily expanded by small changes in currency parities.

The Administration, which is apparently relying on very different research findings, and is also responding to political pressure from industries that compete with imports, has unfortunately chosen to restrict imports directly. To the extent that its principal weapons—the import surcharge and the buy-American clause—make it more difficult to secure changes in currency parities, its policies might prove counterproductive. Moreover, these policies will reduce the total volume of U.S. trade, whereas, if Magee is right, changes in the value of currencies would increase U.S. trade.

U.S. international economic policy over the past few years has exhibited a marked pendulum effect. After nearly three years of doing virtually nothing at all about our international payments problems, President Nixon seems in one dramatic action to have done too much. There is evidence that the President was guided by a set of highly questionable statistics that tended to overstate the seriousness of our problems. What is needed now is a program to encourage the unfolding process of exchange-rate flexibility. The suspension of gold convertibility constituted a step in this direction, but our new barriers to the free movement of goods will unquestionably delay the process.

TURNER N. ROBERTSON RETIRES

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues in paying tribute to Turner N. Robertson, majority chief page, who is retiring after 32 years of service to the House of Representatives, 24 of them in his present capacity. I have known Turner here for more than a quarter of a century and have long admired his devotion to his job and to the Members of the House of Representatives. His job has not been an easy one yet he has performed it admirably as we all know. How many countless times have we all sought his

help or advice on a problem only to have it solved with courtesy and dispatch.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we all owe a vote of thanks to Turner, too, for the magnificent work he has done over the years in training and supervising, as well as guiding, our pages. I am sure that the many hundreds of pages who have served here over the years of Turner's stewardship would join us in saluting this very warm, courteous, and honest human being. We shall all miss Turner Robertson very much but we wish him a long and happy retirement which he has well earned.

JAPAN'S VIEWS ON A PROPOSED MORATORIUM ON THE KILLING OF WHALES

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Ambassador Ushiba of Japan in which he gives the views of his Government on certain points made in reference to Japan during a hearing last summer of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements on a proposed moratorium on the killing of whales. House Concurrent Resolution 387 introduced by Mr. BINGHAM, requesting the Secretary of State to call for an international moratorium of 10 years on the international killing for commercial purposes of all species of whales passed the House by voice vote on November 1, 1971.

I am inserting Ambassador Ushiba's letter in the RECORD at this point:

EMBASSY OF JAPAN,

Washington, D.C., November 4, 1971.

HON. DONALD M. FRASER,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with some testimony made by various witnesses during the public hearing held by your subcommittee on House Joint Resolution 706, I would like to state the following views and positions of the Government of Japan regarding certain points raised during the course of the above public hearings. I hope this letter will clear certain misgivings which were voiced by some witnesses. I would be grateful to you if you would kindly make this letter available to the members of your subcommittee and place it on the record in an appropriate manner.

1. The Government of Japan holds the view that it is the common interest of all nations to assure the orderly development of the whaling industry through the proper conservation of whale stocks. Therefore, it considers meaningful the conservation of whale stocks, as it enables us to utilize the whale resources for food or other useful purposes on a continuing basis. On the other hand, it cannot endorse the conservation of whale stocks just for conservation's sake in the manner which would increase the said stocks beyond the level that produces maximum sustainable yield.

2. The Japanese whaling industry, together with its counterpart in the Soviet Union, is the largest in the world. It is no exaggeration to say that the vicissitudes of this industry are to be determined by the availability of whale stocks. Therefore, Japan is

no less seriously concerned about the conservation of whale stocks than any other nations, and has long made enormous efforts to study these resources so as to find out the scientific foundations for the conservation. Furthermore, Japan has cooperated positively in establishing and implementing whaling regulations for the sake of conservation based upon scientific findings. The positive and cooperative attitude of Japan has been well illustrated by the reactions of Japan toward intensification of whaling regulations in the Antarctic and the North Pacific Oceans, and toward international observer schemes which were discussed in the past annual meetings of the International Whaling Commission.

3. The International Whaling Commission is the only international organization in the world which takes care of whale stocks. The prestige and the performance of the Commission are outstanding in comparison with other international conservation organizations. Therefore, should the function of the International Whaling Commission be denied, it would be extremely hard to find out any alternative measures of conserving the whale stocks of the world. This is the point made by Mr. Roy I. Jackson, Assistant Director-General, FAO, and by American experts who have participated in the work of the International Whaling Commission.

4. The Japanese whaling industry has provided the Japanese with a major source of animal protein; the amount of whale meat production alone accounts for about 10% of total production of animal meat in Japan. Because of the large number of people who engage in whaling and related industries, and the huge amount of capital invested in the said industries, the Government of Japan cannot subscribe to the view that the whaling industry should be terminated or that its catch quota should be sharply reduced without appropriate scientific foundation.

5. In their statements before the sub-committee, Professors Small and McVey assumed that sei, fin, sperm and minke whales are endangered. However, this assumption is contrary to the fact in light of the report of the Scientific Committee of the International Whaling Commission. In addition to that, none of the scientists who participated in the International Conference on Whale Biology stated such an opinion.

6. Both Professors submit that the IWC has never taken any effective measures for the conservation of whales and is not expected to do so. However, since 1960, the IWC has taken a series of regulatory actions, such as the complete prohibition of taking blue and humpback whales, and the drastic reduction of the catch quota in the Antarctic and North Pacific Oceans, etc. And if one looks at the actions and discussions that took place at the annual meeting of the IWC last June, e.g., International Observer Schemes, catch quota by species instead of that based on BWU in the Antarctic Ocean, substantial reduction of catch quota both in the Antarctic and the North Pacific Oceans, etc., it is quite clear that the IWC has adopted effective measures in recent years in order to conserve the resources. And improved activities in this direction can further be expected.

7. Professor McVey stated that uses of whales are limited to lubricants, cosmetics and so on which can be replaced by alternative raw materials. In this connection, the Government of Japan wishes to remind the sub-committee that whale meat has been utilized to the utmost extent as a precious source of animal protein in Japan.

8. Some of the allegations made by Professor Small are utterly unfounded. In particular, the Government of Japan wishes to call the sub-committee's attention to the following points and would be grateful if the record would be put straight on them.

(a) Re: Contention that the Japanese Commissioner on the IWC failed his duty; The Commissioner who represents Japan

in the IWC is not a government official. However, because of his integrity and intelligence, he commands international respect. This is why he was chosen as the Chairman of the IWC. In the IWC, he has strictly followed the instructions of the Government of Japan, and has never been influenced by the interests of the Japanese whaling industry.

(b) Re: Contention that the Japanese Government failed to implement IWC decisions; According to the domestic legislation, the Government of Japan has enforced necessary regulatory measures so as to assure the faithful fulfillment of the requirements placed by the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling.

(c) Re: Japanese whaling operations from the land base in Chile;

(1) In the 1967 whaling season, Japanese vessels operated from the land station in Chile. At that time, the Government of Japan took appropriate measures to assure that the Japanese vessels operated in compliance with the regulations incorporated in the Schedule of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling which included the prohibition of taking blue whales. There is not even the slightest fraction of truth in the allegation that these Japanese vessels took blue whales. In the same whaling season, there was another operating land station in Chile. It is surmised that the record of taking blue whales in Chile which appears in the statistics of the International Bureau for Whaling Statistics at Sandefjord, Norway, reflects the activity of this land station.

(2) The Government of Japan has never encouraged or permitted the establishment of a joint Japanese-Chilean whaling company.

Sincerely yours,

NOBUHIKO USHIBA,
Ambassador.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR REINECKE SPEAKS ON BETTER GOVERNMENT

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently Lt. Gov. Ed Reinecke of California, a former colleague of ours, gave an excellent address to the County Supervisors Association of California. The Lieutenant Governor, along with his many other responsibilities, serves as the chairman of the California Council on Intergovernmental Relations. I would like to present his lucid analysis of how we can better our system of government for my colleagues' benefit:

REMARKS OF HON. ED REINECKE, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF CALIFORNIA

We are faced with the challenge, right now, of preparing our system of government for a new era. The activities and responsibilities of government at every level have increased and accelerated in recent years to the point where every public official must make a genuine personal commitment to work very hard if he intends to make any significant contribution. Government service cannot be a hobby with any of us. It is a tough job. And you are to be congratulated for your willingness to work hard at it. The growth of government activity and responsibility has resulted from several influences and pressures.

1. Our society is more complex than it was just a few years ago. Problems seem more difficult to solve. New discoveries in technology often create just as many problems as they solve.

2. The increase in population in our State has brought with it new resources of talent and manpower, but it has also brought with it more consumers and greater demands for public services.

3. Our citizens themselves are asking the government to do more for them. Their appetite for public services provided by the government has increased enormously. They want government to do more for them, and at the same time, there are greater outcries as they are required to pay for those services.

As public officials I believe that we have a responsibility to not only respond to what the people need, but also to lead them in what we are convinced are the right directions. I believe that in this matter of greater demands for government services, we may have failed as leaders by not trying to talk the citizen out of his demand for more from government. Maybe we would be serving him best by showing him how to help himself, rather than simply appropriating more money from the public treasury, or creating another special agency to handle a new service demanded by the citizen.

4. Finally, government activity has increased because it has allowed itself to become outmoded in some respects. It is always the engine that needs an overhaul that makes the most noise, and spits out the most smoke. Some of the increased "activity" of government is really a lot of noise and smoke. Our government institutions have been allowed to drift into disorganization, inefficiency and sometimes even complete chaos.

When you list these pressures upon state and county government, it is enough to make you want to quit, and go fishing. But we cannot afford to do that. There is too much at stake here. The very existence of our form of democratic government is the real issue. We are faced with the challenge, right now, of reshaping our government for new stresses and strains. This will demand of us the same kind of dedication and sacrifice which our founding fathers pledged when they signed the Declaration of Independence. They were putting their lives, their fortunes, and their honor on the line to get this system of balanced powers and divided responsibilities going. We can't do anything less, if we expect to keep it going.

I believe that the eyes of the Nation are upon California. Just as eastern cities, like New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago have risen in prominence through our history and have exerted national influence upon this Nation in this very crucial time. We have more resources and a greater opportunity to lead the way for the Nation, than any other part of the country has ever had.

The privilege and challenge of this generation of Californians is to prove to the Nation and to the world that this system of federalism will work in a complex, space age, computerized urban society.

I am an engineer. And the way things are put together always interests me most. So, I would like to discuss with you particularly the problems of government structure and organization and how government works. You know it has always been popular among public officials at all levels of government to pass the blame around when something goes wrong. The Federal Government says they cannot get things done because the States and local governments are in the way and clutter up the landscape. The States blame the Federal Government for interfering in their affairs, and by-passing them in dealing directly with local governments. The cities and counties blame both the States and the Federal Government for either not doing enough to help them or else for doing too much and interfering in their affairs. We have real fights going on all over the country between levels and institutions of government.

We seem to have forgotten that while there are several layers of government, there is

only one layer of taxpayers. We have gotten so caught up in our own intergovernmental retaliations that we have forgotten the citizen out there who is supposed to be getting some benefit out of being governed. It is time that we realize that we all need each other. Our cooperation is mandatory for our survival, because the good people of this earth have had a habit of disposing of governments that do not work well, and do not do the job. There are several goals we must set for ourselves in working on these problems of government organization:

1. We have to determine which level of government is best suited to do which kind of a job. This is the question of allocation of public service responsibility. We will have to ask some hard questions and make some hard decisions. It may be necessary, in the interests of good government and for the benefit of the citizen, to take some job away from one level of government and give it to another. It may even be necessary to ask hard questions like whether a particular unit of government needs to exist at all. Maybe we should consider consolidation of units of governments, like cities and counties and special districts, and even state departments and commissions.

We will have to re-examine the question of whether certain services should be provided by government at all. Maybe private enterprise can do a better job; or maybe the job doesn't even need to be done in the first place. Much, much too often government agencies and institutions continue to exist even after they have long ago served the purpose for which they were created. We have seen in recent times government agencies created to solve particular problems continuing to exist, even after the problem has gone away. The agency simply finds some new problem, or else manufactures a reason for its continued existence.

We must determine whether the sharing of responsibilities for different government services may not be an answer to our dilemma. There are 40,000 police departments in the United States. They average nine policemen per police chief. That is not efficient law enforcement. Perhaps the county should take over the police operation, or at least some of the operations, of its cities, for the sake of the citizen who pays the bill, and wants public protection and safety.

The Council on Intergovernmental Relations, in my office, is presently making a study of the allocation of public service responsibilities. The study has taken quite a lot of time. We have a new Chairman, Cliff Anderson, for the Council and a new Executive Director, Jim Johnson; and I am going to see that this study is moved along faster. They met here yesterday because we are going to need your help. We are going to ask you to participate fully in this study, and all of its component parts. We are going to ask you to speed up your involvement in this effort. We will have to ask the question about the forms and boundaries of our government structures. Perhaps counties should be consolidated, or should share certain services.

We have seen that regional approaches to some problems can be a good thing. We are faced with public problems like environmental pollution, transportation, crime, housing and health which know no political boundaries or jurisdictions. They cover large areas of this State without regard to which city or county jurisdiction is involved. I want to ask you to take a hard look at this question, and help us find an answer. We are presently in the situation in this State, with regard to regional approaches to problem solving, where we are polarizing into two extremes: on the one hand we see bills in the Legislature which impose and mandate regional organizations upon whole areas of the State. Some pro-

posals call for directly elected governing bodies and specific direct taxing authority, without regard to the powers or existence of the present governments in the areas.

On the other extreme, we see attempts to break up voluntary associations of local governments which were designed to work on areawide problems with everybody going his own way, without regard to their neighbors related problems. I believe there is a middle ground somewhere between these extremes. We need you to help us find it. Perhaps it should be the policy of the State to endorse and encourage voluntary associations of local governments and then to support them or reward them for their efforts in some way. We are asking these questions. Will you help us find the answers? I am convinced that elected local officials, like yourselves, must take the leadership in this effort. We must do everything we can to support and strengthen general purpose government, governed by elected representatives of the people. In our haste to solve pressing public problems we have often given over our responsibility to govern to the so-called specialists or technicians.

There has developed in our country a kind of functional feudalism—governments within governments. The functional specialists in Washington, D.C. only talk to their fraternity brothers in Sacramento, who only talk to their friends and cohorts in your county seat. They run the government the way they want to without regard to who gets elected, or what the people want. They have risen to power because the elected officials have been too busy, or too naive, or too uninformed to prevent it. The functional feudalsists have filled a void. We must ask whether there is not a better way to solve the problem. Special units of government have even been created to solve specific problems or provide special services in our State. These special government institutions often operate without much control from the public. Most people do not even know they exist, even though they pay the bills for them year after year.

Can you help us find out if that is the best way to operate? Should counties take over the functions of these special units and districts of government? How can we speed up the process of consolidation or dissolution? How can we get government back into the hands of the elected representatives of the people?

We cannot talk about reallocation of public service responsibilities without talking about allocation of resources to do the jobs. There is no question that government power largely depends upon government finances. The level of government which has the money can get the job done. The question we need to keep before us, however, is should a certain level of government do the work or provide the service just because it has most of the money? Why not change the sources of revenue around, and then give taxing authority to the levels of government that can best do the job.

My former colleague in the House of Representatives, Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, says he believes that you cannot separate the power to tax and the power to spend the tax dollar. This is the reason he gives for opposing revenue sharing. He doesn't think that the Federal Government should tax, and let the states and local governments spend the federally collected tax dollar.

On the other hand, Mr. Mills proposes that the Federal Government take over the collection of all income taxes, including those now assessed and collected by the states and local governments, and return those revenues to the states. Now, the Federal Government already collects 93 percent of all income taxes in the country, as it is. The income tax is the best source of revenue because it rises with the growth of the econ-

omy. But nobody has proven to me that the Federal Government is capable of doing the most efficient job with those tax dollars in serving the people. In fact, there is a lot of evidence to the contrary, which is why the President is proposing revenue sharing. He wants to get the revenues out where he believes a better job can be done in using them for the benefit of the taxpayer.

Mr. Mills' proposal to collect all taxes at the federal level presents problems. In the first place, it is the local government and the state government that is suffering most from the fiscal squeeze these days. They are the ones with most of the problems, but none of the growth revenues. If we want to solve this problem, as Mr. Mills suggests, by not separating the power to tax and the power to spend, then maybe we should consider reversing the proposals for revenue sharing by giving the states the power to collect what is now the federal income tax, and let the states return to the national government what it needs to carry out its constitutionally authorized responsibilities in national defense, foreign affairs, civil rights, the post office and so forth. This would allow us to keep at home, where the greatest need is, the greater revenue resource.

California taxpayers last year paid to the Federal Government \$16 billion in income taxes. In return, California's cities, counties, schools, and state agencies, altogether, received back in grants a mere \$2.8 billion. This does not include federal salaries and contracts in California, of course, but then those do not come into California to fulfill the purposes and needs of our local governments. They are spent here to do the work of the Federal Government.

If we were to collect that \$16 billion in California, and share the revenues with the Federal Government, to enable it to do its job, I believe we could have a lot more resource to help our countries and cities do the job they are called on to do.

The Council on Intergovernmental Relations has prepared for you a "Revenue Sharing Fact Pack" which outlines some of the needs of state and local governments, and also outlines some alternatives to solve the problem.

Let me have your views on this. Together I'm sure we can find the solution. Just a few days ago I met in Sacramento with representatives of the County Supervisors Association to discuss the problems of tax reform in California. That discussion, which included members of my staff, was very significant and worthwhile in my opinion. It opened up some good lines of communication on the problems of tax reform. It also was an education to some state officials who deal with tax problems and fiscal affairs. They had their eyes opened. And I think that your representatives and the state people saw that there is good will on both sides. Let's continue those discussions and work toward a solution.

We must continue the search for additional sources of revenue for local governments, to match the proper allocation of public service responsibility.

We have a legitimate concern that if and when tax reform can be adopted to relieve the burden on the property taxpayer that county governments will not rush in to take up the measure of relief created by a shift from the property tax to some other revenue source. We have to find ways to help you conserve your resources. Now, you know, that is not an easy job. We recognize that there are uncontrollable increases in the budgets of the counties. Substantial increase have been mandated by recent court decisions affecting the operations of the criminal justice system.

Perhaps we should study the allocation of responsibility for segments of the criminal justice system to other levels of government besides the county.

In the area of welfare, we are caught on

the same treadmill. Many of our expenses, and yours, are mandated by the Federal Government. We have to keep the pressure on the Congress to do something about welfare, and soon. We have hammered out welfare reform legislation in California. The courts have gotten involved in the implementation of those reforms, and so we will have to wait to see what their impact will be.

But, the simple fact that we have been pushing for reform of the welfare system, and talking about, has had, I think, an influence on the present outmoded system. We have actually had a steady reduction in the number of people going on welfare in this State for the sixth straight month. This is a complete reversal of the trends in the welfare program for the previous three decades. The debate in this State over welfare reform has actually created an atmosphere which seems to discourage people from seeking to go on welfare. Maybe the welfare worker is applying the rules a little more tightly, or exercising more careful judgment before certifying someone for the welfare rolls. We will have to wait to see the full impact of the new laws. Together I believe we can find ways to hold the costs of county and city governments in line. In fact, we must find those answers. We need your help in finding ways to reduce the burden placed on your budget by uncontrollable factors like court decisions, or federal guidelines. The State Legislature will have to re-assess its practice of imposing responsibilities on the local governments without providing a concurrent form of support for that new burden.

Finding relief for the fiscal pinch of local governments will have to involve a close look at the matter of allocation of public service responsibility. We will have to be courageous enough to even ask whether a unit or institution of government should continue to exist. Consolidation of services, and even of governments themselves, may be required. These are hard questions, but they must be asked, and they must be answered.

Frankly, we must look at our government structures and operations with cold objectivity. We must perform a management analysis on them, to see what we are doing wrong, and how we can correct it. I believe that government can be made to operate at a profit, that profit is to relieve the tax burdens of our citizens, and at the same time provide them with essential public services.

We in California, and especially those of you who are elected leaders in county government, are being asked to set the example for the rest of the country by leading us into a new era in county government. Your challenge is to take our government system into the 21st Century. That is our challenge and goal in the state government, too. We need each other. We can work together. We can stop passing the blame around, and resolve to pull in the same direction, toward our common goal—of serving the people of California.

There is no limit to the progress we can accomplish, when we work together, if we don't care who gets the credit. It should be enough of a reward just knowing that we have made things work better, and that we have restored peoples' faith in this government of ours.

THE LATE DR. RALPH J. BUNCHE

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in New York, a personification of the American dream passed from among us.

Though he had been ill for some time, it was with a great sadness that I read of the death of Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, former United Nations Under Secretary General for Special Political Affairs and winner of the 1950 Nobel Peace Prize.

Dr. Bunche, who had been with the United Nations since its inception, lived in a world of pressure and diplomacy that was fraught with belligerence, yet he was capable of bringing great harmony to it.

Dr. Bunche was a black man of learning and experience, and a man whose intellect was so many times applied to the extreme problems of war and peace so that he created solutions when many thought no solution possible. He was a man of many talents, perhaps full of paradox and struggle. But by training and temperament, he was, to my mind, an ideal international civil servant.

Perhaps his most triumphal success in the area of negotiating was that of the difficult 1949 armistice between the then new State of Israel and the Arab States. As the architect of this Palestine Accord, he won the Nobel Peace Prize of 1950.

But despite his fame and skill, Dr. Bunche was not one who sought the limelight or needed publicity as a reward for his service.

In fact, according to a number of the accounts of his life, few people, except those closest to him knew of the details of his middle-class adolescence in Detroit, his youth as an orphan in the care of a grandmother, his adventures as a stowaway and seaman, his toil in menial jobs in working his way through college and his real ambition as a young man—that of wanting to be a teacher.

Though he never complained, his young life must have been difficult—and later in life I am sure he was often frustrated by the color barriers he encountered in those days at hotels and restaurants, even as a high official in the Nation's Capital.

But despite any personal frustrations, he was a man who was ruled by the intellect and his diplomatic skills have long since become legendary at the United Nations. In his position as Under Secretary General, he was the highest American figure in the world organization and, I believe, the most prominent black man of his era whose stature did not derive chiefly from racial militance or a cause specifically in behalf of his race. This is not to say he was not sensitive to racial problems, for he reportedly spoke bluntly about them. But his outlook and his intellect kept him above the daily, mundane tribulations of discrimination. He always pushed ahead with optimism toward the solution of a problem, no matter how difficult, and I sometimes think that he may have, more often than not, found that there was an advantage in his blackness in working with the many different races in the world of international diplomacy.

In hearing of his death, U.N. General Secretary U Thant said he had "lost an incomparable friend and colleague," and praised Dr. Bunche as an outstanding example of "that 20th-century breed of international officials who devote all their gifts and their very lives to the service of the community of mankind."

Dr. Bunche first achieved international recognition for his part in hammering out the armistice between Israel and the Arab world, but he also played a key role in the 1956 negotiations that led to the stationing of a U.N. emergency force in Palestine after the Suez crisis. When the Congo erupted in 1960, Dr. Bunche was the first man sent in to oversee the U.N. civilian and military operations.

After he joined the U.N. in 1947 and domiciled in New York, Dr. Bunche gave himself freely to the cause of equal rights for blacks, delivering countless speeches and taking part in civil rights demonstrations. In 1965, he marched alongside Dr. Martin Luther King in the Freedom March from Selma to Montgomery, Ala.

From his childhood, this great man displayed intellectual prowess and stamina that were to become a trademark in his years at the United Nations.

During his teens, Dr. Bunche helped support the family by laying carpets while attending high school, and later worked as a janitor while attending the University of California at Los Angeles. In his 4 years at UCLA, he earned letters in baseball, football, and basketball and graduated summa cum laude. He later earned a doctorate in government at Harvard.

Following his award of this degree, he traveled throughout the world getting a grounding in colonial problems. He did postdoctoral work at several universities under a series of fellowships and then took field trips to Indonesia, Malaya, and central Africa where he lived with the natives. He returned to this country to join the staff of Howard University in 1938 and entered Government service at the start of World War II, when he served as a specialist on Africa in the Office of Strategic Services.

Dr. Bunche conquered life's difficulties through perseverance and a controlled intellect. The grandson of a slave, orphaned and penurious at an early age, he did not complain or spend himself in self-pity, but went on to become an honor student at UCLA. Throughout life, his objectives and his will to serve somehow made hardships unimportant. He was one who enriched the lives of those with whom he came in contact—and his indomitable spirit inscribed another legend on the wall of the never-ending American dream.

LIGHT FOR AIRSTRIP AT QUANHAGAK, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the many problems as a result of living in rural Alaska is the difficult and hazardous transportation situation.

Because so many villages are in remote and isolated areas of the State, the only means of transportation is by air. As you can well imagine, the severe weather conditions as well as the scarcity of air-

port safety controls makes flying throughout the State relatively dangerous. In many areas in Alaska, airports are not equipped with sufficient lighting and service facilities to insure efficient and safe carrier service.

Often an emergency might arise requiring people or an individual to be evacuated immediately. Since situations may occur which require a landing or a takeoff at night and airport facilities do not include equipment to make the arrival or departure safe, provisions should be made for securing nighttime landing equipment. The Village Council of Quanhagak on the Kuskokwim River has forwarded to me a resolution that requests runway lights be installed at the earliest possible date.

I have traveled to Quanhagak many times, and I know of the severe needs of the area. I am including a copy of the resolution which I am sure my colleagues will find most informative:

RESOLUTION

Whereas: The Village Council and its members of Quanhagak who reside in this village on the lower Kuskokwim area and;

Whereas: We have an airstrip, but it does not have runway lights, and;

Whereas: The AVEC has a powerline running towards the airstrip direction and connections can be made to hook up the lights, and;

Whereas: There have been emergencies that arose in the past where quick evacuation was necessary, but because of no runway lights, the aircraft was unable to land. We can anticipate similar situations to arise in the future, so;

Now, therefore be it resolved: by the Village Council officers of Quanhagak, we request runway lights be installed at the earliest date possible to insure quick evacuations and to insure safety to the pilot and his aircraft.

LOS ANGELES' GLAMOROUS NEIGHBORS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Beverly Hills: Los Angeles' Glamorous Neighbor," contained in the current issue of Travel and Leisure magazine. The city of Beverly Hills is located within the 26th Congressional District and it has been my honor to represent this community for some years now in both the State legislature and the Congress. I think that my good friend, John Weaver, who is the author of the article, has done a remarkable job in capturing the flavor of this exciting city.

BEVERLY HILLS: LOS ANGELES' GLAMOROUS NEIGHBOR—OR HOW A BEAN FIELD WAS RECYCLED INTO A GOLDEN ENCLAVE

(By John D. Weaver)

An outsider coming on Beverly Hills for the first time is struck by the smart, casual look of the bronzed women disappearing into its boutiques and by the tranquility of the residential area north of its commercial heartland. The wide, clean streets lined with neatly skinned palm trees have the deserted look of a plague-stricken city from which the wealthy burghers have just fled.

Sightseeing buses lumber past the tile-roofed pleasure domes, the drivers ticking off the names of famous occupants (Lucille Ball, Jimmy Stewart, Rosalind Russell, Groucho Marx, Edward G. Robinson) who are nowhere to be seen.

Some of the homes have been remodeled in recent years, but they still constitute an architectural jumble, reflecting the styles affected by English country gentlemen, Arabian princes, Swiss bankers, Italian aristocrats, French winemakers and Minneapolis dentists. The streets remain quiet and aloof, much as they were in the days of the silent screen.

In 1925 you could drive up North Beverly Drive and take snapshots of the homes of Pola Negri (610) and Ernst Lubitsch (616). Mabel Normand lived at 26 North Camden and Gloria Swanson at 904 North Crescent.

A 5.69-square-mile island afloat in the urban sprawl of Los Angeles, the vest pocket city is bound on the east by the topless-bottomless feshpots of the Sunset Strip and on the west by the old 20th Century-Fox back lot. The magic wand of corporate capital has turned the studio's false-front New York streets and French village squares into Century City—a real-life complex of shops, restaurants, banks and brokerage offices housed in the geometrical glass-steel-and-concrete towers which remind actor-writer Carl Reiner of "the boxes Disneyland came in."

Until the completion last fall of the new 12-story wing of the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, the city's low-lying, tree-topped skyline was dominated by the small gold cupola atop the Spanish Renaissance city hall that Will Rogers helped dedicate in the spring of 1932. Huddled in the shadow of its high-rise neighbor, Beverly Hills has the incongruous look of a prim, well-kept cottage where an eccentric widow tends her rose bushes, while hard hats tear down the rest of the block to make way for a new skyscraper.

Census takers in 1970 counted 33,416 residents, of whom 348 were black. The faces of the jockey hitching posts in front of some of the city's stately homes have been painted white. There are 4,946 more females than males. Last summer the Recreation Department offered them a class in belly-dancing. Eighty-seven percent of the single-family residences are valued upwards of \$50,000. The Catholic Church is referred to as "Our Lady of the Cadillacs."

Some 600 M.D.'s have a Beverly Hills address, but their patients have no local hospital and, should the dark angel prevail over the medicine men, no cemetery. The natives not only have to leave town to be buried, but also to play golf or to see a play. For every 10 human residents, there is one dog, and city hall has come to cherish those infrequent days when their barking fails to provoke a complaint.

"Had to drive down to my yacht to get a decent night's sleep," an indignant citizen grumbled recently, and late last summer, when a prolonged heat spell had put the populace on edge, an attorney decided to circulate a petition calling for a municipal ordinance barring dogs from the city.

In the 1840's, when deer and cattle drank from the streams that rushed down the canyons flanking what is now the Beverly Hills Hotel, the city's present-day acreage was owned by a Spanish soldier's widow whose black grandfather had been one of the 11 founding fathers of Los Angeles. The last Indian raiders were driven off the land in 1852 (the final skirmish took place in what was to become Benedict Canyon), and the Widow Valdez finally sold her ranch in 1854 to a pair of Yankees.

Much of the old ranch, Rancho de las Aguas (Gathering of the Waters), had been planted in lima beans when it was acquired in 1906 by Burton E. Green, president of

the Rodeo Land and Water Co. He hit on the name of his new subdivision while reading a newspaper account of President Taft's vacation in Beverly Farms, Massachusetts, and called in a New York landscape architect to lay out a residential area with spacious lots, the streets to be lined with trees (palm, maple, elm, magnolia, oak). His legacy is so jealously guarded that the city council once spent three acrimonious years debating what kind of tree to plant on Wilshire Boulevard. The palm won a split decision over the *ficus nitida*, a form of rubber tree.

Back in the 1920's when Los Angeles mounted an aggressive campaign to annex Beverly Hills ("For God's sake," begged Will Rogers, "don't let them annex my ranch in Oklahoma"), Douglas Fairbanks suggested that the city build a wall around its borders. It was never built, but let a proposed freeway or a high-rise condominium threaten the city's serenity, the safety of its streets, and immediately a wall of indignant residents will materialize in defense of their golden enclave. They have managed to hold onto the freedom Hollywood lost when it let itself be gobbled up by Los Angeles in 1910 because its water supply was running low.

The same water ploy was used on Beverly Hills in 1923 after an influx of film celebrities had swarmed over the recycled bean fields, boosting property values. On the April morning when Beverly Hills freeholders were to go to the polls to vote on annexation, they found bottles of malodorous water deposited on their doorsteps. This, they were warned, was a sample of the tap water they'd be drinking unless they opted to become part of the city of Los Angeles.

It was a familiar scene to such villagers as Douglas Fairbanks, Mary Pickford, Rudolph Valentino, Harold Lloyd and Tom Mix. The frock-coated banker, stroking his mustachio, was trying to wheedle the map to the gold mine from the dead prospector's innocent daughter. A monument on Beverly Hills, a few blocks south of the city's main shopping district, pays tribute to the posse of film stars who led the fight to save the city. The story's ending, unfortunately, isn't altogether happy. The city's water is so foul to the taste that no self-respecting restaurateur will serve it.

A visitor setting out to explore Beverly Hills will need a car to prowling the canyons north of Sunset Boulevard, most of which lie outside the city limits, but the shopping district and the gently sloping residential streets south of Sunset are accessible by foot. (No matter what you may have read, you won't be hassled for walking in Beverly Hills unless, perhaps, the hour is late and your stride is a bit uncertain.)

Santa Monica Boulevard, which cuts diagonally across the city, is the boundary line between the more affluent residents and the tradespeople. The major department stores (Saks Fifth Avenue, I. Magnin, Roos-Atkins, Robinson's) are strung along Wilshire Boulevard, west of the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. Many of the boutiques and restaurants are located in the triangle formed by the confluence of Wilshire and Santa Monica Boulevard. The city's busiest shopping street is North Beverly, its most beguiling, North Rodeo.

South of Wilshire small, white stucco houses and three and four-story apartment buildings, shaded by giant sycamores, shelter the silent, unsung majority of Beverly Hills. Here the widowed and the retired are able to walk to the supermarkets, the movies and the white sales. Here, too, are the young couples and the divorced mothers who have settled in Beverly Hills because of the schools.

Despite its air of worldliness, Beverly Hills is an early-to-bed town. The beds may not always enjoy the sanction of church and state, but by midnight they're in use and the streets are empty, except for stray revelers making their way to such private clubs as

The Candy Store. If you feel the need of a nightcap, you might drop by Ye Little Club or enjoy the good fellowship of the Cafe Swiss bar, but if you're in a mood to raise hell, you'd best duck across the city's border and surrender yourself to the wicked embrace of the Sunset Strip.

For stockbrokers and coupon clippers, the day begins in the darkness before dawn when they grope along the silent, freshly washed streets to posh brokerage houses where they can catch the market's opening in club-like comfort. Around 8:30, just before Madison Avenue leaves for lunch, network and advertising men meet for breakfast at the Beverly Hills Hotel and put television packages together between long distance calls.

In midmorning the shopping district comes alive and parking space disappears. Maids in uniform and housewives in hot pants pinch the fresh fruits at Jurgensen's, cast a critical eye at Phil's sand dabs and replenish their liquor supply at Vendome. If unexpected guests are coming for lunch, chances are their hostess will head for NATE-N-AL's.

In London, where he now feels more at home than in Hollywood, film producer Carl Foreman has learned to make do with what the English call "salt beef," but he still dreams of the corned beef, pastrami and chopped liver served at this Beverly Hills institution. Some of its admirers go so far as to call it the finest delicatessen west of the Hudson.

On "Little" Santa Monica Boulevard (there are two boulevards of the same name in this section of Beverly Hills, one for shops, the other for cars), the new mustard-colored Hot Dog Store fills a cultural need long felt by moviemakers reared within reach of Nathan's incomparable Coney Island hot dogs. Carl Reiner used to have them flown in. Now he can walk down to the Hot Dog Store and eat his fill. The place is a favorite hangout for the sad-faced men who contrive to feed and shelter their young by writing comedy shows for television.

At luncheon the more easily recognizable residents of Beverly Hills are dispersed. Some go to Beverly Hills Hotel to eat alfresco at the Polo Lounge; others turn to the Beverly Wilshire's elegant La Bella Fontana or cross the street for one of The Brown Derby's justly celebrated Cobb salads. A somewhat younger crowd packs Jean Leon's La Scala. If the day is pleasant and you feel the stir of lechery, you might settle yourself at one of The Daisy Club's sidewalk tables, where you can sip the house wine, nibble an exotic sandwich and ogle the bra-less young waitresses while North Rodeo's window-shoppers walk by.

Some years ago one such window-shopper ambled into Harry Levinson's rare book shop, got to talking with its sagacious owner and started collecting. Fifteen years later, faced with a terminal illness, he put a bullet through his head after writing three notes—one to his wife, one to the police and a third to his friend Levinson. In his will, he left Levinson a book worth about \$15,000. It was one of some 11,000 volumes valued at half a million dollars.

Beverly Hills, as you can see at a glance, is heavily sprinkled with specialty shops (somebody at the Chamber of Commerce counted 983). One (Jax) deals in women's slacks, another in bikinis, still another in Levi's for any sex or any age ("We're not relying on teenagers—otherwise we couldn't afford the location"). You'll pass display windows crammed with cheese, fat ties, cameras, boots and saddles, old English silver, furs, lingerie, pipes and at Minka's a mind-bending selection of toilet seat devices.

Yves St. Laurent chose the Beverly Hills Rive Gauche for the first complete line of his ready-to-wear accessories. Saks has Jean Patou designs, and by now Amelia Gray is

so well-known that the management decorates the front window with flowers instead of frocks. For men, Dick Carroll's is still popular and recently enlarged. Eric Ross's shop for men is an active place where, if you can believe the gossip columnists, Candy Bergen drops by from time to time to buy something for herself.

The liveliest, most hospitable boutique of the moment is Giorgio. "Everybody who walks through that door is our guest," says Frank Maxwell, the affable black majordomo who presides over the bar and its brass-and-copper café espresso machine. You can order a cappuccino or a cocktail on the house, shoot pool or glance through *Variety* and the *Hollywood Reporter*. You can also spend money. In the four years Fred and Gale Hayman have operated the place, annual sales have shot up from \$40,000 to more than \$2,000,000.

At the end of a day's shopping, you'll have no trouble finding a place to slake your thirst. If you're near Sunset Boulevard, the Polo Lounge will see that you're well taken care of. If you're near Wilshire, take a look at the Zindabad Pub in the new wing of the Beverly Wilshire. Even before the wing was opened last fall this Kipling-esque oasis had come to be known as "the wickedest room in town." It was designed by the vivacious Mexican wife of the hotel's guiding genius, Hernando Courtright.

"Since I never go to bars," explains Marcelle Courtright, "I planned this room entirely around the feeling of what I think a bar should be like if I had to enter one to meet a friend."

For dinner in Beverly Hills, you have a tantalizing choice. The two most elegant rooms in town are the Beverly Wilshire's La Bella Fontana and the Beverly Hilton's L'Es cofier. At La Scala and Au Petit Jean you'll dine handsomely in charming surroundings and see some famous faces. You can also do some discreet stargazing at The Bistro and, if Henry Kissinger has driven up from San Clemente, you may be comforted by the sight of the Secret Service agents on hand to make sure no harm comes to him while he breaks bread with Jill St. John.

If you'd like to sample artfully prepared Norman dishes, book a table at La Chaumière and be prepared for something of a crush. So many devotees have discovered the place and claimed it for their own that it's usually packed. So is La Dolce Vita, where the veal dishes are excellent (try the Veal Fellini). You can also eat extremely well at Malsen Gerard, Konditori Scandinavia, Capriccio, Café Swiss and Adriatic (you might try one of the Yugoslav wines). The Luau is a favorite Sunday night family place. The parents dig the Cantonese dishes, the kids the spears, masks and splashing waterfalls.

On the eve of the second World War, a black girl child was born in Charity Hospital in New Orleans. At six she started making her own clothes. At 12 she was helping her mother and father in the kitchen of their restaurant. A dozen years later La Vetta (rhymes with cheetah) was in Beverly Hills designing clothes for, among others, Diana Ross, Lena Horne and Nancy Wilson. Now she runs a charming, intimate Creole restaurant behind her South Beverly Drive boutique. You'll find gumbo, jambalaya and broiled Louisiana red snapper on the menu. If you're watching your weight you may be undone by the homemade banana bread and the sweet potato pie.

Most Beverly Hills restaurateurs, unfortunately, have failed to keep pace with such distinguished Los Angeles colleagues as Kenneth Hansen of Scandia and Raymond Andrieux of The Tower in offering a representative selection of California's finer wines. Trader Vic's, however, has made a point of featuring a splendid sampling of the state's outstanding vineyards. The wines provide an agreeable complement to the restaurant's manifold delights.

When you seek shelter for the night in Beverly Hills, you can pick among numerous hotels. The Beverly Terrace Motor Hotel is situated on North Doheny Drive, the dividing line between the Sunset Strip and Beverly Hills. The Beverly Carlton and the Beverly Crest are south of the main shopping district, and the Beverly Hilton is near the city's western borders, within walking distance of the Wilshire Boulevard department stores. The Beverly Rodeo Hyatt is surrounded by boutiques. The Beverly Hills Hotel has been a local landmark since 1912.

The Beverly Wilshire Hotel (built in 1928), taken firmly in hand by Hernando Courtright 10 years ago, has re-emerged as one of the country's great hostelrys. The new wing, with its Italian marble staircase, classic ballroom, two-story suites and baroque rooftop pool, is a monument to the proprietor's confidence that elegance will survive the onslaughts of blue jeans, instant soup and franchised chicken.

Beverly Hills may be living in the past, as many of its young pups keep complaining (the city's median age—47—is 20 years higher than the national level), but its past is not without a certain grace and charm. Once you've committed yourself to the care of the Beverly Wilshire or the Beverly Hills Hotel, you're addressed by name and treated as an honored guest with individual tastes in food and drink rather than as a faceless convention delegate who got in on the group rate. The city's best hotels, shops and restaurants are expensive, often unique and possibly anachronistic. They are all part of the phenomenon that is Beverly Hills, a customized island in a ready made world.

CAREER EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, not long ago, a person finishing his schooling with a general education could be assured of finding stable, attractive entry-level opportunities without much difficulty. It is clear that this is not the case in today's job market, nor is it likely to be the case in the future. With such factors as the rapid changes in industrial technology, the increasing complexity of international trade, and the impact of changes in government spending, it is likely that persons finishing school today will have to pursue more than one career during their lifetime. As the job market changes, the person may have to periodically intersperse his working years with periods of further education and skill acquisition. Obviously, what we are talking about is the expanded concept of career education.

One of the foremost proponents of career education is Dr. Sidney P. Marland, Jr., the distinguished U.S. Commissioner of Education. In a particularly forceful address on this subject recently in Pittsburgh, Dr. Marland pointed out that schools are now being asked to perform much more challenging functions. Parents and other taxpayers are assuming, quite justifiably, that their schools provide their students not only with self-confidence, love of learning, and social awareness, but self-sustaining career skills that will enable

almost all young people to become economically self-sufficient participants in our system.

I highly recommend Dr. Marland's speech to my colleagues and to all persons concerned with the responsiveness of education to the needs of the future:

CAREER EDUCATION—A NEW FRONTIER*

(By Sidney P. Marland, Jr.)

Perhaps because Pittsburgh holds many memories for me, I found myself running my own "This is Your Life" as I prepared my remarks for this sentimental journey.

I found myself going all the way back to my high school days and the teacher who doubled as my guidance counselor. We didn't have full-time counselors in small Connecticut towns when I was coming up. At least we didn't call them that—though they were.

At some point in my junior year she and I sat down to discuss what I should do with my life. As I remember it, she looked at my school records and aptitude tests and said that my abilities were in what I considered some rather unlikely fields—architecture, insurance sales, civil engineering, and the performing arts.

Now that I have spent 30-odd years in education, I realize she was trying to tell me I had the makings of a school administrator. In fact, as most of you know, I rounded out 20 years as a superintendent right here in the Pittsburgh system. And I must say that, given the assortment of skills that we now recognize as essential for a working superintendent, I would say that my old counselor was light years ahead of her time.

It's good to be back in Pittsburgh—to see so many familiar faces—to recall the solid professional companionship you gave me during my years here as superintendent—and to note with satisfaction that education in Pennsylvania, and Pittsburgh in particular, continues to flourish in an atmosphere of national leadership. For example, I was especially proud recently to call attention before Congress to the landmark legislation in Pennsylvania in support of education of handicapped children.

On this occasion it is not only a pleasure but a privilege to be back in the city. You have asked me to participate in a conference of personnel and guidance people with "Quo Vadis?" as its theme. You have assembled more than a thousand representatives from your own fields, from school and college administration, from industry and civic life—plus enough young graduate students to keep us honest. And you have given me a platform to talk to these decisionmakers and doers about a subject close to my heart.

I want to talk about career education, about coming together as responsible professionals to design renewal of the American educational system so that every young man and woman, no matter where he or she leaves the system, will take from it a proudly held marketable job skill, at any age, at any time.

I want to talk about the need for career education—about designing model programs that will give us directions as to what should be done, and about developing strategies that will tell us how to do it. I would mention the kind of commitment on the part of everyone involved—from student to teacher to counselor to administrator to legislator and certainly to parents—that is needed if we expect to make career education a reality for young people everywhere. Finally, I would like to suggest fundamental realignments needed in guidance and

counseling as we move toward this very large ideal.

If we are going to develop and install a career education system in the 70s—and I think we must if we hope to deal with a significant number of this country's education-related problems from unemployment to drugs to delinquency to alienation—then we need to plot a sober course at the outset, and we all need to have a part in the design. We in Washington certainly have no ambition to blueprint a program, cast in bronze, and deliver it. The program, if it is to be built, will be built by people like you across the land. We in OE will encourage, provide money and technical assistance, but no approved solutions.

Those of you in the personnel and guidance fields, in industry, and in local and State government have particularly vital roles and responsibilities in this undertaking. We at the Federal level earnestly solicit your ideas, your insights, and your support as we undertake very positive initiatives in regard to career education at this juncture in our social and economic history.

But, before I describe what I mean by career education, let me stress what I don't mean, and that requires citing a few cost and productivity figures coming out of the educational system we call the world's best.

Education has become the Nation's largest enterprise. It now costs \$85 billion a year, which surpasses defense outlays, previously our largest expenditures, by some \$9 billion, and figures out at about 8 percent of the gross national product. I might add that education's share of the GNP has doubled since 1954.

Let's take just the cost of elementary and secondary education. That runs to \$54 billion annually to teach 52 million children. The per pupil cost is roughly \$1,000 a year, or \$12,000 to \$13,000 to get each youngster through the first 12 grades. Higher education costs, as any parent of a college student knows, are now somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2,000 to \$4,000 a year.

Along with the intangibles they buy for children with this kind of money, such as self-confidence, love of learning, and social awareness, I think parents and other taxpayers have the right to assume they are also buying appropriate, self-sustaining career skills that will enable almost all young people to be economically independent when they leave the system.

But the statistics don't support the assumption. Of 3.7 million young people leaving formal education in 1970-71, nearly 2.5 million lacked skills adequate to enter the labor force at a level commensurate with their academic and intellectual promise. Many left with no marketable skill whatsoever.

850,000 dropped out of elementary or secondary school during the year. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the 10th grade. At \$8,000 per child to get them that far, total cost to the Nation can be estimated at about \$9 billion.

750,000 graduated from the high school general curriculum with little or nothing to offer prospective employers. At \$12,000 per student, total cost to the Nation would be \$9 billion.

850,000 entered college but left without a degree or completion of an organized occupational program. Let's assume on the average they left at the end of the first college year, which added \$3,000 to the \$12,000 per pupil outlay through high school. Total cost to the Nation can be estimated at \$12 billion.

These three groups of youngsters, then, represent a combined outlay of nearly \$28 billion—about one-third of the entire amount spent on education in this country last year. We spend billions to prepare 2.5 million young people for potential disen-

chantment, aimlessness and failure, year after year after year!

Even more distressing are the losses we cannot calculate in dollars—the loss of confidence and self-esteem, the sense of alienation and drift, the terrible sense of abasement and nonfulfillment that burdens millions of young people as they embark upon their adult lives. The aftermath of these early defections, of course, usually turns up in our unemployment, welfare, and crime statistics.

The other extreme, of course, is the over-educated young person, at least in terms of the career opportunities available when he or she is ready to enter the labor market. This year young American college-level teachers with doctor's and master's degrees are teaching in German *gymnastiums* or Australian high schools because there are not enough teaching opportunities in this country. In some fields there are seven applicants for every opening. And there are disturbing instances where highly qualified but also highly specialized engineers and other technicians, displaced in the aerospace and related industries, have turned in desperation to running hamburger drive-ins or tending bar. Surely America can do better than this. Surely the art and science of counseling and educational planning can do better than this.

Surely a Nation that can meet virtually any material or physical challenge it sets its sights on, and is willing to align its priorities accordingly, can develop a better approach to the whole career education process, designed to make education more real, more humane, and more responsive to the needs of young people. Trying to pinpoint responsibility is a fruitless exercise; there is more than enough to go around. Suffice it to say that for many years now, most noticeably in the post-Sputnik period, educators, parents, industry and government have been obsessed with the notion that a college education is a young person's only ticket to social worth, economic success, and emotional and intellectual wholeness.

Counselors have found it fashionable, personally satisfying and institutionally rewarding to be a part of that historic cycle.

We have provided good high school programs—and good counseling—for the *minority* of students going on to higher education. We have provided vocational training and perhaps adequate counseling—much of it at least very good—for the *minority* of students who were not college-bound and recognized the need for immediate job skills.

But we have shamefully shortchanged the *majority* of students nationally who have taken neither college preparatory nor out-and-out vocational education; those unfortunate youngsters were given a pallid succotash of some mathematics, some science, some social studies in something called the general curriculum. Its victims enter the job market with nothing to offer beyond their diplomas. Even their basic skills in reading, say, or spelling for lack of academic relevance are often weak and unattractive to employers.

High school counselors, unfortunately, have tended to devote most of their attention to students they could steer into college and understandably so, since that's the way a counselor's performance has been gauged in our value system. They have been part of the problem as they have dutifully responded to the mores of our people.

But that game is over, I hope, and I think it is high time we made some binding promises to young people—not to mention financially pressed parents—that we will take the necessary steps to make school meaningful for them, particularly in a career sense. For an educational system that expends \$85 billion annually and consumes most of childhood and much of early adult years, we are suddenly being called to account, not only by taxpayers, but by the young.

* Before the Third Annual Conference of the Pennsylvania Personnel and Guidance Association, Chatham Center, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Monday, November 15, 1971, 9:15 A.M.

We must guarantee job entry skills for all high school graduates and most dropouts, skills as basic as typing and food preparation perhaps, but undergirded by the sound foundation in mathematics, the social sciences, and English that all of us need to function in virtually any field of employment. I have spent a good bit of my life, as I know you have, attempting to keep young people in school—to reduce the dropout ratio. At the risk of voicing heresy, I must say that those young people who have opted out of our high schools and colleges are not necessarily at fault. It may be that we in the schools and colleges are only now coming to realize that given their choice, they have rejected us. The concept of career education would encourage the opt-out to leave the system whenever he wishes, provided he is ready for satisfying and appropriate work, but he would also be welcomed back into the system cordially and routinely at whatever point he wishes to re-enter and at whatever age. Perhaps career education will set aside forever the whole question of the dropout.

We must provide the option of increasingly sophisticated technical skills for all graduates of two-year colleges and technical institutes, skills moreover for which there is a real demand in the marketplace. Fully half the young people in community colleges should enjoy this option.

We must guarantee relevant career skills for all college graduates with a baccalaureate degree or better. More and more I am impressed with the numbers of young people in our high schools and colleges who seem not to be strongly motivated at this time by economic goals. They seem more to be concerned with helping people and with serving large social causes. I think it should be made clear that lack of economic motivation in no way suggests a disregard for career education, for these very same young people, if they are to serve society well, either at home or abroad, must be equipped with tangible skills and talents. This would include the health sciences, education in all its parts, technology in its infinite array, and certainly the arts and skills of social work.

To deliver on promises of this magnitude—and this has particular reference to guidance counselors—our schools must weigh the impact of two challenging assignments. First, as teachers and counselors we will need to become job market analysts, with a touch of clairvoyance thrown in, for that is the counselor's art, apart from his science. To steer youngsters into fields that promise rewarding jobs when they enter the labor market three to five years hence, you will certainly need to know what opportunities there will likely be three to five years from now—in your community, your State, and nationwide. And I might add that we in the Office of Education are working with the Department of Labor on this—not through simple linear projections of the status quo, and certainly not through what the personnel Vice President thinks he needs next year. Second, you will need to establish a placement service that will actually get young people into jobs. I would like to say a bit about these responsibilities later on; they are an important part of the minimum guarantee I feel the educational system owes our young people.

Last June I met with the Chief State School Officers to outline these minimum student guarantees I believe are essential. I talked about the continuing and largely successful efforts of the Office of Education to improve vocational education programs, to provide graduate fellowships for guidance counselors, to encourage young people to consider careers in technical fields requiring less than a four year college degree, and to provide a number of other career-related services. As you know, some of these programs go all the

way back to the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

The chiefs, like those of us at the Federal level, are acutely aware of the piecemeal nature of these programs, just as State and local efforts have been piecemeal through the years. I asked them if they, on behalf of their States, could commit themselves to active, even aggressive engagement in the installation of an entirely new approach to career education, from kindergarten through graduate school, that would require new and demanding roles for teachers, curriculum specialists, counselors, and nearly everyone else involved in the educational process.

Their response was a strong and encouraging affirmative. I told them about the four career education models being developed by the research community with Office of Education initiative and which are now ready to be further validated in live situations.

I see the financial assistance, the technical assistance, and most of all the national leadership and support needed to get these models into operation as perhaps the greatest single contribution the Federal government can make to education in the coming decade. But the Federal role as implied earlier must be subordinated to the State and local initiative.

The first of these four career education designs—and the one most pertinent to my discussions with the Chief State School Officers and this audience—is the school-based model. This model calls for the restructuring of our elementary and secondary school curricula to begin to familiarize youngsters with basic information about occupations in the primary grades, to help them get exposure to real work situations in the middle years, and to prepare them in senior high school either to enter their chosen field with a marketable skill at graduation or sooner, or go on for technical or professional training at the college level.

This model eliminates the general high school curriculum altogether. Instead, it builds a career orientation into the basic academic subjects all along the line, and helps every youngster learn about the many career choices available in such fields as manufacturing, marketing, health sciences, communications, public services, the professions and the trades. It gives every young person the necessary preparation to earn a living in a field he selects well before he leaves the educational system. It is not designed for the minority of students who go to college, or the minority who select traditional vocational programs. It is simply for everyone, in varying degrees, according to his maturity and interests—but for everyone.

We in the Office of Education are implementing our faith in this career education concept with some concentrated work and funds; specifically we have launched six pilot projects in communities that represent a cross-section of socio-economic populations. School systems in these districts had already been moving toward career education on their own or with State help. They are located in Mesa, Arizona; Los Angeles; Atlanta; Jefferson County, Colorado; Pontiac, Michigan and Hackensack, New Jersey. And now I have asked each State to launch with Federal funds the planning of at least one model this year.

In addition to the school-based are the other three career education models. One is employer-based, providing a structure for industrial firms, businesses, and government agencies to operate work-training programs related to their own employment needs for students still in school as well as for dropouts. Clearly this is an alternate to conventional school. But clearly there must be counselors in the design—perhaps even more necessary than in the school-based model.

Another, the home-based model, will use TV and correspondence courses among other devices to bring undereducated adults back

into the mainstream of formal education or to help them get better jobs than they have. The last of the four we call the rural residential model; its first site is a former Air Force base near Glasgow, Montana, where entire families will live and train together for new and upgraded employment. This site serves six largely rural states.

My meeting with the Chief State Officers was a high point in my first year as Commissioner of Education. As I indicated to you a moment ago, they endorsed the career education concept to a man. To a man they were willing to pledge the resources of their offices and their personal powers of persuasion as we attempt to hammer out the evolving definition and design of this large idea. To a man they assured me that career education is not just another education fad; this is a concept, they held, that must be advanced, and that all schools and their communities must have a hand in the process.

By no means are all of the initiatives on behalf of career education coming out of Washington. In many instances the support of the Chief State School Officers for Federal initiatives is really an extension of convictions and actions already amply demonstrated at State and local levels and among professional associations such as yours. Clear prototypes of this concept were established in Pittsburgh, for example, at least seven years ago. Philadelphia and its Parkway School is a clear prototype of the employer-based option for eager learners.

The Arizona legislature last spring approved \$2 million in State funding to launch career education in 15 school systems this year. Other States with outstanding examples of local efforts to install career education programs include Delaware, Georgia, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Dakota, and Wyoming. Large-city systems turning to career education include those of Dallas and San Diego, as well as Pittsburgh and Philadelphia.

I understand that your association has launched some exciting initiatives of your own. Your surveys of local employment markets throughout Pennsylvania, your identification of available job opportunities and salary ranges, plus the 200 or so job descriptions you have put on the desks of every junior high school counselor in the State are the practical, down-to-earth kinds of commitments and initiatives we urgently need. I commend your efforts and hope that many other professional groups will follow with similar initiatives.

So I think it is fair to say that a heartening number of the professionals, be they educators or legislators, are committed to career education. Still open is the question of local citizen commitment.

Career education startup costs are expected to add considerably to the local burden for the first year or two, then taper off to a level somewhat above present expenditure levels for elementary and secondary education. Money will be needed to train school staff to integrate career education concepts into curriculum materials at every grade level, buy tools and more sophisticated equipment for hands-on high school programs, and to hire many more guidance counselors so that counseling or at least job awareness can be brought all the way down to the early grades. Career entry placement, as I noted earlier, should be a new obligation of the schools, and I can think of no better national model for this role than that exemplary humane professional, Rose Lewis Smith of Pittsburgh! While Federal and State funds are sufficient to mount pilot projects, I think major support of school systems will remain primarily a local and State responsibility for the foreseeable future.

I am convinced, however, that once voters understand that their extra tax dollars are buying genuine motivation and career secu-

ity for their own children, and for every other child in the community, they will support the necessary bond issues and tax increases. For this design moves us a long forward step toward public accountability cost effectiveness.

Those of you in personnel and guidance, in industry, in State and local government will in no small measure determine which way voters go on this proposal—by your own enthusiasm for career education, by your willingness to plead the case in public forum and private conversation, by your ability to demonstrate its long-term cost-effectiveness and by your determination to prevent yet another generation of young people from floundering into the labor market unprepared. And most of all by being part of the planning and design process.

To close on an appropriate "Quo Vadis?" note, let me address several questions, really issues, to those of you working directly in personnel and guidance because you have the key responsibilities in making career education work.

Where do you stand on career education? Which way are you prepared to go? Are you willing to assume a far more demanding and complex role in relation to students, teachers, and the workaday world than you have ever known?

Are you ready to work hand-in-glove with teachers, curriculum developers, industry, and labor, and other professional people to integrate the work concept with academic subjects, from kindergarten through grade 12?

Are you prepared to advise as wisely and well the students who are not going on to college as those who are? Are you willing to undertake for yourself the reorientation—perhaps even retraining—you will need to provide practical advice on up to 20,000 job categories? Because education is the only field most counselors know first-hand, would you accept experience, part-time during the school year or summers, in a drafting shop, factory, salesroom, or hospital? Are you willing to enhance your professionalism by gaining first-hand knowledge in a less than professional position to pass on to students?

Are your contacts in local industry, commerce, and government good enough for you to provide realistic job placement, and follow-up, for high school graduates and early spin-offs who have a wide variety of interests and abilities?

Are you forward looking enough to keep abreast of job market projections 5 or 10 years ahead?

In sum, are you sufficiently sold on the career education concept to become its advocate in the school system and community, to take on added responsibilities that will complicate your personal life but also, I am convinced, bring a new sense of personal satisfaction? I know of no greater reward for any of us than the knowledge that we have helped other human beings find fulfillment in their lives.

Helping children and young people find their way is the greatest satisfaction of all. As we install career education programs, we will in essence be putting students at the crossroads time and time again, asking them to make a decision, to choose a route. It should be satisfying to know that each time they reach a turning point, you will be there to show them the many options, to advise them on the probable outcomes, and to watch them grow into competent and confident adults.

Perhaps the single most important message of career education is the one best known to guidance counselors—a young person will grow and learn and flourish increasingly as he becomes self-motivated through informed self-determination of his own destiny.

ROCKETDYNE'S RS-21 ENGINE TAPPED FOR MORE AMBITIOUS INTERPLANETARY VENTURE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, the company whose rocket engines were instrumental in landing American astronauts on the moon recently proved once again its ability to produce highly reliable propulsion systems for the UW space program. It was an engine produced by Rocketdyne, a division of North American Rockwell Corp., that provided the push to drive the Mariner 9 spacecraft into orbit around Mars last November 13. The tiny rocket engine not much bigger than a football, was responsible for making one of America's most important space goals a reality. This advanced propulsion system enabled the Mariner 9 spacecraft to orbit Mars for a minimum of 90 days during which it will map 70 percent of the planet's surface. The tiny powerplant, designated the RS-21, weighs 17 pounds and delivers a thrust of 300 pounds. It uses pressure-fed storable propellants/nitrogen tetroxide and monomethyl hydrazine. Rocketdyne President W. J. Brennan noted that the RS-21 engine operated for 15 minutes to place the Mariner 9 spacecraft into orbit:

This was the longest firing time of any rocket engine to date in a NASA mission. The engine achieved this feat some five months after the launch of the Mariner 9 spacecraft by a Rocketdyne-powered Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle. The RS-21 engine functioned farther from earth than any other rocket engine ever built.

The small but potent powerplant is the first space engine built of beryllium, the toughest of space-age metals. The properties of beryllium that make it attractive for thrust chamber construction are its low density, its high heat capacity—four times that of stainless steel—and its relatively high melting point. Simplicity, low cost and much greater durability are other advantages of building beryllium thrust chambers. They can be machined and contoured easily from solid pieces of metal. The use of beryllium metal for the RS-21 allows a new cooling principle to be applied in which liquid fuel is sprayed on the inside wall of the engine to absorb heat flowing through the wall from the hot nozzle throat. The cooled beryllium engine concept, co-invented by Joseph Friedman, Rocketdyne RS-21 program manager, and Lewis Glenn, and patented by Rocketdyne, represents a major engineering breakthrough. The Nation's leading builder of high thrust liquid propellant rocket engines has built 10 RS-21 engines to date. Because the RS-21 engine performed so well in the Mariner 9 program it has been tapped for a more ambitious interplanetary venture. The existing RS-21 engine will be upgraded and used on the two Viking orbiter missions scheduled in 1975. During its 16 years of operation, Rocketdyne has delivered more than 2,700 large

rocket engines to the U.S. Government. Almost 80 percent of all U.S. ballistic and space flights have been launched with Rocketdyne powerplants. All of the some 50 astronauts who have flown in space have done so with Rocketdyne engines.

THE NEED FOR GOOD AND PROPER DAY CARE CENTER LEGISLATION

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I fully and enthusiastically support the continuation of Federal assistance for day care centers to assist working mothers and to respond to other proven needs of many low-income families. I have made many personal visits to the federally financed day care centers in my district and have been impressed by the quality of service and the outstanding work of so many of those teachers and aides working in this vital field. I support appropriate growth of day care centers to render service in cases of need, but this growth must follow responsible procedures. We can ruin the program or seriously cripple its proper growth and public image if we flood it beyond its capacity or present public acceptance, if we improperly invade the home, or if we deliver the service in an inefficient and inappropriate manner. For that reason I believe it was proper for the President to request the Congress to pass a better bill than the one we recently acted upon and which I voted against. Meanwhile, present day care centers will continue to operate under Federal appropriations.

The President's veto of the bill has been alternately praised and damned by newspapers across the country, usually according to a pattern of whether the newspaper was conservative or liberal. The Salt Lake Tribune does not fall into either category. The Tribune is essentially objective with a healthy respect for facts and evidence. I therefore believe the Tribune's editorial of December 11 is significant to our evaluation of legislation pertaining to day care centers.

The editorial follows:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Dec. 11, 1971]
PRESIDENT'S VETO STRUCK THE MANNER NOT
CONCEPT OF PUBLIC DAY-CARE

Day-care for U.S. children is about to become a full-blown public issue. It has for some time simmered patiently among new proposals for increased government assistance, but President Nixon's recent veto of a bill that contained lavish day-care provisions will bring it to the front burner.

As usual, parties on both sides of the question stresses their desire to see right and justice protected. In this case, Congress and the administration have agreed that every young American must be assured a right to fully participate in the nation's opportunities. Mr. Nixon, however, rejects the method Congress adopted to advance that guarantee.

The President did say in a 1969 message to Congress: "So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national com-

mitment to provide all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life." But he was plugging for a relatively modest program that would embody a careful planning for such services as day-care.

Day-care for the children of working mothers has rapidly loomed as a serious public concern. For a variety of reasons, groups and individuals anxious to improve the self-reliability of widowed, abandoned or divorced mothers have campaigned for government-supported baby-sitting.

The most persuasive reasoning behind the idea is that since government, through welfare programs, already supports countless families with dependent children, why wouldn't it be more economical and humane in the long run to assist these women find work so they can be less dependent on the dole? In fact, President Nixon has accepted this proposition and has included it in his overall welfare reform bill.

Congress, while bottling up the reform measure, proceeded to pass its own day-care program, which is so comprehensive it is expected to cost \$2 billion the first year with an eventual price-tag of almost \$20 billion. More than supervision of pre-schoolers is involved. There are nutritional benefits for expectant mothers as well as activities for teenagers.

All such provisions may be the logical result when the total concept of day-care is accepted, but Mr. Nixon is correct when he says the national discussion on this matter has not been sufficient to conclude that Americans are ready yet to buy the full idea. There is another critical flaw. The bill as vetoed permitted applications for day-care funds by cities of 5,000 or more population. Local groups and states could also participate, but the Department of Health, Education and Welfare was supposed to give first preference to cities. In any case, the avalanche of applications from the many towns and cities qualified would stretch the money too thin to benefit enough families and children.

President Nixon acted responsibly in vetoing this poorly prepared, briefly considered legislation. There needs to be national day-care policy, but not as the result of political maneuvering and fiscal recklessness.

ADMINISTRATION OF PRESENT FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Nashville Banner of November 3 contains a brief but pointed editorial concerning the weaknesses in the administration of the present Federal welfare program.

The editorial points out that in New York City, at the time of a survey earlier this year, 1,000 welfare families were being housed in New York hotels.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Help," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

HELP!

If on your way to the bank—to church, to work, or anywhere else—somebody stuck

CXVII—2958—Part 36

a gun in your ribs and took from your pocket-book \$763 (or more or less) you would realize you had been robbed, and the least you would do about it would be to call for help.

Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr., of Virginia, disclosed on the Senate floor the other day that one of the features of the present "Welfare" program was the prevalence of cases in New York City in which whole families on relief are put up in hotels there, at taxpayer expense. That of course means that you are helping foot that precise bill.

Said Senator Byrd:

"One evidence of the difficulty of administration (of welfare) is this: In New York City at the present time 1,000 welfare families are being housed in New York City hotels.

"I wrote the Department of HEW to ascertain the average monthly rental being paid by the taxpayers for those families.

"I was informed in a letter from HEW; that the average monthly rental per family is \$763."

Help!

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1972

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 8, 1971

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I urge approval of this foreign aid appropriation. Whatever deficiencies the measure may have, it is necessary that we continue to give essential support to our allies who, whatever their deficiencies, help us in the defense of freedom in the world.

The tiny State of Israel is one country among these which not only defends freedom but practices it. It not only symbolizes democratic freedom; it is the only expression of real self-government in the Middle East. We cannot but do everything necessary to assure this bastion of freedom of the means to defend itself and to defend the cause of freedom.

I had the moving experience last week of hearing one of the great personages of the world, Prime Minister Golda Meir, present the appeal of her country for understanding by the Government and the people of the United States that giving Israel adequate planes and military equipment is the best, if not the only, way that Israel can survive; there can be peace in the Middle East; and the United States will not become directly involved in war.

I think our Government should understand that, with Russian missiles located in Egypt within perhaps less than 5 minutes of Israel's cities and with Russian Mig fighters within 10 to 15 minute range of Israeli cities, that the only way Israel can survive and aggression will not be begun is for all to know that Israel has operational manned aircraft and weapons adequate to assure her defense in case of war.

Even if the United States were to offer that, with our forces, we would go to her defense if Israel were attacked, she would already be conquered, if she is not able to defend herself, before we could get there with our forces; and our having to send our forces would mean we would be involved in war.

All these things one clearly understands when listening to Israel's great Prime Minister. That is the reason I have long favored the Jackson amendment that was put in the defense appropriation bill in the Senate. I urge the House conferees to accept that amendment to fund the \$500 million credit previously authorized to enable Israel to buy the weapons she needs, including more Phantom jets.

This bill includes funds which could give Israel both economic and military assistance, and we should move ahead with it. But this is not sufficient, if we do not also approve the military assistance credit in the defense appropriation bill which would clearly enable Israel to buy the sophisticated jets she needs to protect her tiny nation of 3 million people in a sea of 100 million hostile Arabs.

Favorable action on these measures and recognition by the administration that we must give Israel clear military superiority if she is to survive are essential, in my opinion, if we are to preserve peace in the Middle East and keep the United States out of a war which might turn into a world conflagration.

HEROIN EXACTS A CRUEL TOLL

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, every day across the United States, heroin exacts a cruel toll in human misery and suffering. It has been estimated that over a quarter of a million of our citizens have been entrapped by this addictive murderer. These addicts pay over \$400 million each year for the right to shoot this drug into their bloodstream. They pay to be slowly alienated from and outlawed from society.

The cost of heroin is not restricted to terms of human suffering for the addict and his loved ones. It reaches out and touches each one of us no matter how remote or distant. Crimes which are caused or related to the need to purchase drugs cost our society as much as \$3½ billion annually.

Mr. Speaker, these growing figures demonstrate conclusively that heroin addiction is truly a problem of national dimensions. President Nixon recognized this only last June when he declared this situation to be a national emergency.

I share these sentiments and therefore stand to introduce today legislation to promote research and development of a cure for addiction to heroin. This bill would allocate \$50 million toward this goal.

By way of contrast, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that at present a mere \$2 million is being spent by the Federal Government toward this end. At the same time, almost 200 times that amount is spent treating the effects of addiction in the form of hospitalization, incarceration, and rehabilitation.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 6, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means recently concluded hearings on national health insurance legislation.

As a sponsor of both the National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act and the Health Care Insurance Act, I had the opportunity to testify in support of these measures before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I insert my statement on national health insurance in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE LEGISLATION, NOVEMBER 1971

Mr. Chairman, as the sponsor of two national health insurance measures pending before this Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views in support of H.R. 817 and H.R. 4963.

I would like to discuss these two bills in reverse order, citing first the more general plan of which I am a co-sponsor with numerous of our colleagues in the House and Senate. Certainly, the members of the Committee have already received the testimony of the original sponsors of "The Health Care Insurance Act," or the Medicare Plan as it is more commonly known. I do not want to belabor the committee with further explanations of the effect of this legislation. I would simply like to offer my support for the type and scope of health insurance provided in this bill as opposed to some of the other measures pending before this Committee.

The Medicare Plan envisions a Federal Government program which would pay health insurance premiums for the poor, and allow income tax credits for all others toward the purchase of private health insurance plans. In doing so, this approach is, I believe, more rational, more realistic, and more palatable to the American taxpayer than some of the other measures which have been proposed.

Mr. Chairman, formulating a national health insurance program that will satisfy all sectors will be a massive undertaking for this committee and for the Congress. I would simply hope that the committee will give full consideration to the views of the many House co-sponsors of this Medicare bill that this is a sound approach.

More importantly, however, I would like to bring to the committee's attention a bill which I originally introduced in the 91st Congress. While the overall national health insurance debate may straggle on and on, I think it is imperative that this committee act on the need for catastrophic illness insurance protection. Although one medical writer has suggested that enactment of a catastrophic health proposal would be catastrophic because it would curtail the momentum for passage of a national health insurance measure, I have to disagree. As a co-sponsor of both the Medicare Plan and the National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act, I am convinced that they are not mutually exclusive concepts. Naturally, I would prefer to see a national plan reported including a title on catastrophic illness insurance.

Briefly, I would like to give some background information on this major piece of legislation. I originally introduced this bill on June 30, 1970, and subsequently reintroduced it with 14 House co-sponsors. Simultaneously, it was introduced in the Senate. This year we have 17 cosponsors on H.R. 817 and 4133 be-

fore this Committee and we have three sponsors of S. 191 in the Senate.

Mr. Chairman, I first became interested in the need for this kind of medical coverage after witnessing the personal tragedy of a good friend and former business associate. He suggested the idea for this legislation after watching a rare, catastrophic illness strike and ravage his young son.

The National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act of 1971 would, if enacted, allow our Nation's families to protect themselves against the scourge of catastrophic illness. The bill would provide the mechanism for such protection in a manner which could involve a very small Federal expenditure.

Catastrophic illness, by definition, would comprise those illnesses which require health-care expense in excess of what normal basic medical of major medical coverage provides protection for. Once a family finds itself faced with having to pay for health-care costs of an extended nature, they are saddled with a financial burden that is staggering to comprehend.

Imagine, if you will, what it means to finance for years hospital care which will run between \$80 and \$100 a day after your routine insurance has been exhausted. For middle-income Americans who earn too much to receive welfare and who are not rich enough to even begin to meet such obligations, the result of catastrophic illness is instant poverty. The family is driven to its knees.

Such a family, which has probably already watched one of its members incapacitated and perhaps destroyed medically, also finds that its financial stability has disintegrated. Usually, private hospitals cannot afford to provide care after the family can no longer afford to pay for the hospital's services. This means that the afflicted member of the family must be transferred to whatever public facility exists to treat patients under such circumstances. Unfortunately, these public institutions are often understaffed, under-equipped, and horribly overcrowded. All too often they become depositories where families must leave their children or other loved ones, because the doors of all other possible assistance have been slammed in their faces.

Catastrophic illness does not refer to a specific or rare disease. It is any disorder—from the exotic calamity to the common coronary. It is the fall from a step ladder in a home, a highway accident, or even the untimely sting of a bee, which cost one family over \$57,000. It is anything that happens to any of us that causes medical expense in excess of what the actuaries tell us we should expect. Virtually every family becomes medically destitute when that point is reached. Fortunately, only a small portion of medical cases are of such magnitude. But for the thousands of families who, through no fault of their own, find themselves pummeled into such an abyss, there is—currently—no hope.

While catastrophic illness is nondiscriminating in whom it attacks, when it attacks and where it attacks, it seems that a tragically high number of these cases involve children. When a child is the victim, the parents are often young marrieds who find themselves depriving their healthy children of a wholesome family life in order to finance the health care of sick child. Often, the havoc is so great that the young couples must watch their dreams go down the drain as all present and future planning is marshaled toward the single goal of finding the money to pay for their ill child's care. While nearly all of the pediatric diseases that are catastrophic are individually rare, in the aggregate they afflict more families than most of us would imagine. The list of obscure diseases such as Tay-Sachs disease, Niemann-Pick disease, Baucher's disease, Fabry's

diseases, metachromatic-leukodystrophy, leukemia, muscular dystrophy, myasthenia gravis, and the scores and scores of other maladies that destroy our people at enormous emotional and financial cost to their families appears endless.

Obviously, when catastrophic illness strikes the head of a household—the breadwinner—the disaster is compounded.

We are too great a nation to stand idly by—leaving our families that are victimized by catastrophic illness to their own devices. They have no devices. They are alone.

The National Catastrophic Illness Protection Act will go a long way toward militating against the problems of catastrophic illness because it will stimulate our insurance industry to provide coverage that will allow any family to protect itself fully against the costs of catastrophic illness. The legislation would foster the creation of catastrophic illness—or extended care—insurance pools similar to those that have been successful in making flood insurance and riot insurance feasible.

Because all participating insurance companies would be required to promote the plan aggressively, and because we would be dealing statistically, with a small minority of all claims, the cost per policy should be low. As more people buy this new protection as part of their health care program, thereby spreading the risk, the cost should drop even more. The Federal role would be limited to reinsuring against losses in those instances where insurance companies paid out more in benefits than they took in in premiums. As the insurance industry gained experience under the plan they would be able to sharpen their actuarial planning so that such losses would be limited, if they occur at all.

We have taken careful steps to preserve the State role in insurance administration and to allow the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to participate in the actuarial review of the policy rate structure in order to assure that the rates charged for those new policies are fair to all parties concerned.

Perhaps the most attractive feature of this legislation is that it would be free of all of the constraints that are plaguing existing federally funded health care programs. We would not be overburdening an already overburdened social security system in order to finance the plan. Families who choose not to participate in the program would not be required to do so. However, on the other hand, families desiring to secure this protection would be assured of an opportunity to do so.

Under my program a deductible formula would be used to stimulate each family to provide basic health care protection. It would only be when this deductible level had been exceeded that the catastrophic insurance protection plan would be utilized. Under our formula, a family with an adjusted gross income of \$10,000 would have to either pay the first \$8,500 of medical expense or have provided themselves with \$8,500 worth of basic insurance protection to offset the deductible requirement. Coverage from existing basic health and major medical plans would generally be sufficient to satisfy this deductible amount. However, if a family with an adjusted gross income of \$10,000 incurred expenses during the period of a year that exceeded \$8,500, our catastrophic or extended care program would be available to see the family through the period of financial burden when they would ordinarily be left on their own without help.

Again, because relatively few families would experience medical costs of this magnitude in a single year, the costs for this insurance should be quite reasonable—especially as more and more of our citizens availed themselves of its protection.

In developing this legislation I have met

with many individuals uniquely experienced in the problems of catastrophic illness. I have discussed this proposal at great length with members of the medical community and have consulted leading members of the insurance community. More important, I have met with families that have been victimized by catastrophic illness. I have studied their plight in great detail. I know that it is wrong that these families are, in effect abandoned—almost as a small boat adrift in stormy water.

I know that we can do something to help them and we do not have to spend ourselves into Federal bankruptcy to do it. All we need to do is utilize a concept that has been tested successfully in other analogous areas.

Mr. Chairman, for the Committee's further information on this complex legislation I am attaching a copy of the section-by-section analysis of the measure.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would hope that in its deliberations on these various proposals the members of this committee would give due consideration to the need for mental health provisions in whatever measure is finally reported by the committee. Although in recent years mental health coverage has been added to many private health insurance policies, in many instances there are sharp limitations as to scope and duration of coverage. A national health insurance program should not carry forward this type of discrimination against the mentally ill.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement of my views on national health insurance and catastrophic illness protection.

McDADE DOES IT

HON. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday morning the *Scrantonian*, published in the city of Scranton and one of the distinguished Sunday newspapers in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, heaped editorial praise on our distinguished colleague from the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania (Mr. McDADE), calling him "the most effective Representative in the House at Washington that our area has ever had."

What occasioned the editorial was the culmination of a successful fight, led by Mr. McDADE, to win a production contract for the Chamberlain Corp. in Scranton in the amount of more than \$22¼ million. You may well imagine, Mr. Speaker, the impact of such a contract on an area which has suffered so tragically from unemployment in the past, but which has now come well down the road to a new industrial growth.

In paying tribute to the leadership of Mr. McDADE, the *Scrantonian* commended also our other distinguished colleague (Mr. FLOOD) and our two distinguished Senators, Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SCHWEIKER, for the able help they gave in this fight.

All of us in this House, and most particularly all of us in the Pennsylvania delegation, are vitally interested in the welfare of each portion of our home State. As the editorial remarks:

Everyone interested in the region's welfare can be gratified by this happy turn of events, and can join in commending our Congress-

man, and those who assisted him in bringing it about.

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, and all of our colleagues will join me in saying to Mr. McDADE a hearty: Well done.

Mr. Speaker, I append the editorial from the *Scrantonian* to my remarks:

McDADE DOES IT

Cong. Joseph M. McDade's stature as the most effective representative in the House of Washington that our area has ever had has been further enhanced by the decision which awards a disputed \$22 million contract to the Chamberlain Corp.

An original award of the contract to Chamberlain, influenced to some degree because our area is one of substantial unemployment, was challenged by an Alabama firm which argued that it, too, was in a sector of high joblessness.

The challenge set the stage for a fight in which the Chamberlain cause was espoused by the congressman, the state's U.S. Sens. Hugh Scott and Richard Schweiker and Luzerne Cong. Daniel Flood. They were arrayed against Alabama's two U.S. Sens., John J. Sparkman, a former Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and James B. Allen.

An argument by Congressman McDade that the claim of the Alabama firm citing the unemployment factor was not made until after the bids were opened—and so was "untimely"—evidently persuaded the government to the justice of the case made for Chamberlain.

The successful effort is rich in meaning for Chamberlain, its employees and the economy of the area. The contract award translates into jobs for some 1,100 persons for the next 15 months. Loss of the contract would have been a tremendous blow to Chamberlain, which already is feeling the effects of the nation's withdrawal from the Vietnam fighting.

Leadership of the International Association of Machinists, the union which represents Chamberlain workers, accepted a contract recently offering provisions less than the union desired, but did so in the interest of safeguarding jobs. The union's business agent, Martin Corbett, has hailed McDade's successful fight.

Everyone interested in the region's welfare can be gratified by this happy turn of events and can join in commending our congressman and those who assisted him in bringing it about.

THE MARVELOUS HONEY BEE

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the honey bee is often overlooked in our automated society. Buster Ashmore of Rogers, Ark., president of his high school senior class, has summarized the honey bee's contributions to agriculture in a speech with which he has captured many public speaking honors.

After having won the Arkansas Future Farmers of America public speaking contest, Buster traveled on to the tristate competition in Memphis where he placed second among participants from Tennessee, Arkansas, and Mississippi.

Buster is a beekeeper himself. He is the son of Col. and Mrs. B. H. Ashmore of Rogers, Ark.

With pride I commend to my colleagues Buster Ashmore's prize-winning speech, "The Marvelous Honey Bee":

THE MARVELOUS HONEYBEE

Never have so few owed so much to so many—nature's pollinator, the honeybee. A honeybee is not even as long as your thumbnail. Its brain is hardly larger than the head of a pin. Yet this midget is one of the world's most valuable animals.

It would be difficult to find another which has worked so hard or contributed as much to man's development and well-being through the centuries as the little honeybee.

In the United States alone, honeybees produce honey and beeswax valued at \$55 million annually; but even more significant, the annual value of crops that require bee pollination exceeds \$1 billion.

Americans consume an average of 285,000,000 pounds of honey every year. That means a fantastic amount of work for millions of little honeybees. There is no harder worker anywhere in the world. The average life of a worker bee is about six weeks, after which the bee, its wings literally worn to shreds from flying, simply dies from exhaustion. It takes 556 worker bees flying 1½ distance around the world to produce one pound of honey.

Honeybees are essential for a sound and permanent agriculture. It has been estimated that 80 percent or better of the pollination of our fruit and seed crops in the United States is accomplished by honeybees. A few of these fruit crops are: apple, blackberry, pear, and strawberry. At least 50 agricultural crops are either dependent upon honeybees for production or yield more abundantly when bees are plentiful, these include: alfalfa, buckwheat, clover, and vetches.

Honeybees are necessary for soil conservation purposes. There are two fundamental requirements of any soil conservation program. (1) the control of erosion or to keep the soil in place. (2) to keep the soil fertile and productive. In the first requirement, the honeybee is a factor in maintaining the native plants that cover watersheds and prevent erosion. This provides food for wild and domestic animals. The second requirement cannot be accomplished without the use of the honeybee as a conservationist in pollinating the legume crops. Bee pollination makes it possible to utilize legumes to increase the protein content in pasturelands and dry forage as well as to restore nitrogen to the soil which together would have perhaps a conservative value of \$100,000,000.

Bees must exist in colonies. A fairly strong colony will contain from forty to seventy thousand bees, or even more. In the United States alone there are more than 5 million colonies.

When one observes or studies the bees, he can only marvel in amazement at these little creatures. They are accomplished architects. Their cities of wax are wonders of strength and lightness. The cell walls of the comb are only two thousandths of an inch thick—the same thickness as the diameter of the hairs on your head. Yet, one pound of comb will support at least 25 pounds of honey.

The bee lives in a silent world, for it has no ears. The great compound eyes formed of thousands of six-sided lenses, are color-blind to red but can see ultraviolet light that is blackness to us.

Most animals have a system of warning each other of the possible presence of danger. Man shouts and birds screech. The worker honeybee chiefly resorts to emitting an alarm odor. The alarm substances are produced by glands that are associated with the sting apparatus and the mandibles.

Bees need two types of food. Protein that comes from pollen, and fuel for energy which they find in nectar, both found in flowers. Nectar is merely the raw material of honey. You might collect a ton of nectar and never

have a drop of honey. You need the bee to produce the transformation. As many as 37,000 loads of nectar go into making a pound of honey, which may contain the essence of 2 million blossoms.

An average-sized colony of honeybees will need between 50 and 100 pounds of pollen a year. This means bees must harvest between two and four million loads of pollen. Bees do not swallow pollen as they collect it. Rather they mold it into a solid mass which is attached to the outer side of their hind legs. As the bee gathers this pollen, she also becomes completely dusted with it on her body. In its flight from flower to flower, the bee inevitably leaves some pollen on the stigma of the next flower visited. This helps to pollinate it.

The more we learn about the bee, the more amazing its life becomes. Honeybees can tell other bees where nectar can be found by going through a series of honey-dances. Each bee that returns from an ample supply of nectar performs a dance on the comb, circling first in one direction and then the other, and making a straight run across the comb where the circle meets, its tail wagging vigorously. Other bees crowd all around it, smelling with antennae the perfume of the particular flower it has visited. Then they leave the hive in the direction indicated by the tail-wagging run.

The bee uses the sun as its central guidepost and the rays of the sun as landmarks. If the tail-wagging run is upward on the comb, the source of the nectar is on the side of the hive toward the sun; if the bee descends the comb during its run, the nectar is located on the side away from the sun.

The study of the honeybee in relation to its environment becomes more important as we become more dependent on honeybees for pollination.

Bees too are victims of our changing ecology. The use of pesticides has killed thousands of colonies of bees all across the country. Bees too must be protected.

This is just a brief look at the honeybee and her ever important contribution to our well being. Wherever you observe this diligent worker remember her place in the scheme of things and above all respect her. For, she walks softly and carries a mighty sting, this friend of ours—the marvelous honeybee.

THE LOOMING THREAT OF AGRICULTURE BUSINESS: FACT OR FARCE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have heard increasing talk about the looming threat posed to the family farm by corporate farming enterprise. We all recognize that the number of farm families is decreasing in relation to the population as a whole, and we have tended to place the blame or responsibility for this phenomenon on the corporate farm. As the story is popularly told, superlarge corporate farming interests are invading the countryside, gobbling up family farms one by one and decimating the population of rural America in the process.

But, is this story the whole truth or even the partial truth? As food for thought, I wish to share with my colleagues a most interesting article appearing in the November 28 Des Moines Sunday Register which suggests that cor-

porate farms are not the great economic ogre they are purported to be, and that the family farm in modified form lives on. The article is as follows:

CORPORATE FARM "INVASION" MOSTLY MYTH (By Lauren Soth)

Many farmers and United States senators are fearful that huge agri-business corporations are gobbling up farmland, driving the family farmer off his land and taking over farm production.

These fears came out in the Senate hearings on the nomination of Earl Butz as U.S. secretary of agriculture, because Butz has been closely affiliated with several large agri-business corporations. Also, in hearings of the monopoly subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Small Business, Senator Gaylord Nelson (Dem., Wis.) gave an alarming report about the "intrusion by giant corporations and conglomerates into farming."

An associate of Ralph Nader talked about how "family farmers have suffered from unfair competition from vertically integrated conglomerates which can write off production losses in agriculture against huge profits in their manufacturing or retail operations."

In reality, the small family farm is not being taken over by big industrial corporations but by the large family farm.

8 PERCENT OF SALES BY CORPORATIONS

A U.S. Department of Agriculture survey conducted in 1968 found 13,300 farming corporations (about 1 per cent of commercial farms) operating 7 per cent of U.S. farmland. California and Florida accounted for about one-third of the total, including some of the largest corporate farming enterprises.

Nearly two-thirds of the farming corporations are family corporations and essentially family farms. In 1967, about 8 per cent of the sales of farm products from all farms were sales by corporations. Only about one-tenth of the corporations sold \$500,000 worth of products or more.

USDA found that farming was the only business activity for nearly two-thirds of the farming corporations. The remaining third had nonfarm business interests, and about half of these were in farm-related businesses such as farm supplies, marketing or processing of farm products. The nonfarm-related interests were mostly local businesses such as automobile dealerships, groceries and real estate firms.

In short, the image of the huge conglomerate swallowing up American farming cannot be sustained by the facts. It is true that in some highly specialized farming operations, mainly Florida and California, fruit and vegetable raising, large corporations are dominant. But in the big bulk of agriculture, which is grain and livestock production, the family farm is overwhelmingly dominant.

But the large-scale family farm is rapidly displacing the small, self-sufficient family farm, which many 60-year-olds remember as so admirable from their boyhood days. This is the basic change occurring in American agriculture and not a "takeover" by gargantuan nonfarm business firms.

If the senators want to stop the growth in size of farms and halt the vanishing of the small family farm, they need to look for other "villains". The chief "villain" is advancing technology which displaces labor and makes larger production units feasible for a single family. It is heavily financed by government and vigorously promoted by government.

FARM BUSINESS OFTEN FAILS

It's true that the federal tax laws have tended to favor people with large nonfarm incomes who invested in agriculture. The 1969 tax reform removed a good deal of this favoritism, but further correction in this aspect of the tax laws may be needed.

People who worry about tax-favored corporate giants taking over agriculture notice

whenever a firm sets up a large cattle feeding, hog raising or some other "industrialized farming" operation. They don't notice so often when such businesses fail, and quite a few of them have in recent years.

The tendency for agri-business corporations to go into farm production bears watching. But at this point that is not the most significant structural adjustment in agriculture. In most kinds of farming, the family farm with very little hired labor is superior in efficiency to any industrialized type of farming and holding its own very well.

What the senators could better spend their time on is what to do with the people who are displaced from family farms and who cannot find jobs in rural communities.

HOW MANY DOCK STRIKES?

HON. DAN KUYKENDALL

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, on November 29, 1971, the Memphis Press-Scimitar carried a lead editorial dealing with dock strikes in this country. In this editorial the Memphis newspaper praised President Nixon's decision to invoke Taft-Hartley on the east coast and pointed to the need for comprehensive transportation labor legislation. Such comprehensive legislation is presently pending in the Transportation and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee. I would like to join the Memphis Press-Scimitar in expressing to my colleagues on the Transportation Subcommittee to report out this legislation at the earliest possible date.

The editorial follows:

HOW MANY DOCK STRIKES?

The court-ordered return to work of 45,000 striking longshoremen is new testimony to the failure of collective bargaining on the docks.

President Nixon had no other choice than to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act again and try to repair (at least temporarily) some of the economic damage caused by the 57-day walk-out on the East and Gulf Coasts.

The nation is headed toward a \$2,000,000,000 trade deficit this year and two long dock strikes in recent months have hampered efforts to reverse the trend.

The October deficit was \$821,000,000, the worst trading month in history for the United States.

Only seven weeks ago the President was forced to take court action against the 100-day West Coast dock strike, and the 80-day "cooling off" period now in effect will be followed by a new strike Dec. 24 unless the shippers and union soon get together.

The East Coast strike has been particularly galling because it shut off American exports to Europe and encouraged our customers abroad to find other sources of supply.

The Mid-South has been especially hard hit by damaging blows to industry and the agriculture business.

The issues in these strikes range from the usual pay, pensions and welfare contributions to a dispute over who should unload cargo (on the West Coast) and whether shippers in the New York area should continue to pay a guaranteed annual wage they say is costing too much.

But the most important issue is whether we can still afford the luxury of long strikes that paralyze trade and put thousands of persons out of work in trade-related businesses.

It seems clearer than ever that the nation needs a strong bargaining and arbitration law that applies to all vital transportation industries—railroads, airlines, trucking and shipping.

The President proposed such a law nearly two years ago. How many more dock strikes before Congress gets the message?

"NADER'S RAIDERS" LOSE A FRIEND

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, recently "Nader's Raiders" released a much publicized denunciation of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. The report was so obscurantistic that Bert Hanna, a former staff writer for the Denver Post and a man thoroughly familiar with reclamation and water resources and development in the West, came out of retirement just to comment.

I insert Mr. Hanna's excellent article so that the works and efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation may be put in proper perspective:

[From the Denver Post, Nov. 28, 1971]

"NADER'S RAIDERS" LOSE A FRIEND

(By Bert Hanna)

I'm sadly disillusioned with Ralph Nader and his "Nader's Raiders."

Up to now, I've saluted the Nader effort to protect consumers and taxpayers and to challenge opportunistic and predatory politicians and special interest groups in and out of government.

But I'm beginning to think he's a phony. What triggers me is the report of a Nader task force indicting and condemning the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The report says, in effect, that Western water projects of the bureau, launched in the early years of this century, were a waste of taxpayers' money, "based on contrived estimates of benefits to be gained . . ."

The report says that on the basis of the federal government's own estimates, reclamation projects have resulted in major environmental changes, whose costs are never calculated in justification of reclamation works, etc., etc. And victims of these wasteful policies, among others, have been Indians, the report maintains.

I think it's a specious, foolish report predicated upon superficial analysis by a group of theorists who never bothered to examine background or conduct field studies, but relied only on prejudiced informants.

It's really so ridiculous as to warrant no reply from anyone in the West familiar with what reclamation has accomplished. But I suppose it will receive a lot of credence from zealous environmentalists and the uninformed.

The report—or at least the report briefings—pays absolutely no attention to the income contributed to the gross national product by Western reclamation and the development of Western communities based on precious water supplies.

The report pays no attention to history. It ignores the fact that most reclamation projects have been self-liquidating, returning money to the treasury for what has been spent, building economies and a tax base in areas that would be impoverished without water.

It ignores, or glosses over, the fact that dams not only produce water for arid lands

and municipalities and industries, but also produce a vast amount of hydroelectric power that repays their cost.

Free flowing water. Electricity. No pollution. Think of that in contrast to the pollution from electric energy derived from thermal plants. Think of the tremendous power inerties of the Pacific Northwest and the Southwest made possible by reclamation dams.

I don't think the Bureau of Reclamation is sacrosanct or without flaws. I know the bureau has made mistakes. I know that some projects, advocated and pushed through Congress by horse-trading politicians, have been marginal. I know that some projects on the drawing boards shouldn't be built.

But let's take an overall look.

In my last years as a reporter on the Denver Post prior to retirement, I spent much time looking at reclamation projects, not just at a desk but in the field. I investigated their financing, construction and operation.

I found defects, many things that could be criticized and were criticized.

But, on the whole, I must conclude that Western reclamation has justified every penny put into the program.

I would like to ask the Nader task force what Phoenix, Ariz., would be today without the early Salt River Project that made a desert bloom into an oasis.

I would ask what would have happened to the Uncompahgre Valley in western Colorado had it not been for a project launched in the administration of a great conservationist, Theodore Roosevelt, who was actually the father of reclamation. The project converted a useless prairie into a viable, strong, productive community.

What about the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California? Had it not been for Hoover and Parker-Davis dams, most of this vast national food basket would be undeveloped today and most of southern California's growth would have been stagnated.

Las Vegas, Nev., would still be a dry, dusty, little desert town. Perhaps that would have been better, the Nader group might say.

Let's take a concrete example close to home.

The Colorado-Big Thompson multiple-purpose reclamation project which brings water into Colorado's rich northern agricultural counties was completed in 1951 at a cost of \$162,675,904.

Since its completion, the cumulative value of crops derived from this supplemental water supply has been placed at more than \$1.5 billion.

The project also provides water to towns and cities with a population of 200,860. Where would these people be without that water?

One thing apparently paid scant attention to the Nader group is recreation. The "Big Tom" reservoirs in the mountains collectively have 120 miles of shoreline, most of which have proved highly desirable for recreation developments worth millions of dollars.

Moreover, this project, besides providing a very important source of taxes for support of federal, state and local governments, is paying for its cost in the form of water sales and power revenues.

The great Central Arizona Project (CAP) shouldn't be built, according to the Nader theorists, because it will benefit only a bunch of irrigators. Nonsense!

The CAP must be built to relieve a terrible water crisis affecting the economy of all of Arizona. The Arizona ground water table has dwindled to near zero. Without new water supplies from the Colorado River—Arizona's appropriate share under compact—Arizona's future will, indeed, be bleak.

Nader's task force has charged that Colorado, in exchange for its support of the CAP, bargained for a group of projects in western Colorado, approved in the overall CAP package bill.

But, at least, by gaining approval of these projects, Colorado established its rights to waters it legitimately claims as its own, rather than relinquishing the water rights to be gobbled up by lower Colorado Basin states. Someday, the water will be put to beneficial uses, whether for diversified agriculture or municipal and industrial uses.

Indians?

I can't conceive of any reclamation projects that have meant deprivation for Indian water users. As a matter of fact, many Indian irrigators in the West have benefited from reclamation.

Two major projects authorized by Congress that would be of inestimable benefit to Indians have been delayed by the cost squeeze and curtailment in funding. One, the San Juan-Chama-Navajo, development in southern Colorado and New Mexico would irrigate a vast arid area of the Navajo Reservation in New Mexico. The other, the Animas-La Plata Project in southwestern Colorado, would provide water for a large area of the Ute and Navajo reservations in the Four Corners region.

What the Nader task force hopes to accomplish by arousing Easterners and Southerners to fight future reclamation works already has been largely accomplished by the Nixon administration's drastic curtailment of funds. Hardly enough money has been provided for continuation of going projects, let alone new starts on projects long-authorized.

GLACIER BAY NATIONAL MONUMENT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, recently, the National Park Service held hearings regarding the issue of whether or not to convert the Glacier Bay National Monument to a wilderness area.

During those hearings, Gov. William A. Egan presented testimony requesting at least a 2-year abeyance on the proposal to allow the State to evaluate the proposal more carefully.

The people of Hoonah, Alaska, have forwarded to me a petition expressing their strong support for Governor Egan's testimony and requesting that the National Park Service honor the request to delay the action on the proposal for a minimum of 2 years to allow the State and the people of Hoonah to study the proposal.

At this time I would like to insert a copy of the resolution into the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

MEETING ON GLACIER BAY WILDERNESS RESERVE, DISCUSSION OF PROPOSAL, NOVEMBER 30, 1971

Whereas, The National Park Service has held hearings on the Glacier Bay National Monument for purposes of soliciting public opinion on their proposal for converting the Glacier Bay National Monument to a "Wilderness Area" in Juneau, Alaska; and

Whereas, the community of Hoonah is geographically closer to Glacier Bay than any other community of similar size; and

Whereas, the majority of the people of Hoonah are Tlingit Indians who are direct descendants of Tlingit Indians who have historically made their homes in Glacier Bay; and

Whereas, the Hoonah people have histori-

cally used the Glacier Bay area for gathering food and other subsistence purposes; and

Whereas, The Wilderness Act of 1964 requires that the National Park Service hold hearings regarding any proposed Wilderness Area in an area or location or locations convenient to the area affected; and

Whereas, Hoonah is a location which will be affected by the proposed Glacier Bay Wilderness Area; and

Whereas, The Honorable William A. Egan, Governor of the State of Alaska, has presented testimony in a hearing on the Wilderness Areas in Juneau, Alaska on November 20, 1971, requesting at least a two-year abeyance on the proposal to allow the State to evaluate the proposal; and

Whereas, The Central Council of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska supports the Governor's testimony;

Now therefore be it resolved: that the City of Hoonah strongly supports Governor Egan's testimony and requests that the National Park Service honor the request to delay the action on the proposal for a minimum of two years to allow the State of Alaska and the people of Hoonah to study the proposal; and

Be it further resolved; that the National Park Service hold public hearings on the proposed Glacier Bay Wilderness Area in Hoonah, Alaska on some future date to be determined by the people of Hoonah and the Governor's Office.

LOW-INCOME HOUSING IN FOREST HILLS, N.Y.

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, considerable controversy has been generated over the construction of a low-income housing project in Forest Hills, N.Y., in the Borough of Queens. It is a matter which has created divisions within the community and within the New York congressional delegation.

Last week, two members of our delegation used the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to set forth their point of view in opposition to the project. In view of this, I feel constrained to present the other side of the issue, for it holds major implications not just for the future of New York City, but for every major urban area in our Nation.

I present for inclusion in the RECORD, the text of my December 2 letter appearing in the Village Voice in rebuttal to an article opposing the Forest Hills project, a November 25 article from the New York Times, reporting on support for the project from 16 local civic groups and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and excerpts from a speech I delivered before the Ethical Culture Society of New York on December 5.

THE FOREST HILLS AFFAIRS: BEYOND STEREOTYPES (By Herman Badillo)

Clark Whelton, in last week's issue, raised the spectre of the destruction of Forest Hills if a low-income housing project under construction there is completed. He also leaves one with the presumably irrefutable notion that this project will contain such large numbers of crime-ridden minority group families that the neighborhood will be overwhelmed by crime, urban decay, and declining property values.

The facts just don't bear up Whelton's arguments, which he has buttressed with numerous informational errors and distortions.

Linking the size of the proposed Forest Hills project to the fear about too many poor tipping the neighborhood, for example, is the worst form of exaggerated fear-mongering when the facts of the situation are closely analyzed.

To begin with, Forest Hills is not the bucolic community of small homes that so many imply. It houses ten of thousands of families, many of whom live in high-rises just a few blocks away from the 108th Street site, so at best 840 units are hardly enough to tip it.

But even this over-generalization also fails to take into account that of the 840 units, in addition to the 40 per cent already set aside for the elderly, preference on the remainder is also being given to Queens residents, which includes a number of eligible poor white families. When you consider that the Housing Authority has already received more than 400 applications from Forest Hills residents alone, you realize that the charge of the community being flooded with outsiders is patently untrue.

What the Housing Authority figures show is that the project will be nearly 65 per cent white, which means that only about 275 units will be occupied by Blacks and Puerto Ricans. This must be compared to the nearby Latimer Gardens Project in Flushing, where more than 200 minority group families already live. Even Congressman Rosenthal concedes that Latimer Gardens has been successfully integrated into the community, and neighbors have praised the new tenants.

Thus what Congressmen Koch and Rosenthal would have us believe is that while more than 200 minority group families in nearby Flushing have had no negative impact on the neighborhood, 275 similar families in nearby Forest Hills, which is larger, are going to overwhelm and destroy the neighborhood.

Not only is the number of future minority group tenants exaggerated, but the nature of the prospective tenants is subject to the most dangerous kind of misinformed stereotyping.

It is true that too many troubled families in one place, such as a ghetto, breed extra problems and higher crime rates. But to extrapolate these figures and to use them to infer that any grouping of Black and Puerto Rican families will therefore bring large amounts of crime is stereotyping at its worst. It certainly has not been borne out in places like nearby Latimer Gardens, for example. In addition, New York Police Department statistics show that crime rates within housing projects are about three times lower than the city-wide crime rate.

Another distortion is the assumption that most Blacks and Puerto Ricans, in the projects or out of them, are on welfare. In fact, not only is the percentage of welfare families in city projects only 16 per cent (and I invite Congressman Koch to present figures to the contrary), but in middle-class neighborhood projects that figure drops to eight per cent.

The post office strike of a few years ago should have made more people realize that it is possible to have a full-time breadwinner in the house and still remain at a subsistence level, in white as well as Black homes.

When we look at the Housing Authority's tenant selection more closely, we see that not only will the Forest Hills project have less than 35 per cent minority group families, but those families that are accepted will be carefully screened in advance. Far from the Forest Hills residents having a complaint on this score, I think Blacks and Puerto Ricans in this city should be outraged, for it is clear that the city has bent over backwards to accommodate Forest Hills at their expense.

Contrary to Whelton's argument that the city has thrown in no sweeteners to the com-

munity, it has already made 11 major concessions, including the 40 per cent reserved for the elderly, the decision to build on only 15 per cent of the land in order to provide a community park and the decision to provide a large day care center that will serve the whole neighborhood.

Claims of the strain on existing facilities caused by this project are similarly exaggerated. Time and time again, when I was Borough President of The Bronx as well as Relocation Commissioner, I heard people make the same arguments against low-income housing in their neighborhoods. When I called them on this, and asked specifically what new services they felt the city should provide so that I could do something about it, they were stumped. It's a great argument to raise, but the community leaders and elected officials cannot be taken seriously unless they are willing to do something concrete beyond talking to TV cameras. In this case, the proper procedure would be to hold local community planning board meetings and public hearings so that specific requests could be brought up, discussed, and voted upon by the community itself. Such recommendations as they agreed upon could then be submitted to the City Planning Commission and the Board of Estimate for action. *But in Forest Hills the local community planning board has never met for this purpose.* Therefore, I suggest that the issue of strained services is really a straw man.

It's like Congressman Koch's claim that "it is absolutely rational to believe property values will decline in the area of a high-rise housing project." There's just no evidence to support this supposition, and in places like Pomonok Houses in Fresh Meadows, the opposite seems to be true.

Congressmen Koch and Rosenthal are also quoted as saying that integrating people at different economic levels is "practically impossible," and a seemingly confirming quote by Eleanor Holmes Norton, chairman of the Human Rights Commission, is tacked on for support. In fact, Mrs. Norton's quote was taken out of context from blockbusting hearings in communities which were already economically as well as racially integrated, such as Laurelton in Queens, and where many whites accept the existing racial economic mix and are fighting to preserve it. This is the same economic argument people raised in the South when they didn't want their children to go to school with poor rural Blacks. We saw the same angry pickets then that we are seeing now in Forest Hills. But our public officials stood firm, and the schools which were integrated did not collapse.

But the school struggle revealed that integration cannot be decided by majority vote. Now the very Northern liberals who supported the findings of the Kerner Commission and the implementation of its recommendations are changing their tune because of the same irrational fears on the part of some of their constituents. Congressman Koch is suddenly the same fellow who absented himself from the busing vote in the House, and then shows up in New York to oppose housing integration as well.

Based on the facts in their proper context, it is clear that the issue in Forest Hills is not only a racial one, but a distorted one in which fears are being allowed to multiply and spread without proper rebuttal. But if we ever hope to achieve integrated healthy cities, we are going to have to break down the barriers that continue to exist between the minority poor and the white middle class. This must be done partly by addressing ourselves to real community problems, but it must include a breaking down of the group stereotypes that Whelton perpetuates, and a growing acceptance of Blacks and Puerto Ricans as individuals.

Since the Housing Authority has stated that it will know the prospective tenants at least a year before the project is completed,

there is no reason why the Forest Hills community organizations cannot set up informal meetings at that time to become acquainted with their future neighbors as individuals. Then perhaps they will realize that the new residents are not aliens, but are people who although from different backgrounds, in some cases, nevertheless share many of their hopes and aspirations.

SIXTEEN CIVIC GROUPS AND DEFAMATION LEAGUE SUPPORT HOUSING PROJECT IN FOREST HILLS

(By Murray Schumach)

Strong endorsement for the controversial low-income housing project just started in Forest Hills, Queens, came yesterday from 16 civic and community groups that work in Queens and Long Island.

Jewish, Catholic and Protestant clergymen joined, as did blacks and whites, in support of the project with a statement that the development would not, as many residents of the middle-class area say, threaten the almost entirely white and heavily Jewish area.

"No community can morally justify barring from its midst those who seek to escape the ghettos," said the joint statement read by a rabbi at a session of the group representatives at Automation House, 49 East 68th Street.

LEAGUE SUPPORTS PLAN

And upstate, in Grossinger, N.Y., the Anti-Defamation League, a major Jewish human relations organization, voiced overwhelming support of the project, which will cover 8.46 acres with three 24-story buildings for 840 apartments.

At City Hall, Mayor Lindsay, who has pressed for the project, observed in a statement that while there were sometimes conflicts between community and citywide goals, the overriding priority in this case was for the policy of scatter-site housing, where by low-income projects are built in middle-class areas to break down racial hostilities.

"No city-assisted housing proposal," said the Mayor, "can be implemented without full and public community consultation, affirmation by the City Planning Commission and approval by the Board of Estimate."

"It is, at the same time, always the duty of city officials to be guided also by citywide priorities and policies. It is in reconciling these two sometimes conflicting points of view that responsible government is put to its most severe test."

As these statements were made, several dozen residents of Forest Hills continued to picket at the site, where Jerry Birbach, head of the Forest Hills Residents Association, said the campaign to gather signature for Mayor Lindsay's impeachment would begin tomorrow.

The meeting of the 16 civic groups—four of which were from Forest Hills—erupted into strong disagreement when the head of the Queens Liberal party, Stanley Shaw, while endorsing the project, criticized Simeon Golar, chairman of the city's Housing Authority, and Mayor Lindsay.

Mr. Shaw called Mr. Golar "a totally inadequate administrator" and said the Mayor was at fault in failing to consult with the Forest Hills community on the project and "ramming it down their throat."

Mr. Golar was defended by Herbert Kahn, head of the Queens Council for Better Housing, who was chairman of the meeting. This organization is an umbrella group to which many of the organizations represented belong.

The joint statement of the meeting, read by Rabbi I. Usher Kirshblum, past president of the Queens Rabbinical Assembly, said the meeting was called because "it is now vital to make a beginning toward clearing away the misunderstandings and factual misrepresentations."

"In supporting this project," he read, "We

are not blinding ourselves to the problems that must be faced, nor are we ignoring the fears of the community. Indeed, our major purpose in coming together today is to make a new beginning toward uniting the community in a most constructive approach toward solving the problems and allaying the fears."

At a news conference later, Rabbi Kirshblum, when asked if it was true that a large majority of residents of Forest Hills were against the project, replied:

"This is a moral issue and such issues are not decided by a majority or minority vote. It is not governed by the vote of who is for or against it. We feel we are fighting for a moral issue."

Mrs. Joan Rosenthal of Forest Hills, who said she was appearing as an individual, not as an officer of the National Council of Jewish Women, Forest Hills, conceded that support of the project "is not a popular view" in the community, but she said it "will be accepted."

The Rev. Robert Kennedy, Social Action Director of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, said there was a great need for public housing and "everyone wants it someplace, but not next door."

Mr. Kahn said that many residents of Forest Hills who were not opposed to the project, were fearful of saying so. He argued that "the city has to function as a city."

The Rev. Timothy Mitchell, chairman of the drug advisory board to Chancellor Harvey B. Scribner, and pastor of the Ebenezer Baptist Church, Flushing, Queens, ridiculed the idea that the housing project in the area bounded by 108th Street, Horace Harding Boulevard, Colonial Avenue and 62d Drive, would destroy Forest Hills.

Mayor Lindsay, in his statement, denied an article in The New York Times yesterday that top city officials had discussed the possibility of reducing the size of the project. That article had quoted the Mayor's press secretary as having said he had no knowledge of such discussions and a denial by Mr. Golar that such discussions had taken place.

The Mayor also denied an article in The New York Post that "plans" for a smaller project had been worked out and vetoed by the Mayor.

Queens Borough President Donald R. Manes, who has called for a smaller project, said that so far as he knew, no plan had been detailed. He declined to comment on reports that he and Mr. Golar had discussed the possibility of scaling down the size of the project.

B'NAI B'RITH BACKS PROJECT

GROSSINGER, N.Y., November 24.—The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith voiced its "overwhelming support" today of the controversial Forest Hills low-income housing project and urged that more such projects be built to achieve racially and ethnically balanced communities.

In a resolution, the Jewish agency, which is devoted to safeguarding civil and religious rights, deplored the confrontation, that had developed in Forest Hills over the project.

The league called on the Federal and city governments to continue "to implement low and moderate-income, scatter-site, public housing programs."

Specifically, the resolution singled out such projects as the one in Forest Hills—which is a heavily Jewish community—to accomplish such integration.

Introducing the resolution at the closing session of the league's 58th annual meeting, Lawrence Peirez, chairman of the agency's fact-finding committee, asserted that those who opposed the low-income and moderate-income housing plan "have been agitated out of all proportion into baseless fears that their neighborhoods will be destroyed."

"High crime and violence," he said, "are

problems for the police, not for housing developers."

Mr. Peirez said "that if the community fears a sudden epidemic of crime, representation should be made to police authorities not to the builders of badly needed housing."

We find that here we have a project in Forest Hills which was approved at the time I was Borough President of the Bronx in 1966. I was a Member of the Board of Estimate and voted for the project. I was present at the public hearings of the project. I was present when Mr. Cariello (then Borough President of Queens) recommended the project. As a result of discussions he had with elected officials and community leaders in Queens, he recommended it and he voted for it. And then in the ensuing five years, not once has there been any proposal by the Community Planning Board or by the elected officials, including the successive Borough Presidents of Queens, to suggest that more community facilities were necessary so that when the people moved into the project they would be able to have true community life.

Now, when construction begins, all of a sudden community facilities are required—after five years of inaction. Even assuming community facilities are required, the project itself will not be built for about two or three years. There's plenty of time now to call in the Community Planning Board to recommend the community facilities, to submit them to the City Planning Commission, to bring them before the Board of Estimate and have them approved and have the community facilities built.

Certainly the lack of community facilities is not to say let's not build anything. Let's build the housing, and let's build the community facilities as well. But this is not being proposed.

The other argument being heard is that people are being moved into areas where no one knows them, no one knows what their backgrounds may be or what criminal records they may have or what instability they may have within their homes. Of course, the same people who make that argument are also aware that the New York City Housing Authority is not going to pick people out of nowhere. They have a tenant selection procedure. Out of the 800 families involved, 40 percent will be elderly people which in this town is a euphemism for saying "white." You say "elderly" because it is known that 98 percent of the elderly are white. After all, the Puerto Rican community is the youngest community in the City. The median age of Puerto Ricans is 19 years. I'm only 42 years old, and I'm considered the eldest statesman of the Puerto Ricans. So one of the ways of avoiding the question of Blacks and Puerto Ricans is to say "elderly."

Therefore, the Housing Authority has already said that 40 percent of the 800 families for the Forest Hills project will be elderly. Then the Housing Authority says that 30 percent of the remaining 60 percent will be residents of Queens, which is another euphemism for saying white, because while there are some Blacks and Puerto Ricans in Queens, the understanding is that when you pick from Queens, you're picking from a white population. When you pick from Manhattan, the Bronx and Brooklyn, you're picking Blacks and Puerto Ricans.

Now you have 70 percent who are white. What does that leave? It leaves 30 percent Blacks and Puerto Ricans who will be chosen from Manhattan, Bronx and Brooklyn. Those 30 percent will be identified about a year before the project is completed, so if anybody is concerned about the nature of the families, whether they have a criminal record, whether the kids are behind in school, whether there's a husband in the family, whether they're on welfare, those who are protesting the project can go and meet the families. They can ask them to come to

Forest Hills and can introduce them at community meetings. They can help the kids with tutoring. They can make them feel welcome. There's absolutely no need to worry about the unknown because everything will be known well before occupancy takes place.

Another argument that has been brought forth when all of this is spelled out is that government should not move low-income people into middle-income areas—that while nobody is against Blacks or Puerto Ricans as such, people are against economic integration. They say if you were to move middle-class Blacks and Puerto Ricans into a middle-class area, there would be no problem, but because you are moving even a small number of low-income Blacks and Puerto Ricans into a middle-class area, you are interfering with a basic American right—that the programs of government should not provide for economic integration. I think it's time that that particular argument be met and met very directly. I don't think that any group has the right to say that a neighborhood should be set aside just for one economic group. I don't know of any place where that right is mandated to any group in our society.

Government officials have clearly said that no group has the right to use any part of the city as their turf. Just as the Black Muslims cannot ask that they be given a part of Harlem because they're Black, or the Young Lords cannot demand they be given a part of the South Bronx, so a community, because of its middle-class population, cannot, in my opinion, claim they are entitled to that turf and that only a certain kind of housing shall be provided there and only a certain kind of people shall be moved into the neighborhood.

That argument has got to be met and has got to be discussed and has got to be resolved, because it is the one argument that most of the people have been avoiding in this discussion. It isn't enough to say in answer to the argument that we are going to oppose economic integration because the majority of the people in the district oppose it, because that's precisely the problem: of course the middle-class people are going to say that they don't want low-income people moved in. Of course the middle-class people are going to say, "Sure we used to live in a slum in Brooklyn, and we worked our way up and now that we're middle-class, we don't want to live next to low-income people."

If you're going to take it to a vote, you will end up with a City that has one group of poor on one side, and one group of middle-class and upper-class on the other. So why not carry it to its logical extreme: if the Black Muslims say they want total community control, give it to them. And start giving away pieces of the City to every group that says they have a right to it. One group says that they have a right to their turf because of their economic standing. Another one says they have a right to their turf because of the color of their skin. What is the difference? Are we going to have a society in which every little community is going to decide by majority rule what it wants, and then we step back and say that's what the majority wants?

This is the issue we have to confront in the City today, and we must begin to think about it not from the point of view of the minority. When people ask, "Can representative government work?" and when they talk about the rights of the minority and the power of the majority to override the rights of the minority, everyone begins to think about the minority. Everyone says, "We should do something for the poor Blacks and Puerto Ricans and the minority. It isn't right that most of the laws passed in this country are for the benefit of the majority. We should go out of our way and do something—not too much—but something."

That's the feeling I get in the Congress. Most of the Congressmen, senior Congress-

men in particular, are very sympathetic towards the minority. They come to me and say, "Herman, we understand the problems you have. We know New York City has terrible problems, and you're a good spokesman for the City and your people, and we would like to help you." But I get the impression that they feel towards me the same way they feel about Mrs. Gandhi in India. She has a lot of problems, and we'd like to help her because so many people in India need help, but we're not going to send billions of dollars to India—and they're not going to send billions of dollars to New York City.

So while you may get a little amount of money, or you might get a low-rent housing project built, you are not going to move towards a resolution of the problem—not as long as the majority insists upon looking at the problem from the point of view of the minority. It's not a problem for the minority, but for the majority.

Bear in mind when the *Southerners* began this process a long time ago, at first being opposed to busing, and then being opposed to housing integration, they had a clear national strategy in mind. The national strategy was that if they made life impossible for the Black man in the South, the Black man would come North. The strategy worked very well because there has been a migration of the Blacks in the past twenty-five years to the Northern cities. The migration has been encouraged by the policies of the Southern Congressmen, many of whom are there now sitting next to me. These same Southern Congressmen are today advising our Northern friends that they should follow the same policies they did. They prepare the same resolutions and they tell them how it all worked twenty-five years ago. But the difference is if we in the Northern cities now come out against busing, against low-income housing in middle-income neighborhoods, and against integration, the Black man has no place to go. There's no other Northern area to go to. He can't go to Canada. This is the end of the line.

So if we support the policies the *Southerners* followed, the white majority is the one that's going to have to go, because the Blacks can't go anywhere. The Puerto Rican can't go anywhere—they already came here from Puerto Rico. Insisting upon the rigid separation of the groups—the poor, the Black, the Puerto Rican and the white other groups—is only going to guarantee precisely what the Kerner Report talked about: that we will move in the North towards two separate and unequal societies. The ones who will be the losers will not be the Blacks and Puerto Ricans because they will take control of New York City.

Every indication is that in the next 10-15 years, New York City will become well over 50 per cent Black and Puerto Rican if the present trends continue. That of course has happened in Newark and in Cleveland, and will happen in every city in the North. However, whether or not New York City becomes Black and Puerto Rican is not the problem of the Black and Puerto Rican. It's the problem of the other groups that are leaving. By insisting on drawing lines and fighting to the end, you're going to polarize the situation. You are only bringing about precisely what the fears are—that it will become a totally poor city, a Black and Puerto Rican city.

From the point of view of the majority, it is therefore not a question of whether government can do it or whether the Congressmen can do it because unfortunately it is perfectly clear that the Congressmen say they are *representatives*, that they believe in the concept of majority rule, that they will vote the way the majority wants them to vote. So if you want to have change, don't look to your congressman. Don't say we have to change the Congressman. You are the ones who have to change. The way to bring about change is not by changing the individual representa-

tives but by changing the people who vote for them. The people who elect the representative must believe that we should have a government, not for the benefit of the majority, but a government for all, a government that protects the majority and the minority. Until everyone that votes believes in that concept, we are not going to have true representative government, a government which is supposed to be a government for all.

OTEPKA AND ELLSBERG

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on July 5, 1971, Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., Deputy Under Secretary of State for Management, appeared before a nationwide television audience on the NBC Today Show and said with reference to the 7,000 Government documents turned over to the New York Times by Daniel Ellsberg that little if any sensitive material from the Pentagon papers had appeared in print. Mr. Macomber credited the Times with restraint.

Since then many stories have been published, and a large number of them have been put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, suggesting that Mr. Ellsberg is a national hero and it would be unfair to punish him. It has been reported that Mr. Ellsberg was honored at testimonial dinners and luncheons and he has made public speaking appearances and written articles for which he received large fees. Recently the prestigious Saturday Review reported that nearly a thousand Government employees in Washington voiced unanimous adulation for Mr. Ellsberg at a luncheon in his honor sponsored by Government personnel. Collections have been taken to defray his legal expenses.

I think it is fine that the public has been given an expert opinion by the State Department's chief housekeeper to allay its concern about the gravity of Mr. Ellsberg's offense. But the Department's apparent tolerance of Mr. Ellsberg's actions seems rather confused and contradictory in comparison to the position it took with respect to Mr. Otto F. Otepka, the Department's former chief security evaluator and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

In 1963, Mr. Macomber's predecessor as chief housekeeper, Mr. William J. Crockett, unsuccessfully sought to get the Justice Department to prosecute Mr. Otepka for espionage. The only basis for demanding this stringent punishment for Mr. Otepka was that during his testimony before a congressional committee he furnished two—I repeat, only two—classified documents to the committee. These documents had no connection with our foreign policy objectives. They did not involve military plans. They had no bearing on the national security whatsoever. Mr. Otepka did not make them public. He furnished the documents in executive proceedings. They were provided on the committee's request in order to prove—and they did prove—that two State De-

partment officials had lied under oath about Mr. Otepka before the committee.

Before the present administration elevated Mr. Macomber to his present post, he served under the previous administration as Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations. While he was in that capacity I requested the Department's assistance in answering 11 questions relative to the mutilation of documents and the tapping of telephones by certain persons who were involved in efforts to malign Mr. Otepka with a wrongdoing he did not commit. Mr. Macomber replied to my letter.

Mr. Macomber did not answer any of my questions. He gave me a brushoff. On January 30, 1968, I had our exchange of correspondence placed into the RECORD. I made it clear that I tried but could not get any information from the State Department as to who the real culprits were in the Otepka case.

When the State Department began its long and weary attempts to fire Mr. Otepka for furnishing information to Congress, the New York Times was in the front row applauding. On November 14, 1963 it editorialized against Mr. Otepka and Congress with these words:

Orderly procedures are essential if the vital division of power between the legislative and executive branches is not to be undermined. The use of underground methods to obtain classified documents from lower-level officials is a dangerous departure from such orderly procedures.

Today, the shoe is on another foot. The same newspaper which condemned Mr. Otepka after he told the truth to Congress, clandestinely obtained thousands of classified papers from a lower-level former employee of a Government contractor. Apologists for Mr. Ellsberg's actions now want to establish a separate standard for him and future Ellsbergs who do not observe orderly procedures.

The same men in the State Department who hounded and harassed Mr. Otepka for properly responding to a summons of a congressional committee have condoned the serious derelictions of other employees. Mr. Otepka did no more than his duty in complying with the committee's request. All nine members of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee before whom Mr. Otepka had testified commended him for his forthrightness. All signed a letter to Secretary Rusk deploring the attempts to fire him, insisting that a committee of Congress has a right to obtain the truth without impediments when wrong doing in the Government service is involved.

Mr. Otepka simply was made the victim of dominant forces who resented his uniform application of the Department's personnel security regulations to every applicant and employee regardless of rank, or station, or the extent of the person's political influence.

President Nixon felt that Mr. Otepka had been unjustly accused and demoted and he therefore appointed him to the Subversive Activities Control Board in 1969 in order that Mr. Otepka could continue in the profession in which he was best qualified. But entrenched holdovers who previously charged that Mr. Otepka did not observe proper channels when

he proved that there were liars in the State Department, brazenly continued their vendetta against Mr. Otepka from their vantage point in the State Department. For almost a year after Mr. Otepka's entry on duty these holdovers mailed out letters to Members of the House and Senate and they distributed printed statements to the public and the press suggesting that Mr. Otepka had committed a security violation while he was in the State Department. They implied he had been dismissed for that reason. The New York Times and the Washington Post found these statements most helpful in writing frequent editorials urging Congress to abolish the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I received some of the Department's statements about Mr. Otepka myself. I found that Mr. Macomber had signed many of them. Late in 1970 I complained to the Civil Service Commission that the statements were false and misleading and destructive to Mr. Otepka's long and honorable career. In addition they were an insult to every member of the Subversive Activities Control Board who, like Mr. Otepka, is a Presidential appointee approved for his position by the U.S. Senate. I pointed out that the Commission had an oversight responsibility to correct this kind of personnel policy.

Commission Chairman Robert Hampton agreed that the statements were improper and I was promised that they would be corrected. I thought the matter was ended until I read the recently published testimony of Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist Clark Mollenhoff before the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Information, given on June 30, 1971. I saw where Mr. Mollenhoff complained to the subcommittee about the Department's misstatements regarding Mr. Otepka. His complaint resulted in a subcommittee letter to Mr. Macomber. The relevant question asked was answered by Mr. Macomber on September 17, 1971.

Mr. Macomber's reply is phrased in typical bureaucratese gobbledygook. He says that although the Department's form statement was accurate "it was excessively long and detailed and modification was in order." The translation of that Aesopian language is "We were wrong, but cannot admit it."

As I stated in the RECORD on February 19, 1970, I find it hard to register surprise or shock at new revelations of doubledealing and duplicity issuing from the State Department. Regardless of the administration in power the hierarchy at State continues on its merry, self-perpetuating way, laughing at feeble congressional attempts at administrative oversight. Presidents from Herbert Hoover to the present day have publicly expressed the need for overhauling this Department, but the job has never been done.

Mr. Speaker, on November 11, 1971, veteran newsman Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune, who is another very competent observer of Foggy Bottom intrigue, wrote that Mr. Otepka's powerful enemies in the State Department held over from the Kennedy and

Johnson administrations, are trying to entomb Mr. Otepka's pending nomination for another term on the SACB, by the petty and spiteful contention that his 1963 testimony before Congress is analogous with Mr. Ellsberg's leaking 7,000 papers to the New York Times. They want Mr. Ellsberg cleared first.

Since the RECORD has been filled with material in defense of Mr. Ellsberg, including his interviews with the noted Walter Cronkite and articles that Mr. Ellsberg has written in his own behalf, it is only fair to Mr. Otepka that I include relevant data about the false analogy in order to balance the issue involved.

At this point, I submit various material relating to my discussion:

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel,
June 27, 1971]

TIMES HASSLE A PLOY?

EDITOR: In all the hassle about the Times publishing the stolen secret papers, one must remember that the Times, through the Herbert Mathews articles, sold Fidel Castro to the country. There was also connivance in the State Department.

This, along with who is really responsible for the Vietnam war is brought out in "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka" by William J. Gill, published by Arlington House.

Anyone who is interested in what we are headed for might spend 15 cents with the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C., and get Department of State Publication 7277, Disarmament Series 5, released September 1961.

They might also inquire of their senators about the Status of Public Law 87-207, 87th Congress H.R. 9118 Sept. 26, 1961. T.L.'s is the Arms Control and Disarmament Act.

The confirmation of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board will come up on the floor of the Senate before long and it is vital to the security of the country that he be confirmed to this position.

Mr. Otepka was separated from the security control section of the State Department because he would not pass for employment in sensitive positions men who had Communist affiliation or association in their background.

This Times hassle might just be a ploy to draw attention from Mr. Otepka.

S. B. JIM CROWE,

Sanford.

[From the Sunday Bulletin, June 27, 1971]

PUBLIC NEEDS TO HEAR MANY MORE SECRETS (By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON.—It is time for the public and the news media to become concerned about the people's right to know on some issues that are as basic as the right of the New York Times and the Washington Post to print material from papers carrying a designation of "Top Secret-Sensitive."

The Nixon administration has a right and duty to prosecute in criminal and civil court every violation of this classification of "Top Secret." Likewise, the federal courts have a right to rule that the administrators of the Pentagon and the White House have gone beyond their authority in classifying such papers.

DOZENS OF CASES

There are dozens of other cases in government today that represent the same kind of arbitrary interference with the people's right to know as the deception and outright lies of President Johnson, Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

In closed hearings and through withheld records, the rights of individual government

employees have already suffered irreparable harm from the arbitrary decisions of executive branch officials.

Civil Service Commission Chairman Robert Hampton is imposing secrecy on the hearings into the firing of cost analyst A. Edward Fitzgerald, the man who exposed the huge cost overruns on the C-5A cargo plane. Fitzgerald wants an open hearing, and he says he cannot receive a fair hearing behind the closed doors of the Civil Service Commission.

CLAIMS A FRAME

Fitzgerald claims his superiors in the Air Force framed him by filling his file with "smears" about "conflicts of interests" and then simply abolished his job as one of the alternatives for getting rid of him.

Also, the Civil Service Commission is responsible for failing to provide an open hearing for Kenneth S. Cook, a 57-year-old Air Force weapons analyst. Cook's troubles started when he complained in 1966 that his commanding officer, Lt. Col. Roderick W. Clarke, was distorting scientific reports on the defenses against Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles.

Cook claims he has been denied access to information about reports filed about him. He also claims he was railroaded by a medical report by a base doctor who was a close friend of his commanding officer.

FOUR-YEAR ORDEAL

It has been a more than four-year ordeal for Cook, and it would have been settled in a few weeks if he had been afforded an open hearing and access to his record.

The State Department personnel office stalled for nearly two years before giving John Hemenway, a career foreign service officer, a grievance hearing. He is getting it after many protests.

He contends the department's personnel office has struck out paragraphs in a memorandum that support his charge that he was framed, lied about, and railroaded by superiors. His problem started over a policy difference with his superiors in the German affairs section. Both of his superiors were promoted.

SECURITY BREACH

Stephen Koczak also was selected out of the foreign service ostensibly because he had not been promoted. He had reported a serious security breach by a superior, who then was allowed to write the rating report on which Koczak's chances of promotion were based.

Later, Koczak forced an admission that the superior should not have been permitted to rate him. But the low rating report remains in his file and he has been refused the opportunity to review his entire file. Both of Koczak's superiors were promoted also.

The case of Otto F. Otepka, a former State Department evaluator, is one for special mention in connection with the New York Times decision to print "Top Secret-Sensitive" documents. The Times was highly critical of Otepka a few years ago for delivering three "confidential" documents to a Senate committee to prove he was telling the truth about lax security in the State Department.

IRREPARABLE INJURY

The Times found a "dangerous departure" from normal procedures in Otepka's delivery to a Senate staff lawyer who was cleared for security matters. Otepka didn't make the papers public. His only deviation from proper procedures is that he did not clear the delivery of the three documents with the man he was proving was a liar.

The ultimate in irreparable injury was sustained by the family of Charles W. Thomas, a brilliant 48-year-old foreign service officer, who was the victim of one bad rating by a superior. An inspector general's report, correcting the rating officer's report, was misfiled in the folder of a man with the same name at the State Department personnel office.

Thomas was without a job for almost two years before he committed suicide last April.

[From the Oregonian, June 30, 1971]

OTEPKA IGNORED

TO THE EDITOR: Almost lost in the sound and fury over the recent New York Times disclosures was a tiny item (at the bottom of page 15, June 18 edition) about President Nixon's nomination of Otto Otepka for a full term on the Subversive Activities Control Board. Otepka, though but few remember, was ousted in 1953 for allegedly—get this—turning over confidential documents to the Judiciary Committee's internal security unit.

Thursday, June 17, the Senate Judiciary Committee approved the President's nomination against the objections of Sens. Ted Kennedy, Birch Bayh and Phil Hart. Come now, fellas, just what's the objection? Ted Kennedy, as you might expect, is loudly screaming for "full disclosure no matter what happens" of the illegally obtained documents already partially published by The Times. Otepka, charged in 1963 with unauthorized disclosure of information, has long since been cleared. What is the big fat problem, gentlemen? Could it be that Otepka doesn't have a liberal-leftist union card, and is probably a Republican to boot? Surely all patriotic Americans—like Kennedy and his liberal friends—would be for full disclosure of all classified information as soon as possible, legally or otherwise, wouldn't they?

JOHN A. MELROSE,
Stevenson, Wash.

EXCLUSIVE

JULY 2, 1971.

This week's Supreme Court decision okaying publication of top secret Pentagon papers was not the "set-back for the Nixon Administration" that has been portrayed in the press. For one thing, the majority on the Court did not deny federal authorities the right to prevent publication of all classified government documents. Only a four man minority (Justices William O. Douglas, Hugo Black, William Brennan and Thurgood Marshall) took the hard line First Amendment stand of insisting that there can be no government censorship of the press. The three more conservative members of the Court (Chief Justice Warren Burger and Associate Justices Harry Blackmun and John Harlan) saw no reason why publication of the secret Pentagon study should not be prevented at least until lower courts have tried the case and decided whether the published material would endanger national interests. The deciding votes were cast by Justices Potter Stewart and Byron White who took a qualified stand in behalf of freedom of the press. The secret documents under study in this case, they said, were not sufficiently sensitive to outweigh the importance of the First Amendment privilege of free publication. They warned, however, that the Court decision does not mean that newspapers "will be immune from criminal action" if they publish all the documents in the Pentagon's Vietnam archives.

In addition, the Court ruling left the door wide open for the Justice Department to prosecute those persons who were responsible for "leaking" the classified documents to the press. The only one who has been charged with such a breach of security regulations thus far, is Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, a 40 year old senior research associate at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who surrendered to federal authorities in Boston last Monday. He was released on \$50,000 bond without surety until a July 15 hearing which will consider whether he should be removed to California to face the federal charges.

In the wake of the 6 to 3 Court decision, the Justice Department is likely to ask Congress for new laws increasing the penalties for stealing or disclosing government secrets.

Another result of the Court ruling is that many of the 20 million government documents that are currently classified will be declassified soon unless they contain information of a clearly sensitive nature. Such a step is undoubtedly in the public's interest since the vast bulk of those government papers which are presently impounded have been classified, not because they contain national security secrets, but because they contain information which could be embarrassing to some bungling bureaucrat. They are protecting themselves, not the nation, by classifying these documents.

In addition, the White House is well aware of the fact that further newspaper publication of the Pentagon papers in question cannot possibly reflect badly on the policies of the Nixon Administration regarding Vietnam. The study does not even cover the Nixon era—it relates primarily to the behind-the-scenes war decision of the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. The thrust of the Pentagon report is that both Democrat leaders seriously deceived the American people regarding the Vietnam story and the extent of U.S. involvement in the war. Politically speaking, then, President Nixon will probably benefit indirectly from continued publication of the documents.

Finally, the Supreme Court ruling opens the door for the deliberate declassification by the Nixon Administration of other secret government papers which relate to the wheeling-dealing actions of Democrat officials—some of whom may try to play a role in defeating Nixon next year.

Although both the New York Times and the Washington Post were bitterly critical of the government's actions in the pentagon papers case, neither publication has attempted to reconcile their current anti-censorship stand with their earlier position in the Otepka case. In 1963, when State Department security officer Otto Otepka furnished a Senate subcommittee with two classified documents to prove that certain of his superiors had lied under oath regarding him and Department security procedures, both the Times and the Post lambasted Otepka. In an editorial titled "The Congressional Underground" the Times declared: "Orderly procedures are essential if the vital division of power between legislative and executive branches is not to be undermined. The use of 'underground' methods to obtain classified documents from lower-level officials is a dangerous departure from such orderly procedures."

The Post labeled what Otepka did "unlawful" and "unconscionable." It declared: "He gave classified information to someone not authorized to receive it. . . . He had no authority to give it. . . . If any underling in the State Department were free at his own discretion to disclose confidential cables or if any agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation could leak the contents of secret files whenever he felt like it, the Executive branch of the government would have no security at all."

By those standards, the leaking of the top secret Pentagon papers to the press would constitute perhaps the most "unlawful" and "unconscionable" breach of security in modern history—and yet neither the Times nor the Post seems the least bit concerned.

[From Human Events, July 3, 1971]

TIMES' CURIOUS VIEW OF U.S. SECURITY

While the New York Times may deny there's anything harmful in printing those stolen, top-secret Pentagon documents, that opinion is not shared by Paul C. Warnke, former Defense official who had over-all responsibility for the preparation of that Pentagon study.

Warnke, a liberal and a dove, said in a press conference last week that there were "certain elements of unpublished portions of the study that could adversely affect the

national interest if prematurely revealed." As one example, he cited the section of the 47-volume study that concerns the secret diplomatic initiatives taken during the Administration of President Johnson.

Though an outspoken war critic, Warnke also deplored the unauthorized publication of the Pentagon study. The release of top-secret documents, he stressed, could set a "very mischievous precedent."

In sharply criticizing the publication of the study, Warnke said the man who leaked the documents—ex-Times man Sidney Zion has publicly accused Daniel Ellsberg, a charge Ellsberg refuses to deny—"violated not only a law, but a trust. If we can't count on the trust being respected, then the conversations and debates on major issues within the government will be severely restricted."

When Otto Otepka was a top security evaluator for the State Department, he was whiplashed by the Times for turning over classified material—none of it affecting the national security—to a duly constituted congressional subcommittee. Moreover, the subcommittee had demanded the material—three documents in all—to see whether Otepka or his superiors were telling the truth. The documents proved conclusively that Otepka's superiors had lied in important areas. Yet the Times termed this turnover of material to Congress as a "dangerous departure" from normal precedent. In countless editorials and articles the newspaper repeatedly tried to convince its readers that Otepka had committed a crime, even though this was clearly not the case.

The Times also waxed self-righteous back in 1962 when it bitterly condemned Stewart Alsop and Charles Bartlett for revealing Adlai Stevenson's superfluous role in the Cuban missile crisis. In an editorial called "Breach of Security," the Times commented:

"Whether or not Mr. Stevenson is the latest victim of a Washington vendetta is less significant than the apparent fact that the secrecy of one of the highest organs of the United States government (the National Security Council) has been seriously breached. This organ was, during the Cuban crisis, the top-level advisory group to the President of the United States.

"How is it possible to believe that the opinions expressed therein can have any value if they may appear in the public press the next day, or the next month? . . . How can anyone be expected to advance positions that may be politically unpopular or unprofitable? Does no one in Washington recall the McCarthy era and the McCarthy technique?"

The only trouble with the Times' fulmination on the subject was that the "highest organs" of the U.S. government had not been breached. President Kennedy, himself, had "declassified" that piece of information on Stevenson.

Thus the Times, one must believe, is entirely hypocritical on the subject of security. The consensus in Washington is that the paper, far from possessing lofty sentiments, released our top secrets for the purpose of sabotaging President's Nixon's Vietnamization program and selling newspapers.

[From the Boca Raton (Fla.) News, July 11, 1971]

Otepka Was Only Doing His Job

TO THE EDITOR: The attempt by the UPI's Mr. Roy McGhee (The News, July 8th) to compare the actions of Daniel Ellsberg in stealing classified government documents and giving them to certain newspapers with those of Otto Otepka in connection with his testimony before a committee of the United States Senate boggles the mind.

There is no comparison between the two cases.

Ellsberg, a private citizen, took it upon himself to copy classified documents and publicize the information contained therein to the entire world. He seems to have given

little or no thought to the implications of his actions vis-a-vis the security of this nation.

Mr. Otepka, a State Department official, on the other hand, delivered to the Senate Internal Security sub-Committee, an authorized functionary of the United States government, certain documents vital to his testimony before that body.

On November 16th, 1961 Mr. Otepka, along with two other security officials of the Department of State, was called to testify before the sub-committee on the matter of lax security procedures in the department.

In this and in subsequent appearances before the sub-committee, all of them authorized by the department, Mr. Otepka painstakingly documented the dismemberment of the security program by department officials.

Other State Department officers were called to testify. In many cases, their testimony was widely at variance with that of Mr. Otepka. Clearly, somebody was perjuring himself.

That somebody turned out to be Mr. John Reilly, Otepka's New Frontier superior.

Jay Sourwine, sub-Committee counsel called upon Mr. Otepka to refute Reilly's testimony. In his own office in the Department Mr. Otepka, fully knowledgeable of the fact that his office was "bugged" and that his words were being overheard by his superiors, dictated a memorandum of some thirty-nine pages, which gave the lie to Reilly's testimony. Mr. Otepka then attached to his memorandum some thirty-six documents meant to support his own testimony and refute that of Mr. Reilly.

Twenty-five of the documents were completely un-classified; six were classified "Official Use Only"; three "Limited Official Use"; and two "Confidential". Most of the documents had been classified by Mr. Otepka himself.

Otepka, one of the most knowledgeable security officers in the entire government, then studied each document to be certain that he was "not giving any information which would be prejudicial to the national security if it were to be published by the Senate sub-committee. The two papers marked 'Confidential' were only transmittal memorandums that referred to certain attachments." Mr. Otepka did not supply these attachments—the reason for the "Confidential" classification to begin with, to the subcommittee even though the information contained in them has already been published by various congressional committees.

Mr. Otepka proved his case. Reilly had lied. Exit Mr. Reilly from the Department of State.

In his story, Mr. McGhee states that Mr. Otepka had been "cashiered out of government service". Not true. Mr. Otepka, before his testimony, had been subjected to harassment by his new superiors because he refused to grant waivers of security clearance to a whole slew of prospective appointees whose backgrounds demanded thorough investigation. The harassment continued. They "bugged" his office, tapped his phone, cracked his safe, spied upon him, gave him meaningless jobs, demoted him, transferred him, and lied about him to the subcommittee. For nearly eight years they had him in what he used to call "limbo".

But they never fired him. In the end Dean Rusk, then Secretary of State, disciplined him by demoting him, moving him out of the security field where he was best qualified, and cutting his salary.

During those seven years and some months I was very close to Otto Otepka. It was a moving personal experience to have been associated with him. He refused to buckle under the enormous pressure his superiors continued to subject him to. His sole concern during all of that time was the security of his nation and his belief that it was being undermined.

Interestingly enough, the people who look

the worst in the Pentagon study were among those who Otepka refused to clear by waiver.

No, Otto Otepka cannot be put into the same classification as Ellsberg. He was doing his job, fulfilling his oath of office as a government official. Ellsberg, on the other hand, was merely playing God.

PHILIP V. BRENNAN, JR.

[From the Vermont News, July 11, 1971]

TIMES FACES LIBEL SUIT ON OTEPKA

(By Edith K. Roosevelt)

WASHINGTON.—The New York Times, which faces possible prosecution under espionage statutes for publishing top secret documents on the Vietnam war is already involved in another law suit regarding its controversial approach to security matters.

Otto F. Otepka, a former State Department security chief and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, has filed a \$4 million libel suit against the Times, charging the newspaper with conducting a "malicious program . . . to discredit and defame him."

Specifically, Otepka objected to a passage in the Times article of March 15, 1970, by Robert Sherrill, Washington editor for The Nation magazine, which said:

"Otepka was charged with, and on Nov. 5, 1963, dismissed for, violating three regulations governing the release, declassification and mutilation of Government document."

Otepka has contended that Sherrill did not explain that the State Department had changed its presentation to the remaining charge concerning his delivery of documents to a person outside the State Department, namely, J. G. Sourwine, Chief Counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. The Times has retracted Sherrill's false statement about Otepka.

The documents which Otepka had produced at the request of Senators revealed that George Ball, then Under Secretary of State, and Harlan Cleveland, then Assistant Secretary for International Organizations, sought to appoint Harding Bancroft, Executive Editor of the New York Times, to a State Department Advisory Committee on International Organizations without the required security procedures.

Since Bancroft would have had access to classified information, the regulations required a preappointment background investigation by the FBI.

Otepka's superiors had told the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee under oath that he had never discussed Bancroft's derogatory background with them but when Otepka was called back to testify he produced memoranda signed by his superiors acknowledging receipt of Otepka's admonition about Bancroft and others.

Otepka refused to waive the investigation of Bancroft because there were unresolved allegations about the New York Times editor's close, sympathetic association with Alger Hiss, the convicted perjurer who lied about his espionage activities before a Grand Jury.

Also, Loy Henderson, former Ambassador and Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, had expressed his distrust of Bancroft because Bancroft had sided with the Soviet Union when it refused to withdraw its troops from Iran at the end of World War II. Bancroft was at that time a division chief in the State Department dealing with the United Nations, a position for which he had been selected by Hiss.

Over Otepka's strong objections, Bancroft was appointed to the State Department Committee. After that, Bancroft and other members of the Committee drafted an Executive order advocating the elimination of security checks for American employees of governmental international organizations. This Executive Order was blocked by Otepka.

Interestingly enough, about the same time

that the Executive Order was proposed, the New York Times published a letter from Leonard Boudin, a New York attorney, which advocated the elimination of security checks for American members of international organizations. This was the same Leonard Boudin who had represented numerous individuals fired from the United Nations because they took the Fifth Amendment before Congress in refusing to reveal whether they had ever been or were then Communists.

Boudin's name is now in the news as the attorney for Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, the former State Department and Pentagon employee who stole the top secret documents on the Vietnam War and gave them to the New York Times.

The name of George Ball has also surfaced again in the Ellsberg affair. Ball's statements defending Ellsberg for giving the Times top secret information have been widely quoted in the press.

Yet only a few years earlier, Ball made several trips to Capitol Hill to try to stop the publication by the Subcommittee of Otepka's statements regarding Bancroft. However, the Subcommittee found that the testimony given by Otepka was not related to national security and voted unanimously to release it together with corroborating documents.

Although this published material disclosed that Otepka's superiors had lied under oath, nonetheless the State Department demoted Otepka to an inferior job.

While he was preparing his case for Federal Court, appealing his reprimand and demotion by the State Department, Richard Nixon emerged as a victor in the 1968 Presidential race. After promising that "Justice will be done Otepka," Nixon appointed him a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. Otepka is presently awaiting Senate confirmation for a new term on the board.

Meanwhile, questions raised by the publication of the secret papers on the Vietnam war have prompted charges in Administration circles that a double standard exists concerning the Times attitude towards security.

The Republican National Committee noted in its publication entitled Monday, dated June 28, 1971, that both the Times and the Post had lambasted Otepka for furnishing the Senate Subcommittee the documents that it had requested. In an editorial referring to Otepka entitled "the Congressional Underground" the Times declared:

"The use of 'underground' methods to obtain classified documents from lower-level officials is a dangerous departure. . . ."

Yet, the Republican National Committee observed, that Times Publisher Arthur Ochs Sulzberger has cavalierly dismissed the Government's claim that publication of the Vietnam papers is destroying the faith of foreign governments in this country's ability to keep diplomatic confidences. The Committee noted that the New York Post of June 19, 1971 had quoted Ochs as saying:

"Oh, that's a lot of boloney. I mean really."

In noting that there has been a 180 degree policy change by the New York Times and Washington Post in its so-called "Vietnam Papers caper," The Republican National Committee declared:

"As far as the Times and Post are concerned it appears that there are good security leaks and bad security leaks. It all depends on who is leaking what to whom."

[From Counterattack, July 12, 1971]

IT DEPENDS ON WHOSE "OCHS" IS BEING GORED

In the not too distant past the editors of The New York Times condemned the action of one Otto Otepka, a patriotic State Department employee, for making available copies of classified documents to a subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary of the United States Senate. Now The New York Times in the possession of stolen property consisting of secret Government documents has ignored its

responsibility to report the larceny to responsible public officers. This duty rests on taxi drivers, bank guards, hotel employees, and even The New York Times. After The New York Times clandestinely devoted a period of three months examining the 47 volumes that came into its unauthorized possession, it began publishing selected material from these volumes. It now appears that this distinguished newspaper evidently has experienced a change of position on the use of classified reports which it had criticized in the Otepka case. Perhaps the Times' new position is motivated by the self-serving cliché, "It depends on whose 'Ochs' is being gored."

As lawyers, we are in agreement with the majority decision of the United States Supreme Court which upheld the strong First Amendment policy against prior restraints on publication. We do not believe in government by injunction. Attorney General Mitchell has stated that the Justice Department will institute criminal prosecution to determine if violations of the United States Criminal Code, in particular the Espionage Act, have been perpetrated by the ones who purloined the documents and the alleged Fagins who received and kept the stolen government property.

Of the many appointments President John F. Kennedy made during his term of office, the most effective was the Supreme Court designation of Byron R. (Whizzer) White, a former college All American and an outstanding professional football player. One Sunday afternoon in New York's Polo Grounds in the late 30's we heard Steve Owen, the coach of the defeated New York Giants, become laudatory over Whizzer White (who ran wild with the hipper dipper handoffs from Dutch Clark) by saying, "We lost to the team with the National League's greatest all around back. For the Giants' sake let's hope he makes haste in becoming a lawyer." Mr. White followed Stout Steve's advice and became a lawyer's lawyer. The logic and wisdom of Mr. Justice White's concurring opinion in the New York Times case strengthens our belief that this distinguished jurist has now emerged as a judge's judge. Counterattack is pleased to publish his definitive opinion which is a legal treatise and not a primary critique in social science.

"I concur in today's judgments, but only because of the concededly extraordinary protection against prior restraints enjoyed by the press under our constitutional system. I do not say that in no circumstances would the First Amendment permit an injunction against publishing information about Government plans or operations. Nor, after examining the materials the Government characterizes as the most sensitive and destructive, can I deny that revelation of these documents will do substantial damage to public interests. Indeed, I am confident that their disclosure will have that result. But I nevertheless agree that the United States has not satisfied the very heavy burden which it must meet to warrant an injunction against publication in these cases, at least in the absence of express and appropriately limited Congressional authorization for prior restraints in circumstances such as these.

"The Government's position is simply stated: The responsibility of the executive for the conduct of the foreign affairs and for the security of the nation is so basic that the President is entitled to an injunction against publication of a newspaper story whenever he can convince a court that the information to be revealed threatens 'grave and irreparable' injury to the public interest; and the injunction should issue whether or not the material to be published is classified, whether or not publication would be lawful under relevant criminal statutes enacted by Congress and regardless of the circumstances by which the newspaper came into possession of the information.

"At least in the absence of legislation by

Congress, based on its own investigations and findings, I am quite unable to agree that the inherent powers of the executive and the courts reach so far as to authorize remedies having such sweeping potential for inhibiting publications by the press. Much of the difficulty inheres in the 'grave and irreparable danger' standard suggested by the United States. If the United States were to have judgment under such a standard in these cases, our decision would be of little guidance to other courts in other cases, for the material at issue here would not be available from the Court's opinion or from public records, nor would it be published by the press. Indeed, even today where we hold that the United States has not met its burden, the material remains sealed in court records and it is properly not discussed in today's opinions. Moreover, because the material poses substantial dangers to national interests and because of the hazards of criminal sanctions, a responsible press may choose never to publish the more sensitive materials. To sustain the Government in these cases would start the courts down a long and hazardous road that I am not willing to travel, at least without Congressional guidance and direction.

"It is not easy to reject the proposition urged by the United States and to deny relief on its good-faith claims in these cases that publication will work serious damage to the country. But that discomfiture is considerably dispelled by the infrequency of prior restraint cases. Normally, publication will occur and the damage be done before the Government has either opportunity or grounds for suppression. So here, publication has already begun and a substantial part of the threatened damage has already occurred. The fact of a massive breakdown in security is known, access to the documents by many unauthorized people is undeniable and the efficacy of equitable relief against these or other newspapers to avert anticipated damage is doubtful at best.

"What is more, terminating the ban on publication of the relatively few sensitive documents the Government now seeks to suppress does not mean that the law either requires or invites newspapers or others to publish them or that they will be immune from criminal action if they do. Prior restraints require an unusually heavy justification under the First Amendment; but failure by the Government to justify prior restraints does not measure its constitutional entitlement to a conviction for criminal publication. That the Government mistakenly chose to proceed by injunction does not mean that it could not successfully proceed in another way.

"When the Espionage Act was under consideration in 1917, Congress eliminated from the bill a provision that would have given the President broad powers in time of war to proscribe, under threat of criminal penalty, the publication of various categories of information related to the national defense. Congress at that time was unwilling to clothe the President with such far-reaching powers to monitor the press, and those opposed to this part of the legislation assumed that a necessary concomitant of such power was the power to 'filter out the news to the people through some man.' 55 Cong. Rec. 2008 (1917) (remarks of Senator Ashurst). However, these same members of Congress appeared to have little doubt that newspapers would be subject to criminal prosecution if they insisted on publishing information of the type Congress had itself determined should not be revealed. Senator Ashurst, for example, was quite sure that the editor of such a newspaper 'should be punished if he did publish information as to the movements of the fleet, the troops, the aircraft, the location of powder factories, the location of defense works and all that sort of thing.' 55 Cong. Rec. 2009 (1917).

"The Criminal Code contains numerous provisions potentially relevant to these cases.

Section 797 makes it a crime to publish certain photographs or drawings of military installations. Section 798, also in precise language, proscribes knowing and willful publications of any classified information concerning the cryptographic systems or communication intelligence activities of the United States as well as any information obtained from communication intelligence operations. If any of the material here at issue is of this nature, the newspapers are presumably now on full notice of the position of the United States and must face the consequences if they publish. I would have no difficulty in sustaining convictions through these sections on facts that would not justify the intervention of equity and the imposition of a prior restraint.

"The same would be true under those sections of the Criminal Code casting a wider net to protect the national defense. Section 798(e) makes it a criminal act for any unauthorized possessor of a document 'relating to national defense' either (1) willfully to communicate or cause to be communicated that document to any person not entitled to receive it or (2) willfully to retain the document and fail to deliver it to an officer of the United States entitled to receive it. The subsection was added in 1950 because pre-existing law provided no penalty for the unauthorized possessor unless demand for the documents was made. 'The dangers surrounding the unauthorized possession of such items are self-evident, and it is deemed advisable to require their surrender in such a case, regardless of demand, especially since their unauthorized possession may be unknown to the authorities who would otherwise make the demand.' S. Rep. No. 2369, 81st Cong., 2d Sess., 9 (1950). Of course, in the cases before us, the unpublished documents have been demanded by the United States and their import has been made known at least to counsel for the newspapers involved. In *Gorin v. United States*, 312 U.S. 19, 28 (1941), the words 'national defense' as used in a predecessor of Sec. 793 were held by a unanimous court to have 'a well-understood connotation—a 'generic concept of broad connotations, referring to the military and naval establishments and the related activities of national preparedness'—and to be 'sufficiently definite to apprise the public of prohibited activities' and to be consonant with due process. 312 U.S., at 28. Also, as construed by the Court in *Gorin*, information 'connected with the national defense' is obviously not limited to that threatening 'grave and irreparable' injury to the United States.

"It is thus clear that Congress has addressed itself to the problems of protecting the security of the country and the national defense from unauthorized disclosure of potentially damaging information. Cf. *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579, 585-628 (Frankfurter, J., concurring). It has not, however, authorized the injunctive remedy against threatened publication. It has apparently been satisfied to rely on criminal sanctions and their deterrent effect on the responsible as well as the irresponsible press. I am not, of course, saying that either of these newspapers has yet committed a crime or that either would commit a crime if they published all the material now in their possession. That matter must await resolution in the context of a criminal proceeding if one is instituted by the United States. In that event, the issue of guilt or innocence would be determined by procedures and standards quite different from those that have purported to govern these injunctive proceedings."

The following is the text of the Supreme Court order in *The New York Times, Washington Post Pentagon Papers Case*:

"We granted certiorari in these cases in which the United States seeks to enjoin the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*

from publishing the contents of a classified study entitled 'History of U.S. Decision-Making Process on Viet Nam Policy'—U.S.—(1971).

"Any system of prior restraints of expression comes to this court bearing a heavy presumption against its constitutional validity" (Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan, 372 U.S. 58, 70 (1963); see also *Near v. Minnesota*, 283 U.S. 697 (1931). The government 'thus carries a heavy burden of showing justification for the enforcement of such restraint' (*Organization for a Better Austin v. Keefe*,—U.S.—(1971)). The District Court for the Southern District of New York in the *New York Times* case and the District Court for the District of Columbia and the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the *Washington Post* case held that the government had not met the burden. We agree.

"The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit is therefore affirmed. The order of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is revised and the case is remanded with directions to enter a judgment affirming the judgment of the District Court for the Southern District of New York. The stays entered June 25, 1971, by the court are vacated. The mandates shall issue forthwith.

"So ordered."

In retrospect it is now obvious that the Johnson Administration sacrificed candor in foreign affairs for the purpose of achieving its domestic program of the Great Society. The logical straightforward course in 1965 was to follow the military advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to ask Congress for a declaration of war, mobilize the reserves, raise taxes to pay for the war, and control inflation by imposing wage and price controls. Victory in the Vietnam War and the war on poverty was never achieved since government by guile was substituted for traditional honesty.

As the aftermath of this disillusionment, there is still nothing wrong with our economy or our national defense that a miracle couldn't cure.

Sursum corda.

[From *Twin Circle* (National Catholic Weekly) July 18, 1971]

HIGH COURT VALIDATES THIEVERY

(By Dale Francis)

When I saw the Spanish moss hanging from the trees, I thought of Charlie Sample and took a detour off my route to follow the dirt road that leads to the general store at Public Opinion, North Carolina, the place where Charlie holds court on the front stoop.

He was sitting there, leaning back in a chair, his feet on the railing, when I drove up and he didn't move when I came up to him.

"Haven't seen you in a coon's age," Charlie said, motioning to a chair nearby. "You come with questions again I suppose."

"Yep," I said, "just want to get the viewpoint of a Sample of Public Opinion."

He grimaced at the pun, the way he always does. "So what is it you're wondering about now?"

"Well, I was wondering what you think about the Pentagon Papers." He was silent so I spoke up again, "You have heard of the Pentagon Papers, haven't you? How *The New York Times* and the *Washington Post* and all those other papers published them?"

REFORMING PURPOSE

"Oh, sure," he said. "I heard of them. Seems to me they served a great reforming purpose."

I was puzzled. "What do you mean?"

"Well, I remember a few years back when Otto Otepka decided there were some executive papers that a Senate committee should see. So he passed on those papers to the Senate committee and all those newspapers that printed the Pentagon Papers,

they liked to have a conniption, said all sorts of unpleasant things about him."

He took his feet off the rail and sat up straight in his chair and looked at me direct. "Then along comes this man Ellsberg; he doesn't just quietly pass on information to a Senate committee, he passes it out for public distribution, for newspapers to publish, a far more serious thing than Otepka did, and he's a great hero, a patriot. All those newspapers were totally reformed, changed completely."

"Perhaps they thought there was a difference?"

FIT EDITORIAL VIEWS

"Oh, there was, there was. What Otepka did was something that was designed to expose leftist elements. It just didn't fit into the editorial policies of those papers. What Ellsberg passed on to them fit their own editorial aims. That was the difference."

"Are you trying to say all those papers are leftists?"

He shook his head. "No, I'm not trying to say they are all leftists, I'm just saying they are mighty selective and they are able to adapt principles to fit their particular viewpoints."

"But surely there must be freedom of the press."

VALIDATES THIEVERY

He smiles. "Yes, of course, but there's no freedom without responsibility. The way I figure it what is called the free press has done real damage to the freedom of the press. What they done was to validate thievery."

"All this talk, even the Supreme Court decision, has set us up for a situation where any man with access to secret documents and a copying machine is given the right to pass on secrets to any newspaper and that newspaper has the right to print it. That's what has been set up. Any man, any paper, they got the right now."

I argued with him, "But they can be prosecuted if they reveal secrets dangerous to the nation."

He spat over the rail. "A fat lot of good that will do after it is done. No, son, what's been done can bring a heap of trouble."

I shook my head. "You're going against the viewpoint of a lot of important people, Charlie. Most people aren't going to like what you say at all."

He lifted his feet back on the rail, leaned back, smiled over at me, and said, "That just worries me almost plumb out of my mind."

[From the *Washington Star*, July 22, 1971]

JOURNALISTIC FLIP FLOP

SIR: Discussion of the publication by the *New York Times* of the stolen Pentagon papers has paid little attention to the *Times'* sudden flip-flop on the subject of secrecy breaches, real and imaginary.

Remember the *Times'* extensive fulmination at Otto Otepka for revealing to a duly authorized congressional committee three documents needed to nail down some lies told by a superior in an earlier hearing denying lax security practices in the State Department? Providing such information (never mind that it was perfectly legal and moral) was a "dangerous departure," the *Times* proclaimed.

Again, the *Times* agonized at the possibility that a thorough study, finding links between the anti-Vietnam war movement and Hanoi (as well as various pro-Hanoi organizations), might get published despite the Johnson administration's decision to keep it secret, for fear of starting a wave of recriminations ("McCarthyism," you know).

And, of course (to mention only the third of many possible examples), the *Times* was considerably upset about the leak exposing Adlai Stevenson's appeasement-minded attitude during the Cuban missile crisis, calling

it a serious breach of secrecy for some reason, rather than supporting the public's right to know.

But now, suddenly, the Times worries no more about the classification category of stolen documents, obtained from ideologically berserk individuals, who pilfered them. Instead, it prints them enthusiastically.

One might argue that the Times has honestly changed its mind, except that it has not yet retracted what it said about Otepka (for one), not by a long shot! Hence, one cannot help but conclude that it is the ideological lust of the Times' editors rather than their considered judgment, that makes them recklessly ignore the grave consequences to national security in order to rationalize its monomaniacal delusions about our alleged "aggression" in Vietnam. John Kreuttner was right; it's "All the News that Fits the Tint."

TALIVALDIS L. SMITS,
Cheverly, Md.

[From the Richmond News Leader
July 27, 1971]

THE APOTHEOSIS OF ELLSBERG

Contemporary America has a penchant for elevating the lowest sorts of persons to the status of neo-saints—witness what happened, and is happening, to such dismal souls as the Rosenbergs and Angela Davis. And now, in what Newsweek calls "the pilgrimage of Daniel Ellsberg," the nation seems on the verge of making a martyr-hero of a man who purloined government documents and, in consequence, styles himself a patriot.

Daniel Ellsberg has made no pretense of innocence in the affair of the Pentagon Papers. He has admitted publicly that he stole them—or, in the euphemism of Huck Finn, that he borrowed them. He has justified his theft of the documents in the name of higher truth. "I felt as an American citizen, a reasonable citizen," he said, "that I could no longer co-operate in concealing this information from the American people . . . I took it for granted that I would be subject to successful criminal prosecution. . . . Ten years in prison is very cheap if that would contribute to ending this war."

But these days truth is as accommodating as a weathercock. Ellsberg and his apologists demand truth only when truth serves their purposes; they are content with less than the truth when it does not. In the name of truth, for example, they justified the filching of files from the office of the late Senator Thomas Dodd, and from the office of the FBI in Media, Pennsylvania. But they have been selectively—and conveniently—blind to the cause of truth in the case of Otto Otepka, whose only alleged transgression was to exercise his right to tell a Congressional committee what he thought about security practices at the State Department. And they have been curiously quiet in demanding that truth be served by releasing the full report of the Warren Commission.

Ellsberg did not play by the rules, just as the priests, Daniel and Phillip Berrigan, did not: They spilled animal blood on draft papers in Baltimore, and they are charged with conspiring to kidnap Henry Kissinger and to blow up Federal heating systems. For such morally dubious acts, these holy terrorists have been elevated to high plateaus of respectability. And so it probably will be with Daniel Ellsberg. Breaking the law these days has become relatively respectable, relatively safe. Ellsberg seems destined to be regarded by many as a latter-day Robin Hood—one who steals for the public good. Such exoneration is possible in a country in which more and more persons play by the rules less and less.

The French poet and philosopher, Paul Valery, wrote: "Truth is a means. It is not the only one." Daniel Ellsberg has presented himself to the nation as one of truth's dis-

ciples—deliberate, dour, and driven by his own notions of right and wrong. He defends his thieveries with the fervor of a convert tormented by his mistakes. He is a premeditating practitioner of civil disobedience—indeed, of civil disobedience gone mad. Yet many persons would have the nation acquiesce in his convoluted truths as a means to his apotheosis.

The nation should say, No. It should support the government's prosecution of the case against him on charges of illegal possession of secret documents. If Daniel Ellsberg had the "courage" to steal from the government, then the nation must have the courage to put him behind bars. This is not a particularly cozy view. Yet the nation should resist the temptation to tolerate its Daniel Ellsbergs. For the Daniel Ellsbergs—the malicious and the merely mischievous alike—would do this nation in by the salami technique, slice by slice. Such a fate is justified only for nations that would rather eat baloney than grapes. Daniel Ellsberg "took it for granted" that he would be successfully prosecuted. The American people should see that he is.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 2, 1971]

WHAT ABOUT OTEPKA?

CHICAGO.—It is strange that no one has pointed out the curious double standard that has been applied in the case of Daniel Ellsberg. This man is praised for supplying documents [for an admittedly political purpose] secret—stolen documents—to a prime administration critic, the New York Times.

Where were these defenders of the public's right to know when Otto Otepka was fired by the State Department for testifying before a Senate committee?

Liberals in such situations are praised and defended by everybody from the American Civil Liberties Union to Mother Goose. But conservatives are dismissed, because of their political views, as not being members of the human race and as unworthy of anything save editorial denunciations.

DANIEL JOHN SOBIESKI.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 11, 1971]

FOES STALL OTEPKA CONFIRMATION (By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON.—Some quality in Otto F. Otepka—perhaps it is his invincible calm under fire—has always provoked his opponents to extremes.

The former security chief of the State Department was the victim of isolation, surveillance, phone-tapping and perjured evidence during his successful six-year fight [1963-1969] against dismissal on trumped up charges.

He seemed to have won vindication in 1969 when President Nixon nominated him to a short term on the Subversive Activities Control Board and the Senate confirmed the appointment, 61 to 28, in June.

But when that term ended Aug. 9, 1970, and Nixon reappointed Otepka to a full five-year term, his foes began engaging in obstructive tactics which have prevented the Senate, ever since, from recording its will.

Nearly six months ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee, after hearings, recommended Otepka's confirmation. Customarily, such committee indorsements are submitted to the Senate for a vote within a few days.

This one has remained on the Senate calendar and will remain there, according to reliable report, perhaps not to be acted upon before the November, 1972, elections when, Otepka's antagonists hope, a successor to Nixon will be elected.

Dilatory maneuvers are not new to the Senate and sometimes command approval, but this one, under scrutiny, lacks a practical purpose since it does not prevent Otepka from continuing to serve. The law insures his tenure until a successor is provided.

The delay, thus, is regarded by many in the Senate as a petty and spiteful exercise. It merely serves to keep in a kind of legalized limbo an official who made powerful enemies during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations who are still in the State Department under the Nixon administration.

Sen. Mike Mansfield [D., Mont.], the majority leader and technically responsible for entombment of the Otepka nomination, is evasive when asked for the identity of senators responsible for denying the Senate a vote on it. One of those under suspicion is Sen. Edward M. Kennedy [D., Mass.], his brother, Robert, the late attorney general, was one of the first to tangle with Otepka over security procedures eight years ago.

Altho the anti-Otepka campaign began more than a year ago, his opponents are now privately advancing a new excuse for delaying a Senate vote. They compare the Otepka case to that of Daniel Ellsberg who announced that he gave classified documents [the Pentagon Papers] to newspapers and who is now under indictment for this act.

Unless and until Ellsberg is cleared, a small group of senators is reported arguing, no Senate vote on Otepka should be permitted.

What are the facts in this Ellsberg-Otepka analogy?

Ellsberg, by his own account, leaked to the press an estimated 7,000 pages of classified information. It was published without government knowledge or approval. A grand jury labeled this act "conversion to private use of government documents."

Otepka, called upon the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to provide evidence in answer to sworn testimony disparaging his character, supplied two confidential papers, eight pages in length, to prove the testimony was false. These papers, entrusted to recipients officially qualified to receive them, were examined in closed session. They were not publicized.

Otepka, by the State Department's own testimony, never violated security. The courts will eventually determine if Ellsberg did.

Meanwhile, on the basis of claimed similarities between the two cases, the Senate is being deprived of the right to vote its judgment on a Presidential nominee recommended for approval by one of its own committees.

STATEMENT OF CLARK MOLLENHOFF BEFORE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. MOLLENHOFF. Now, the case of Otto Otepka, who is a former State Department evaluator, is one for special mention here with the New York Times decision to print this top secret sensitive document.

The Times was highly critical of Otepka a few years ago for delivering three confidential documents, administratively confidential that he had classified himself, to a Senate committee to prove he was telling the truth. The pointed issue here—the Times found dangerous departure from normal procedure in Otepka's delivery of the documents to a Senate Staff lawyer who had been cleared for security.

Otepka didn't make the papers public. His only deviation from proper procedure is that he did not clear the delivery of the three documents with the man he was proving to be a liar.

Now, what is there is harsh, but it's all proven now. There are circumstances for the three documents—we can discuss them now—we couldn't at the time. One of the three documents was a memorandum that proved that Otepka had told his superior what he told his superior, and it had been initiated by the superior.

The second was a memorandum his superior had written to another person signed by the superior, and the third was simply typical handling of a personnel file

with no derogatory information. There was no real problem of security involved in any one of these documents, and all he was doing was proving he was telling the truth, his superior lied. Who was his superior? John F. Riley, who is now down with the Federal Communications Commission.

They had to get rid of him at the State Department, but they moved him over to the Federal Communications Commission.

Now, you might say on that point, that is probably a good place for him, because he took part in illegal eavesdropping and wiretapping against Otepka and others at the State Department. This was proven. This was admitted.

Initially he lied under oath. He denied that he had anything to do with this, or knew anything about it. A few months later, then he said, oh, yes, oh, I just forgot. We did listen in on that wire, but we didn't get anything but static, so I thought it was all right to deny.

Then, a little later, it comes out that there were at least a dozen recordings made on that line. Each of these is a fallback position on a lie. He is over at the Federal Communications Commission now, and I would think probably this committee might want to call him up and start to find out all about how this whole thing came about back there in 1963, 1964, and 1965. This is the man who brought the charges against Otepka, for having delivered the three documents to a committee that was authorized to receive them.

This has never really been explored properly in the press. I blame the press as well as the Congress for the fact that these conditions have been permitted to arise.

Now, the State Department has been sending out false information, even recently, to persons who have written asking them about the Otepka case, and has given the impression that he was fired as a security violator.

Otepka was appointed to the Subversive Activities Control Board, a \$36,000-a-year job, by President Nixon. However, the Secretary of State continues to permit his name to be signed to letters indicating a security violation. It does not make much sense to me.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.
BEFORE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND
GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Question 18. "Another well-publicized case mentioned by Mr. Mollenhoff is that of Otto Otepka, a former State Department employee. Would you comment on his charge that Secretary Rogers is still signing letters in response to inquiries that present an alleged erroneous account of the Otepka case?"

Answer. Earlier this year it was brought to our attention that certain questions were being raised regarding the Department's standard answer to inquiries relating to Mr. Otepka. Upon review we determined that although our answer was accurate it was excessively long and detailed and modification was in order. Appropriate changes were made in late February and the Department's proposed response to any inquiries on this subject would be a brief factual statement (copy attached) of the procedural steps taken in this case. We do not believe there is any question about the accuracy of this statement. Since this revised statement was prepared, however, the Department has not had occasion to respond to a single inquiry on this subject.

In 1963 Mr. Otepka was charged with violation of a 1948 Presidential order which requires that "Reports, records, and files relative to the (employee loyalty) program be preserved in strict confidence." The Department found that Mr. Otepka delivered copies of classified memorandum and an investigative report to a person outside the Department (Chief Counsel of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee) without authority, in violation of the Presidential order, and

ordered his dismissal. The decision was later changed after review by the then Secretary of State in favor of reduction in grade, reprimand, and transfer to other duties. This adverse finding was appealed initially to the Civil Service Commission's Appeals Examining Office, and subsequently to its Board of Appeals and Review, which upheld the Department's action on September 25, 1968.

Mr. Otepka indicated his intention to pursue the matter further in the Federal Court, and the Department expressed its willingness to facilitate court consideration by extending additional leave to Mr. Otepka to prepare for it, by assuming the cost of reproducing the record of the administrative proceedings in the case, and by considering further his status pending completion of court action.

In March 1969, Mr. Otepka was nominated by the President to serve as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, and on June 24, 1969, the nomination was confirmed by the Senate. He took the oath of office for his new position on June 30, and his employment by the Department of State was terminated as of the previous day.

A PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE
CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the veto of S. 2007, the Economic Opportunities Amendments of 1971. This veto, if allowed to stand, will not only threaten the continued existence of the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity, but will thwart the desires of millions of people across the country for quality child development programs for their children.

The child development program which would be established by S. 2007, has as its objectives the provision of a full range of health, education, and social services essential to the achievement of the full potential of the Nation's children.

The program would build upon the demonstrated success of the Headstart program. It would give priority to the provision of services to those groups most in need of them. Special emphasis would be placed on preschool programs for economically disadvantaged children and for children of working mothers and single parent families. This latter point is most important since one of the major hurdles facing the poor family is how to care for children while both parents, or in many cases, the only adult in the household, seek full-time employment.

In addition, the program would provide services for the steadily-increasing number of children whose mothers choose to continue to work. In these cases, however, fees would be charged to all but low-income families.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I have strongly supported Federal funding for children's day-care centers which would give supportive services but not compulsory service.

There is a need for these centers to give quality care in quality facilities to

the children while giving peace of mind to the working parent.

President Nixon in 1969 pledged "a national commitment to provide all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first 5 years of life." I am shocked that President Nixon does not match his eloquency with action.

There has been opposition to this bill because of deliberate misrepresentations of what the child care provisions of this bill really are.

There is nothing in the conference report that would require compulsory preschool education for all children—there is neither compulsion or Government control of children. The rights of parents have been absolutely protected. For example, the conference report reads that:

1. Comprehensive child development programs "should be available to children whose parents or legal guardians shall request them..." (Sec. 501)

2. "... that decisions on the nature and funding of such programs be made at the community level with the full involvement of parents..." (Sec. 501)

3. References to "universally available" child care were specifically deleted from the bill.

4. All child development councils and project policy councils shall be constituted so that "not less than one-half of the members of such council shall be parents of children served in child development programs under this part..." (Sec. 514) (Sec. 516)

5. Financial assistance for programs and services may be provided "only for children whose parents or legal guardians have requested them..." (Sec. 515)

6. Part E of title V provides for research and demonstration projects. In order to protect the children from unwanted research being done with them the conference report specifically provides that any parent or guardian must be informed if any research is contemplated and may, as a matter of absolute right, insist that his child not participate in it. (Sec. 580)

7. Finally, in recognition of parental responsibility for children, the conference report states that "nothing in this title shall be construed or applied in such a manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional or physical development of their children. Nor shall any section of this title be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law, or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law. (Sec. 581)

I find this veto even more surprising in view of the wide-spread support that has been given to this proposal. Since this type of program was proposed in the House in August of 1969, numerous witnesses have appeared before House and Senate committees to testify to the need for a comprehensive approach to child development.

The 1970 White House Conference on Children considered this area and the delegates voted as their top national priority the provision of comprehensive family-oriented child development programs, including health services, day care, and early childhood education.

One of the major reasons given in opposition to this bill is the lack of a significant role for the State in its administration. Traditionally, States have not been significantly involved in the child

development field and most of what the Federal Government did, at least until recently, grew out of a direct Federal-local relationship, particularly through the Headstart program.

Aside from this, though, the bill does require State involvement at every stage: creation of prime sponsors, formation of comprehensive child development plans and project operation. Up to 5 percent of operating funds will be available to States to carry out their functions.

It is hard to support an argument that the States have been overlooked when the statement of findings and purpose expresses Congress' intent that the planning and operation of child development programs be a partnership of parents, community, and State and local government with appropriate assistance from the Federal Government.

To give more muscle to the State's role, the legislation gives the Governor a minimum of 30 days in which to review applications from other organizations that wish to be designated as a prime sponsor, to offer his recommendations to the applicant and to submit his comments on the application to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The State which fails to extend its influence on programs undertaken within its boundaries will do so because of its own lack of interest and not through any failing in the legislation.

I do feel, however, that the emphasis given to the local community and to parent participation is most important. The community-based decisionmaking offers an opportunity for the deep involvement of communities, families, and individuals with each other and their children's destinies.

The legislation, therefore, assures that the programs will be accessible and responsive to the concerns of parents, and will avoid the danger of remote governmental control.

Cost also has been pointed to as a reason to oppose this program. However, in view of the great need and the fact that the program would build up gradually over the next 2 years as the capability to implement it is developed, I feel that this argument loses its importance. Moreover, the bill meets the administration's request that free services be provided only to children in families having an income below the family assistance eligibility cutoff of \$4,320 for a family of four. We must be willing to pay the reasonable costs of providing for the needs of our children for after all, they are the future of our country.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I urge that this House take prompt action to override this veto and provide a much-needed program of comprehensive child development for the children of our land.

CHRIS CHRISTENSON

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to join with other Members of

the House of Representatives in expressing genuine regret that Chris Christenson is retiring from his work in the House coincident with sine die adjournment of this first session of the 92d Congress.

Through the years that Chris has been an employee of the House, none has served more capably or with greater dedication. His presence will be missed by all.

Not only has Chris been unfailing in his work, but he is a true gentleman. It has been my pleasure when the House was not in session, to go fishing with him and I can say that never have I had a finer fishing companion.

And so, Chris, as you embark upon retirement may you and Mrs. Christenson have many years of good health, and may you have many days of good fishing on the Rappahannock River or in any other water where your rod and reel indicate the elusive members of the finny tribe may be found.

U.N. CHARTER REVIEW RESOLUTIONS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the renewed interest in the United Nations and its charter, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to U.N. Charter review resolutions sent to me by Mr. Walter Hoffmann, president, New Jersey branch, World Federalists, U.S.A.

The resolutions were developed by the Committee on United Nations Charter Review of the World Peace Through Law Center. Mr. Hoffmann served on the committee which met in March 1971 to prepare these resolutions for the Belgrade — Yugoslavia — World Peace Through Law Conference July 21-25, 1971, which I had the privilege to attend.

With regard to charter review, excerpts of the committee's resolutions follow:

EXCERPTS OF THE RESOLUTION

I

Outlawing of War: . . . the preamble of the United Nations Charter be amended to provide specifically that war is no longer tolerable or permissible as a means of settling international disputes.

II

Membership in the United Nations: . . . the United Nations Charter be amended to provide:

1. Every state, by virtue of its existence, shall be a member of the United Nations. No member shall have the right to withdraw from the United Nations, nor shall any member be expelled from the United Nations.

2. In the event of a question or dispute arising as to whether an entity is a state, or as to the persons entitled to represent that state, the question or dispute, at the instance of the United Nations or any member, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice which shall decide the matter.

III

Voting procedures in the General Assembly and Security Council: . . . the United Nations Charter be amended to provide for

a revised system of voting in the General Assembly whereby the voting power exercised by various members will better reflect significant aspects of the world situation. Such a revised voting system might retain the existing "one nation-one vote" formula, reflecting the principle of sovereignty and sovereign equality of states, with respect to certain types of decisions, while adopting a form of weighted voting or proportional representation, based on the facts of relative population, wealth, or other potentially relevant factors, as to other types of decisions. Consideration should also be given to . . . direct popular election of at least some United Nations delegates.

. . . serious consideration be given to . . . abolish (ing) the "veto power" of the permanent members of the Security Council.

IV

United Nations Revenue System: . . . supplement the present system of financing the United Nations through assessments and voluntary contributions of members as set forth in Article 17 of the Charter; that this be done under a system of financing which will give the United Nations adequate powers, subject to proper safeguards, to raise, both through collaborative arrangements with member nations and through independent and direct sources, such as revenues related to exploitation of the resources of the sea and other sources, sufficient and reliable revenues to assure the fulfillment of its responsibilities.

V

International Courts: . . . urges all members to take appropriate measures, through amendment of the United Nations Charter, by other multilateral conventions, or by other means, to strengthen the role of the International Court of Justice and other international judicial tribunals by providing, inter alia, that:

1. The International Court of Justice shall have compulsory jurisdiction to decide any question or dispute involving international law, including matters arising under the United Nations Charter or involving the interpretation or application of any treaty. Any issue as to whether a particular question or dispute involves international law shall be decided by the International Court.

2. The United Nations, and any other public international organization, shall have the right to bring an action involving a question of international law in the International Court of Justice, or in other international judicial tribunals, against any state, or, where appropriate, against any person.

3. A person shall have the right to bring an action involving a question of international law in the International Court of Justice, or in other international judicial tribunals, against any state.

4. The International Court of Justice, or some other international judicial tribunal, shall be vested with jurisdiction over international crimes, including those specified under the Nuremberg principles.

5. The international judicial system should be expanded through provision for regional courts, international trade courts, and a system of international appellate jurisdiction culminating in the International Court of Justice.

6. Every state shall be obligated to comply with the decisions of the International Court of Justice and any other international judicial tribunal of final resort. All states shall likewise comply with decisions of regional international courts unless such decisions are enjoined pending an appeal to the International Court of Justice. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by such court, the other party shall have recourse to such United Nations organs or agency as shall be empowered to take measures necessary to ensure compliance with such judgment.

VI

International arbitration: . . . Article 33 of the United Nations Charter be amended by adding the following additional paragraphs:

"3. If the dispute is not resolved under paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article by other specific means of settlement, any party to the dispute may request that the matter be settled by arbitration.

"4. The party requesting arbitration shall notify the Secretary-General of such request. Thereupon the Secretary-General shall notify the other party of such request; such notice shall state that a request for arbitration has been made, and that the other party should respond by agreeing to arbitrate or to submit the dispute to the International Court of Justice. The other party must respond to such notice and make its selection of a panel member within sixty (60) days after receiving the notice.

"5. If arbitration is selected as in paragraph 4 above, the Secretary-General shall submit the dispute to a Board of Arbitration composed of three (3) qualified members. Each party to the dispute shall appoint a member to represent it on the panel. The Chairman of the panel, who shall not be a national of either party, shall be selected by mutual agreement of the arbitrators selected by the parties. If the arbitrators selected by the parties shall fail within sixty (60) days to select a Chairman, the Secretary-General shall appoint the Chairman. The decision of a majority of the panel shall be binding on the parties.

VII

International Human Rights: . . . the United Nations and all states take prompt action, through amendment of the Charter and otherwise, to strengthen the international protection given human rights and fundamental freedoms, and that such action include, *inter alia*, the following:

1. Article 7 of the United Nations Charter should be amended, with such other amendments as may be appropriate, to establish, as new organs of the United Nations, a Human Rights Council, an independent High Commissioner for Human Rights, and a Human Rights Commission made up of independent experts.

2. A Universal Court of Human Rights should be established . . . steps should be taken to strengthen the competence, powers, and procedures of existing international judicial tribunals and specialized international human rights machinery so as to permit the widest possible access to international forums for the vindication of human rights.

3. The right and remedy of World Habeas Corpus should be made available to all persons throughout the world either by amendment of the United Nations Charter or through conclusion of an independent multilateral convention, with provisions for implementing the right through appropriate international judicial machinery.

4. Every person should have the right to bring an action in such Universal Court of Human Rights, regional human rights tribunals, or other international tribunals against his own state for violations of fundamental human rights and freedoms, as well as other violations of international law. However, it is understood that any person seeking relief before an international tribunal on such grounds shall normally first have exhausted his available local remedies, provided that such local remedies are prompt, adequate and effective.

5. The United Nations Charter should be amended to provide expressly that the United Nations is itself prohibited from interfering in any way with human rights and fundamental freedoms.

VIII

Disarmament and an International Police Force: . . . governments and international organizations . . . take appropriate action to ensure that, parallel with the process of Charter revision and the establishment of procedures for the settlement of international disputes, the international community adopts and implements a process of general, complete and enforceable disarmament under United Nations supervision, inspection and control.

IX

Aid to Developing Nations: . . . all states and international organizations . . . take appropriate action (through Charter amendment or otherwise) to establish a World Development Authority. The World Development Authority should be adequately financed (with not less than two (2) percent of the aggregate Gross National Product of all member nations) and empowered to make grants-in-aid and loans for the furtherance of projects which will create conditions of stability and well-being, as envisaged by Article 55 of the Charter . . . emphasis be placed in the future on programs under which economic assistance is extended within a multilateral framework rather than through unilateral grants-in-aid and loans by individual nations.

X

Environmental Protection: . . . the United Nations Charter be amended to provide that all human beings share a right to a decent and ecologically balanced environment, and . . . the United Nations and all member nations take appropriate action to establish, under Article 68 of the Charter, a Commission on the World Environment. This Commission shall have responsibility for making appropriate studies of the global environment, for setting international standards as appear necessary to protect this environment, including particularly the purity of the air and waters of the world, and for bringing appropriate sanctions to bear against any state which fails to comply with such standards or to control the poisons which its citizens inject into the atmosphere and oceans upon which mankind depend for life.

XI

ECOSOC and the Specialized Agencies: . . . urges that the United Nations and its member states consider actions (through Charter amendment or otherwise), designed to facilitate coordination of the activities of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, its various subordinate organs, and the various Specialized Agencies and to make their collective operations more effective, and . . . consider measure . . . designed to broaden and enlarge the right of the various accredited international nongovernmental agencies to participate in a nonvoting capacity in the work of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, its several subordinate organs, and the various Specialized Agencies, including the right to present observations and proposals with respect to issues before these bodies.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

PROSPERITY FOR EVERY AMERICAN

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that the following letter, which I received from a constituent, Mr. William C. Gaines, of Louisville, Ky., be inserted in the RECORD.

I would like to point out that Mr. Gaines has concerned himself with a problem that we face, in one form or another, each and every day here in the Congress. His approach is a fresh one and one well deserving of our attention.

The letter, in which Mr. Gaines discusses his plan for "Prosperity for Every American," follows:

Dear Congressman Mazzoli: People want out of poverty right now, and the Nation needs and wants a solution *right now*. That is why I have written you this letter—to attract more immediate and widespread attention to the availability of a solution.

The subject of this letter is the problem of poverty and a proposed solution.

There is a saying: "If you give a man a fish, you feed him for a day. If you teach him to fish, you feed him for life."

It can be inferred that "Teach him to fish" includes improvement in functioning in all areas of the student's life which lead to self-support. If we could teach all the people who now live in poverty to "fish"—in that complete sense—we would advance toward solution, but to accomplish that much teaching on a nation-wide scale would require more taxes. Also, with direct tax-supported teaching/training, one suspects that it is impractical to guarantee completely efficient results.

Yet, people are thinking that solutions can and should be found to problems even those previously thought to be unsolvable.

People say, "If we can go to the moon why don't we . . . ?"

It has been said that if there is cash profit in doing a thing, that thing always gets done. Dangerous, financially risky, enormous in scope, opposed, called impossible by all "experts"—no matter, it gets done. Profit, what a power!

The following proposed solution to the problem of poverty applies that power directly.

The nitty gritty is:

How do we make it profitable for companies to eliminate poverty? and how can this be done by lowering taxes? and how can the Congress guarantee results?

Picture this scene:

Board of directors meeting, U.S. Steel Corporation.

SECRETARY. "The vote is unanimous. (Reading:) It is resolved that this corporation will choose one man who is now living in poverty and offer to him assistance in all areas of his life necessary to:

Develop his untapped potential into a bright future of satisfying employment, earned income and a good life as defined by him,

Educate/train him; which shall include the essential teaching of success-creating habits, and, if he accepts, will assign a team of managers, nutritionists, motivation specialists, etc. to the chosen man to achieve these resolutions—with sufficient funds allocated, and continue to provide assistance in any necessary area of his life, when requested by him, for the remainder of his entire career."

What on earth could cause such a vote at U.S. Steel? For a reasonable number of people living in poverty, they would do it altruistically. However, to make such an extensive commitment to much larger numbers of people, any company would require a reasonable probability of extensive profitable income.

Where and how will the money be raised? Remember, this solution lowers taxes. The money will come from the future earnings of the chosen people or, more precisely, from the taxes thereafter paid by the chosen people.

In the above case, U.S. Steel will receive 100% of the federal income taxes thereafter paid by the chosen man.

(All other taxpayers will save the tax cost of welfare payments, and other poverty-related costs.)

Such receipt can be arranged to be simple and nearly costless (to the taxpayer) to administrate. The chosen man will pay his taxes directly to U.S. Steel by normal procedures such as paycheck deductions where he works. A sufficient percentage of receipts will be forwarded by U.S. Steel to an Internal Revenue Service account for use by IRS only in making tax refunds for overpayment. The Federal Government will insure adequacy of this account.

Above, you have read of effectiveness with profit lower taxes guarantee.

Furthermore, all rights of the chosen people must be protected against the potential that U.S. Steel and other "sponsors" could become "1984" style "big brothers". This is covered by "Title IV" of the following sketch of the proposed

Act of Congress:

I. QUALIFICATIONS AND FEES

Any qualified legal entity which sponsors a person (who qualified as being chronically unemployed and who willingly agrees to be sponsored by that entity) and thereby assists that person to change from a tax burden to a tax payer shall receive (as payment for the services thereby rendered to said person and to the Nation) a fee equal to 100% of the federal income taxes thereafter paid by said person.

II. ADMINISTRATION

The federal government organization known as _____ (Note: Suggest that a bureaucracy be selected which will experience a gradual reduction in welfare administration workload as this solution gradually removes people from the rolls) shall determine which individuals are qualified for said sponsorship because of their status; shall assist persons who request help in evaluating offers of sponsorship; and shall administrate the operation of this act in the interests of the sponsored persons, the sponsors, and the public—according to guidelines of Title V.

III. TAX PAYMENTS

Persons so sponsored shall file tax returns and pay all federal income taxes according to the laws, schedules and regulations governing such payments but shall make said payments directly to their respective sponsors. Any entity employing a sponsored person shall not discriminate against him by reason of his being so sponsored nor by reason of his making said payments, and shall withhold federal income taxes from his salary and wages and remit said taxes in the

normal manner but directly to the sponsoring entity. A percentage (determined by IRS) of all said payments shall be deposited by the sponsor in an account set up by IRS for use by IRS only for making tax refunds.

IV. PERSONAL RIGHTS PROTECTION

All rights of all persons so sponsored shall be protected against potential abridgement by sponsors. In the event of a law-suit by a sponsored person against his sponsor, or an entity attempting to become his sponsor, regarding matters covered by this act, and in the event that judgment comes down against said sponsor or attempting sponsor, said sponsor or attempting sponsor shall pay all of the sponsored person's (a) damages as determined by the courts, and (b) all reasonable legal fees, court costs, and all other costs—such as travel, parking, lost wages, etc.—reasonably required pursuant to the case. After all court actions have been taken, sponsor or his lawyer shall submit to the court in which the case was originally filed, an itemized list of said costs. Said court will determine the amount to be paid, and said amount shall be paid within ten calendar days after said determination, appeals of said determination notwithstanding. No sponsor shall assist or influence, directly or indirectly, any sponsored person in determining the amount of any of his taxes, or filling out or filing his tax return. Violation of this prohibition shall subject sponsor to triple damages.

A PART OF AMERICA DIED

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the policemen of our Nation are entrusted with a difficult task of keeping peace at a time of great internal conflict. We call upon them to put their lives on the line in defending every citizen from the criminal elements in our society.

Eddie Arnold recently recorded a tribute to the Men in Blue on the RCA label, which I believe deserves the attention of my colleagues. For their benefit I am including the lyrics of this record in the RECORD at this point:

A PART OF AMERICA . . . DIED

Somebody killed a policeman today
And a part of America died.
A piece of our country he swore to protect
Will be buried with him at his side.
The suspect who shot him will stand up in
court
With counsel demanding his rights,
While a young widowed mother must work
for her kids
And spend many, long, lonely nights.
The beat that he walked was a battlefield
too,
Just as if he'd gone off to war,
Though the flag of our nation won't fly at
half mast.
To his name they will add a gold star.

Yes, somebody killed a policeman today,
Maybe in your town or mine;
While we slept in comfort behind our locked
doors,
The cop put his life on the line.
Now his ghost walks the beat
On a dark city street
And he stands at each new rookie's side;
He answered the call, of himself, gave his all,
And a part of America died.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S VETO OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UNDERMINES AMERICAN FAMILY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I find it more and more incredible that President Nixon should have vetoed on December 9, 1971, the bill S. 2007, an act to provide for the continuation of programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act. I find it particularly unbelievable to read that the President has stated that the proposed child development program contains "family weakening implications" and that it is the "most radical piece of legislation to emerge from the 92d Congress."

We can only hope that the President in due course will reverse himself as he did after his veto of the Employment and Manpower Act just about a year ago. This act was designed to provide public service employment for the jobless. The President's message vetoing that particular bill made it perfectly clear that he had not read and did not understand the legislation he was rejecting. It was only 7 months later that he signed the Emergency Employment Act which provided public service employment in a manner almost identical to that in the bill which the President had vetoed a few months earlier.

The veto message of President Nixon with regard to the child development program contained in the bill extending the Economic Opportunity Act indicates that he and his advisers understood little if anything of the testimony given by 166 witnesses during the period 1969-71 to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

President Nixon states that the child development program would put the "National Government on the side of communal approaches to child rearing; over against the family centered approach." The President goes on to state that there is a "respectable school of opinion that this legislation would lead toward altering the family relationship." The President did not state a single person or a single argument from that alleged "respectable school of opinion" from which he presumably learned that certain provisions of this bill had "family weakening implications."

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat as emphatically as I can that there is nothing—absolutely nothing—in S. 2007 that would weaken the family relationship. There is nothing in this bill that would lead to communal ways of child rearing.

I feel that I can speak on this subject with authority since I am a former chairman of the Section of Family Law of the American Bar Association and a chairman of the section of family law Quarterly published by the American Bar Association. In addition, I have been a professor of family law for a decade and the chairman of the Family Law Committee of the Massachusetts Bar As-

sociation as well as the chairman of the Committee on Family Law of the Association of American Law Schools.

As a person who has taught, lectured, and written in the area of family law for more than 10 years, I find it frightening, incredible, and indeed appalling that the President of the United States would state that this bill, endorsed by the National Council of Churches and the United States Catholic Conference, would "lead toward altering the family relationship."

In February 1969, President Nixon told Congress that—

So critical is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life.

On August 11, 1969, President Nixon, in proposing his welfare reform bill, stated:

The child care I propose is more than custodial. This administration is committed to a new emphasis on child development in the first five years of life.

It is indeed unbelievable that the President who is the author of these two statements could state in his veto message of December 9 that—

Neither the immediate needs nor the desirability of a national child development program of this character has been demonstrated.

President Nixon's veto message is filled with contradictions of his previous promises and commitments. His veto message is, furthermore, replete with contradictions implicit in the nine reasons offered for his rejection of the child development plan.

The assertion by the President that H.R. 1 will meet the day care needs of the children of this Nation is simply false. Under the President's welfare plan day care and custodial care will be available only to the recipients of welfare. Consequently the family of four which earns more than \$4,300 would, in virtually all cases, be ineligible for day care assistance under H.R. 1.

The bill which President Nixon vetoed was designed to offer a tremendous opportunity to the children in the 5.5 million households headed by women who must work. The bill vetoed by the President was designed to provide adequate child care facilities to meet the needs of the 6 million children of preschool age in this country for whom only 700,000 positions are available in licensed child care centers.

The veto of the President is an affront to the Child Welfare League of America, the National Education Association, the Academy of American Pediatrics, the League of Women Voters, the National Council of Churches, and the United States Catholic Conference—responsible and intelligent national groups—all of whom endorsed the child care provisions of S. 2007. It is surely an affront of monumental and unprecedented proportions for the President of the United States to tell the members of all of these groups that they have endorsed a bill which goes contrary to "good public policy" which "requires that we enhance

rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed and religious and moral principles are first inculcated."

It is, moreover, more than an affront for the President of the United States to tell the 63 Senators and 210 Congressmen who voted for the conference report on S. 2007 that they have supported a bill which "would commit the vast moral authority of the National Government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family centered approach."

The absurd allegations of the President constitute, of course, a rebuke to the Republican leaders of the Senate who voted for this bill. Senator HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania, Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN of Michigan, and the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Senator ROBERT DOLE of Kansas, all voted for the child development bill. Now these leaders are told by the President that title V, "Child Development Programs," is "certainly laudable" but that is "overshadowed by the fiscal irresponsibility, administrative unworkability, and family-weakening implications of the system it envisions."

Apparently Senators SCOTT, GRIFFIN, and DOLE understood the President better than I did since on December 10, 1971, they all voted to sustain his veto.

Mr. Speaker, I think it fair to conclude from the veto message of President Nixon that he is endorsing the principle of requiring poor people to put their children in day care centers while he is against permitting middle-class people to do so.

The incredible veto of President Nixon, in the name of family solidarity, is in itself the most lethal blow against that family solidarity which the child development program was designed to foster.

Mr. Speaker, the League of Women Voters of the United States stated in their endorsement of S. 2007 on November 30, 1971, that—

The League believes that it is absolutely essential for this Nation to provide comprehensive care for children. Every year of delay is a year's opportunity denied to millions of children.

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to state that President Nixon's veto has denied countless opportunities for medical, educational, and social enrichment to millions of children.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD editorials denouncing the President's veto of day care from the New York Times of December 11, 1971, and the Washington Post of December 12, 1971:

[From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1971]

ABANDONED COMMITMENT

President Nixon explained his veto of the child development program by calling this plan too costly, administratively unworkable, professionally ill-prepared and designed to undermine the American family. The sweeping nature of this attack cannot obscure the fact that the concept of child care and development enjoys broad popular support across most of the traditional divisions of politics, class, economics and race.

The arguments put forth in the veto message are not convincing. Initial costs would

not have been high. By limiting free services to the welfare level of poverty, Congress had already responded to the Administration's budgetary objections. Contributory fees could have readily been revised later, when operations would have provided a clearer picture of the extent of voluntary participation.

The President's vague reference to an unworkable bureaucracy reflects the Administration's apparent preference for control and management by the states, hardly the best administrative level for action that must be geared to local communities and neighborhoods. Participation by a wide variety of public and non-profit private agencies was one of the attractive features of the plan.

The President's charge that day care weakens the family ignores the realities of much of modern family life. Poor and working-class families normally have to leave their children improperly supervised or entirely unattended for much of the day; families at virtually all other income levels rely heavily on baby-sitters and, in the upper brackets, a variety of domestic help.

Mr. Nixon is justified in his concern over the lack of trained personnel, but much of the bill's first-year expenditure was to be devoted to the necessary training. The veto suggests that the President's concept of child care is limited to welfare cases and is only custodial at that. This approach reduces the chances that disadvantaged children will be lifted out of their debilitating environment at an early age.

In his message, Mr. Nixon observed that the proposal "points far beyond what the Administration envisioned" when it made its earlier commitment of providing healthful and stimulating development for all American children during the first five years of life. But in the absence of a positive program, his veto has reduced that supposed commitment to mere political rhetoric.

BIG STRAW IN A MILD WIND

Senator Muskie's still undeclared Presidential candidacy got one of those lifts this week that are as important for what they say about a man's prospects as they are for any actual benefits they may bring him. The man from Maine has won the endorsement of Senator John V. Tunney of California—a freshman Senator but a power in his state's Democratic party. California will have 271 delegates, the second-largest bloc at the Miami Beach convention—and they will be chosen in a winner-take-all primary.

What gives the Tunney endorsement a special flavor is the fact that he is close to Senator Edward M. Kennedy. The prevailing view among political theorists has been that Mr. Kennedy—or at least his ardent supporters—want nothing so much as a dead heat between Mr. Muskie, the front-runner, and Senator Humphrey of Minnesota—a development made to order for a draft of the Senator from Massachusetts. But that script could hardly be squared with the pronouncement from Mr. Tunney.

What might possibly be squared with such a pronouncement is a belief that Senator Muskie is still clearly in the lead and is not likely to be headed off. If the party's potential angels in California are typical of their kind, they are reluctant to waste their gifts in a free-for-all primary, only to be called on for heavier contributions in the November elections. Better to settle in advance on the likeliest candidate if that is at all possible. Senator Tunney's move is probably a reflection of just that strategy.

Viewed in this light, the California development, which also includes the commitment to Mr. Muskie of Robert Moretti, powerful Speaker of the California Assembly, may be read as an authoritative gauge of the direction the political winds are blowing. It is a better gauge, on the whole, than opinion polls, which sometimes allow as much for whim as for wind.

AND HUMBLE OF THE RIGHT

New York's Conservative party, disturbed by what it believes to be President Nixon's leftward drift, is at least tentatively withholding its support for his re-election. Its executive committee's announcement to this effect follows preliminary action by an elite band of conservative chieftains, already known as the "Manhattan 12."

Eying the Democrats' script of 1968 as a possible guide to action, the right-wingers would play McCarthyite rebels to the President's Lyndon Johnson. And they would use the New Hampshire primary to fire their opening volley.

No doubt Mr. Nixon, as candidate for re-election, is eager to conciliate this segment of his normal following; the language of his veto message on the child development program (see above) suggests something of that concern. But it would be surprising if he were genuinely alarmed by the rebellion. The differences between the situation of the Democrats in 1968 and that of the Republicans today are greater than the resemblances.

First, the Democratic rebels of four years ago did not find shopping for a candidate quite so difficult, even allowing for Senator Eugene McCarthy's indecisiveness in the early stages of the game. Nor did they have the least qualm about characterizing their activity as a "Dump Johnson" movement.

This year's mutinous conservatives appear to have fixed their sights on Representative John M. Ashbrook of Ohio, whose chief claim to their regard is that he has opposed the Nixon Administration's foreign policy moves more than 80 per cent of the time. Putting off a decision until next week, Mr. Ashbrook reports himself "leaning a little more against" the idea than for it.

Even less likely to fire up the Republican masses of New Hampshire than the ambivalence of the invited leaders is that some of the conservatives' own top figures, Senator James L. Buckley will have nothing to do with the movement to back another candidate. His brother William, one of the party's founders, was likewise opposed to it when it was launched. Mr. Ashbrook candidly divides his fellow-conservatives between "those who want to get the President's attention and those who want to beat him"—and includes himself among the former.

This is hardly the stuff to promise a brawling convention at San Diego next summer. It would be surprising, in fact, if it even proved enough to stir up the voters of New Hampshire.

THE STRANGE CASE OF EDGAR SMITH

The legal odyssey of Edgar H. Smith Jr., who was released from prison after 14 years in death row for the murder of a 15-year-old girl in 1957, has left a trail of unanswered questions about the processes of justice. Paradoxically, Smith was convicted when he protested his innocence and freed when he admitted his guilt. He had gained national fame from a book written in prison as an exposé of alleged injustice.

Smith's release was the result of a judicial deal. The choice left to him was either to confess guilt in return for a prison sentence limited to the time already served, or stand a new trial. Judicial trades, through the device of letting the accused "cop" a plea in return for clemency, is a common legal maneuver for forshorten the complex trial process, particularly when it leads to exposure of more serious crimes at the price of forgiving lesser ones.

But in the Smith case the only plausible explanation is that the judge, having been ordered by a Federal court to bring the case to a conclusion, felt that Smith would not be convicted of first-degree murder in any new trial. For a crime of either passion or panic, as this one perhaps was, the penalty

might not have exceeded the time already served. These may have been among the considerations that led Smith to choose the course that would avoid another lengthy and costly trial.

Despite these rationalizations, the judicial process emerges trashed. The initial flaw was reliance on a confession, subsequently renounced and invalidated because it had been obtained through illegal police interrogation. Although there may well have been sufficient evidence to convict for second-degree manslaughter, the prosecution triggered years of inconclusive legal battles in the effort to obtain the death penalty.

In the aftermath of Smith's release, further ambiguities cast a shadow of doubt once again over the case. Rushed from prison to television studio, Smith was encouraged to go half-way toward repudiating his latest confession, thus exposing himself to possible perjury charges.

In the face of so many contradictions, justice would have been better served not by grandstanding appeals to public emotion but by evidence accepted or rejected in court. Now, until and unless Mr. Smith explains in detail what happened 14 years ago, if he can, the mystery is only deepened and new suspicions aroused about guilt, innocence and flawed judicial procedures.

THE VISIT OF GENERAL MÉDIC

President Nixon put his talks with President Médici of Brazil in the context of the "vitally important" consultations he is conducting with this country's "closest friends" prior to his visits next year to China and Russia. It was the kind of recognition and association Brazil has long sought from Washington.

Brazil has valid claims to such recognition. As Mr. Nixon noted, it is far and away "the largest country in South America," with 92 million people and half the land mass of that continent. In many respects the old crack that "Brazil is the country of the future—and always will be" is dramatically out of date. The Army-led Government has presided in recent years over spectacular, if uneven, industrial development and an economy growing at an annual rate of 9.5 per cent.

But Mr. Nixon's placing of Brazil among this country's "closest friends" will be taken in Latin America as bestowing Washington's blessings on the less attractive aspects of the junta's record as well as on the unexceptionable. General Médici seems to have forgotten his promise on taking office in 1969 that he would lead Brazil back to democracy before his term expired in 1974. There was serious retrogression last month when the President signed an edict empowering him to issue secret decrees. Hundreds of Brazilians remain deprived of their political rights; and the use of torture on political prisoners is well documented. Many Americans still reject the notion that economic development can be achieved in Brazil only at the cost of basic freedoms.

A FUTURE FOR EVERY CHILD

On Dec. 11, 1946, there was born perhaps the most successful and surely the most appealing of all agencies created by the General Assembly of the United Nations. This was the International Children's Emergency Fund; today, a quarter century later, it is alive and well into its maturity, and known universally as UNICEF.

Totally supported by voluntary contributions from governments, groups and individuals, UNICEF has helped the helpless in no less than 112 countries. It has provided food for the hungry, medicine for the sick, schools for the ignorant. It has brought nutrition to mind and body; it has meant literally new life to countless millions of children regardless of race or color throughout the world.

Its work alone would have made the U.N., which created it, worthwhile.

Its usefulness can only expand during the next quarter-century, along with the demands that will be made upon it. UNICEF is one international agency that has only friends, and it deserves them in every corner of the globe.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 12, 1971]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF DAY CARE

President Nixon's veto message to Congress explaining why he disapproves of the Child Development Act is, just to begin with, weird. It is weird because it is contradictory, arguing first that day care centers are good and then that they are evil. The contradiction points only to one possible conclusion; that this message is a bone he has tossed to his critics on the far right, with next November in mind, and at the expense of mothers and children and of a day care program which the President would have us believe he really supports.

The President's straddle comes about because day care centers are an integral part of his welfare reform program. His plan, sent to Congress two years ago, included a request for \$750 million for funds to provide day care for children of poor families so their mothers can work. Indeed, it required that ultimately welfare mothers with children over age 3 put those children in day care centers and take jobs, providing both the centers and the jobs are available. This provision, as we have pointed out before, is largely window dressing as things are, since neither the centers nor the jobs exist, but it is the enticement the President used in trying to win right-wing support for welfare reform. In his veto message Thursday, the President called again for passage of that welfare day care program, saying that it would fill one of the needs of the country, a need "for day care, to enable mothers, particularly those at the lowest income levels, to take full-time jobs."

Now, if that were all Mr. Nixon had done in favor of day care, it would be fair to conclude from his veto message that he is for requiring poor people to put their children in such centers but against permitting middle-class people to do so. But it isn't all he did. The President also used the veto message to announce his support for substantial increases in the income tax deductions that parents who are working can claim for day care expenses. This is a clear encouragement to middle-class parents to use day care centers and go to work.

Having thus put himself on the record in favor of day care—an issue about which many organized groups in the country feel strongly—Mr. Nixon then vetoed the bill which would have given a much needed spur to day care development. This bill, he said, is "the most radical piece of legislation" to come out of this Congress. You might expect, once he had said that, that he would offer an explanation of how this particular day care program differed so much from those he supports. The President did list nine specific objections. Five of them are complaints that this bill would partially duplicate services he hopes to provide in the welfare bill, would give the states too minor a role, would cost too much, would create "a new army of bureaucrats," and would create centers which would be difficult to staff. Since there is nothing "radical" in those specifics—we hear them all the time about almost every piece of legislation—the radicalness of this particular bill must lie in his other objections. They are:

"Neither the immediate need nor the desirability of a national child development of this character has been demonstrated." . . .

"For more than two years this administration has been working for the enactment of welfare reform, one of the objectives of

which is to bring the family together. This child development program appears to move in precisely the opposite direction. There is a respectable school of opinion that this legislation would lead toward altering the family relationship . . .

"All other factors being equal, good public policy requires that we enhance rather than diminish both parental authority and parental involvement with children—particularly in those decisive early years when social attitudes and a conscience are formed, and religious and moral principles are first inculcated . . .

"For the federal government to plunge headlong financially into supporting child development would commit the vast moral authority of the national government to the side of communal approaches to child rearing over against the family-centered approach."

We do not find in this one word that distinguishes the day care program Mr. Nixon vetoed from the day care program he is supporting. His specifics apply to all child care facilities and it is logically impossible to square his assertion that we need to enhance parental involvement with children with his program to compel welfare mothers to put their children in day care centers. Perhaps he did not distinguish between the programs because drawing such distinctions is difficult.

That is what convinces us that this veto message is the bone he has decided to throw to the right wing of his party. If it were not, Mr. Nixon could have vetoed this bill on the other specific objections he set out—it would, for instance, create major administrative problems—and Congress could have met them. But as it is, the President chose to kill the whole idea by spelling out his veto in language that comes straight from the material circulated against this bill by the far right, language that distorts what the bill was all about and what it would have done.

ANOTHER BRAVE FIGHTING MAN IS KILLED

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men, Pfc. Richard R. Kapsha, of Glassport, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam on November 6.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated servicemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Private First Class Kapsha, I wish to honor his memory by placing in the RECORD the following article:

RICHARD KAPSHA

Pfc. Richard R. Kapsha, 20, of 710 Detroit Ave., Glassport, was killed on Nov. 6, in Vietnam. He was son of Rudolph A. Kapsha of Clairton and Mrs. Genevieve M. Wibel Anuszkiewicz of Glassport.

Pfc. Kapsha was a graduate of South Allegheny High School. Before enlisting Feb. 4, 1971, in Pittsburgh, he was a bricklayer apprentice at U.S. Steel's Irvin Works. He was a member of St. Cecilia Church, Glassport.

Survivors, in addition to his parents are a sister, Mary Joyce Kapsha, and a brother, Mark Allen Kapsha at home; and grandparents, Joseph P. Kapsha of Clairton, Peter Wible of Homestead and Mrs. Mary H. Wible of McKeesport.

THE SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH ABOUT DAY CARE

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, when the OEO conference report was debated in the House, I urged the House to defeat it because of its defective delivery system and go back to work and report out a reasonable, rational bill which will truly meet the needs of our Nation and its children.

Because so many questions were raised as to the actual benefits as well as the effects of child care legislation, it is my hope that as we renew our efforts to produce legislation in this area that we give special attention to considering ways the legislation can be revised so that one of its main purposes will be to strengthen the family as well as to care for children of working mothers.

I think many questions are still being asked as "The Search for the Truth About Day Care," by Sheila Cole, which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on December 12, 1971, indicates:

[From the New York Times Magazine,
Dec. 12, 1971]

THE SEARCH FOR THE TRUTH ABOUT DAY CARE (By Sheila Cole)

Waiting lists at day-care centers in some areas are eight times the capacity, and new centers—good to indifferent—are opening all over the country. But despite all this apparent enthusiasm, day care has its doubters—including many of this country's most respected child-care experts.

I first became aware of their doubts when a group of which I was a member tried to start a day-care center in the Rockefeller University-New York Hospital community. We believe that day care would be good for our children. Certainly better than baby sitters who plunged them down in front of the television set. Maybe even better than the narrow confines of the Manhattan nuclear family and its few selected friends.

Our group invited the chief of child psychiatry at New York Hospital to talk about the psychiatric aspects of planning a center. The doctor had written a proposal for a day-care center for the hospital two years before, and he told us that he was interested in our efforts.

Much to our surprise, he had little good to say about day care. Instead, he talked at length about the dangers of separating young children from their mothers and placing them in group settings. He made some of us feel that we would be damaging our children if we left them every day to go to work and that we would compound that damage if we placed them in a day-care center.

Day care dangerous? That was hard to believe. The children in the day-care centers I had visited in Moscow and New Haven seemed healthy, happy and extremely well cared for. As far as I was concerned, day care had something to offer to just about everyone: children, mothers, employers and society.

A few months later, two women from the New York City Health Department, which is in charge of licensing day-care facilities, came to discuss proposed sites for a day-care center with our group, all middle-class, all professionals. The conversation was warm and friendly until one of the women from the Health Department finally caught on: "Do you mean you are going to put your

children in the center, too?" Taken aback we answered, "Yes." The conversation turned cool.

Did the woman from the Health Department mean that she wouldn't place her children in a day-care center? Or that day care was a good solution only for mothers who had no other choice?

My faith in day care began to waiver. These women were experts; maybe they knew something I didn't. I decided to look into the matter.

What I found was that most experts in the field of child development think that the ideal place for the preschool child is home—with mother. One of the main sources for this belief is Dr. John Bowlby, an English psychiatrist. In the nineteen-fifties, Dr. Bowlby reported on his findings that children who lived in institutions not only seemed to be less intelligent than children raised by their families, but many of them also displayed physical and emotional defects.

More recently, it has been discovered that the child needs special stimulation to develop intellectually. Appropriate stimulation is normally provided by the mother as she cares for and plays with her child. Baby needs a familiar person who will respond to his smiles and gurgles, smile back and make noises and occasionally add a small variation to the game. And he plays an active role in getting his mother to provide him with the necessary stimulus.

In an institution or group-care setting where one caretaker has several babies to watch over and where several people care for each child, it is difficult to provide adequate and appropriate stimulation for each child. Psychologists have reported extreme cases of children in institutions who have withdrawn stopped making any demands on the people around them, stopped reacting and eventually grown up to be intellectually and emotionally stunted.

Another potentially dangerous consequence of disrupting the mother-child relationship is that the child's attachment to his mother forms the basis for a great deal of his later development. In trying to please his mother, the child will behave as she wishes and will tend to accept her values and attitudes.

Reviewing these studies, one finds it easy to understand the New York Hospital psychiatrist's fears about day-care centers. It is clear, however, that the child-care experts talk in extremes. They pit ideal situations against miserable ones.

In the typical woman's magazine child-care articles, the mothers with whom young children stay at home are portrayed as very special. They are story-book mothers—patient, kind, gentle, intelligent, resourceful, alert, tolerant, always available and always responsive. Their sole function is to minister to the needs of their families. And that family is assumed to be emotionally healthy and financially provided for by the husband. These are women without worries, tensions, interests, or desires that might conflict with their availability to their children.

While the child development experts were discussing ideal situations, the fact that large segments of the population live and grow in far from ideal circumstances has been seeping into the public consciousness. It was all very well for the experts to maintain that young children should be at home with their mothers, but what if they had no mother? Or if their mother had to work to support them? Or she was sick? Or incompetent? Some professionals who work with children, like the women from the New York City Health Department, cautiously began recommending day care as a stopgap measure. Others suggested that day care might help poor children break out of the "poverty cycle." They argued that day care could reach children early enough to help them succeed in school; and if they succeeded in school, then maybe they would no

longer be poor. For everyone else, though, the experts still recommended the traditional mother-child setup.

Nevertheless, several million working mothers began to consider day-care centers as the solution to their child-care problems. The discussion within the Government of day care both as a way of "breaking the cycle of poverty" and as a way of getting women off welfare roles has inevitably raised the question with many mothers who do not claim to be poor: Why not us too?

With this new climate of opinion and the resulting demand for day care, it should be no surprise that the research on the effects of maternal deprivation has come in for re-examination; the dire predictions about the consequences of separating mother and baby are now couched in such terms as "day care may be dangerous," rather than "day care is dangerous."

A World Health Organization monograph, written a decade after Bowlby's influential work, concluded that whether or not a child is emotionally scarred by being separated from his mother depends on a great variety of factors—certainly a long way from the statement that separation invariably has a bad effect on the child's development.

In one of the few studies that have been done directly to test the hypothesis of maternal deprivation and its applicability to day care, 2-year-old children attending a day-care center were compared with 2-year-olds in a residential nursery who were separated from their families for periods of time ranging from a few weeks to six months. It was found that although the quality of substitute care in both situations was similar, the reactions of the children were substantially different. The children attending the day-care center seemed to behave normally, while those in the residential nursery seemed to be upset. In addition to crying and asking for their mothers repeatedly and then withdrawing, the children in residential care were sick more often, regressed in their speech and toilet behavior, and were more hostile than the children in day care. These findings support Bowlby's contentions about maternal deprivation in residential institutions, but separate such situations from day-care arrangements.

The authors of this study concluded that the major factor was the total absence of the mother for the residential nursery children. But even the damage of residential care does not appear to be necessarily permanent. In one study, 2-year-olds who lived in a "home management house" (orphanage) for four months before being adopted were compared with children who had lived in foster homes for four months before being adopted and with children of the same age who had been raised by their natural families. No significant differences were found among the three groups.

So the worst prognoses of the maternal-deprivation theorists do not seem to apply to day care. But does that mean that day care is a trouble-free solution to our preschoolers' child-care needs? As a concerned mother, I wanted more than just an assurance that day care would not harm my children. I wanted to know if it was good for them. And if not, why not?

I asked Jerome Kagan, the Harvard psychologist who has played a prominent role in the discussion of day care, what were the real effects on children. He was more than modest about what psychologists actually know about the consequences of placing small children in day-care centers.

He did point out that day-care centers can occupy more than 8,000 hours of the child's first seven years—approximately two full years of his waking hours. With so much time, a center cannot help but teach social values and beliefs, as well as care for the child's physical needs and encourage his intellectual and emotional growth.

An important question that should be asked when planning day-care facilities is what cultural values the institution should foster. This is an ethical question which should not be left up to the professionals, Kagan warned. Psychologists can be asked to help carry out the will of society, but they should not decide what society should be.

I asked him what kind of day-care program he would recommend if, for example, we wanted a day-care center to foster the values already held by our society.

To begin with, Kagan emphasized that children under 2 years of age and preschoolers have different needs. The baby and toddler should not be cared for by more than two or possibly three people, and these people should have a continuous and emotionally satisfying relationship with him. The very young child needs a predictable environment with a certain amount of carefully paced variation.

The preschooler is much different from the child under 2. He no longer needs the one-to-one relationship with his mother; he needs to explore, to try new things and work at them until he can do them successfully. Kagan thinks that day-care centers might even be superior to many mothers when it comes to building up the preschool child's confidence and permitting him to explore. To support this, he cited a recent study which found that mothers said "no" to preschoolers on an average of eight times an hour, because they were afraid that the youngsters would hurt themselves, make a mess, or damage something. In a good center a child is rarely told not to do something, because most dangers have been eliminated. He is allowed to test his powers and explore the equipment and social activities of the center. The day-care center may also be a better environment for the older preschool child who is learning to deal with symbols and intellectual problems because it frees him from parental pressures and anxieties.

Day-care centers, Kagan fears, might have some difficulties, in providing children with role models. A preschooler needs to have people to imitate, and to identify with. Day-care centers tend to separate children from adults and older youngsters who might serve as role models. "A child makes an assumption that things have to be as they are. He sees certain kinds of behavior and accepts them as right," Kagan said. "To the extent that the child learns his values and moral standards from his peer group in the day-care center, rather than from his parents, these values probably will be more flexible and easier to change because of the number of different values and standards the child is exposed to in a group. Such a child would probably be more flexible in his moral code. If the child has strong adult role models at home, his home environment will counterbalance the values learned from other children."

Another expert worried by the consequences of age-group segregation is Prof. Urie Bronfenbrenner of Cornell University. "No doubt day care is coming to America," says Bronfenbrenner. "The question is what kind?"

He has studied socialization, the process by which children are molded to become adult bearers of their parents' cultural traditions, in the United States, the Soviet Union, Israel and Switzerland. The cultural question, he says, is whether the day care we provide separates the child from his family and reduces the family's feelings of responsibility, or whether it helps the family maintain its role as the "primary and proper agent for the process of making human beings human."

"If children are placed in the hands of female professionals, I see some real problems for society," Bronfenbrenner says. "In a society which has explicit, clearly stated character goals, those goals can be built into a day-care program. But in our society there

no agreed-upon goals that can be part of a day-care program. Segregating children into homogenous age groups in the care of professionals locks them out of the process in which socialization naturally occurs." This process takes place in everyday family life, where children are surrounded by people with whom they can identify and from whom they learn skills, attitudes and values.

"I would like to see day-care centers where everyone was welcome. Where parents, grandparents, older children, neighbors and people who work in the neighborhood could drop in and play with the children, show them how to do things. In this way the children would grow up as part of a community, rather than being alienated from it."

After talking with Kagan and Bronfenbrenner, I felt with some certainty that I could put my children in a day-care center. Not any day-care center, but one in which I and other parents who shared my values and concerns were involved. One that had a warm, good teacher who shared our attitudes.

It has become clear to me that there is no simple or single answer to the question: Is day care good for children? Like all other human institutions, it has good aspects—and bad. The dangers do not warrant excluding day care from our society. That would leave us where we were before, with a picture-book mother and child who are not part of real life.

THE PRINCETON ALUMNI COLLEGE: "A THRIVING POPULATION IN A SHRINKING WORLD"

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in June 1970, Princeton University successfully offered its first Alumni College. For 3 days alumni and their families lived on campus and attended lectures and seminars relating to the theme "The Challenge of a Deteriorating Environment."

This year, the Alumni College was expanded in both size and curriculum. It took place from Monday, June 7, through Friday, June 11. One series of seminars afforded a comprehensive study of our environmental problems. It was entitled: "A Thriving Population in a Shrinking World."

It was a great pleasure for me to moderate one of the panels on this subject, specifically dealing with the problems of "Power Generation—A Study of Present Resources in Relation to Population Growth."

Participating in this panel were three distinguished experts in the field of energy resources: Robert C. Axtmann, Mobil Professor of Chemical Engineering for Nuclear Studies, Princeton University; Robert G. Mills, senior staff and head of engineering and development division, Plasma Physics Laboratory, Forrestal; and Clyde Ruffie, director of environmental affairs, Public Service Electric & Gas Co., who presented a statement which had been prepared by Edwin H. Snyder, director and consultant of the Public Service Electric & Gas Co., Newark, N.J. Mr. Snyder was unable to attend.

In view of the serious national concern

with energy resources, power generation and powerplant siting, and pending congressional legislation, I include in the RECORD the remarks of the panelists who participated in the forum on "Power Generation—A Study of Present Resources in Relation to Population Growth," at the Princeton University Alumni College on June 9.

POWER GENERATION: A STUDY OF PRESENT RESOURCES IN RELATION TO POPULATION GROWTH
(Introductory Remarks of Congressman
WILLIAM F. RYAN)

For years we have considered the United States a vast country, unlimited in resource. Now, we are beginning to realize that our resources are finite and that this country—indeed the entire planet—is endangered by the exploding dimensions of the environmental crisis.

The question we must face today is whether the many demands created by a burgeoning population, consumer and service-oriented, with a huge appetite for energy, will prove too much for an environment already overburdened.

For years it has been assumed that this appetite must be satisfied; that the interests of the economy and progress demand growth: more industry, more consumer goods, more energy. But at last, the very obvious results of unplanned, irrational growth have begun to overwhelm the land, the cities and the people.

Demand continues to increase. The supply of electrical energy has doubled every ten years, growing at the annual rate of seven percent.

The nation will require 250 new power plants in the next 20 years. A report to the Federal Power Commission states that between now and 1990 the eleven Northeast states will require four times as much electric generating capacity as has been provided in the 80-year history of the industry.

The time has come to initiate a long-range comprehensive plan for the development, allocation and use of our energy resources. The time has come to stop and take a good look at our concepts of growth, progress and consumption. We must have a national policy on power conservation.

This plan should include a national grid for the transmission of power, a power plant siting policy, reliability standards, and a program for conserving energy and energy resources—all of which must be compatible with the environment.

Planning decisions should be made on a regional basis, considering the needs of a whole region, not just a single community. This would simplify permit and licensing procedures—which currently overlap. There should be a single form of judicial review so that utility, governmental and public interests may be considered in an orderly fashion.

Research and development must be greatly increased, both by federal agencies and utilities. Two primary needs are research into improving fossil fuel facilities, which will be needed for years to come; and research to make power production more efficient.

Other areas which badly need more intensive research are undergrounding transmission lines; improving transmission capacity and ability (so that mine-mouth and other locations remote from population centers may be used); improving present pollution control methods and finding new ones; researching effects of pollutants and methods of preventing or treating these effects. Projects to develop new sources of energy must receive more support and funding; one form of energy cannot be abandoned in favor of another until both the supply and environmental problems have been solved.

While we develop a system for planned growth that will satisfy the population's

basic needs and protect the environment, it may be necessary to make some sacrifices—reduce current use, delay new uses, restrain demand, even ration electricity.

The design and implementation of long-range plans for orderly growth of power generation and demand will take time and require the cooperation of all levels of government. Environmentalists, conservationists, all the scientific disciplines and citizens must be involved. While a long-range management system is being developed, some interim measures will be necessary to prevent further environmental damage, brown-outs or blackouts, disorderly and constant rate increases, and inequitable distribution of supplies.

In view of the detrimental impact upon the environment caused by power generation, the environmental protection abilities of the Federal government should be strengthened immediately. The generation of power results in a high degree of pollution—sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, carbon dioxide, and particulates foul the air. Solid waste (ash) despoils the land. Waste heat affects our lakes and rivers. Even the best technological controls cannot eliminate all pollutants.

An extensive campaign must be considered to reduce the demand for electricity, especially in areas where demand is outstripping supply. The waste of electricity is so great in our affluent society that such a campaign could relieve utilities of much of the pressure to produce more power immediately. Utilities could include with each billing statement a reminder to save electricity, with a list of how-to suggestions, and could advise customers on avoiding unnecessary use during peak periods.

Large commercial users could find ways to reduce their demand: using fewer lights at night (is it necessary that all the skyscrapers in Manhattan blaze with light all night?); using less air conditioning; changing work hours to redistribute power loads which also redistribute passenger loads on mass transit facilities.

A public education program, via all media, should advise the consumer of the problems, of the necessity for changing attitudes and habits, and of the necessity of paying for pollution control and other environmental costs for supplying power demands. But it's difficult to convince consumers not to purchase products after they have been manufactured and a desire for them stimulated through advertisements. Therefore, we must ask for voluntary restraints on the part of manufacturers. Population growth is great enough to provide markets for necessary appliances without manufacturers producing fad and gimmick items that wear out quickly (creating a waste disposal problem).

Manufacturers should also apply their design abilities and technology to improving products, especially with respect to the amount of electricity they require for operation—rather than changing the design or adding more buttons. A good example is the electric blender. Designers and manufacturers keep increasing size and adding buttons, instead of increasing efficiency and reducing noise. Impetus for this sort of design could be supplied by federal regulation: a requirement for labelling appliances to show how much electricity is required to operate them and how much the cost would be per month.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for restraint and new attitudes on the part of manufacturing, industrial and other commercial users. Per capita consumption of electric power is increasing three times faster than population growth; this means that people are being stimulated to use more and more electricity. If manufacturers do not assume responsibility for slowing this trend, they will be overtaken by the ecology move-

ment, and find themselves with growing inventories of unsold appliances.

Rate structures should be revised to reflect costs of land use and environmental damage. Promotional rates for large users stimulate waste. Perhaps rates should go UP as use goes up, to properly reflect the cost of the service rendered or the product manufactured and serve as a disincentive for wasting electricity.

If demand cannot be substantially lowered by such means, consideration should be given to limiting or even banning certain uses that do not satisfy an essential social or life-supporting need. For instance, illuminated billboards not only blight the landscape and pose a danger to safe driving, but they needlessly consume electricity.

However, none of these measures will be sufficient if our population continues to grow at present rates. Some observers contend that population growth is not a part of the electric supply problem, but I believe it is related in various ways.

The people of the United States have been for some time migrating to urban centers. At present, 53% of the population lives in 13% of the total land area. This concentration alone presents problems: in densely settled areas, like the New York-New Jersey metropolitan area, there is such a high demand for services and products that the sheer number of power plants required to meet the electrical need produces an intolerable burden of pollution. With more people moving to urban centers, this aspect of the problem will intensify.

Increasing population, and accompanying demands for goods and services, especially among affluent people, create an ever higher consumption of goods. Families once owned a family car; then it became two cars; now it is not at all uncommon for both parents as well as one or more children to own and drive cars, creating physical congestion and adding to air pollution.

Each new member of the population becomes a consumer. And every purchase offers the possibility of using more electricity: hair dryers, electric tooth brushes; electric carving knives and can openers; electric mixers, blenders, juicers, toasters—all these appliances are promoted unceasingly. Considerable amounts of electricity are used in the factories to produce them; more is used in the TV industry to sell them; more is required for their use at home. Most of these could be classed as non-essential uses.

We have to learn to choose, to say no, to give up the luxury of unlimited choice. We have no alternative but to turn away from uncontrolled economic and technological growth.

It is essential that we re-examine all the basic factors—population, demand, sources, environment—that shape our energy policies. What is needed is a comprehensive assessment of the long-range outlook for energy in general—for the purpose of establishing a broad national program to guide future energy development, allocation and use, consistent with society's overall needs and nature's overall limitations.

TECHNOLOGICAL METHODS FOR CONSERVING ENERGY

(By Robert C. Axtmann)

Before we begin the discussion today, I thought it would be worth while to review some well-known and some not so well-known facts about the electrical utility industry. I've been asked to discuss technological methods for conserving energy—and I think it important that we establish some of the reasons why this is a desirable thing to do. And I'm grateful that Clyde Ruffie is here to keep me honest and to correct me if I slip a decimal place here or there.

First of all, I'd like to point out that electricity is one of the biggest bargains avail-

able. According to the 1970 issue of the *Statistical Abstract of the United States* (hereinafter SA), the average residential monthly bill for 500 kilowatt-hours in 1940 was \$10.55 (SA, p. 350). In 1969 the average bill for the same amount of power was 23¢ less than it was 30 years earlier. In the meantime the Consumer Price Index (which includes electricity) had increased from 49 to 128—almost a factor of three. To reverse the argument, in terms of 1940 dollars, the price of electricity has decreased to a bit over one-third of what it was just before World War II.

The reasons are not hard to find. First, the utilities have been able to buy equipment that is much more efficient, i.e., that will produce more electricity from the same amount of fuel.

Second, the coal mines have automated to the point that mining is more efficient. Finally (and this is less well-known than the previous factors), the railroads have improved their methods drastically for transporting coal from the mines to the power plants.

So the very cheapness of electricity is one of the reasons—a psychological one—why voluntary methods for power conservation are difficult to encourage.

A second aspect of the electrical industry is widely known—that the consumption of electricity has doubled approximately every ten years since World War I. This has not occurred without the vigorous encouragement of the industry itself. I was about to say connivance, but Clyde sits too close. Until very recently, the industry has actively encouraged, even boosted the sale of their product. Barely 18 months ago Clyde Ruffe and I attended a conference of utility executives and engineering educators with the joyous title "Energy Times 21"—a title that derived from the projected increase in the demand for electrical energy that would occur over the working lifetime of a young man entering the power industry from the graduating Class of 1969. I recall circulating around at a cocktail party at the conference gently asking some of the executives if it might not be environmentally more responsible to have a less ambitious goal. I also recall some rather stony glances and even a suggestion that perhaps I might better avoid the bar for awhile. Times have changed, at least locally, with Con Edison's "Save a Watt" campaign—but Charles Luce is widely regarded as an apostate amongst his peers and it is certainly true that his campaign does not derive from environmental consideration alone.

Thirdly, it cannot be denied that the power industry is the largest single source of many sorts of pollution. It accounts for a full 75% of all thermal pollution in the U.S. (cf. *Thermal Pollution: Status of the Art* by Frank L. Parker and Peter A. Krenkel, Vanderbilt University, 1969). The percentage is also high for sulfur dioxide, for particulate matter, and although I have no hard data, I suspect also for the oxides of nitrogen. Nuclear power, which provides an opportunity for reducing all of these types of pollution except for thermal pollution (where it will actually increase the thermal load on the troposphere), has its own environmental problems. More significantly, for the present discussion, nuclear power currently accounts for only 2% of U.S. power production and while that percentage will rise as time goes on, fossil fuel plants are still being built and will continue to be built for many years to come.

Finally, it is worthwhile recalling that alone among American industries, the power industry irreversibly consumes valuable natural resources. When coal or oil or natural gas or uranium is burned to produce power, the fuel is irretrievably lost. Lost to us and to future generations. When we consume other mineral resources, say aluminum (of which I'll have more to say in a moment)

or iron or titanium or lead, in principle at least we can recover them for reuse. And we will reuse them when it is economic to do so. For many years, for example, lead has been recycled—that's why Sears will pay you \$2.00 for your old automobile battery. In fact, over 40% of all lead marketed last year in this country was reused. Not so for aluminum, although it may some day be so. Aluminum is being recycled in Princeton Township, but only because hordes of well-meaning people are volunteering their labor.

To summarize what I've said so far: the power industry is a major source of pollution; there are historical forces at work (that ten-year doubling time of power demand) which indicate that it will become an even more serious source of pollution; the very act of producing electric power by present technologies involves the irreversible loss of valuable natural resources; and, finally, the present low price of electricity is not likely to impede the demand for or the use of electricity. I do not mean to imply by this rather selective description of the power industry that I find it villainous. Far from it. But it is within the context of this description that we must look for ways and for reasons to decrease the consumption of power.

Before I proceed, however, I'd like to make a few remarks on the relationship between population and the growth of power demand, for it is population that is the main topic of the Alumni College. Many economists and some population biologists ("population biologist" is a word that real ecologists use to describe themselves now that the rest of us think of ourselves as ecologists) like to separate the growth in power demand between that due to population growth alone and the increase in the per capita use of power. When this distinction is drawn, the conclusion is often drawn that population growth *per se* is a relatively minor factor. Being neither an economist nor a population biologist, I find the distinction between per capita consumption and the number of capita somewhat artificial, not to say arbitrary. I can illustrate why with one of Barry Commoner's hobby horses—the aluminum industry.

Aluminum, as many of you know, is refined from ore through an electrolytic process known as the Hall Process. There is no economically competitive process that does not involve the use of electricity. It takes approximately 6.5 times as much energy to produce a pound of aluminum as it does a pound of steel. Since 1940 the total aluminum production in this country has risen by a factor of almost twenty while the production of steel has risen barely a factor of two. The aluminum industry now accounts for approximately 10% of the total industrial use of electricity. The point is that the rapid increase in the use of aluminum is not related to the growth of population (which surely didn't rise by a factor of 20 since 1940) or even to the per capita use of power. Rather it is a result of an aggressive marketing operation on the part of the aluminum industry. Nor, as Commoner is fond of pointing out, does it represent any increase in real affluence. One can see this if one considers the aluminum beer can. If the latter represents increased affluence, it is surely the beer rather than the can that is the affluent quantity. But even here we run into contradiction because the per capita consumption of beer hasn't changed appreciably in the last 25 years.

To summarize this point, then, we find that a very substantial component in the consumption of electricity is related not to population, perhaps not even to per capita consumption, but rather to a technological choice to substitute one metal (aluminum) that is environmentally unfortunate—it does not corrode rapidly and therefore does not automatically return itself to the environment—for another, iron, which does. Before

leaving the point I simply point out that it's a reversible decision (with possibly unfortunate consequences for those involved in aluminum manufacture) but a reversal will require the sort of coalitions that are driving tetraethyl lead and supersonic transports from the marketplace.

And now to move on to ways and means for conserving energy. There are lots of little ways. A recent report published by an environmental subcommittee of the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects pointed out a half-dozen things architects could do in the design of buildings to minimize the consumption of electricity. Things like fighting down the urge to light every square foot in the building with artificial light of sufficient intensity that a racing form can be read. Or using natural ventilation in some areas rather than relying on air conditioning. Or cutting down on non-essential lighting such as that used for advertising. Or using incandescent lights where fluorescent lights could be used. These are important, and I hope the architects take them seriously, but I would prefer to spend the moments here on schemes of greater total impact.

Then there is a whole series of proposals having to do with mass transportation. Typical of these is the use of flywheels in subway trains to be used as brakes. The forward momentum of the train, instead of being dissipated as heat in brake shoes, would be absorbed in setting a heavy flywheel in motion. Then when the train is ready to start up again, the energy stored in the flywheel can be used to overcome the inertia of the train and conserve the heavy drain of electrical current normally required to put the train in motion once again. It sounds good on paper but the idea makes me despair a little because (a) there are very few subways in North America and (b) the research that would be necessary to develop the scheme would undoubtedly have to be paid for by John Lindsay and Lindsay doesn't have enough money to pay motormen on the trains let alone sponsor research programs. And again, the overall impact on the nation's energy problems would be fairly minuscule.

So instead of describing piecemeal approaches to energy conservation, I'd prefer to spend my remaining time on a technological process with the promise of real impact on the problem.

Earlier I mentioned that one of the reasons electricity is as cheap as it is because the efficiency of power plants has been raised substantially in the past few decades. Further significant advances in efficiency now seem quite unlikely given the basic design of power plants (both nuclear and fossil fuel) which involve the heating of water to steam and the use of steam to spin turbines which generate the electricity. There are theoretical limits on such processes and we're about as close to them as we are likely to get.

To obtain more kilowatt-hours for a given amount of fuel will require completely new technologies. Dr. Mills will be describing my favorite candidate—controlled thermonuclear power—in a matter of minutes. But my second choice, the process with impossible name of magnetohydrodynamics, which happily can be abbreviated to MHD, is one which can in the opinion of many experts be developed much more quickly, much more cheaply and (at least in principle) be adapted to the power plants that are already in existence. If successful, it could increase the efficiency of fossil-fueled plants by as much as 40 to 50%. When you consider the annual fuel bill for power plants (something on the order of 6 billion dollars per year), increases like this seem worth pursuing.

MHD is a process that permits a much more direct conversion of heat energy into electrical energy than does the steam-turbine cycle I described a moment ago. Instead MHD

involves the transformation of the energy in hot, moving molecules which are ionized—that is, electrically charged—into electricity. No moving parts such as a turbine are involved. The principles of MHD have been known for a long time, but no really serious attempts have been made to apply them to electrical power production. Approximately once every three years someone in the federal government organizes a study panel to examine MHD. I have three such reports in my office. They all conclude that MHD has great promise, that the power utilities cannot be expected to do the research to reduce it to practice because of the expense involved, that the electrical equipment manufacturers cannot be expected to perfect the process for the same reason and that the government should embark on a wide-scale program. Last year, the federal government invested exactly \$300,000 in MHD, according to a report entitled "Electric Power and the Environment" published by the President's Office of Science and Technology. That same report estimated that a total effort of \$500,000,000 would be required to do the job.

To recapitulate, an investment of a half-billion in MHD has the potential of saving billions of dollars per year in fuel costs. It is tempting to compare these numbers with the experience in developing nuclear power where several billions have already been invested in the development of the current generation of nuclear reactors and three more billion are projected for the development of the next (breeder) generation. And all this to produce power that is barely competitive with the technologies that have been in existence for years.

Why has MHD been ignored? The answer is complex, but let me try. There is no central energy authority in Washington. No agency with the technical clout, political backing and thrust to take on MHD. The Atomic Energy Commission is constrained by law to develop only the peaceful uses of atomic energy. While the Nixon administration has recently proposed, as one component of its governmental reorganization plan, an overall Energy Commission (with the concomitant partial but substantial dismantlement of the AEC), this proposal has met with instant hostility by influential members of Congress—particularly those members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy whose power and influence would undoubtedly recede if the AEC were to be reduced in size and budget. Perhaps Congressman Ryan will have a more authoritative, and hopefully a more optimistic report, on the future of this proposal.

Research and development on advanced technologies is simply one component of an overall energy policy for the nation. The area of energy policy reaches far and includes, for example, such difficult and complex subjects as depletion allowances, import quotas, freight rate schedules, mine safety regulations and many others. And I repeat, there is no central agency charged with developing and presiding over a coherent, overall energy policy. When one considers that the yearly bill for electrical power is now over twenty billion dollars, the magnitude of the problem comes into focus.

There have been a few encouraging signs. Late in the Johnson administration, a section of three men was set to work on the energy problem in the President's Office of Science and Technology. And as recently as last year a new division of the National Science Foundation was set up to fund, with pitifully limited funds, a few new research efforts in this vastly important area. The decisions which effect energy policy, as nearly as I can determine, tend to be made by the faceless men in what was once called the Bureau of Budget. I personally think we deserve better. And I urge you to join with me in pressing for a change. Thank you.

POWER GENERATION—A STUDY OF PRESENT RESOURCES IN RELATION TO POPULATION GROWTH (Presented by Clyde Ruffe)

Good morning ladies and gentlemen: On the original program for Princeton Alumni College '71 I am listed as "Alumnus from utilities industry." It is true that I have spent my adult lifetime working in the utility industry—Public Service Electric and Gas Company—but I must confess that I am not an alumnus of Princeton University although I should feel honored to be one. I welcome the opportunity of telling this audience about some of the problems which face our industry and more specifically of giving my personal views on the outlook with respect to power generation and fuel resources as related to population growth.

I should like to say at the outset that I am convinced that in the future, we in the United States, will be able to produce and distribute the electric energy required to satisfy the needs of all the population and with steady abatement of the undesirable environmental impacts in which all of us are so deeply interested.

Being an engineer, I am certainly not qualified to forecast the timetable of reduction in population growth as proposed by the advocates of Zero Population Growth, but I am satisfied that it is not necessary to consider this factor in our discussions today. Its impact at best will not be significant within the period of the long range growth forecast upon which the utility industry bases its plant expansion plans. This view is expressed in an article in the Conference Board Record of May 1971, Dr. Phillip M. Hauser, Professor of Sociology and Director of the University of Chicago Population Research Center said "But sometimes I fear that the public relations people on the Zero Population Growth front have not made clear that we will probably not achieve that condition in this nation for at least 80 years."

The electric utility industry is a high capital intensive industry, requiring the installation of very large plant facilities such as generating stations and transmission lines planned well in advance of the increments of growing load. Consequently, for many years we have made load forecasts 10 to 20 years in advance.

Population growth interestingly has not been the most important factor in the increase in use of electric power in the past as is indicated by the fact that the nation's population since 1882 has grown at a rate of 1.6% per year, equivalent to doubling every 40 years, while electric power use has grown at an annual rate of 7%, equivalent to doubling about every 10 years. Thus, it is evident that the demand for goods and services, increase in personal income, and individual preferences as to how the available income will be used, and technical developments, are more important factors in the growth of electric power use than is the basic population growth.

In the future we see environmental improvement activities as a new factor that increases the use of electric power. For example, a comprehensive survey of regional sewage treatment facilities required to clean up the major rivers of the United States indicates that this program could require additional electric power supply of several million kilowatts. Other programs to improve the environment such as solid waste recycling and new or expanded mass transit systems will also add materially to the nation's future power requirements quite apart from population growth.

All of us are concerned with the adequacy of supply of fuels for power generation in the face of vastly expanded electric power needs in the future. In connection with the 1970 National Power Survey now in the final stages of preparation by the Federal Power Commission, the Northeast Regional Ad-

visory Committee estimates that power needs in this region will require a power supply of 2.7 to 3.5 times the present level by the year 1990.

People are concerned that at this rate of growth we may soon run out of fuels for the generation of electric power, and as a matter of fact, the supplies of some fossil fuels are indeed limited. However, in my opinion we need have no fear of running out of fuel for the following reasons:

Natural gas and oil reserves within continental United States are low, being estimated at 13 years, and 9 years, respectively, while coal reserves are estimated at 400 to 1,400 years at present rates of usage by industry and utilities. In the field of nuclear fuel, uranium for conventional fission reactors is estimated to be adequate for about 13 years, and the development of a practicable breeder reactor now under intensive research and development could extend the availability of fissionable material substantially. Fossil fuel and uranium supplies from foreign countries will, of course, augment these domestic reserves.

Beyond this, the exciting promise of a massive new fuel source for the long pull lies in the development of a commercially feasible controlled nuclear fusion reactor. Five or six major research projects on controlled fusion are under way in the United States and there are a number elsewhere in the world. Estimates of time required to reach commercial operation range from 20 to 30 years. Since the fuel for such reactors is heavy hydrogen, which occurs in the ocean, lake and stream waters of this planet, the supply of this resource can be considered as virtually unlimited.

One of the most promising research efforts in controlled nuclear fusion is being carried out here at the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory. I am sure you will be most interested to hear what Dr. Robert Mills has to tell us on this vitally important subject.

From the above remarks it is obvious that fossil fuels, except for coal, will not be available to take a large share of growth in power production. Coal reserves are substantial, but the problems of fly ash and sulfur dioxide emissions from coal burning plants are serious.

Uranium reactors which are just coming into widespread use are our best hope for the near future. They emit no fly ash or combustible gasses. However, the need for breeder reactors to expand the usable reserves of uranium is very pressing and research and development work must be carried forward as rapidly as possible. It is estimated that commercially practicable breeders will be available in the early 1980s and this expanded source of fuel will tide us over until the 1990s when, hopefully, fusion reactors will be available.

What will we do to reduce air pollution from fossil fired plants during the progression to widespread use of the essentially pollution free nuclear plants? Much has already been done. For example, the record in New Jersey to date is impressive. By the end of 1971 my company will have reduced the discharge of fly ash by 76% and of sulfur dioxide by 63% since 1966. We are proud of this record and we are working to continue the downward trend which is most important in the face of increasing use of electric energy.

I am sure you must know that the substantial reduction in the quantity of pollutants is an expensive undertaking which today requires the use of high cost low sulfur fuel to reduce the sulfur dioxide emission and the installation of highly efficient electrostatic precipitators to take the fly ash out of the flue gas stream. Incidentally, every boiler that my company has installed since 1937 has been equipped with electrostatic precipitators, so this technique of

pollution control is nothing new to us. However, there have been ever increasing requirements under the air pollution control code in New Jersey. It is now necessary to install precipitators having an efficiency of at least 99%, whereas in the earlier days 85% to 90% efficiency was considered adequate.

You no doubt have heard some say that the proper way to reduce pollution is to curtail the use of electricity by various methods, such as by charging a higher price per kilowatt hour for higher usage, or by placing a stiff sales tax on important appliances such as house heaters, air conditioners, TV sets, etc., or by passing legislation prohibiting home owners from connecting more than one of each heavy use appliance to his service. All of these moves are negative steps. They would seem to discriminate against the economically disadvantaged. They would encourage the use of energy in other forms which would have a more deleterious effect on the environment. Some of these moves would be difficult to implement, and of course would be contrary to our free society.

I do not believe that we in America have reached the point where we no longer have the determination, the ingenuity and the technology to meet the needs of our people for such necessities as additional lost cost housing, improved mass transportation, reasonably priced food and clothing and ample electric energy and to meet these needs without serious impairment of the quality of our environment. To curtail our efforts in any of these areas would be a serious blow to the future of this nation. A negative course cannot solve the problem. We must continue to strive to achieve a reasonable balance between environmental quality and sufficient electric power for all of our requirements.

In these introductory remarks, time does not permit me to discuss all of the environmental problems facing the utility industry in building an adequate plant to meet the growing load, while at the same time designing and operating the system to provide an ample and reliable supply of electric power at a reasonable cost to the consumer.

I have discussed the problems of minimizing air pollution in some detail, as we consider this to be the most important area of our impact upon the environment. We consider of next importance the problem of thermal effects on the rivers which supply the condensing water needed for our steam turbine generators. Nuclear plants require relatively large amounts of cooling water. My company's first nuclear plant is under construction on the Delaware River near Salem, N.J. The Army Engineers' model at Vicksburg, Miss. was used to duplicate conditions under various tidal flows and inlet and outlet designs from which the optimum arrangement was selected and is now under construction. Also, we retained Dr. James H. Carpenter of Johns Hopkins University to make exhaustive studies of stream flow and water discharge patterns to determine temperature rise in the river at this location.

In addition to this we have retained Dr. Edward Raney of Cornell University and as many as 30 marine biologists to make an unusually comprehensive survey and study of marine life and radiation levels at and above and below the plant site so that a basis of comparison between conditions prior to and after operation of the plant can be determined. The study was started in 1968 and will continue until at least five years after the first unit is started in 1973. This is the most extensive in-depth ecology survey ever undertaken prior to the erection of a nuclear generating station.

I should like to say at this point that I believe the intrusion upon the environment brought about by the operation of electric power systems can be clearly classified into three categories. First, the possible effects

on the health of human beings. Second, effects on the ecology of the area, such as plant and marine life, and third, aesthetic impacts.

I have discussed to some extent the first and most important of these, the effect of air pollution on the health of human beings, and I reiterate that we are making every effort to minimize these effects and to comply with the criteria of the various codes that have been established to serve as a basis of comparison.

We are also very conscious of ecological effects as illustrated by the extensive studies being made of aquatic life at Salem nuclear generating station. Here, too, there are criteria, for example, a temperature-rise limit established by the Delaware River Basin Commission. Our new plant will fall well within the prescribed limit.

The third category, aesthetic considerations, is most difficult to deal with, because of disagreement as to what is or what is not an acceptable design of tower line, power plant or substation. The design of a power plant or tower line which meets the approval of Community A may not be acceptable in Community B. The increased interest in our designs on the part of individuals and groups makes the process of arriving at choices very difficult and time consuming. We are, however, working very hard to meet the desires of people in our area regarding the location and design of these essential facilities. This problem is nationwide but is more acute in densely populated areas such as the State of New Jersey.

We make a practice of giving advance notice of our general plans followed by discussions with municipal, county and state bodies and frequently by public hearings to obtain agreement where possible on the most acceptable plan. People generally are reasonable when our needs are put before them but often the response is "sure we need electric service but why don't you put that substation in the next town."

In line with our efforts to improve the appearance of our facilities, we are continuing our long-established program of putting heavy distribution lines underground, giving special architectural treatment to structures, landscaping our facilities, using specially designed towers and dynamic color schemes for our structures. These measures, together with expenditures for air and water quality control have required expenditures totaling 96 million dollars, of which about 55 million dollars has been spent in the last 4 years.

Now, let me conclude by summarizing briefly a few of the things that have been said:

Energy requirements in the northeast part of our country may, by 1990, increase up to as much as 3½ times present levels.

Population growth will not be the most important factor in this increase, but other factors, such as improving the nation's health, education and environment, and its standard of living in general, will make up the significant part of this increase.

The increase in available electric energy will be accomplished by shifting from the fossil fuel technology to nuclear and possibly other technologies; and, by the end of the century to fusion energy itself.

The resources to meet the increased requirements for electric energy are available.

As indicated today, the utilities are on a descending curve of environmental impact. The effect per unit of energy is being drastically reduced. This trend will unquestionably continue.

Consequently, I am convinced that this country has the present and foreseeable technology and natural resources to produce and distribute the electric energy to satisfy the needs of its people for many years with a minimum impact on the environment.

The real question mark in the nation's ability to obtain sufficient electric energy may well be whether it has the appropriate political and social mechanisms for this achievement. For the short run, the threat to sufficient quantities of electric energy may lie in the onrush of environmental codes and regulations, some of which are unattainable, and with the regulatory agencies whose jurisdictions at times are overlapping, inconsistent and competing.

June 9, 1971

THE PROMISE OF CONTROLLED THERMONUCLEAR POWER

(By R. G. Mills)

I. INTRODUCTION

There has been a striking growth in recent years in public interest in all the aspects of population pressure on our environment and all the secondary symptoms that we must begin to deal with if life is to remain pleasant on our planet. This has generated a great deal of talk, and I am proud to be able to tell a Princeton audience that Princeton is no Johnny-come-lately to the problem; nor is it simply a talker rather than a doer. One part of Princeton University, namely the Plasma Physics Laboratory on the Forrestal Campus, has been working on one of the fundamental problems of mankind for almost twenty years. This laboratory is actually the largest single element of Princeton University. Today I want to tell you about what we are doing out there, but first I want to describe the problem.

II. THE ELECTRICAL POWER DEMANDS OF THE NATION

In round numbers we have 300,000 megawatts of installed electrical generating capacity, and the demand doubles in ten years. The increase in demand comes partially from increased population and partially from new uses for electricity. This accelerating growth will not continue for very long. One way or another the population will be stabilized, and the rate of rise in power use per capita will slow, but that does not alter the fact that today the load is increasing at this rate, and it must be met. Every ten days this nation needs to add a new 1000 MW plant to its system. This is a fact of mid twentieth century life. There are those among us who offer to meet the resulting environmental problems by putting economic pressure on large power users by inverting the price structure with respect to the cost structure, by special taxes, or by rationing, but I submit that these measures show very little imagination. At best they would be palliatives merely slowing the development of the problem; at worst they would be counterproductive preventing amelioration of environmental problems. As one example of the latter consider the situation that would meet the development of low cost batteries and high performance electric automobiles. The automobile is today's worst offender, and the electrical automobile would be a tremendous boon. It would, of course, boost the demand for electric power. Many things could be done better electrically if that marvelously clean and quiet form of energy were cheaper.

However the electrical system as a whole is not clean. That new 1000 MW plant that we need every ten days may burn 9000 tons of coal every day of its productive life after it goes into operation. Getting that coal and getting rid of the wastes is a dirty problem. To really solve it we need a brand new technology, not a tinkering with the old system to patch it up and make it a little better, but an innovation that eliminates the problem. Such is the promise of controlled thermonuclear power, the task our laboratory is working on. If we can tap the enormous energy reserves of the heavy hydrogen (deuterium) in the oceans, mankind will have an inexhaustible supply of fuel of negligible

cost, distributed throughout the world and capable of clean, low cost power.

Coming back once again to that 1000 MW plant, let us compare the fuel consumption and waste production from a coal plant with those of a fusion plant. The accompanying chart gives the numbers. Note that the numbers are not only bigger; so are the units. We are talking about tons of fuel and waste for coal plants whereas we have pounds of fuel and waste for fusion plants. Furthermore, the "waste" of a fusion power plant is ordinary helium gas, a valuable commodity that may be in short supply in subsequent decades.

The primary fuels are deuterium and lithium, with tritium (triply heavy hydrogen) burned directly in the nuclear "boiler", but regenerated from lithium in the power plant.

DAILY FUEL CONSUMPTION, DAILY WASTE PRODUCTION
(1,000 Mw)

Coal plant	D-T Fusion plant
Fuel: 9,000 T. Coal	1 lb. D, 3 lb. Li, (1½ lb. T.)
Waste: 30,000 T. CO ₂ 600 T. SO ₂ 80 T. NO _x	4 lb. He.

III. THE FUSION POWER PROCESS

It would be inappropriate this morning to get into a very technical discussion of the subject, and believe me, it is one of the most technical subjects imaginable; but let me give you just a flavor of the complexity of harnessing fusion power by a brief description of what must be done to produce a nuclear fusion fire.

Just as in the burning of coal where we must arrange things to bring atoms of carbon in the coal into close proximity with atoms of oxygen from the atmosphere, so in nuclear fusion we must bring nuclei of deuterium into close proximity to nuclei of tritium. However, nuclei carry positive charges and vigorously repel each other; so it is extraordinarily difficult to get them close together. The answer is to hurl them together with sufficient velocity that their momentum allows them to collide despite their strong mutual repulsion. When the arithmetic is all done it turns out that the secret of fusion power is to build a container in which we can heat a gas of fusible fuel to a temperature of 100,000,000° C.

No material wall can be used, and laboratories throughout the world are making use of magnetic fields as a tool for confinement of these hot gases, known as *plasmas*.

IV. PRINCETON'S PART IN THE WORK

Since this is a Princeton audience, I shall describe only our work, but I should make it clear that essentially every industrial nation has mounted a large research effort directed toward the goal of commercial fusion power. In the United States the work up to now has been supported predominantly by the Atomic Energy Commission. This support has gone principally to four laboratories: Los Alamos in New Mexico, Oak Ridge in Tennessee, Livermore in California, and the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory. The annual national budget in recent years has been about \$28 million.

Our laboratory employs almost 400 people. Of these 400 about 100 are professional scientists and engineers. The work is expensive and requires large amounts of equipment. To generate the high magnetic fields used to confine the plasma high power is required. We have three large motor generator sets each with a 96 ton flywheel. It is flanked on either side by modified steel mill motors operated as dc generators. Each shaft is driven by a 7000 horsepower electric motor. The peak power output of this system for

two seconds is 200,000 kW, enough power for a city the size of Trenton. For economy the system is operated cyclically so that our average power is only 15,000 kilowatts, a load similar to that for the town of Princeton. This power supply feeds a wide variety of experimental machines.

V. THE PRESENT STATUS

During the past 17 years there have been periods of optimism sandwiched between periods of disappointment. In the past the optimism was generally associated with the appearance of fresh, new ideas that appeared full of promise. In contrast, today's high optimism is based on solid experimental results that make the proof of scientific feasibility appear imminent.

The excitement had its origin in 1969 when it became clear that the Russian T-3 Tokamak experimental machine was heating its plasma to somewhat higher temperatures and maintaining its confinement for ten times longer than similarly shaped machines had accomplished in the past. The Russian results at first were viewed with some skepticism in the west where it was thought that their measurements of high temperatures might be explained by a two-component plasma of moderate temperature plus a group of high energy electrons. These alternate interpretations can be discriminated between by instrumentation by laser equipment. In 1969 the Russians didn't have suitable laser apparatus available in Moscow, but such equipment was available in England. The English offered to take their equipment to Moscow to make the measurements. The Russians welcomed this assistance and in September of 1969 at the conference in Novosibirsk, the thermonuclear fraternity was greeted by the news that the T-3 plasma was really hot, indeed somewhat hotter than the original claim.

This news stimulated the laboratories of the world to determine why the Tokamak did better than other toroidal containers, and a number of laboratories undertook fabrication projects. Princeton decided in November to modify its Model C stellarator into a Tokamak by cutting out the straight section and moving the two U-bends together to form a circle, and had the ST (Symmetrical Tokamak) operating in May of 1970. During the past year we have confirmed the Russian results and extended measurements to a more detailed knowledge of the plasma structure and behavior.

The important aspect of this work is not merely that higher temperatures and longer confinement times have been achieved; more important is the fact that for the first time conditions are improving as the temperature rises, rather than deteriorating. We already have demonstrated in the laboratories a low enough diffusion rate to make a reactor possible. The next step is to show that we can maintain this as we raise the temperature to reactor conditions. In these machines we have electron temperatures of 15,000,000° C, and ion temperatures of 5,000,000° C. We need to improve these by about a factor of ten, and the key to doing this is to have a larger machine.

VI. THE FUTURE

More powerful machines mean larger and more costly equipment. It is significant that several different design studies of machines to demonstrate the scientific feasibility of fusion power cost in the range of 25-30 million dollars each, approximately the present national AEC budget for the entire program. Fortunately, as the recent successes attract attention, more interest in the program is generated, and it appears that the budget may be increased. It is especially gratifying to us that the public utility industry is very interested in the program. The Public Service Electric and Gas Company of New Jersey was the first to contribute financial backing to our efforts, and others have followed suit.

This is a most important development and is a first step toward the day when the cost of developing fusion power will be shifted from the government to industry.

The questions always arise of how long will it take and how much will it cost. Predicting the future is hazardous, but in broad terms it looks like the proof of scientific feasibility will come during the seventies, demonstration plants will operate in the eighties, and commercial fusion power will be a reality in the nineties. The costs should average \$100 million per year until the new industry is born.

What does this promise? Simply a permanent solution to the energy problems of mankind, inexhaustible, low cost fuel; an inherently safe generating system that is clean and quiet enough for location within regions of high population density, and a substantial improvement in the problem of waste heat.

U.S. CONTROL OF CARIBBEAN VITAL TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, continued U.S. control of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone, as well as of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba and our military installations in Puerto Rico is vital to the military defenses of this country.

I view with grave concern the present negotiations with Panama involving our sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone and the failure of the executive branch to respond vigorously to the blatant vituperations by the Communist spokesmen for Soviet Russia and Cuba condemning our presence in Guantanamo Bay and openly stating their intention to remove American presence there. While our naval stations at San Juan and Roosevelt Roads have not been subjected to such verbal threats, there is a separatist movement for nationhood underway by those in Puerto Rico who would socialize that island and nationalize all industries.

The Panama Canal is at the strategic maritime crossroads of the Western Hemisphere and is of great importance for interoceanic commerce in peacetime and the security of the United States in time of war. Under no circumstances should we allow it to come under the control of any other nation or of any international agency such as the U.N.O.

The demands by Panamanian officials for complete sovereignty by Panama over the Canal Zone are unreasonable and without legal justification. Three treaties form the legal basis for U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 with Great Britain acknowledged the sole right of the United States to build the canal.

The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty with Panama of 1903 granted to the United States in perpetuity "the use, occupation and control" of the Canal Zone territory for the "construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection" of the Panama Canal with full "sovereign rights, power and authority"

within the zone to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power or authority." This treaty not only binds the United States in perpetuity to maintain, operate, and defend the Panama Canal but also binds Panama to recognize the validity of the treaty. Also the United States was given "all rights, power, and authority" over a strip of land 5 miles on each side of the canal extending the approximately 50-mile length of the canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

The third treaty legalizing America's sovereignty over the Panama Canal is the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of 1922 whereby Colombia recognized ownership of the Canal as "vested entirely and absolutely in the United States of America."

These three treaties to protect America's interests were hammered out by wise and realistic negotiators. The main concern of those presently bargaining with the Panamanians seems to be placating America's enemy. Our early negotiators realized that Panama was a politically unstable country plagued with recurrent revolutions. So, they insisted that U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and over operation of the canal be granted in perpetuity. In perpetuity means forever.

Guantanamo Bay, which is located at the crossroads of the Caribbean Sea, commands the Windward Passage from the Atlantic to the Caribbean and serves as a sentinel in defense of the Panama Canal.

By a Treaty of Relations between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba of 1903 as renegotiated in 1934, this country has the right to retain the naval base at Guantanamo. The agreement cannot be abrogated without the consent of the United States—not by treaty but by an act of Congress as provided in article 4, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution.

Another factor to consider in any claim by the present regime in Cuba of its right to Guantanamo is that the treaties of 1903 and 1934 were made by freely elected representatives of the Cuban people. There have been no free elections in Cuba since Castro seized power in 1959.

And then there is the treaty of 1904 between the United States and Cuba wherein the United States relinquished claim of title to the Island of Pines in consideration of the use by the United States of Guantanamo as a naval station. The United States has just as much right to claim the Isle of Pines as Cuba does to claim Guantanamo.

In 1960, both Castro and Khrushchev condemned the United States for being in Guantanamo, claiming that it rightfully belonged to the Cuban people.

President Eisenhower issued a forceful statement letting the world know that the United States had no intention of giving up Guantanamo and of our intention to take whatever steps might be appropriate to defend it.

On November 1, 1971, Castro and Kogysgin, at the end of the latter's visit to Cuba, issued a joint communique which proclaimed:

The Soviet side highly appreciated the

achievements of the people of the Republic of Cuba in building the foundations of socialism. It condemned again the imperialist blockade practiced by the United States of America against Cuba and different U.S.-encouraged hostile actions, including piratic actions and violations of air space, as well as expressed itself against the unlawful presence of the North American military base of Guantanamo in Cuban territory.

While in Chile a few weeks ago, Castro boasted that he would soon make a claim for Guantanamo, and that the United States would surrender the base without a shot being fired.

On December 10, 1903, Armed Forces of the United States entered Guantanamo for the first time. Cuban Dictator Fidel Castro this past Friday, the 68th anniversary of American occupation of Guantanamo, utilized the occasion to verbally blast the United States, stating that our presence in Guantanamo was illegal and that the stubborn attitude of the United States of remaining in Guantanamo would provoke a conflict.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it imperative that the United States make it clear to the world that U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone and the Panama Canal are nonnegotiable, that this Nation declare again as did President Eisenhower its intent to take whatever steps as may be necessary to defend Guantanamo, and that we beef up our defenses to be prepared for any foreseeable eventuality in the Caribbean area.

If the United States ever gives up its base at Guantanamo, it should be given to the free Cubans as a base for liberating their homeland.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a report by Roberto E. Socas entitled "U.S. Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, Background Analysis," and the texts of the 1903 and 1934 treaties concerning Guantanamo and the treaty of 1904 regarding the Isle of Pines between the United States and Cuba.

[From the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service]

U.S. NAVAL BASE, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA—
BACKGROUND ANALYSIS

(By Roberto E. Socas)

INTRODUCTION

On January 3, 1961, the United States severed diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba. This step followed a series of increasingly hostile actions by the Cuban Government. Cuba had expropriated almost \$1 billion in United States-owned property. It had consistently followed a policy of vilification of the United States and its leaders. It had accused the United States before the United Nations of intervention in Cuba and of aggression against Cuba. Cuba had drawn closer to the Sino-Soviet bloc and continued to receive quantities of military and other forms of assistance from that bloc.

In view of the present state of relations between Cuba and the United States the position of the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, has been the subject of grave concern to Americans. This paper provides background on the situation of the Guantanamo Naval Base. It notes the legal right of the United States to lease the area upon which resides the Guantanamo Base. It describes the physical characteristics of the Base. It draws together differing estimates of the military-strategic and political importance of Guantanamo to the United States. Finally, it outlines United States, Cuban and Soviet policies toward the Base.

I. BACKGROUND TO UNITED STATES ACQUISITION OF GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE

The United States originally acquired the area upon which it established the Naval Base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, through a lease agreement negotiated between the United States and Cuba in 1903. While recognizing that Cuba retained ultimate sovereignty over the leased area, the United States was granted "complete jurisdiction and control" for as long as it retained use of the area. By a further agreement that year, the United States agreed to pay Cuba \$2000 in gold annually for the use of the leased area. By the Treaty of Relations of June 9, 1934, Cuba and the United States reaffirmed the provisions of these lease agreements.

In addition, an Executive Order signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt on May 1, 1941, established Guantanamo Bay as a "Naval Defensive Sea Area" and a "Naval Air Space Reservation." This order, which is still in force, closes Guantanamo Bay to foreign warships and aircraft, as well as to commercial shipping and aircraft, except vessels engaged in Cuban trade.

II. A DESCRIPTION OF GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE

The Guantanamo Naval Base, on the southeast tip of Cuba roughly 500 miles from Miami, encompasses 19,621 acres of land and 9,196 acres of water. This 45 square mile area of land and water is enclosed by 27 miles of perimeter fence inland and on the seaward side by 9 miles of waterfront. On the land side it is surrounded by red clay hills and high jungle land, all suitable for Cuban artillery emplacement.

This United States Base represents an investment of some \$76 million, contains harbor, docking and ship repair facilities, communications, medical, supply, ordnance stowage, training, and administrative installations. There are two airfields with associated shop and hangar facilities, including a 5000-foot runway at McCalla Field for conventional aircraft and an 8000-foot strip for jets at Leeward Point. In addition, on-base housing and recreational facilities are provided for American personnel.

The Base is a self-contained entity except for the water and part of its electric supply. Water must be pumped from a pumping station on the Yateras River more than four miles outside the Base; part of the Base's power needs are supplied by a Cuban power company. In the event that essential utilities are cut off, alternative emergency sources could be resorted to if usage were strictly rationed.

In recent months, military personnel has included about 250 officers and 3000 enlisted men. Two hundred sixty United States civilians are employed in a Civil Service status and resident on the Base. Dependents total about 2770. In addition, close to 3600 Cubans are regularly employed on the Base, most of whom live outside the naval installation.

Current annual maintenance and operating costs total \$8.3 million. Of this about \$7 million is in the form of wages to the 3600 Cuban workers at the Base, and \$500,000 in the form of purchases of fresh provisions and other commodities from Cuba. Since the Base presents about the only major opportunity for employment in the area and the land is too arid to cultivate, the Base provides a welcome livelihood for thousands of Cubans who might otherwise fare badly on that part of the island.

From the above it can be seen that the Base contributes \$7.5 million annually (\$7 million in wages and \$0.5 million in purchases) to the Cuban economy. In addition, Cuba has been receiving \$3,386.25 since 1934, in place of the \$2000 in gold coin originally agreed to.

Defense preparations are reported to be thorough. The naval, marine and air contingents regularly stationed on the Base, along with the weapons at their disposal and high wire fences and land mines, have been placed

in readiness to combat any direct assault. In addition, reinforcements are readily available from our bases in nearby Puerto Rico, the West Indies, Florida, and our Caribbean naval forces which are steaming in the vicinity of the Base.

III. ITS IMPORTANCE TO THE UNITED STATES

A. Military-strategic importance

The Base at Guantanamo Bay with its deep water harbor and its excellent climate, has a variety of strategic uses.¹

Lying at the crossroads of the Caribbean, Guantanamo commands the Windward Passage from the Atlantic to the Caribbean and serves as an outer defense post for the Panama Canal. It is an important link in the chain of bases protecting the Caribbean. Guantanamo's central location and extensive facilities make it a staging base for military fighter, bomber and supply-carrying aircraft bound for Central and South America, as well as for any surface or troop activities in the Caribbean.

In view of growing Soviet submarine strength, including atomic submarines, it is argued that Guantanamo is important in assisting in the search for and identification of Soviet submarines and that it therefore discourages Russian submarine incursions along the Eastern seaboard and the Caribbean. Its training facilities are deemed excellent, particularly for anti-submarine warfare and for practice in amphibious strike exercises.

From the logistical viewpoint Guantanamo's value lies in its unique ability to support naval and other operations in the Caribbean. Its many and varied facilities are considered to be invaluable by the naval authorities who hold that they cannot be duplicated elsewhere except at great cost in money and time.

It has been further argued that Guantanamo has a negative strategic value. So long as the United States occupies it, the Base is denied to international Communism. Were Cuban relations with the Soviet bloc to become even more intimate and were the United States to withdraw from the Base, Castro might feel free to turn the Base over to Soviet control. Such an eventuality would speed the penetration of international Communism into this Hemisphere and, by affording a haven to Soviet submarine craft, would pose a close threat to the Western Hemisphere.

Some commentators, on the other hand, have questioned many of these views. They feel that fixed bases are outdated in the age of modern missile artillery. One leading naval spokesman, for example, has stated that with the increase in range of ballistic missiles, the growth in the power of their warheads and the development of greater precision and accuracy of the guidance systems of these missiles, if military forces are to survive an attack, they must seek greater dispersion, mobility and be more effectively concealed.² Although he did not explicitly apply this judgment to Guantanamo, it might be agreed that "Gitmo" shares these limiting characteristics of fixed bases.

Hanson W. Baldwin, *New York Times* military analyst, admits that Guantanamo,

¹ The principal United States justification for the strategic role of the Guantanamo Base is to be found in a statement by Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, at the Hearings on Defense Appropriations held by the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, January 21, 1960, p. 168ff. The key excerpts are reproduced in Appendix I.

² Statement made by Admiral Russell, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, on February 2, 1960, at Hearings on *U.S. Relations with Panama*, before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 86th Congress, 2nd session, p. 93.

though highly important in any limited war, is "probably not vital" from the strategic viewpoint. He adds that "For all-out nuclear war, Guantanamo Bay, with its present facilities, is useless."³ Others agree with this analysis, pointing out in terms of global strategy that Guantanamo "has only marginal value," or that Guantanamo "is a military convenience, not a necessity."⁴ *Life* Magazine observed that "with the increasing mobility and endurance of modern armament, military men concede that Gitmo is no longer absolutely essential to American defense."⁵

Finally, critics note that the whole problem of the value and role of United States overseas bases is being reassessed by policy makers, from the viewpoint of their strategic utility, of the political difficulties they usually arouse, and the balance of payments drain they represent.

In this context it is argued, unlike other United States overseas bases Guantanamo is not located near the front lines of defense against Soviet and Communist Chinese advance. As such it is held to offer little deterrent value to that potential enemy.

B. Political importance

1. Political importance to the United States of retaining Guantanamo

a. As a symbol of United States interest in Caribbean affairs

It has been contended that Guantanamo is politically important to the United States as a symbol of our continued interest in developments in the Caribbean and throughout the Western Hemisphere. In his Inaugural Address, President Kennedy has affirmed this interest and the desire of the United States to "let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain master of its own house." Some argue that our continued use of this Base unambiguously confirms this intent while any other policy would seem to deny this intent.

b. As a symbol of United States strength and prestige

Those who stress the political importance of retaining Guantanamo argue that any concession to a Communist-controlled regime is seen by Moscow or Peking as a sign of weakness. Any evidence of a readiness on the part of the United States to withdraw from the Base, some argue, may only invite Castro to be more hostile and provocative and ease his passage to a closer intimacy with the Soviet Union.

Many observers feel that a withdrawal from Guantanamo would symbolize a sharp decline of United States power and influence throughout the Caribbean and, therefore, at the least, throughout the Hemisphere and probably throughout the world. As Hanson W. Baldwin has summarized this view:

"Gitmo, important militarily, is even more important as a symbol of the United States' position in the world today, and as a sanctuary of freedom in a land where freedom is dying. We retreat at our peril."⁶

c. Policy toward Guantanamo and precedent

Some argue that any policy adopted toward Guantanamo will be taken as a precedent of United States policy toward other bases. Should the United States abandon Guantanamo, where our right is clear, it is

³ "Clouds over Guantanamo," by Hanson W. Baldwin, *New York Times Magazine Section*, August 21, 1960.

⁴ "At Guantanamo Base: Quiet—and Danger." *U.S. News and World Report*, October 31, 1960, p. 70. Also "Cuba—Stakes at the Base," *Time*, March 28, 1960, p. 38.

⁵ "Communism's Take Over in Castro's Cuba," by Keith Wheeler, *Life*, July 18, 1960, p. 21.

⁶ "Guantanamo—Ours or Castro's?" *Saturday Evening Post*, September 24, 1960, p. 72.

argued that a dangerous precedent may be established which could apply with even greater validity to bases where our position is not as clear nor our rights based on such historic treaty arrangements. Some argue, therefore, that withdrawal from Guantanamo will imperil the entire structure of United States overseas bases ranging from the Panama Canal Zone to our European, African and Asian outposts.

d. Guantanamo as a link to the Cuban people

With the break in diplomatic relations and the absence of many other opportunities for contact between the peoples of Cuba and those of the United States, communications between those two nations may suffer, misunderstandings arise, images become distorted. Some argue that our naval forces and their excellent behavior in the Base seen clearly by the Cuban workers there give lie to the claim that we are a nation of imperialistic ogres and warmongers. Guantanamo can be seen as one of the last links between the American people and the Cuban people. Consequently, it serves as a sign of our support for the aspirations of the Cuban people and as a symbol, perhaps the last remaining one, of freedom in Cuba.

2. Political importance of withdrawing from Guantanamo

There are some, on the other hand, who argue that more is to be gained than lost if the United States should withdraw from Guantanamo. These critics contend that: (a) Guantanamo is now of relatively low strategic importance; and (b) there are real risks in retaining the Base, particularly if the Cuban Government should provoke a campaign of active harassment. They are concerned about the blow that could be dealt to United States prestige abroad should the United States, in defending the Base, be forced to injure or perhaps even cause the death of misguided but innocent Cubans involved in agitation against the Base. Furthermore, were the United States to withdraw, Guantanamo no longer could serve Castro as a scapegoat nor could it be denounced before the world as a focus of United States interventionary action against Cuba.

In addition, these advocates contend that a policy of withdrawal has certain positive aspects. They argue that: (a) by withdrawing voluntarily, the non-imperialist nature of United States foreign policy would be made unambiguously clear; and (b) withdrawal would improve relations with Castro.

Critics of these views stress what they feel to be the political importance of retaining Guantanamo. They argue that United States-Cuban relations are influenced not only by what United States policy is toward Guantanamo but more by a complex of United States-Cuban differences, particularly those caused by the expropriation of United States-owned property, the anti-United States campaign waged by Castro, and the close relation of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

IV. UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD GUANTANAMO

In late September 1960, Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, expressing the nation's concern over developments in Cuba, declared the intention of the United States to defend Guantanamo by force should the need arise. The following month Admiral Burke stated his objection to any attempt at unilateral abrogation of the lease agreement by Cuba.

In November 1960, as relations with Cuba appeared to deteriorate further, President Eisenhower enunciated United States policy on Guantanamo in a special statement.⁷ The President stressed the legal right of the United States to retain the Base and gave notice of United States unwillingness to abro-

⁷ Appendix II: White House statement delivered November 1, 1960.

gate the Treaty. In addition, he reaffirmed the United States intention to defend the Base should the need arise.

After the severance of diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba in January 1961, concern was evidenced in official circles of the effect this might have on Cuba's policy toward Guantanamo. To avoid misunderstanding of the United States position, President Eisenhower authorized a statement which noted that the diplomatic break had no effect at all on Guantanamo. It asserted that United States treaty rights could not be abrogated without the consent of the United States.

These statements of policy stress the United States resolve to retain the Base and to resist, with force if need be, any Cuban attempt either to abrogate the lease agreement or to force a United States withdrawal from the Base.

The United States position on Guantanamo is further defined by the official naval evaluation of the strategic importance of Guantanamo⁸ and by considerations of the political importance of the Base, both discussed above. To this should be added: (a) the assertion of the right of "complete jurisdiction and control" over the leased territory in Cuba, as granted by the 1903 lease agreement and as reaffirmed by the 1934 Treaty; (b) well-publicized shows of United States strength in the Caribbean, and specifically at Guantanamo; and (c) the reiteration by the United States of its policy of non-interference in Cuban internal affairs.

V. CUBAN POLICY ON GUANTANAMO

For the present it appears that Castro and the other Cuban leaders are seeking to demonstrate that they are temporarily permitting the United States to retain the Guantanamo Naval Base. In addition, they take pains to reiterate that Cuba will not attack the Base. Behind this policy, however, lies the stated threat that Cuba may adopt alternative policies.

In the early months of the Castro regime, from January to October 1959, while stressing his desire to establish friendly relations with the United States, Castro had emphasized his intention to allow the United States to retain the Base. However, with the growth of United States-Cuban differences in October 1959, Castro began to challenge the United States right to retain Guantanamo and the Base became one other object of his hostility toward the United States.

Since then he has charged that the Base is the focus of "Yankee intervention" against Cuba. Castro has threatened (a) to request the United States to withdraw; (b) to refer to an international court the question of the legal right of the United States to retain the Base; or (c) to unleash a campaign of harassment and incidents against the Base.

Yet Castro has not carried out any of these threats. It may even be possible to argue that the Cuban Premier has acted in a comparatively restrained manner, confining himself to occasional charges against the Base in order to keep before the people the issue of a United States base on Cuban soil. The moderation of his tone is surprising when contrasted with the passion of Cuban attacks on other United States interests and policies.

Even after the United States severed diplomatic relations with Cuba and United States-Cuban relations deteriorated still further, Cuba's indignation over this step did not appear to affect its policy toward Guantanamo. References to the Base made as late as ten days after the break reaffirm this spirit of restraint. At that time, Castro merely stated that the Base is a "headache for the United States" and that "the legal position of

the United States with respect to the base is becoming untenable."

The clearest exposition of Cuban policy is a three-page passage contained in the 21-page speech Castro delivered before the United Nations General Assembly on September 26, 1960. It serves to point out the official Cuban line on Guantanamo, one which Cuban President Dorticos, Foreign Minister Raul Roa, Ernesto "Che" Guevara and other Cuban leaders follow consistently in their mentions of Guantanamo. The themes in this speech comprise the main element of Cuba's stated policy toward the Base thus far:

(1) The Base belongs to the Cuban people. It was the United States that took advantage of a weak Cuba to impose an unfair lease agreement on her.

(2) Cuba will not commit any act of aggression against the United States. This stand is difficult to follow, however, because of the United States policy of "self-aggression." This Castro defines as the design of the United States to have Castro precipitate an incident against the Base which will give the United States justification for invading Cuba.

(3) The Base is a source of United States intervention against Cuba. It is a "springboard of aggression," a "dagger pointed at the heart of Cuba," a military staging point from which "counter revolutionaries" can embark on an invasion of Cuba.

(4) Cuba fears involvement against her will in an atomic conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union merely because it tolerates the presence of a United States Base. This, Castro argues, is all the more unfair since Cuba does not want the Base on her soil.

(5) Cuba is willing to let the United States keep the Base until "the moment when that country has become a threat to the security and tranquility of our people." At that time Cuba will then demand withdrawal or refer the matter of withdrawal to an international court. Then, Castro argued, justice will prevail and the United States will be forced to leave in obedience to "the canons of international law."

At this point, it may be well to inquire into what considerations appear to influence Cuban leaders in developing this particular policy.

(a) Considerations that may affect the shaping of Cuban policy on Guantanamo

The following considerations may play an important role in the shaping of Cuba's policy toward Guantanamo:

(1) Reiterated United States intentions to defend the Base against Cuban attack. Cuba realizes its military weakness as compared to United States defensive preparations at the Base and overall United States military capabilities in the Caribbean.

(2) Fear that a vigorous Cuban campaign of harassment against the Base might lead to incidents which would give the United States an excuse to intervene.

(3) Uncertainty about the extent, if any, of future Soviet assistance against the United States were Cuba to be the object of military action by the United States.

(4) Because of the urgent need in Cuba for dollars, the \$7.5 million contributed in the form of wages and local purchases annually by the Base to the Cuban economy, is sufficiently important to justify continuing the present arrangement.

(5) Guantanamo has value to the Cuban leaders as a scapegoat, a "whipping-boy," a symbol of "Yankee imperialism" in Latin America. The presence of the Base on Cuban soil and its military forces provide Castro with an excuse to decry before the United Nations, alleged United States "interventions" stemming from the Base. It serves Castro as a justification for seeking help from extracontinental powers against the "warlike" Base and from the "Yankee aggres-

sions" emanating from the Base. Castro is thus able to seek the approval of many Cubans for closer relations and contacts with the Soviet world.

(6) Finally, Castro may be unwilling to show overt hostility at the present moment with the advent of a new United States Administration in Washington.

(b) Alternative policies available to Castro
Among possible courses of action open to Castro are these:

(1) Use of force to gain control of the Base. Many believe this to be unlikely in view of Castro's awareness of United States military preparedness at Guantanamo and United States intention to defend the Base.

(2) Formally request United States withdrawal from the Base.

(3) Formally bring the question of the legal right of the United States to retain the Base before an international court.

(4) Demand more annual rent from the United States for the Base. At present, the United States pays \$3,386.25 annually for Guantanamo. To many Cubans this seems very little by comparison to the millions the United States makes available in military and economic aid to other nations in exchange for permitting the United States to maintain bases on their territory.

(5) Begin a policy of harassment. In view of the tension between the two countries it is truly remarkable that up to the present no incidents of a serious nature have occurred. This possibility, however, is always there. As a United States officer put it:

"What if there is a peaceful invasion, which Castro has suggested—a march of women and children? We have mob control devices, but what if somebody shoots? Is that an incident or a war?"

These harassments could include: (a) inciting mass protest movements; (b) effecting a general strike against the Base and preventing Cuban Base employees from going to work there; (c) cutting off the Base water supply as well as the power that comes from the Cuban power sources; (d) encouraging labor agitation at the Base among the Cuban workers; and (e) fomenting sabotage at the Base by the Cuban workers.

VI. SOVIET POLICY ON THE GUANTANAMO BASE

In view of the close ties between Cuba and the Soviet world, Soviet policy on Guantanamo deserves some mention.

At the news conference of July 12, 1960, at which he contended that the Monroe Doctrine was dead, Premier Khrushchev attacked the United States retention of the Guantanamo Base. He referred to the treaty sanctioning the lease of the Base from Cuba as "a treaty without a time limit on terms enslaving to a small nation—that is sheer inequity." The Soviet leader ridiculed charges that the Soviet Union wanted or needed military bases in Cuba by asserting that Soviet rockets based in the Soviet Union could hit any part of the world. At the meetings of the U.N. General Assembly in the Fall of 1960 friendship between the USSR and Cuba appeared to have been further cemented.

Since then, however, there have been signs that Soviet support for Castro is not all-out. The Soviet Premier has not visited Cuba as he had promised to do. Khrushchev's offer to launch Soviet rockets against the United States were it to intervene against Cuba has been lately explained as having a "symbolic" meaning, rather than being a real military commitment. Furthermore, some contend that Khrushchev is becoming increasingly perturbed about being associated with an ally of such unpredictability and instability as Castro. Others argue that in view of the identification of Castro with international Communism, the prestige of the Communist world would be hurt if Castro were to fall.

⁸ See Appendix I and Section on Strategic Importance of Guantanamo.

⁹ "Crisis on our doorstep—How long Castro?" *Newsweek*, January 16, 1961.

Since Castro's position, in this view, is not secure, it is to Soviet interest to dissociate itself to some extent from Castro's future. Others contend that since Khrushchev is presently attempting to appeal to all groups in the underdeveloped world, he wishes to dissociate himself from Castro in order to reassure those who find Cuban solutions too radical.

Finally, there are certain indications that the Soviet Union is attempting to ameliorate US-USSR relations with the advent of a new Administration in Washington. It may be that the Soviets would consider desisting from interference in the Western Hemisphere as a necessary step toward better relations with the United States.

VIII. CONCLUSION

United States policy toward Guantanamo has remained steady and firm. In general, most United States analysts surveying the Guantanamo problem, have supported the present United States policy of retaining and, if need be, defending the base. They have argued a variety of grounds for its importance to the United States. The few voices recommending immediate withdrawal have remained a small minority. However, some attention is being paid to the risks of retaining Guantanamo in the face of a possible Cuban campaign of harassment and incidents.

Guantanamo can be examined as another United States overseas base and its usefulness or obsolescence weighed on primarily military grounds. Many analysts surveying the problem, however, see important political implications to United States policy toward Guantanamo. Any final policy determination must be the result of a proper blending of the different and sometimes contradictory considerations.

APPENDIX I

Statement of Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, at the Hearings on Defense Appropriations held by the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, on January 21, 1960, on strategic role of Guantanamo Naval Base.

(a) Guantanamo Bay is a part of the base complex consisting of Panama, Trinidad, Roosevelt Roads, and Guantanamo Bay, required to support combatant naval forces in the defense of the Caribbean Sea area, to carry out ASW operations, to defend the Panama Canal, and to protect shipping between the Caribbean and eastern Atlantic-South American ports.

(b) The naval installation in the Guantanamo area provides an important contribution to the defense of the United States. The base at Guantanamo provides excellent year-round training facilities for U.S. naval forces. The installation also provides an important support base for wartime naval operations to insure control and protection of the Caribbean area. Denial of these facilities to the United States could have far-reaching effects on the overall political and military stability of the area. The base is in no way obsolete and will be required in the foreseeable future for support of units of the Atlantic Fleet. Retention of these facilities provides assurance of a continuing U.S. military and political position of strength in this potentially critical area. Development of similar alternate facilities in the area would require extensive expenditures from U.S. resources.

(c) In summary, the U.S. Navy has a continuing requirement for the naval base at Guantanamo Bay to insure that essential fleet training may continue in an orderly and uninterrupted basis, and, in the event of war, that it may be used in support of essential naval operations to insure control of the vital Caribbean Sea area.

In addition, Admiral Burke listed the following as strategic values of the Base:

(a) *Controls the Windward Passage.*—The

Windward Passage is one of the main entry points to Caribbean. It is on the direct shipping route from Europe and South America to the Panama Canal.

(b) *Base for anti-submarine warfare operations.*—Fine natural harbor and well-developed facilities for basing and logistic support of ASW forces covering the trade routes, Caribbean Sea, and lower Atlantic.

(c) *Base for defense of inter-American shipping.*—Is a midlink in chain of key points, Key West, Guantanamo, Puerto Rico, Trinidad, for providing air and surface protection of shipping engaged in the transport of strategic materials from South America to the United States.

(d) *Controls air routes from the east coast of the United States to the west coast of South America.*—Is located midway on over-water routes.

(e) *Base for training ships and crews.*—Fine natural harbor and well-developed installation for training ships and crews both in war and peace.

(f) *Damaged ship haven.*—Centrally located as a haven for recovery and repair of ships suffering war damage incident to anti-submarine warfare and convoy operations along the intra-America shipping lanes.

(g) *Key point for operations in defense of Panama Canal.*—Provides centrally located base for surveillance and patrol of sea approaches to the Panama Canal.

APPENDIX II

Statement by President Eisenhower on Guantanamo delivered November 1, 1960.

While the position of the Government of the United States with respect to the Naval Base at Guantanamo has, I believe, been made very clear, I would like to reiterate it briefly.

Our rights in Guantanamo are based on international agreements with Cuba, and include the exercise by the United States of complete jurisdiction and control over the area. These agreements with Cuba can be modified or abrogated only by agreement between the two parties, that is, the United States and Cuba. Our Government has no intention of agreeing to the modification or abrogation of these agreements and will take whatever steps may be appropriate to defend the Base.

The people of the United States, and all of the peoples of the world, can be assured that the United States' presence in Guantanamo and use of the Base pose no threat whatever to the sovereignty of Cuba, to the peace and security of its people or to the independence of any of the American countries. Because of its importance to the defense of the entire hemisphere, particularly in the light of the intimate relations which now exist between the present Government of Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc, it is essential that our position in Guantanamo be clearly understood.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON U.S. NAVAL BASE, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA

I. UNITED STATES POLICY ON GUANTANAMO

1. *U.S. Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba*, 6-page study prepared under the direction of the Director, Politico-Military Policy Division, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, 26 January 1960. This describes treaty rights, description of Base, and its strategic importance.

2. *The History of Guantanamo Bay*, by Rear Admiral Marion Emerson Murphy, DPPO, Tenth Naval District, U.S. Naval Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, 1953.

3. Policy statements by Admiral Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, found in:

(a) Hearings on the *Department of Defense Appropriations for 1961* before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, 86th Congress, 2nd Session, Part II, pp. 168ff, on January 21, 1960. (Also Appendix I)

(b) Interview appearing in *U.S. News and World Report*, October 3, 1960, pp. 70ff.

4. Statement by Admiral James S. Russell, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, issued at Hearings on *U.S. Relations with Panama*, before Subcommittee of Inter-American Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, 86th Congress, 2nd Session, on February 2, 1960, p. 91ff.

5. *Facts Concerning Relations between Cuba and the United States*: A reply to allegations made in the United Nations by Prime Minister Fidel Castro of Cuba, U.S. Delegation to the General Assembly, October 13, 1960, pp. 4, 19-20.

6. President Eisenhower's *Declaration on Guantanamo*, see U.S. press on November 1 and 2, 1960. (Also Appendix II)

7. For diplomatic break and reassertion of United States rights on Guantanamo, as well as for articles on the Base, see U.S. press on January 4 and 5, 1961.

II. CUBAN POLICY ON GUANTANAMO

1. Most complete exposition of official Cuban policy on Guantanamo presented in Premier Castro's speech before the U.N. General Assembly, September 26, 1960. See U.S. press, UN Documents, or *UN Review* issue of November 1960.

2. For Cuban reaction to United States declarations and policy statements see U.S. and Cuban press (*Revolucion, Hoy, Mundo*) on days above cited.

3. Further insight into Cuban thinking provided by C. Wright Mills' book, *Listen, Yankee*, (1960), see pp. 20-21, and 94-95.

III. UNITED STATES-CUBAN LEASE AGREEMENTS OF 1903 AND TREATY RELATIONS OF 1934 BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND CUBA REAFFIRMING THE LEASE AGREEMENTS, REPRODUCED BY FOREIGN AFFAIRS DIVISION, LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS. AVAILABLE ON REQUEST

IV. SELECTED ARTICLES ON THE GUANTANAMO NAVAL BASE

(a) "Cuba—stakes at the Base." *Time*, March 28, 1960.

(b) "In Castro's Cuba—a U.S. base in trouble 500 miles from home." *U.S. News and World Report*, April 11, 1960.

(c) Two installment series on Guantanamo Naval Base, by John G. Norris, July 7 and 8, 1960, *Washington Post*.

(d) "Communism's take-over in Castro's Cuba," by Keith Wheeler, *Life*, July 18, 1960.

(e) "Clouds Over Guantanamo," by Hanson W. Baldwin, *New York Times, Sunday Magazine Section*, August 21, 1960. Condensed version appears in *Readers Digest*, December 1960.

(f) "Guantanamo: ours or Castro's?" by Hanson W. Baldwin, *Saturday Evening Post*, September 24, 1960. Spanish version appears in *Bohemia Libre*, January 1, 1961.

(g) "At Guantanamo Base: Quiet—and danger." *U.S. News and World Report*, October 31, 1960.

(h) "Cuba's invasion jitters," by Carleton Beals, *The Nation*, November 12, 1960.

(i) "Cuba—crisis on our doorstep." *Newsweek*, January 16, 1961.

(j) "What shall we do about Cuba?" by Kyle Haselden, *The Christian Century*, February 1, 1961.

[From the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service]

RELATIONS: TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CUBA (Guantanamo Naval Base Agreements, Texts—1903 and 1934, Treaty Series No. 866)

Signed at Washington, May 29, 1934. Ratification advised by the Senate of the United States, May 31, 1934 (legislative day of May 28, 1934).

Ratified by the President of the United States, June 5, 1934.

Ratified by Cuba, June 4, 1934.

Ratifications exchanged at Washington, June 9, 1934.

Proclaimed by the President of the United States, June 9, 1934.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas a Treaty of Relations between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba was concluded and signed by their respective Plenipotentiaries at Washington on the twenty-ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four, the original of which Treaty, being in the English and Spanish languages, is word for word as follows:

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being animated by the desire to fortify the relations of friendship between the two countries and to modify, with this purpose, the relations established between them by the Treaty of Relations signed at Habana, May 22, 1903, have appointed, with this intention, as their Plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America; Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America, and Mr. Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The Provincial President of the Republic of Cuba, Senor Dr. Manuel Marquez Sterling, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Cuba to the United States of America;

Who, after having communicated to each other their full powers which were found to be in good and due form, have agreed upon the following articles:

ARTICLE I

The treaty of Relations which was concluded between the two contracting parties on May 22, 1903, shall cease to be in force, and is abrogated, from the date on which the present Treaty goes into effect.

ARTICLE II

All the acts effected in Cuba by the United States of America during its military occupation of the island, up to May 20, 1902, the date on which the Republic of Cuba was established, have been ratified and held as valid; and all the rights legally acquired by virtue of those acts shall be maintained and protected.

ARTICLE III

Until the two contracting parties agree to the modification or abrogation of the stipulations of the agreement in regard to the lease to the United States of America of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba on February 16, 1903, and by the President of the United States of America on the 23d day of the same month and year, the stipulations of that agreement with regard to the naval station of Guantanamo shall continue in effect. The supplementary agreement in regard to naval or coaling stations signed between the two Governments on July 2, 1903, also shall continue in effect in the same form and on the same conditions with respect to the naval station at Guantanamo. So long as the United States of America shall not abandon the said naval station of Guantanamo or the two Governments shall not agree to a modification of its present limits, the station shall continue to have the territorial area that it now has, with the limits that it has on the date of the signature of the present Treaty.

ARTICLE IV

If at any time in the future a situation should arise that appears to point to an outbreak of contagious disease in the territory of either of the contracting parties, either of the two Governments shall, for its own protection, and without its act being considered unfriendly, exercise freely and at its discretion the right to suspend communications between those of its ports that it may designate and all or part of the

territory of the other party, and for the period that it may consider to be advisable.

ARTICLE V

The present Treaty shall be ratified by the contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods; and shall go into effect on the date of the exchange of their ratifications, which shall take place in the city of Washington as soon as possible.

In faith whereof, the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty and have affixed their seals hereto.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, at Washington on the Twenty-ninth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four.

CORDELL HULL,
SUMNER WELLES,
M. MARQUEZ STERLING.

And whereas, the said Treaty has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the ninth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, have caused the said Treaty to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States of America and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this ninth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and fifty-eighth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

(By the President: Cordell Hull, Secretary of State.)

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CUBA

(Treaty series, No. 418, lease of coaling or naval stations)

Signed by the President of Cuba, February 16, 1903.

Signed by the President of the United States, February 23, 1903.

AGREEMENT

Between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba for the lease (subject to terms to be agreed upon by the two Governments) to the United States of lands in Cuba for coaling and naval stations.

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being desirous to execute fully the provisions of Article VII of the Act of Congress approved March second, 1901, and of Article VII of the Appendix to the Constitution of the Republic of Cuba promulgated on the 20th of May, 1902, which provide:

"Article VII. To enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba, and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the Cuban Government will sell or lease to the United States the lands necessary for coaling or naval stations, at certain specified points, to be agreed with the President of the United States."

have reached an agreement to that end, as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Republic of Cuba hereby leases to the United States, for the time required for the purposes of coaling and naval stations, the following described areas of land and water situated in the Island of Cuba:

1st. In Guantanamo (see Hydrographic Office Chart 1857). From a point on the south coast, 4.37 nautical miles to the eastward of Windward Point Light House, a line running

north (true) a distance of 4.25 nautical miles;

From the northern extremity of this line, a line running west (true), a distance of 5.87 nautical miles;

From the western extremity of this last line, a line running southwest (true) 3.31 nautical miles;

From the southwestern extremity of this last line, a line running south (true) to the seacoast.

This lease shall be subject to all the conditions named in Article II of this agreement. 2nd. In Northwestern Cuba (see Hydrographic Office Chart 2036).

In Bahia Honda (see Hydrographic Office Chart 520b).

All that land included in the peninsula containing Cerro del Morrillo and Punta del Carenero situated to the westward of a line running south (true) from the north coast at a distance of thirteen hundred yards east (true) from the crest of Cerro del Morrillo, and all the adjacent waters touching upon the coast line of the above described peninsula and including the estuary south of Punta del Carenero with the control of the headwaters as necessary for sanitary and other purposes.

And in addition all that piece of land and its adjacent waters on the western side of the entrance to Bahia Honda included between the shore line and a line running north and south (true) to low water marks through a point which is west (true) distant one nautical mile from Pta. del Cayman.

ARTICLE II

The grant of the foregoing article shall include the right to use and occupy the waters adjacent to said areas of land and water, and to improve and deepen the entrances thereto and the anchorages therein, and generally to do any and all things necessary to fit the premises for use as coaling or naval stations only, and for no other purpose.

Vessels engaged in the Cuban trade shall have free passage through the waters included within this grant.

ARTICLE III

While on the one hand the United States recognizes the continuance of the ultimate sovereignty of the Republic of Cuba over the above described areas of land and water, on the other hand the Republic of Cuba consents that during the period of the occupation by the United States of said areas under the terms of this agreement the United States shall exercise complete jurisdiction and control over and within said areas with the right to acquire (under conditions to be hereafter agreed upon by the two Governments) for the public purposes of the United States any land or other property therein by purchase or by exercise of eminent domain with full compensation to the owners thereof.

Done in duplicate at Habana, and signed by the President of the Republic of Cuba this sixteenth day of February, 1903.

T. ESTRADA PALMA.

Signed by the President of the United States the twenty-third of February, 1903.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

CUBA—LEASE OF COALING OR NAVAL STATIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

(Lease to the United States by the Government of Cuba of certain areas of land and water for naval or coaling stations in Guantanamo and Bahia Honda)

Signed at Habana July 2, 1903.

Approved by the President October 2, 1903. Ratified by the President of Cuba August 17, 1903.

Ratifications exchanged at Washington October 6, 1903.

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being desirous to conclude

the conditions of the lease of areas of land and water for the establishment of naval or coaling stations in Guantanamo and Bahía Honda the Republic of Cuba made to the United States by the Agreement of February 16/23, 1903, in fulfillment of the provisions of Article Seven of the Constitutional Appendix of the Republic of Cuba, have appointed their Plenipotentiaries to that end.—

The President of the United States of America, Herbert G. Squiers, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary in Havana.

And the President of the Republic of Cuba, Jose M. Garcia Montes, Secretary of Finance, and acting Secretary of State and Justice, who, after communicating to each other their respective full powers, found to be in due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:—

ARTICLE I

The United States of America agrees and covenants to pay to the Republic of Cuba the annual sum of two thousand dollars, in gold coin of the United States, as long as the former shall occupy and use said areas of land by virtue of said agreement.

All private lands and other real property within said areas shall be acquired forthwith by the Republic of Cuba.

The United States of America agrees to furnish to the Republic of Cuba the sums necessary for the purchase of said private lands and properties and such sums shall be accepted by the Republic of Cuba as advance payment on account of rental due by virtue of said Agreement.

ARTICLE II

The said areas shall be surveyed and their boundaries distinctly marked by permanent fences or inclosures.

The expenses of construction and maintenance of such fences or inclosures shall be borne by the United States.

ARTICLE III

The United States of America agrees that no person, partnership, or corporation shall be permitted to establish or maintain a commercial, industrial or other enterprise within said areas.

ARTICLE IV

Fugitives from justice charged with crimes or misdemeanors amenable to Cuban Law, taking refuge within said areas, shall be delivered up by the United States authorities on demand by duly authorized Cuban authorities.

On the other hand the Republic of Cuba agrees that fugitives from justice charged with crimes or misdemeanors amenable to United States law, committed within said areas, taking refuge in Cuban territory, shall on demand, be delivered up to duly authorized United States authorities.

ARTICLE V

Materials of all kinds, merchandise, stores and munitions of war imported into said areas for exclusive use and consumption therein, shall not be subject to payment of customs duties nor any other fees or charges and the vessels which may carry same shall not be subject to payment of port, tonnage, anchorage or other fees, except in case said vessels shall be discharged without the limits of said areas; and said vessels shall not be discharged without the limits of said areas otherwise than through a regular port of entry of the Republic of Cuba when both cargo and vessel shall be subject to all Cuban Customs laws and regulations and payment of corresponding duties and fees.

It is further agreed that such materials, merchandise, stores and munition of war shall not be transported from said areas into Cuban territory.

ARTICLE VI

Except as provided in the preceding Article vessels entering into or departing from the

CXVII—2960—Part 36

Bays of Guantanamo and Bahía Honda within the limits of Cuban territory shall be subject exclusively to Cuban laws and authorities and orders emanating from the latter in all that respects port police, Customs or Health, and authorities of the United States shall place no obstacle in the way of entrance and departure of said vessels except in case of a state of war.

ARTICLE VII

This lease shall be ratified and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the City of Washington within seven months from this date.

In witness whereof, we, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this lease and hereunto affixed our Seals.

Done at Havana, in duplicate in English and Spanish this second day of July nineteen hundred and three.

H. G. SQUIERS,
JOSE M. GARCIA MONTES.

I, Theodore Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, having seen and considered the foregoing lease, do hereby approve the same, by virtue of the authority conferred by the seventh of the provisions defining the relations which are to exist between the United States and Cuba, contained in the Act of Congress approved March 2, 1901, entitled "An Act making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902."

THEODORE ROOSEVELT,
WASHINGTON, October 2, 1903.

CUBA, 1904: TREATY FOR THE ADJUSTMENT OF TITLE TO THE OWNERSHIP OF THE ISLE OF PINES

(Signed at Washington, March 2, 1904; ratification advised by the Senate, with reservation, March 13, 1925; ratified by the President, March 23, 1925; ratified by Cuba, March 18, 1925; ratifications exchanged at Washington, March 23, 1925; proclaimed, March 24, 1925)

(Treaty Series, No. 709; 44 Statutes at Large, 1907)

The United States of America and the Republic of Cuba, being desirous to give full effect to the sixth Article of the Provision in regard to the relations to exist between the United States and Cuba, contained in the Act of the Congress of the United States of America, approved March second, nineteen hundred and one, which sixth Article aforesaid is included in the Appendix to the Constitution of the Republic of Cuba, promulgated on the 20th day of May, nineteen hundred and two and provides that "The island of Pines shall be omitted from the boundaries of Cuba specified in the Constitution, the title of ownership thereof being left to future adjustment by treaty;" have for that purpose appointed as their Plenipotentiaries to conclude a treaty to that end:

The President of the United States of America, John Hay, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

The President of the Republic of Cuba, Gonzalo de Quesada, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Cuba to the United States of America;

Who, after communicating to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I. The United States of America relinquishes in favor of the Republic of Cuba all claim of title to the Island of Pines situate in the Caribbean Sea near the southwestern part of the Island of Cuba, which has been or may be made in virtue of Articles I and II of the Treaty of Peace between the United States and Spain, signed at Paris on the tenth day of December eighteen hundred and ninety-eight.

ARTICLE II. This relinquishment, on the part of the United States of America, of claim of title to the said Island of Pines, is in consideration of the grants of coaling and

naval stations in the Island of Cuba heretofore made to the United States of America by the Republic of Cuba.

ARTICLE III. Citizens of the United States of America who, at the time of the exchange of ratifications of this treaty, shall be residing or holding property in the Island of Pines shall suffer no diminution of the rights and privileges which they have acquired prior to the date of exchange of ratifications of this treaty; they may remain there or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce and professions being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners.

ARTICLE IV. The present treaty shall be ratified by each party in conformity with the respective Constitutions of the two countries, and the ratifications shall be exchanged in the City of Washington as soon as possible.

In witness whereof, We, the respective Plenipotentiaries, have signed this treaty and hereunto affixed our seals.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in English and Spanish this second day of March one thousand nine hundred and four.

JOHN HAY,
GONZALO DE QUESADA.

A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas a treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines was concluded and signed by their respective Plenipotentiaries at Washington on the second day of March, one thousand nine hundred and four, the original of which treaty, being in the English and Spanish languages, is word for word as follows:

[Here follows the English text of the treaty]

And whereas the said treaty has been duly ratified on both parts, and the ratifications of the two Governments were exchanged in the city of Washington on the twenty-third day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five;

Now, therefore, be it known that I, Calvin Coolidge, President of the United States of America, have caused the said treaty to be made public, to the end that the same and every article and clause thereof may be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington, this twenty-fourth day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and twenty-five, and of the Independence of the United States of America, the one hundred and forty-ninth.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

(By the President: Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State.)

SENATE RESOLUTION ADVISING AND CONSENTING TO RATIFICATION

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

March 13, 1925.

Resolved (Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty with Cuba signed at Washington, D.C., on the second day of March, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines, subject to the following reservation and understanding to be set forth in an exchange of notes between the High Contracting Parties so as to make it plain that this condition is understood and accepted by each of them:

1. That all the provisions of existing and future treaties, including the Permanent Treaty proclaimed July 2, 1904, between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba shall apply to the territory and the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines.

2. The term "other foreigners" appearing at the end of Article III shall be construed to mean foreigners who receive the most favorable treatment under the Government of Cuba.

Attest:

GEORGE A. SANDERSON,
Secretary.

By H. W. CRAVEN,
Chief Clerk.

[Exchange of notes]

[The Secretary of State to the Ambassador of Cuba]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 17, 1925.

Excellency: I have the honor to inform you that on March 13, 1925, the Senate advised and consented to the ratification of the Treaty between the United States and Cuba, signed on March 2, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines, subject to the following reservation and understanding to be set forth in an exchange of notes between the high contracting parties so as to make it plain that the reservation and condition are understood and accepted by each of them:

1. That all the provisions of existing and future treaties, including the Permanent Treaty, proclaimed July 2, 1904, between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba shall apply to the territory and the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines.

2. The term "other foreigners" appearing at the end of Article III shall be construed to mean foreigners who receive the most favorable treatment under the Government of Cuba.

I am glad to assure you, by direction of the President, that this note will be considered as sufficient acceptance by the Government of the United States of the reservation and understanding quoted, and I beg to express the hope that they will also be accepting by your Government. An acknowledgment of this note, accepting, by direction and on behalf of your Government, the said reservation and understanding, will be considered as completing the required exchange of notes and the acceptance by both Governments of the reservation and understanding.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

FRANK B. KELLOGG.

His Excellency Señor Don Cosme de la Torriente, Ambassador of Cuba.

[The Ambassador of Cuba to the Secretary of State]

[Translation]

EMBASSY OF CUBA,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1925.

Excellency: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's note dated March 17, 1925, in which you were pleased to inform me that on the 13th day of this month of March the Senate advised and consented to the ratification of the Treaty between the United States and Cuba, signed on March 2, 1904, for the adjustment of title to the ownership of the Isle of Pines, subject to the reservation and interpretation which is set forth in your note, the translation of which follows hereinbelow.

I take pleasure in informing Your Excellency that, being duly authorized thereto by the Senate of Cuba, the President has empowered me to accept in behalf of my Government, as I hereby do, the following reservations to the above-mentioned Treaty, thus completing the exchange of notes required in this case, namely:

1. That all the provisions of the existing

or future treaties, including the permanent Treaty proclaimed on July 2, 1904, between the United States of America and the Republic of Cuba shall apply to the territory and the inhabitants of the Isle of Pines.

2. That the term "other foreigners" appearing at the end of Article III [of the said treaty concerning the Isle of Pines] shall be construed to mean "foreigners who receive the most favorable treatment under the Government of Cuba".

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

COSME DE LA TORRIENTE.

His Excellency Mr. Frank B. Kellogg, Secretary of State.

PAKISTAN IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Benjamin Hilborn Oehlert, Jr., former Ambassador to Pakistan, is recognized as one of the foremost American authorities on that country. He is a careful student of the Pakistanis, their government and country, and his work as Ambassador was widely hailed in diplomatic circles. On October 19, he delivered a speech on Pakistan to the Downtown Rotary Club of Jacksonville, Fla. There are so few in America who can speak intelligently and without bias on the subject of Pakistan that I feel his remarks are particularly apropos. His comments will be interesting and worthwhile to the membership of Congress, and I submit his speech for reprinting in the RECORD.

PAKISTAN IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Benjamin Hilborn Oehlert, Jr.)

A few months ago a friend from Naples, Italy, was visiting my wife and me. She told us that a new clinic had recently been opened in Naples—a clinic devoted exclusively to the transplant of brains. One day a citizen decided that he needed a new brain so he went to the clinic to examine the merchandise. Three of the brains in stock looked interesting enough to price. One was \$100, another \$200 and the third was \$1,000. "Why is that one so expensive?" the customer inquired. The salesman responded: "Well, you see that one belonged to an American diplomat—so its never been used."

The story seems particularly applicable to me at this time and place. If I were using my brain, I wouldn't be here. How can a fellow expect a sympathetic audience from Rotarians when he himself has been thrown out of two Rotary Clubs? But whatever you may think of me, I hope that you'll keep an open mind about my subject for I do hope to arouse your sympathy for the most maligned country in the world—Pakistan.

When the British Raj withdrew from the sub-continent of Asia in 1947, two independent nations were created out of what had been British India.

One, the "Islamic Republic of Pakistan", was composed of most of the predominantly Muslim areas of old India. The other, made up of the predominantly Hindu areas and the rest of the Muslim areas, we still call "India".

"Pakistan" was a coined name in which "P" stood for the Punjab; "A" for Afgania (North-West Frontier Province); "K" for Kashmir; "S" for Sind and "TAN" for Baluchistan.

Today, more than twenty years later, "India" is a household word in the United States while Pakistan was relatively little known—til unhappily called so graphically to our attention by nearly concurrent natural and political storms—despite the fact that, population-wise, it is the fifth largest country in the world. Its population is exceeded only by those of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Russia), Bharat (India) and the People's Republic of China (Red China), in that ascending order.

There are many reasons why Pakistan and its people should be better known and better understood than India here in the United States.

Religiously, it is very close to us.

Islam, or "Mohammadanism" as it is called in the West, is monotheistic, where Hinduism is a religion of many Gods, some being naturalistic, such as cows and other animals, or rocks and stones, and others being imaginary like the ancient Gods of Greece and Rome.

Not only to the Moslems worship only one God, but he is the same God of the Judeo-Christian religion, and they accept nearly every important doctrine of both the Old and New Testaments, except the virgin birth and divinity of Christ. They even recognize Jesus as one of their own prophets—"The Greatest except for Mohammed."

Many of their given names are Biblical. There are Ibrahim (Abraham), Ayub (Job), Yakub (Jacob), Yusef (Joseph) and a host of others.

Their religious ethics and moral codes are the same as ours save only for plural marriages—and that custom is rapidly disappearing. Although still acknowledged by the faith, secular laws have severely limited or eliminated it in most Moslem countries including Pakistan.

But religion marks only one of our many common interests with Pakistan. Economically, they are staunch supporters of the Free Enterprise System—usually called by them "The Private Sector". There again is a contrast with India, which is an avowed Socialist State.

Language is little if any barrier between Pakistan and ourselves. Although it is a country of several "Mother Tongues" (not nearly as many as India), all of the educated classes speak fluent English, which is their official language of higher education, of the judicial system, of their Parliament and of their foreign office and other Central Government departments. The predominant language of East Pakistan is Bengali. That of West Pakistan is Urdu.

For years, Pakistan was called "The Most Allied of our Allies."

Her men, then in the British Indian Army, fought shoulder-to-shoulder with ours in World War II. General Agha Mohammed Yahya Khan, now President of Pakistan, was captured in the Italian Campaign, but effected a heroic escape.

She was, and is, a member of CENTO (The Central Treaty Organization).

She was, and still is, a member with us of SEATO (The South-East Asia Treaty Organization) and offered to send a military medical team to Korea.

She was the only Asian country to join both those pacts.

She was, and still is, a member of UNCURK (The United Nations Commission for the Unification of the Republic of Korea).

We had, and still do have, a mutual bilateral defense agreement with her under which we agree to come to her aid in case of attack, even with our own arms and men.

She furnished us with an invaluable communications base, the ten year lease on which has recently expired.

She furnished us with a U-2 base in Peshawar for the surveillance of Russia. It was from that base that Gary Powers flew his ill-fated mission over Russia. In fury over

this, Khrushchev threatened Pakistan with nuclear attack if she did not substitute neutrality for her alliance with us, but Pakistan stood firm.

In the many confrontations at the United Nations, Pakistan could be counted on to be at our side.

All of this is remarkable when one considers Pakistan's geo-political location. Pakistan has a common border with Red China and is separated from Russia only by a narrow panhandle of Afghanistan.

But she cast her lot with us at frightful risk and exposure.

In the last eleven months, Pakistan has suffered three tragic blows.

The first was a ferocious cyclone and a monstrous tidal wave which struck the delta area of East Pakistan on the night of November 12-13, 1970.

The second was that most terrible of all wars—Civil War—which broke out only three months after the cyclone-tidal wave.

The third and greatest tragedy of all was the misunderstanding in this country of the first two tragedies.

The cyclone-tidal wave tragedy wreaked the greatest havoc of any natural disaster in the world for at least the last century, if not indeed in all recorded history. 500,000 people are believed to have lost their lives. Millions were maimed and millions of others remained homeless—without shelter, clothing or food. The human suffering was impossible to describe.

One would have thought that this would have aroused the sympathies of the United States, pricked its conscience and stimulated a great outpouring of help. But the private response to the relief effort was seriously blunted by unfortunate and inaccurate stories which appeared in our press. This development can be laid to the facts that no American reporters were on the scene, and that therefore, the stories came either out of India—Pakistan's long and implacable enemy—or from American Indiaphiles or from Pakistani instigators of the incipient revolution which was even then about to break. A real witches brew.

The limitations of time will permit me only to mention briefly a few of the canards which circulated.

One was that the Pakistanis had not bothered to use a costly warning system which had been financed in part by AID funds and that, had it been used, the loss of life would have been avoided. But the system was used in timely fashion. The trouble was first that so few people heard it—after all not many Bengali peasants have transistor radios. Second, most of those who did hear the warnings, or hear of them, assumed either that the predicted storm wouldn't be as bad as indicated or that they could ride it out if it was. The "it can't happen to me" psychology is at least as prevalent in the Eastern mind as it is in the Western. Third, even had the warnings been universally heard and universally heeded, it is highly unlikely that many could have escaped such an unprecedentedly severe blow which built up with such rapidity. It must be remembered that, in that entire area, there are no roads such as we know them, no motor transport, no railroads, and no airports. Travel is by river boat and except for a pitifully few of modest size, all might be described as manually operated dug-outs. Where could the people have gone and how could they have gotten there?

A second false story was that President Yahya was so disinterested in the calamity that he didn't even visit East Pakistan for thirteen days. His first trip from Islamabad, the capital, to East Pakistan was thirteen days after the storm, but that was his second trip there. He had been abroad when the storm struck. He flew directly to the scene, spent two days organizing the relief effort, went to Islamabad to consult the diplomatic

community and then went back to East Pakistan. The Press conveniently forgot his first trip.

A third story was that it took six days to get helicopters from West to East Pakistan to help in the relief effort. True. But the only way to get them there was to overfly India and it took six days to get the necessary permission from the Indian government.

Press stories like those caused millions of Americans who might otherwise have contributed generously to the relief effort to shrug their shoulders and say: "Why should I send my hardearned money to the Pakistanis when they themselves don't give a damn?"

So the people who started the stories falsely criticizing the Pakistan Government for its alleged inhumanity, actually contributed more than anyone else to the inadequacy of the relief effort.

Pakistan was still struggling to extricate itself from the devastation of wind and wave when a second and even more tragic storm broke—a storm of words and swords—a storm of bloody revolution which had been brewing for some time.

Our liberal press, especially the New York Times, the Washington Post, Time Magazine and Newsweek, from which much of the rest of the press draws its stories, burst into a shrill and frantic denunciation of the Pakistan government for having the effrontery of trying to preserve its sovereign integrity from the rebels. But this was not surprising to people knowledgeable about the sub-continent of Asia.

India had never been reconciled to the existence of Pakistan. From the time of partition on August 14, 1947 to the present day, her leaders have made repeated public statements to the effect that India would some day, somehow, bring Pakistan back into India.

The Achilles Heel of Pakistan has been East Pakistan, separated from the west by 1000 miles of hostile Indian territory, whose people more closely resemble the West Bengalis of India than they do the people of West Pakistan, except for the important element of religion. Consequently, the Indians have mounted a continuous barrage against the loyalty of East Pakistan—using clandestine radio stations and infiltrating arms and guerrilla fighters. If this seems strange behaviour by "Pacifist India" remember her use of force with respect to Kashmir, Hyderabad, Jungadah, Mangrol and Goa.

Our liberal press always favored India over Pakistan despite Pakistan's alliances with us and despite India's constant preferment of Russia over us. While admittedly an oversimplification, that attitude can be explained by the simple fact that India is socialistic whereas Pakistan is capitalistic.

Consequently, the liberal press took out after Pakistan in a big way when martial law was declared in March of 1969. President Yahya was described as a "military dictator" even though he early on removed the previously existing restrictions on political parties and political activities.

He was ridiculed when he promised free elections at an early date. It was predicted that no elections would be held. When it became apparent that they would be, the cry was that the elections would be rigged.

The elections were held, less than two years after martial law had been declared, and their results were such that not even the worse fanatic could claim that they had been rigged. There had been wide-open political campaigning for nearly a year. The Pakistan People's Party of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, no darling of the military won a smashing victory in West Pakistan. The Awami League of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the greatest of all thorns to the military, won an even more smashing victory in East Pakistan—giving it a clear majority of all the seats in the National Assembly.

The military accepted the results and President Yahya publically described Mujibur Rahman as "the future Prime Minister of Pakistan." And so he would have been except that success went to his head. Although he had the whole country in his hands, even before the National Assembly could meet to frame a new Constitution, he began to make impossible demands which would have meant the dismemberment of Pakistan. He demanded separate currencies for east and west. He demanded that the Central Government should have no authority to levy or collect taxes. He demanded that East Pakistan should be allowed to conduct separate foreign relations in the negotiation of foreign trade and aid.

Obviously these were conditions which no sovereign government could accept, so the date for convening the National Assembly was postponed to allow a period for negotiations among the political leaders.

Mujibur then became even more intransigent. He refused to meet with the other leaders. He called for general strikes. He ordered government workers to absent themselves from work. He closed banks and other financial and business establishments. He ordered all schools closed. He ordered the people not to pay their taxes. On March 7, he announced plans for running a parallel government. He began to speak of East Pakistan as a separate country called "Bangla Desh." He had a Flag. Even Time Magazine—on March 15, 1971, quoted Mujibur as having told its correspondent, Dan Coggin, that "Pakistan, as it stands today is finished." Mujibur was totally indifferent to the twin facts that this was revolution and that the people who had voted for him had given him no such mandate.

But he was not content with revolutionary words. As the crescendo of words mounted to the point of a declaration of independence, the words were accompanied by a rising crescendo of violence. Time will not permit me to chronicle this violence, but it may be summarized as follows: It consisted of loot, rape, murder, arson and other acts of vandalism. It consisted of ambushing police and troops and raiding police stations and military posts for arms. Telephones and telegraphs were closed down. Trains were derailed and looted. Bridges were destroyed. Government funds were confiscated. Homes, government offices, business establishments were bombed. Whole villages were massacred. Genocide was directed at Hindus and at Muslims who had emigrated from West Bengal. In Santahar more than 15,000 persons were surrounded and systematically murdered. Women were paraded naked in the streets and mothers were forced to drink the blood of their own children. In Chittagong, over 10,000 people were bayoneted to death and in Sirajganj, 350 women and children were locked in a hall which was set on fire and the inmates roasted to death.

It is estimated that more than 100,000 innocent civilians lost their lives in such outbursts. They were reported in the world press, even in the Indian Paper "Statesman" of New Delhi. Reporting in the New York Times of May 10, 1971, Malcolm Browne stated that: "The impression, based on the testimony of hundreds of witnesses, is that when it seemed that the Awami League was about to come to power, Bengalis in some communities looted and burned Bihar houses and slaughtered their occupants."

The military exercised remarkable restraint throughout these dreadful happenings. Hoping against hope for a political settlement, the troops were kept in their barracks except for one foray on March 1 when they were called out in aid of civil power.

Mujibur declared March 23 to be "Republic Day" and ordered "Bangla Desh" flags to be flown throughout the province. He took the salute at an armed march past his resi-

dence at which the "Bengla Dosh" flag was ceremonially unfurled. He appointed Ex-Colonel Usmani as "Commander of the Revolutionary Forces." Plans were adopted for an armed uprising to begin on a signal from the Awami League. It was not until then, on the night of March 25-26, that the Army moved in to quell the revolt.

When the Army did move, it moved with vigor. People were killed. Refugees fled to India. But both the loss of life and the number of refugees were grossly exaggerated. And I doubt that any other government or Army ever waited so long or so patiently to suppress such an obvious and such a vicious rebellion.

As Malcom Browne reported in the New York Times of May 10, 1971: "The European Manager of a local bank said: 'It was fortunate for every European living here that the Army arrived when it did; otherwise I would not have lived to tell the tale.'"

There are millions of refugees in India. Their plight is desperate and deserving of help. But let us keep in mind that there are not nearly as many as claimed; that many of them fled the terrorists rather than the Army; that many others fled because of their guilty association with rebellion; that all have been invited back; and that full amnesty has been declared even for the guilty ones.

There is left to consider India's role in this latest tragedy. Ample evidence is available from Indian and other news media that she has encouraged the secessionists by every means short of actual war. She has massed troops on the Pakistan border. She has trained and supplied guerillas. She has infiltrated arms and men. Her Prime Minister and Foreign Minister have traveled all over the world begging other governments to cut off all supplies, even economic aid to Pakistan. Her Prime Minister moved and her Parliament passed a Resolution insuring the secessionists that "their struggle will receive the whole-hearted sympathies and support of the people of India."

The General Secretary of the West Bengal Unit of the All India Congress Committee, K. K. Shukla said on April 4th: "Sheikh Mujibur Rahman is fighting India's War."

On March 30, the Bombay "Indian Express" openly advocated India's armed interference, stating: "It is a truly historic moment, and the time to act is NOW."

On April 7, Mr. Subramaniam, Director of the India Institute for Defence Studies, said that: "What India must realize is the fact that the break-up of Pakistan is in our interest and we have an opportunity the like of which may never come again."

In an article in "Motherland" on June 15, it was stated that: "The break-up of Pakistan is not only in our external security interest, but also in our internal security interests. India shall emerge as a super-power internationally and we have to nationally integrate our citizens for this role. For this the dismemberment of Pakistan is an essential pre-condition."

And also on June 15, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister declared: "India would not for a moment countenance a political settlement which meant the death of Bangla Dosh."

If you doubt the perfidy of India in this instance, ask yourself why, despite her loud protests against the flood of refugees and her cries for help to feed them, she has steadfastly refused a United Nations offer of a neutral team to supervise the care of the refugees and their repatriation. Pakistan accepted the offer with alacrity. What does India have to hide?

It is passing strange that Pakistan has been so severely criticized for resisting dismemberment by violence and genocide while India has had the benefit of such sympathy even though she has fostered the revolt in direct violation of the Charter of the United Nations and even though she has turned her back on United Nations efforts to help al-

leviate the problem. With her begging bowl and fake olive branch, she has managed to hoodwink us while playing footsie with Russia. I hope I have aroused your interest enough to cause you to wonder if we haven't misplaced our sympathies. Pakistan is no paragon of virtue but neither is she a pariah. She is entitled to less condemnation and more understanding and sympathy.

A TRIBUTE TO I. F. STONE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the writing of I. F. Stone seldom, if ever, appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I would like to take this opportunity to insert a tribute to this journalist by the Washington Post's Nicholas von Hoffman.

Known as a "journalist's journalist," Mr. Stone had the unique ability to read through pages and pages of boring Government documents, usually printed in agate type, and find the contradictions that pointed to a mistaken official policy. He was easily one of the first to point out the mistakes which brought us the Vietnam war, a fact duly noted last year by an issue of the Columbia Journalism Review.

Last spring, Mr. Stone took the time to speak to a group of interns in my office. That afternoon, he showed what real commitment is through his own personal ideals of what Government should strive to be.

At 63, Mr. Stone is ending his biweekly reports to work for the New York Review of Books because he feels putting out his biweekly is too demanding. His rest is well-deserved, but just the same, there will be thousands of subscribers across the country who will miss reading what he has to say every week—whether they agreed with his opinions on that issue or not. At this point I wish to insert Mr. von Hoffman's article into the RECORD.

The article follows:

IZZY STONE: "PREMIER INVESTIGATIVE REPORTER OF HIS TIME"

(By Nicholas von Hoffman)

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly won't be coming in the mail anymore. Izzy has folded it after 19 years, during which the few readers became many, and marginal influence became major. With the last issue, which Izzy is hiding out and working on, he will have reached a unique preeminence, as perhaps the most respected reporter, especially investigative reporter, of this time period.

Although in the last couple of years Izzy has gotten rather famous—Dick Cavett loves him and has him on his show—his real following is among a smallish group of left/liberals and his fellow journalists. For us he's been a model.

As an investigative reporter, Izzy hasn't bothered with small scandals. He hasn't spent his time getting the evidence on sticky-fingered city councilmen or larcenous zoning commissioners. Izzy has been investigating the true stories of war and other major catastrophes. From Korea to Vietnam, Izzy's readers got the straight story first, not days or months but often years before the readers of other, better-known publications.

Izzy, the premier investigative reporter of

his time, did it without a congressional press pass. "I used to have all those press cards when I worked for PM but I lost them when I started the newsletter. They said I wasn't eligible because we didn't have advertising. So I swapped an ad for a suit with a tailor named Brooks—not Brooks Brothers—but then they said the publication had to be substantially supported by advertising in order to get credentials. Still, I was given the courtesy of the press gallery. They were very nice to me, although I was barred on the days when the President came. I suppose I was a security threat."

Izzy was barred from everything. As he says, "I owe my eminence as a reporter from being barred from State Department briefings. It saved me so much time."

Izzy isn't one for briefings. As he puts it. "If I were standing outside a bank which had just been robbed, and there was Johnson with a suitcase waving for a cab, and I asked him what he was doing and he answered that he was trying to get a taxi, what would you call that? A lie or an incomplete briefing?"

As much as any single person, it has been Izzy and his skeptical way of working that his undercut the old way of covering national and international politics. The people who thought covering the news was covering what highly placed government officials say have missed all the big stories. Izzy, the pariah, carefully going over the records, studying the federal budget, sifting through evidence like a scholar going after the historical dead, was the guy who got the story first and printed it.

In the process he showed that all the stuff about the Washington press corps and their inside sources of information was just that—stuff, the stuff of the legend that what we print is the news. Izzy demonstrated that you can send a copy boy to cover the White House; a reporter you need for more valuable tasks.

This attitude kept Izzy out of the daily commercial press for a long time. Things have changed now so that any, even half-way intelligent editor would slobber to get him. Not that he applied for work. He knew once he left PM, that remarkably innovative New York paper of the early 40s, that he'd never have the freedom he needed. "The only way to get the truth is to be irresponsible, so to speak. And if you do that you know you'll lose 365 papers who won't print you. So you save your fire for when you can get results, and that's usually like reforming a whore house by getting the maid to put paper cups in the latrine."

So Izzy has always gone his own way, and he has been left alone by Washington. Neither the IRS nor the FBI have ever bothered him; no congressional committee has tried to expose him. How could they? As he says, "How do you expose Gypsy Rose Lee? I've always had it all off."

Naturally they don't invite him to any of those famous Washington parties where the inside poop journalists get all that useless information, but as he says, "Being shut out gives you a chance to read and think for yourself."

But don't feel sorry for Izzy. He's loved it. "You do it because you enjoy it. You don't want to be a jerk and work for the rich and the powerful. My boyhood picture of a newspaper man was a cross between Galahad and William Randolph Hearst. I've done it because I love it. I don't expect Nixon to call me up and say, 'Hey, I read your newsletter and I've changed my mind.'"

Things have never gone so well for Izzy. Why they even invited him to a diplomatic dinner recently. He said it was so dull that on the way out he was moved to remark, "I never did catch the name of the deceased." Nor is he going into a premature retirement. "I'll be writing for The New York Review of Books and I'm going to haunt the Pentagon. Maybe they'll make me a general, so if you

see me with three stars on my shoulder, don't salute."

Many of us would like to salute Izzy now but this latter-day fame and adulation is beginning to bug him. "It's about time I get exposed. Somebody ought to attack me."

Not today, Izzy, we owe you too much.

SALUTE TO BOB HOPE

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tremendous work that Bob Hope has done for the American serviceman. Since the Christmas season is almost upon us, I would like to pause and salute this truly great American who, I am happy to say, is a constituent of mine.

One of the finest tributes to Bob I have ever read appears in this month's edition of the U.S. Army magazine, *Soldiers*. I wish to present the following article written by Sp5c. Tom Bailey:

WHERE THERE'S HOPE

At the rear of an otherwise empty stage Les Brown cranks up his "Band of Renown" with a nostalgically familiar rendition of "Thanks for the Memory." Then pandemonium. Striding from a door at one side of the platform, golf club in hand, Bob Hope stops before the microphone at stage center.

His hair looks thinner. His gait is still strong but a little stiffer than before. His wit has not changed. "With all the troop withdrawals I'm surprised to see any of you here." The line draws guffaws and hoots from Long Binh soldiers. "It's nice of you to wait just to see me," he closes solidly. Laughter, cheers.

Hope has found the key to laughter among a generation much more selective of their humor than those past. Airing highlights of his Christmas shows nationwide has become an annual event, TV screens crowded with laughing, cheering, clapping GIs.

Despite the occasional moments of uneasy silence following World War II-type jokes that young audiences no longer think funny, Hope never falters. The longer he confronts the young soldiers the better he gets. That is the mark of a master. Hope the patriot, epitome of establishment, still draws standing-room-only crowds and standing ovations from young troopers because he can read young military audiences and adapt to their brand of humor.

In this day of dissent, of rebellion against the established heroes and stars with whom this generation of soldiers has grown up, Hope remains afloat and shows no signs of taking water. Vietnam veterans who have witnessed several of Hope's Christmas shows say the lines were the same as in years past—only the endings are changed to meet local situations. But that's all that's needed. Hope gives GIs something to identify with; he sympathizes with them, chides them and pokes fun at their leaders—and they love it.

VETERAN TROOPER

Hope and the Armed Forces have gone a long way together. In other wars and even during early Vietnam years, Hollywood stars flocked to the battle zones to entertain our troops. But as Vietnam wore on and dissent grew, one by one the stars declined requests to perform for soldiers. However, even in this most unpopular of wars, Hope has continued to respond.

He still isn't having to go begging for audiences—either in Vietnam or among the World War II generation. His January 1971

program was number one TV show of the year, drawing almost 60 percent of the viewing audience.

Whenever he is asked why, at his age (68 last May) and with his busy schedule, he still does military shows, Hope characteristically replies, "I guess I'm hooked on the box lunches."

On a more serious note he explains: "There are many reasons but it all boils down to one—like the time when we arrived in Bayonet Bowl (Korea). It had been snowing all night and we found the guys sitting out there in the snow. They had been there since dawn."

Every year Hope says he thinks that particular military show will be his last. It never is. The Department of Defense continues to ask him to entertain and he continues to respond.

BOUNCING BOY

It is hard to pinpoint Hope's motivating force. He has been before the public so long it seems that his public and private lives are enmeshed.

He was born Leslie Townes Hope in Eltham, England, the fifth of a stonemason's seven sons. Hope became a citizen of the United States by virtue of his father's naturalization in 1920, a few years after the family moved to Cleveland, OH. His acting career began with a Fatty Arbuckle dancing skit back when vaudeville was big. Since then he's made 53 movies and taped more than a thousand programs.

Before breaking into show business Hope tried many jobs. He worked as a delivery boy, soda jerk, shoe salesman and for an auto company. He tried amateur boxing under the name Packy East and describes that career as akin to Rembrandt—too much time on the canvas! He was also a journalist and a dance instructor.

Hope's early entertainment career wasn't all roses. In his first appearance at the Palace in New York "I was numb," Hope recalls. "Not just scared, numb." At least one critic agreed: "They say Bob Hope is the sensation of the Midwest. If that's so, why doesn't he go back there?" stated a review in the now defunct "Daily Graphic."

Today Hope's public relations office calls him "King of Comedy." They aren't far from correct. His technique with topical and personal jokes has been a phenomenal success. Two qualities in this brand of comedy, nurtured during years of vaudeville, legitimate stage, radio, movies and television, seem to stand out and directly relate to his success.

One is his versatility—his ability to range from white tie and tails at a dinner show to fatigues at a Vietnam base camp. Whether he is delivering his incisive one-liners in dapper dark suit before the cameras or clowning with Phyllis Diller on a sandbagged hillside, he is master of the comic situation.

The other is his timing. He describes it this way: "At times I have good material; at other times I have great material. But I know how to cover up the merely good and make it sound better by timing."

"I know how to snap a line, then cover it, then speed on to the next. You have to get over to the audience that there's a game of wits going on and if they don't stay awake they'll miss something..."

The Nation's needler spares no one with his prods—least of all himself: "They gave me the USO award the year I didn't leave the country. They gave me an Oscar for being a humanitarian. And the B'nai B'rith gave me an award for being Christian. I can hardly wait to break a leg—it might mean the Nobel prize!"

Hope's ribbing never hurts, however. He jokes with and about presidents and kings but casts his barbs in fun—never in spite or with harmful intent. He's been friends with every president since Franklin D. Roosevelt and has kidded them all.

Nobody laughed harder than the new president when, after the 1968 election. Hope announced, "I'm going down to Whittier this weekend. I understand they just finished building the log cabin that Nixon was born in."

Harry Truman kept under the sheet of glass on his desk a wire Hope sent after Truman defeated Dewey in the 1948 election. Hope had signed his name to one word, "Un-pack!"

MILITARY MEMORIES

It was a spring afternoon, 1941, at March Field, CA, when Bob Hope did his first show for the military. Before the show some GIs took him for a plane ride—a real barnstormer. Afterward Hope asked, "How come you were wearing the safety belt, not me?" The pilot answered, "They need me."

Three decades have passed since that first GI show and Hope's still standing ready. Somewhere along the line Hope got the idea that maybe they didn't need him but they could use him.

The tradition of touring military bases got into full swing with the 1941 peacetime mobilization. Hope took his radio show to camps and air bases all over the country. Then when war broke out he packed a bag and took off for England, the Continent, North Africa, the South Pacific, Alaska, Iceland—whatever soldiers were training or fighting.

There was one night in North Africa he remembers particularly well. "Tony Romano, Jack Pepper and I were riding along in a jeep and suddenly an air raid alarm sounded," Hope recounted. "We decided to head away from Bizerte and drove across the desert until we came to a place our driver said looked like a good place to stop. After we had sat there about 20 minutes lights came on all around us. We were parked in the middle of an enormous ammunition dump."

"When World War II was over and we went on into Korea I went there too with another USO troupe," continued Hope, recalling yet another battlefield adventure. "When I reached Japan I told the boys in Tokyo, 'I know it's not on our schedule but I'd like to do a show for the First Marines.'"

"We went from Seoul to Pyongyang, did a show, then took off for Wonsan where the First Marine Division was scheduled to be. As we flew into Wonsan we saw a lot of shipping in the harbor and small boats headed toward shore," he said. "That's nice, I thought, they're coming to see our show. But when we arrived at Wonsan airport there wasn't a soul in sight. We went over to the hangar and finally some brass showed up."

"When did you get here?" they asked. "We've been here for 20 minutes," I told them," continued Hope. "Twenty minutes!" they exclaimed. "You beat us to the beach! We've just landed!"

"They'd been attacking the place but it turned out to be a bloodless invasion," Hope concluded. "When we landed at the airport there were guerrillas all around us but we didn't know it. The fact that we beat the Marines to the beach made the AP wire."

OFF AGAIN

Hope has been making his annual Christmas pilgrimage to Vietnam since 1964. Even after the explosive reception he received some years back he keeps returning. "Everyone has heard about our experience in Saigon when the Viet Cong blew up the Brink's officers' quarters across from our hotel. We thought we were being given one hell of a reception when we saw all the crowds in the street," he quipped. "I spent the next several hours cowering under my bed wondering what was going to happen next."

Humorist Stan Freberg comments: "Audiences love Bob because he provides situations which enable him to laugh at himself. This is the basis, I think, of true American humor."

Freberg also explains how the 68-year-old

trouper can withstand the physical and mental strains of these trips year after year: "He's got the energy of 10 men, the talent of 20..."

These trips begin each year with a request from the Defense Department "usually in August." Then an itinerary is drawn up and a cast selected. "I just ask myself—what do the guys want?" said Hope. "And I always come up with the same answer—girls!

"In addition to the cast, our show needs a production staff of about a dozen people and a number of technicians," he continued. "One big thing—we like to get a lot of in-the-spot background material from the locations where we expect to entertain because the guys like to hear lots of local stuff in our gags.

"Another thing is the timing of the shows—considering a number of personnel and amount of equipment we carry. In combat areas the Department of Defense allows us to stay only a certain length of time—it's called 'reaction time'—the amount of time it would take the enemy to discover we're there and take action," he explained. "We are required to make fast stops and quick getaways so we can cover as much territory as possible. Also, where we go is classified—not even we know until we're on our way."

The military goes even further to see that Hope and his troupe are safe. "They usually have a whole ring of MPs around us. That's to protect the girls," he said. "They usually give me a slingshot.

"There's really no basic difference in entertaining in a combat zone and New York or Hollywood," he said. "I was trained in vaudeville. I've been ducking ever since.

"Seriously," he added, "soldiers are the best audience in the world. They know that you came to see them and they really show their appreciation."

Unlike the premature landing at Wonsan and the bombing in Vietnam, there are many unpublicized stories about the long walks Hope has taken through miles of hospital wards shaking hands, cheering up drooping chins, taking addresses with the promise of calling loved ones when he gets back home.

It really doesn't make much difference why Hope makes military tours. The fact remains that he continues to make them. He is willing, for whatever the reason, to give his time and efforts so that soldiers might find a little light in an otherwise bleak situation. And that's something that many other celebrities won't do for any reason.

THE PROBLEMS OF THE JEWISH POOR

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently commented here on the stereotyping of various ethnic groups and the grave detrimental effects such stereotyping has on these groups. Perhaps no group is more affected than the Jewish people.

Most Americans—including many Jewish people as well—do not think of Jews as being a deprived group. Yet as a recent editorial from the Jewish Week points out, there are many very poor Jewish people. Yet because of the stereotyped image of all Jews as wealthy people, those that are living in poverty have great difficulty obtaining assistance.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues

may have the benefit of the thoughts expressed in the editorial, I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

JEWISH POOR ARE DENIED THE PITIFUL PRIVILEGES OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAMS

Would it make sense to "frame" an accused person when there is ample truthful evidence?

This is precisely what is being done by the restless and revolutionary critics of the "Jewish Establishment." False and wild accusations are being made, yet the most substantial sin of omission of the American Jewish community has scarcely been sensed, let alone stressed.

When a local employee of a certain national organization was disclosed to have shown an FBI agent the courtesy of furnishing a clipping from a local newspaper, critics went so far as to proclaim that "informing" in Jewish tradition was punishable by death!

Yet, the most strident accusers have not expressed any concern over the greatest sin of omission of the American Jewish community—the utter abandonment of the Jewish poor.

It is a fact that the Jewish poor exist in great numbers and that they are being discriminated against both by officialdom and by non-Jewish poor on the ground that Jews are not a disadvantaged ethnic group!

This has now been going on for years in New York, a city with as large a Jewish population as the whole of Israel, yet no effective voice has been raised against such terrorist discrimination either by the Jewish community or by the presumably liberal administration governing the city of New York. Yet the facts are indisputable. An official federal report confirming these facts is due to be released September 1.

Will the Jewish community then wake up to its responsibility?

NO ONE HAD THE FACTS

The editors of The Jewish Week had long sensed that there has been massive Jewish poverty despite the reputation of Jews for affluence. Our very first journalistic enterprise when we began publishing our New York edition last October was to look into the Jewish poverty situation. We naturally inquired of all the redoubtable Jewish organizations for information. No facts were available.

Searching elsewhere, we discovered an old study of ethnic poverty in New York under auspices of Columbia University, that included some statistics on Jewish poverty. Projecting these figures to the present time by allowing for apparent economic and population trends, we published articles last November suggesting that more than one-fourth of a million Jews in New York were living below the recognized poverty level. By going into neighborhoods, we discovered that many Jews submerged in poverty were being discriminated against in a most hostile manner because it was felt that other ethnic groups had better claims.

Subsequently, one of the great national Jewish organizations showed a belated interest in Jewish poverty and, using the quite inadequate material we had surfaced, published a paper that came up with the exaggerated conclusion that one-million Jews in America were living below the poverty level. We then felt obliged to dispute that report, pointing out that one-half million would be closer to the truth, since Jewish poverty in the provincial cities and towns was less, proportionately, than in the by-passed Jewish neighborhoods of Brooklyn, the Bronx, Miami Beach and Los Angeles.

Such is the low quality of the Jewish Community's interest in the problems of the Jewish people who have been left behind in the general upward economic movement of the Jewish people!

AN ATTITUDE OF DISDAIN

It is but fair to note that the Jewish Establishment is not out of step with the sentiment of its constituents in ignoring the existence and sorry plight of the Jewish poor. It is not, as might be suspected, merely a case of elitist aloofness. There was a time around the beginning of the century when the Jewish community consisted of a Central European elite, and an East European mass. Then the affluent were greatly concerned to provide for their problem people, so that they should not become a bad reflection on them. Today, the great majority are known for affluence and social generosity, and they tend to be more contemptuous than concerned for their brethren who have straggled and strayed behind in the rise of American Jewry.

The prevalent attitude towards the Jewish poor has been one of disdain that they should persist in living in poor neighborhoods and become an ugly issue of contention in the fierce competition of the insurgent ethnic groups. When demagogues lay all the sufferings of the Black people to their "exploitation" by Jewish neighborhood grocers who toll longer hours for less earnings than their "victims", the most kindly Jewish reaction is to suggest that the Jewish storekeeper be rescued by making him a charity client. The right of a poor Jewish person to earn his livelihood in his own way is not only undefended, but scorned. Nor are the wildly exaggerated accusations against Jews in the ghettos seriously questioned. Jewish poverty is so offensively reflective on the Jewish success myth that it acquires the sinister aspect of obvious guilt.

Still, there are many scores of thousands of Jewish poor and they are surely no poorer genetically than those of us who think we have arrived. Given a chance to struggle with life, they may be fully as precious to the Jewish future as their more prosperous but assimilated fellow-Jews.

It is, we agree, important for our Establishment to fight for the right of Jews to a place in the executive suite. But is it not far more important to fight for the right of a poor Jew to share fairly in the crumbs provided for the poor?

When will those segments of the Jewish Establishment that have been foremost in fighting the cause of non-Jewish minorities extend a little understanding and help to the most disadvantaged of all the poor—the Jews who are denied the pitiful privileges of poverty?

EMPLOYEE BENEFITS PROTECTION ACT

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's new pension program represents a dramatic breakthrough in our efforts to assure an adequate retirement income for the Nation's elderly. No problem is more vexing than the problem of guaranteeing that our Nation's senior citizens will be able to live in dignity; no one has suggested a more comprehensive solution than the one the President has presented to the Congress.

Old age should be a time of purpose and meaning, a time in which the wisdom of the years can be used for the benefit of one's fellow man. Too often it is a time of misery, of struggle, of need.

That is why I am confident that the Congress will recognize the imperative of the program the President has announced and support his effort to assure our citizens that their retirement years will truly be golden years of promise and opportunity.

CLEVELAND'S 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, this year marked the 175th anniversary of the founding of the city of Cleveland—the sesquicentennial celebration of the city of Cleveland.

During the course of this year, the city conducted a complete year of celebration and festivities. The city streets were filled with music and friendship; the merchants explored attractive methods of developing a carnival-entertainment atmosphere on the main streets of the city.

The entire community was filled with pride for the city's heritage and plans were proposed for things to be done during the remainder of the 20th century.

One of the outstanding events which occurred was the sesquicentennial dinner which was held in the lobby of the Palace Theater—one of the most beautiful chambers in America. This theater was built by B. F. Keith with artifacts representing all of the ethnic cultures comprising the Greater Cleveland community. The dinner was chaired by Kay Halle of Cleveland and Washington, D.C., who organized the dinner for 175 Cleveland men and women of exceptional achievements. Among the honorees were such famous Clevelanders as entertainer Bob Hope, orchestra leader Sammy Kaye, Olympic medal winner Stella Walsh, several of the former mayors of the city of Cleveland, former Congresswoman Francis Bolton, former Under Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose, and conductor Mabel Cississle.

It was only appropriate that Miss Kay Halle should chair this important event, since she has been the patroness and guiding force of two important projects: first, to restore the cultural spirit of the Playhouse Square area of Cleveland and rehabilitate the theater district—one of the finest in the United States, and second, to develop a permanent residence for whoever serves as mayor of the city. These are extremely exciting and popular projects. Following is a complete statement which was made by Miss Kay Halle on July 24, 1971, to celebrate the 175th anniversary of Greater Cleveland.

The statement follows:

OPENING REMARKS OF KAY HALLE—TOAST-MISTRESS AND CHAIRMAN OF THE DINNER FOR 175 CLEVELAND MEN AND WOMEN OF EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS—TO CELEBRATE THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREATER CLEVELAND

On this 175th Anniversary of Greater Cleveland for a Greater Cleveland, I speak for the

Super Sesqui Commission in saluting you, who have come here—some from afar—our honored guests who are deeply associated with Greater Cleveland, either by birth or significant years of residence. Your exceptional achievements have brought honor and fame to our city by the national and international recognition you have earned.

As I look over this gifted assembly in this glorious Grand Hall of the Palace Theatre—soon to celebrate its 50th birthday—I am reminded of the evening when President John F. Kennedy addressed a group of Nobel and award winning Americans at a dinner in the White House when he said, "There never has been such a concentration of brains and talent under this roof, except perhaps the evening when President Thomas Jefferson dined here alone."

As it was my happy task to help select and shepherd those gifted national and international award winning Americans invited to President Kennedy's Inaugural, I was delighted to discover that out of the final Honor List of 168, Cleveland had contributed more than any other city.

You may wonder why we awakened this sleeping beauty, the Grand Hall of the abandoned Palace Theatre from her slumbers over our past achievements, to serve as the setting for this dinner of celebration.

For one thing we felt it might evoke the inspiration that animated the birth of our great founding days with its cultural and scientific achievements and the creation of our diversified industries which earned us the titles, "the Athens of the Western Reserve," and "the best location in the nation." This Grand Hall echoes not only with the voices of Elsie Janis, Ina Claire, Ethel Barrymore, Danny Kaye and a host of others who performed here, but with promises of further advances generated by you, whose exceptional talents, and achievements are being honored here tonight.

The treasures that surround us in this Great Hall came from abroad, as did so many of our citizens who settled here. Look up at the crystal chandeliers, exact copies of those from Louis XIV's Palace of Versailles. They came from Czechoslovakia.

The superb marble columns that support the Grand Hall are from Carrara, Italy.

From France the bronzes and a painting by Corot that once hung here. From India and yes, China, the great rugs and vases—all symbolic of the variety of nationalities that compose the mosaic that is Greater Cleveland. We are a true blend of a United Nations which we are painfully striving to become—if we are to survive.

On our 175th birthday our watchwords might be, *A United Greater Cleveland For A Greater Cleveland*. United is the operational word. It is not what Cleveland may be in 175 years from now that should divert us, but what it will be 5 years from now that should absorb our waking hours.

Living as I do between my native Cleveland and our nation's capital, I am in accord with a letter I received from Sir Winston Churchill after he learned that a statue of him by Cleveland's Bill McVey was to be placed before the British Embassy with one foot on American, the other on British soil. "Be assured," he wrote, "that I will stand firmly on both feet."

At times, perhaps, one can see a bit truer from the outside looking in than the other way around to evaluate true worth.

Not far from me in Washington stands the Pre-Columbian Museum, a part of Dumbarton Oaks. Designed by Cleveland's world famous architect Philip Johnson, attracting admiring visitors from all over the world.

The other evening I listened with pride to three ex-Ambassadors to the Soviet Union, Averell Harriman, Llewelyn Thompson and Charles Bohlen extol the expert translation of *Khrushchev Remembers* by Strobe Talbot,

a Cleveland still in his twenties. And the author-director of "Godspell" the smash musical hit in New York is Cleveland's John Tebelak, a youth of 22 years.

The economist in the White House with the Office of Management and Budget is Cleveland's Arthur Laffer. This is to mention only a few of our giants-at-large.

In winter at night-time when I look from my window out on the unparalleled Lincoln Memorial bathed in a veil of light, I draw pleasure from knowing that its architect, Henry Bacon, also designed downtown Halle's.

It is also reassuring to review some of our innovative firsts as a challenge for tomorrow. One of our city's founders, Jephtha Wade, gave to the world the Western Union system of communications and to Cleveland its series of green lungs—Wade Park.

Charles Brush's discovery of the arc light resulted in Cleveland's streets and the Hollenden Hotel being first in the world to be electrified.

Out of two small basement rooms, one at Case, the other at Western Union some 96 years ago, Doctors Michelson and Morley measured the motion of the earth through space with the aid of light waves revealing the failure of any motion. All this led to Einstein's theory of relativity depending on the motion of the observer—which in turn opened up the atomic age!

It was an official of the United States Postal Service in Washington who reminded me that 108 years ago Joseph Briggs, a Cleveland window delivery postal clerk carried the first letter from the Post Office to its destination. For his innovative act President Lincoln's Postmaster General, Montgomery Blair, called Mr. Briggs to Washington to set up a delivery system for the nation!

It was Cleveland's Florence Allen, from whom I first learned Latin, who became the first woman judge appointed to the Ohio State Court and later as Judge of a U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. A founder of the Cleveland Clinic Dr. George Crile performed the first successful blood transfusion on a human being. When blood donors were being sought at the beginning of World War II, Dr. Crile was invited by a national network to be interviewed on his discovery. On learning that the blood of black people was not being accepted he condemned the ban as wholly unscientific and refused the interview. We have come quite a long way.

What other major city can boast of our imaginative Cultural Gardens or our Emerald necklace of Parks. And it was Cleveland the first major city in the nation that united to elect a black Mayor, Carl B. Stokes.

Recently, walking up Euclid Avenue from the Public Square to Playhouse Square with Judge Earl Hoover, a distinguished historian of the Western Reserve, we stopped to read a bronze plaque tucked on the side of a building which noted that it was in a room above that Archibald Willard painted his celebrated "Spirit of '76."

It brought home to us the urgent need to devise some system for those who live in the affluent doughnut of the suburbs, to join hands and forces with the Center City in order to form "a more perfect union" in "The Spirit of '71."

May I suggest that we begin to plan for the greater needs and enjoyment of Greater Clevelanders by honoring the milestones we are celebrating with some residual gifts—some lasting expressions.

Let us allocate a permanent space in the heart of downtown Cleveland, patterned after Copenhagen's Tivoli Gardens, where different expressions of entertainment and the talents of all groups that compose Greater Cleveland could be enjoyed.

Let us bring life once again to Playhouse Square which possesses such potential cultural riches as the Allen, State and Palace

Theatres—now idle. Had they been standing along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington it might not have been necessary to erect the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Indeed if anything we suffer from an embarrassment of riches of which we were vividly reminded, in 1932 after the economic crash, by Winston Churchill's words to an audience of 2,000 Clevelanders, "We are stripped bare by the curse of plenty!"

And lastly let us create an official residence for future Mayors of Cleveland in the historic Mather Mansion now part of Cleveland State College, once the home of Samuel Mather, brother-in-law of John Hay, President Abraham Lincoln's Private Secretary who later became Secretary of State. Once again let Cleveland assume its historic role of innovator by instituting a participating alliance in the Mansion between the Mayor and selected College students and their professors in political science, history, urban affairs, etc. To establish and service a special Situations Room in the Mansion for the Mayor, to brief and keep him up to date on city, county, state, national and international developments. The mansion's ballroom could serve as a setting for the entertainment of distinguished visitors to Cleveland where the Mayor could invite various of Greater Cleveland's gifted music, ballet and theatre groups to perform.

Much lies ahead to be done, and it can be done. Samuel Johnson put it best, "Depend upon it, Sir, when a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully."

Let our 175th birthday then remind us that we call ourselves Clevelanders. Well then, let us "concentrate our minds wonderfully" and become, in fact, Greater Clevelanders.

LUIS QUERO CHIESA

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 13, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Luis Quero Chiesa was recently elected chairman of the board of higher education in New York City. His accession to that position is greatly significant in that he was the first Puerto Rican member of the BHE and the first to be elected its chairman.

An award winning artist and writer, Mr. Quero Chiesa is with Blumenthal International Association, Inc. His short stories appear in anthologies and in readers used in the Puerto Rican schools. His paintings, using native Puerto Rican motifs, have been shown in San Juan, in New York, and as a part of a traveling exhibit of American art shown throughout the hemisphere. Under his leadership as president of the Institute of Puerto Rico in New York, an extensive cultural program has been carried out and a youth group organized.

Mr. Quero Chiesa has served as second vice chairman of the board of higher education, which governs the City University of New York. CUNY now enrolls more than 200,000 students.

In the last several years Mr. Quero Chiesa has devoted particular energy to the Committee on Expanded Educational Opportunity, which he chairs. The committee deals with the special programs developed for disadvantaged students, including SEEK, College Discovery, and

the paraprofessional programs conducted for employees of schools, hospitals, and social agencies.

Mr. Quero Chiesa has been an advocate of bilingual education. Speaking of children in the schools, he says,

The head start which Puerto Ricans have because of their knowledge of Spanish can be used to teach them English more effectively as a second language.

Mr. Quero Chiesa, 60, was born in Puerto Rico and completed high school there. He is a graduate of the Parsons School of Design in New York City, and has studied art in Mexico. He is a corresponding member of the Hispanic Society of America.

Mr. and Mrs. Quero Chiesa live in Flushing, Queens. They have two daughters, Mrs. Frank Nappa, a fashion designer, and Mrs. Rafael Cuello, a physician.

Mr. Speaker, his success is but another example that discrimination on the basis of race, creed, or country of origin can be eliminated in this Nation. His work has brought about a tremendous improvement in the educational opportunity for Spanish-speaking Americans in New York City. His life should serve as a model not only for Spanish-speaking Americans, but for all. I wish him great success in his new position.

1971 ANNUAL REPORT

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in offering this, my 23d annual report to the people of New York State on my own activities as well as on the work of the first session of the 92d Congress, I am struck by the fact that 1971 was pivotal for the destiny of our Nation and the future of all nations.

Some bold initiatives taken by the President and by the Congress will help to secure better international understanding and more promise of world peace, but there were also some serious steps backward at home and abroad.

The dramatic turnaround in U.S. policy toward mainland China—first in the President's announcement of his forthcoming trip to Peking and later in our support of entry of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations—represents the first real hope that our relations can be normalized with the world's third power with which we have been at sword's point, including a war, for nearly three decades. So, too, does the President's planned trip to the Soviet Union in 1972 hold out the hope of a further easing of tensions with our most serious—and dangerous—world competitor. And the President's Vietnamization policy—while not achieving complete disengagement from Southeast Asia currently—is winding down the war which remains the single most destructive influence on our Nation's unity, motivation, and destiny.

But countering this forward momen-

tum has been a growing protectionist and isolationist tide evidenced in some disturbing and potentially perilous efforts to erect special self-defeating trade barriers, cut back foreign aid, hedge on our moral and humanitarian commitments to the United Nations, reduce precipitously our participation in NATO and view narrowly our vital national-security interests in the Middle East.

Another pivotal situation for our Nation and the world has been the President's announcement of the most sweeping changes in economic policy since the New Deal, seeking to curb inflation, reduce unemployment, and restore a favorable balance of trade and international payments. And, as we approach the new year, we begin to see the first promising signs that his stabilization plan—phase II—now authorized by Congress, may be taking hold.

On the domestic front, as in the international sphere, 1971 leaves us with something of a mixed bag: On the one hand, we have the promise of the President's welfare reform, revenue sharing, and environmental-protection proposals, as well as the progress made in the Congress toward greater consumer protection, draft reform and a massive drive on cancer. But—due largely to the continued imbalance between our defense and domestic priorities—we made precious little progress in combating crime and violence, reducing the traffic in and abuse of narcotic drugs, eradicating hunger and poverty, fighting urban decay, assuring low- and moderate-income housing and national health care, promoting civil rights and liberties, and equal educational opportunity in all sectors of our society and achieving meaningful governmental reform. And we even suffered some setbacks, such as the failure to establish a national child development program.

I have found it most challenging and gratifying to be engaged in seeking solutions to our great international and domestic problems as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee; as ranking Republican member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, and the Select Committee on Small Business; as second-ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, and as a ranking member of the Government Operations Committee.

I look ahead with hope and confidence to 1972 as a year in which so many initiatives begun this year to achieve world peace, social justice, and general prosperity can come to greater fruition.

ECONOMIC STABILIZATION

On August 15, 1971, President Nixon announced a series of far-reaching steps in domestic and international economic policy which probably will be remembered as a major turning point in our Government's economic activity, as well as in Republican economic philosophy. That day marked the beginning of the wage/price freeze leading to the system of "phase II" controls which are with us as we enter 1972. At the same time, the President announced a series of tax

proposals designed to stimulate business activity, increase consumer spending, and reduce unemployment.

As the ranking Republican Senator on the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress, I had a unique opportunity to review and influence administration economic policy. Long before August 15, I sought to warn the administration as to the consequences of failing to adopt an "incomes policy" for restraining wages and prices. In April, I specifically urged the establishment of a wage and price board and introduced legislation to that end. In May, I urged the closing of the U.S. "gold window" as the best means to stop the drain on our remaining gold stock. In July, I urged a wage/price freeze as a first step to setting up such a wage/price board. On August 4, I was joined by 13 other Republican Senators in introducing legislation for a wage/price board and which, among other things, would have forbidden Government contracts to be awarded to firms violating the wage and price guidelines. I was pleased that the President adopted many of these policies as part of his Economic Stabilization program.

I supported most of the administration's measures for stimulating the economy, including personal income tax reductions and the investment tax credit. I also felt that we needed more policies designed to directly stimulate jobs and reduce unemployment. Therefore, I proposed an incentive job development tax credit based on the number of jobs actually created by each employer-taxpayer.

We should give priority attention to the problem of improving the productivity of our labor force. Accordingly, last spring I introduced legislation—now becoming law—to begin an expanded productivity drive by using Federal funds to encourage the establishment of plant and local-level productivity councils similar to those used so successfully during World War II.

TAX LOOPHOLES

The Federal Government loses over \$40-billion annually through special tax provisions. Many of these special provisions are desirable as incentives or relief measures; some might be regarded as loopholes. Because I believe it is most important that these revenue losses be regularly reported to and reviewed by the Congress, I introduced legislation which passed the Senate requiring estimates of such losses to be itemized in the annual budget. The Department of the Treasury has now agreed to publish these estimates annually.

LOCKHEED LOAN

I voted for the \$250-million emergency loan guarantee to the Lockheed Corp. to meet the emergency of a sudden loss of productivity and jobs and confidence that would accompany the failure of a national defense producer.

TRADE, GOLD, AND FOREIGN AID

It was an enormously difficult year for the international economic relations of the free-world nations. Shortly before the President's August 15 announcement of his new economic policy—freeze—I urged that the "gold window" be closed while allowing the dollar to float tempo-

rarily pending a reform of the monetary system.

I later urged the administration to accept a modest change in the price of gold in terms of the dollar, or a widening of "gold points," as part of a substantial realignment of the major currencies against the dollar to achieve an interim settlement of the monetary and trade crises—I introduced legislation to this effect. Over the longer term, I have urged that we strengthen the role of special drawing rights—SDR's—as an international reserve asset and correspondingly downgrade the role of gold.

I supported the President's 10-percent surcharge on imports as a necessary short-term measure to strengthen the bargaining position of the United States. However, I also warned that the maintenance of the surcharge and the "Buy America" discriminatory provision of the investment tax credit beyond the end of 1971 could unnecessarily strain our domestic economy as well as the vital economic relations among the nations of the free world. The ultimate danger in these measures was a world recession leading to trade wars and mitigating against securing the desired currency realignments.

I also opposed the regrettably successful efforts on the Senate floor to write protectionist trade legislation into the Revenue Act of 1971. This legislation gave the President almost unlimited authority—which he did not want—to impose import quotas and import surcharges. The Senate-House conference struck these unwise provisions.

Closely related to the Senate's growing protectionism the assault made on our foreign aid program. I was successful in managing the fight in the Senate against the attempt to reduce our voluntary contributions to the United Nations by more than \$100 million, and in organizing the bipartisan coalition in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee which revived a meaningful development assistance and security assistance program following the initial Senate defeat of the AID bill.

I strongly supported the continuing effort to channel more of our development assistance resources through multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank to assure that there will be greater burden sharing with the other major donor nations and that long-range development, not short-term political gain, is the driving force behind our aid programs.

CRIME AND DRUGS

The impact of high rates of violent crime and the closely related problem of drug addiction continued to have a devastating effect upon life in urban America—notably in New York City. Many of our people live in an environment of fear and hopelessness.

I proposed and supported legislation seeking to strengthen law enforcement capabilities, identify and deal with the causes of crime, lower the high rate of recidivism among those leaving prisons, and to control the supply and availability of handguns.

I actively supported efforts to increase

to \$250 million the funds available to relieve the pressures building up within our correctional and prison systems. These funds were used in many States and localities to develop and operate community-based corrections facilities, including diagnostic services, halfway houses, and probation and work-release programs under the direction of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

I was successful in obtaining a new federally sponsored correctional manpower training program, sponsored by the New York City Board of Education and located at the Rikers Island Reformatory.

By the year's end, I prepared—for introduction in 1972—three major bills designed to have a significant impact upon the crime problem by first, assisting large cities where crime rates are highest; second, conducting innovative programs—with emphasis on the involvement of the private sector—in the rehabilitation of offenders by means of manpower-training programs in pretrial and correctional situations, and third, formulating an explicit set of national standards and criteria for reform of correctional systems throughout the country.

I again supported vigorously legislation to achieve a national registry of all guns and licensing of all gun owners—moves which I feel are essential to combating violent crime, but which do not jeopardize the rights of sportsmen and others who have legitimate use of firearms.

I was a primary sponsor of the most comprehensive drug-abuse legislation ever to pass the Senate. The Drug Abuse Office and Treatment Act of 1971 which authorizes \$1.5 billion in new funds to establish a national policy and program for combating drug abuse. To reverse the rapid trend toward addiction-related crime, I authorized legislation to launch large-scale methadone-maintenance programs as an interim measure—for the treatment of heroin addicts on a nationwide basis.

In seeking to deal with the tragic problem of addiction among our fighting men in Vietnam, I coauthored legislation—which was for the most part enacted—to assist in the identification and treatment of drug- and alcohol-dependent members of the armed services.

During this session, I again sponsored a resolution for a New York-New Jersey compact which would create an airport commission authorized to exercise powers at the New York metropolitan area airports in an effort to curb the high incidence of cargo theft.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WAR POWERS

On December 7, 1971, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, unanimously reported out to the Senate a proposed War Powers Act. This potentially historic measure was my bill sponsored with Senator STENNIS of Mississippi and Senator EAGLETON of Missouri and others, which seeks to restore the Constitutional balance between the legislative and executive branches of Government by estab-

lishing clear restraints over the initiation and conduct of undeclared wars unless specifically authorized by Congress. This bill was the focus of extensive hearings conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee and attracted considerable attention and comment from academic experts, legal and constitutional authorities as well as in the press; and is expected to receive favorable consideration by the Senate early in the next session. If enacted into law, the war powers bill will be truly historic because it not only would provide strong safeguards against tragic involvement in future Vietnams, but should also go far toward restoring confidence in our political system among the many Americans who have been so disillusioned by Vietnam.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

The Vietnam war continued to be a highly divisive issue, weakening our Nation at home and abroad and draining vital resources urgently needed elsewhere. I continued to bend my efforts to bringing U.S. involvement in this tragic war to a swift and complete end, and I shall continue to do so until this goal is achieved.

While President Nixon's policy of Vietnamization and withdrawal reduced the tempo of the fighting and significantly diminished the scale of U.S. combat involvement in Vietnam, the war continued and no date was fixed for complete U.S. withdrawal. My visit to Vietnam in May reaffirmed my conviction that Congress must continue to press for an early date for full U.S. withdrawal; thus, I supported all Senate measures toward this end, namely the unsuccessful Hatfield-McGovern amendment which I cosponsored, and the Mansfield amendment, which passed the Senate on three different occasions in 1971. But the latter measure, which sought to establish a 6-month withdrawal deadline, was weakened in its final legislative form as a result of action by the House of Representatives.

I supported successful Senate amendments placing ceilings and restrictions on the level of U.S. involvement in Laos and Cambodia. My own amendment—first adopted in 1970 and again adopted as part of the Foreign Assistance Act passed by the Senate—established legislatively that assistance to Cambodia does not constitute a U.S. commitment to Cambodia's defense.

CHINA AND JAPAN

1971 was a watershed year in our relations with the two most important nations in Asia—China and Japan. President Nixon made bold and imaginative initiatives toward normalization of our relations with mainland China. They were in close accord with the policy I have publicly advocated over the past several years including 1970 as a U.S. delegate to the U.N.

On February 2, I introduced a Senate resolution calling on the administration to adopt a new policy in the U.N. favoring admission of mainland China while also seeking to preserve representation for the Republic of China on Taiwan. That policy later became that of the Nixon administration, although efforts to preserve Taiwan's seat were defeated in

the U.N. General Assembly. I considered the General Assembly's action to expel the Taiwanese Government most regrettable, but I successfully opposed efforts in the Senate to retaliate by sharply cutting U.S. voluntary contributions to United Nations humanitarian programs.

My visit to Japan in May, when I had discussions with Prime Minister Sato and other Japanese leaders, reinforced my conviction that continued close U.S.-Japan relations should be the basis of our post-Vietnam policy in Asia and was a prerequisite for peace and prosperity there. Accordingly, I supported the treaty to restore full administrative rights over Okinawa to Japan, and continued to work hard to prevent overall United States-Japan relations from being adversely affected by trade and monetary disagreements.

INDIA AND PAKISTAN

The outbreak of full-scale war between India and Pakistan constituted a danger to world peace. I urged that the efforts of the United States be directed toward halting the bloodshed and helping to alleviate the massive human suffering caused, in the first instance, by the repression in East Pakistan and increased manifold by war between India and Pakistan. As there was at least some measure of blame on both sides, I urged our Government to maintain political neutrality while concentrating on peacemaking and humanitarian relief of the millions of refugees from East Pakistan in India.

NATO AND EUROPE

Pointing up how crucial 1971 was for the future of the NATO alliance were the continuing efforts in the Senate, led by Majority Leader MANSFIELD, to effect large, unilateral cuts in the U.S. troop levels among NATO forces in Europe. I opposed these efforts because I felt that any weakening of NATO could undermine the good prospects for opening negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe as well as for the ongoing active negotiations on nuclear arms limitation, on Berlin and the convening of a European Security Conference. At the same time, I favor a greater sharing of the NATO military burden by other member nations.

At the October 1971, meeting of the North Atlantic Assembly—formerly the NATO Parliamentarians—in Ottawa, I stepped down as chairman of the political committee to accept the chairmanship of a new ad hoc committee of "Nine Wise Men" commissioned by the Assembly to undertake a thorough review of the Atlantic Alliance—NATO—and to make recommendations by November 1972, on its future.

WORLD COURT

I introduced a resolution to strengthen the World Court as an instrument of achieving international peace by encouraging the submission of a greater number of international disputes by the United States to the Court.

MIDDLE EAST SOVIET JEWS

Although the cease-fire along the Suez continued in effect, the Mideast situation remained ominous and there were renewed threats of war emanating

from Cairo. The Soviet Union continued to supply aircraft, missiles, and other sophisticated weapons to Egypt, and a large number of Soviet military personnel—including combat pilots—were stationed in there. U.S. efforts to promote a negotiated settlement, including an interim partial settlement to reopen the Suez, were frustrated by demands which were incompatible with Israel's vital security requirements and continued Egyptian threats to resume the shooting.

I took the lead legislatively on several measures to bolster Middle East security by bolstering Israel's self-defense capabilities. I was a principal sponsor of Senate Resolution 177—ultimately cosponsored by 78 Senators—which called for the resumption of arms shipments, specifically Phantom jets, to Israel. I authored in the Foreign Relations Committee an amendment to provide \$85 million in defense support to Israel, in recognition of the enormous strain which the defense burden places on Israel's limited budgetary resources. I also was a principal author of the amendments to authorize \$300 million in credits to Israel to purchase Phantom jets and other military equipment under the Foreign Military Sales Act. Also, I worked actively with Senator JACKSON of Washington to provide \$500 million in credits to Israel for military purchases, including \$250 million specifically earmarked for the purchase of Phantom jets.

In a closely related area, I continued to work actively against the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union and the denial of their rights including the right to emigrate—many of them to Israel. I also continued to work actively in seeking an end to the persecutions of Jews in Iraq, Syria, and in other lands where they have lived in peace for centuries.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee which closely investigated the constitutional and legal implications of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide—the so-called Genocide Convention—I was instrumental in having the Convention favorably reported to the full Senate by a vote of 10 to 4 on March 30. I hope ratification will come early in 1972.

POVERTY, SOCIAL SERVICES

Foremost among the initiatives to come to grips with the poverty affecting some 24 million Americans was the President's historic family assistance program. For the first time, a minimal national income level would be established along with incentives to reduce the welfare rolls and ease the burden on State taxpayers by providing a national Federal takeover of welfare costs. I strongly supported this basic approach and introduced amendments, with Senator RIBICOFF of Connecticut, to strengthen the proposal, particularly from the viewpoint of such large industrial States as New York. Senate action on this House-passed bill is expected in the spring.

A number of initiatives which I proposed became law:

In July the President signed into law the Emergency Employment Act, which I coauthored with Senator NELSON of Wisconsin. This represented the first

postwar public service jobs proposal and authorized approximately \$2.25 billion over a 2-year period for the creation of more than 100,000 public service jobs for unemployed and underemployed persons.

The President signed into law on May 25, a special supplemental appropriation of \$105 million which I sought for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job programs to deal with the special problem of youth unemployment in the summer months. I also led the fight for the \$44 million funding of manpower programs to assist disadvantaged youth and older persons.

Regrettably, the President vetoed the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1971, providing a 2-year extension of the crucial antipoverty program and establishing a new child-development program for preschool services for poor and other children on the local level, which was patterned basically on my proposal the year before for a comprehensive Community Child Care Act. The bill also included a new community economic development section based upon a bill coauthored by Senator KENNEDY with me to combine the efforts of the poor with those of public and private resources toward eliminating poverty in low-income areas, as has been demonstrated so successfully in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn. The economic opportunity amendments also contained a vital provision which I proposed to have Puerto Rico regarded as if it were a State for the purpose of receiving assistance under the Antipoverty Act.

Although the Nixon administration has advanced further than any other in providing assistance to the hungry and malnourished, I expressed my concern to the President that the funding of the school lunch program was inadequate and voted for the legislation which increased funding for free lunches to insure that all those who needed them would get them. Nor was I satisfied with the limits the Department of Agriculture placed on eligibility requirements for food stamps and I continue to work for their revision.

A crucial problem affecting the poor, as well as all citizens, is the matter of administrative abuse by Federal, State, and local government. I introduced the Administrative Ombudsman Experimentation Act of 1971, to provide a 2-year test of the ombudsman "watchdog" concept in combating administrative abuse at all levels of government. I am hopeful that hearings will be held in the near future.

EDUCATION

The Congress reaffirmed its priority interest in education by appropriating \$5.024 billion—an increase of some \$539 million over last year's appropriation. This included increases in student assistance and other higher education programs, as well as in vocational education, education of the handicapped, programs for the disadvantaged, bilingual students and adults.

The Senate approved two major education bills which must now await resolution by a House-Senate conference—of which I will be a member—before they can be signed into law. The first of these, unanimously approved by

the Senate, was a comprehensive higher education measure which I cosponsored. In addition to continuing and expanding existing higher education programs, it established a landmark student assistance and by means of a program of basic educational opportunity grants. Assistance is also provided for institutions of higher education—many severely pressed by lack of funds—and for expansion of work-study and loan programs.

Included in the bill were several provisions of which I was the principal sponsor, including establishment of the National Foundation for Postsecondary Education to stimulate innovation in higher education; authorization of matching grants to the States for State scholarship programs; inclusion of half-time students in educational opportunity grant programs; establishment of Educational Opportunity Centers to counsel poor and others on entering college; permitting developing institutions to receive two-thirds Federal funds for construction grants; establishment of a Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education within the U.S. Office of Education, and inclusion of at least one student on the governing board of the National Foundation for Postsecondary Education.

The other major bill awaiting conference action—the Emergency School Aid and Quality Integrated Education Act of 1971—passed the Senate by a 74 to 8 vote, having gained the support of southern Senators who sought Federal assistance for court-ordered integration programs in their States. It would authorize \$1.5 billion in financial assistance to encourage the establishment and maintenance of stable, quality integrated schools, to assist in eliminating minority-group isolation in public school systems throughout the Nation, and to aid schoolchildren in overcoming the educational disadvantages of minority-group isolation.

HEALTH

I introduced the National Health Insurance and Health Services Improvement Act of 1971 to extend the present medicare hospital and physician coverage to all citizens, while simultaneously expanding the range of health-care benefits. To implement a national health insurance system and rationalize medical care services and facilities, I introduced as a companion measure, the Local Comprehensive Health Services Systems Act of 1971, as well as the administration's Health Maintenance Organization Assistance Act of 1971.

A comprehensive new law, Public Law 92-157—to increase the supply and improve the use and distribution of physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health manpower—was in large measure based on health manpower legislation I introduced for the administration and on provisions I authorized. Also enacted into law—Public Law 92-158—was legislation I authored and cosponsored to provide a balanced program of support to nursing schools and nursing students.

To wage a new war against cancer—the major health concern of the American people—I offered with Senator KENNEDY a landmark bill to accelerate and vitalize the war on cancer which, in large measure was enacted into law.

The treatment of other dread—yet, tragically, neglected—diseases also received my concern and careful attention. I cosponsored the Senate-passed bill to combat sickle cell anemia and Myasthenia Gravis. I also cosponsored legislation to provide new innovative programs of dental care and to establish programs of Federal support for water fluoridation.

THE HANDICAPPED

Congress enacted into law legislation I authored amending the Wagner-O'Day Act. This legislation extends the special priority in the selling of certain products and services to the Federal Government—heretofore reserved exclusively for the blind—to the other severely handicapped, assuring, however, that the blind will have first preference.

ENVIRONMENT

In 1971, the Environmental Protection Agency was established and it moved forcefully and effectively in the areas of air and water pollution to enforce and implement stricter standards throughout the Nation.

On August 6, the Senate passed a bill which I sponsored to establish the Gateway National Recreation Area for the New York City metropolitan area, encompassing Great Kills Park in Staten Island, Breezy Point and Sandy Hook in New Jersey, and Jamaica Bay. This legislation is expected to become law very early in 1972.

On November 2, I joined in the Senate's 86-to-0 vote to pass the Water Quality Standards Act (S. 2770), which would provide \$14 billion over the next 4 years for the construction of sewage treatment facilities throughout the country. The Senate bill contained a provision which could bring approximately \$1 billion to New York State by reimbursing States and localities for moneys morally but not legally owed to them by the Federal Government.

In 1971, I again introduced a bill to provide a bounty on abandoned automobiles to help eliminate a serious litter problem in many areas in New York State and the Nation. In another effort to combat the solid waste problem, I introduced legislation to require all those contracting with the Federal Government to use a certain percentage of recycled materials in the performance of their contracts. I will press for enactment of both measures in 1972.

HOUSING

The year 1971 saw construction of the largest total of subsidized housing—in excess of 400,000 units. Despite this increased effort, the housing shortage for low- and middle-income families remained severe throughout New York State, especially in the large metropolitan centers.

I was again active in efforts to secure increased funding for Federal housing programs and was instrumental in increasing the appropriation to \$200 million for the section 236 subsidy program in fiscal 1972—the program through which most of the federally subsidized housing in New York State is constructed.

I introduced a community development bill (S. 609) to provide supplementary

Federal grants to local governmental units which seek to develop programs for increased low-cost housing and to deny Federal assistance to those localities which—by means of restrictive land practices—exclude such publicly assisted housing. I hope for enactment early in 1972.

I also introduced a bill, S. 1859, to create a National Institute of Building Sciences to propose nationally accepted standards for local building codes and to serve as an authoritative source of information on latest advances in construction.

In addition, continuing our efforts to produce new housing, we must adopt fresh initiatives to preserve and upgrade our existing housing stock to stem the alarming rate of deterioration in "transitional areas." Accordingly, I urged a new preservation strategy to expand and improve existing programs and establish new programs to allow for refinancing and modest rehabilitation of existing properties. I also recommended a 90-percent Federal grant for improvement of such essential neighborhood services as police, sanitation, and lighting.

TRANSPORTATION

Concerned with the beleaguered state of urban mass transit in our State and Nation, I urged the President fully to obligate all funds the Congress has authorized for the development and improvement of mass transportation. I was disappointed that the administration planned to hold in reserve \$300 million for the next fiscal year; I will make every effort to have those funds released.

I coauthored an amendment to the Revenue Act of 1971 which would have diverted a portion of the highway trust fund for urban mass transit purposes. The amendment was narrowly defeated but I will continue the fight.

I introduced a bill to authorize \$1 billion over a 5-year period for specific operational subsidies to mass transit systems. If this bill passes next year, it would offset the shortage of funds caused by defeat of the New York State transportation bond issue.

To improve our Nation's railroads, I cosponsored legislation to provide additional funds to improve the railroad roadbeds and rights-of-way along our urban corridors. I am supporting legislation to increase the funds available to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, "Amtrak," so that the quality of our intercity rail travel can become a viable alternate method of transportation.

LABOR

During 1971 the country again found itself faced with several railroad strikes which—in the absence of effective legislation, fair to workers, to safeguard the Nation's health and safety—led to a temporary state of near-paralysis. In May, a strike by the railway signalmen began; at the request of the administration and as ranking minority member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I introduced a resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 98, which would provide for a temporary extension of the status quo under the Railway Labor Act. After the adop-

tion of two amendments, I offered—one extending the legislation's terminal date to October 1, 1971, the other providing for payment of the wage increases recommended by the Emergency Board which had been convened to deal with the dispute—the resolution passed both the House and the Senate, and was signed by the President on May 18.

While the other significant railroad disputes of the year were settled without the need for legislation, the long and debilitating longshoremen's strikes on both our east and west coasts finally forced the President to seek 80-day injunctions.

I introduced a bill (S. 594) to establish a permanent mechanism for dealing with labor disputes that threaten the national or regional health and safety.

Hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Labor to discuss this as well as other bills I introduced to deal with this serious perennial problem. Hopefully, some measure with the cooperation of labor will be enacted into law early next year.

The Subcommittee on Labor continued its investigation of the United Mine Workers election of November 1969. Much of the subcommittee's investigative material has already been utilized by the Department of Labor as evidence in its suit to set aside the election.

The Labor subcommittee also conducted extensive hearings on the need for legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act for the purpose of increasing the minimum wage and expanding its coverage. I believe the basic minimum wage should be increased to at least \$2 per hour.

PENSION REFORM

In January I introduced a bill (S. 2) to provide comprehensive and sorely needed protection of the pension rights of 30 million American workers. My bill, currently the subject of hearings by the labor subcommittee, would provide protection for employees against loss of their pension benefits in the event that they lose or change their jobs, or that their employer goes out of business or moves away. In addition, it would establish a new commission—similar in structure and objectives to the Securities and Exchange Commission—to supervise pension plans so that their \$130 billion in assets are properly managed in the worker's interests. I am confident that appropriate and adequate legislation will be forthcoming before the end of the 92d Congress for improving and protecting private pension plans.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

I again worked actively for the passage of legislation to establish a Federal Consumer Protection Agency as a ranking member of the Senate Government Operations Committee. This year, the House as the Senate did in 1970, passed legislation which would create such an agency but which varied significantly from the bill I introduced. I am confident that differences between the bills will be worked out, and I expect that this legislation will pass during the next session of Congress—thereby establishing a Federal Consumer Protection Agency and authorizing grants to State and local

governments for consumer protection programs.

The Senate passed a bill to establish minimum Federal standards for warranties. I strongly supported this legislation, and am hopeful that the House will act favorably.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL LIBERTIES

The most significant civil rights legislation considered by Congress this year was a bill to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission enforcement power similar to that enjoyed by other Federal administrative agencies and to expand its jurisdiction to afford more comprehensive equal employment opportunity protection to all our citizens.

I voted with a majority of the Senate last year in favor of a strong equal employment bill, while the House unfortunately failed to act on a similar one of its own. This year, the House passed a bill and the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported a strengthened version for Senate action early next year.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS

The House passed an equal rights amendment guaranteeing equality in law between the sexes. The Senate will probably consider this amendment next year. Meanwhile, I introduced a resolution, which the Senate passed, amending the Senate rules to permit the appointment for the first time in history of girls as Senate pages. I then appointed a New Yorker, Paulette Desell, as the first such girl.

18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

A constitutional amendment guaranteeing the vote to 18-year-olds, which I cosponsored, was ratified by the States this year. This amendment, which applies to all elections, supplements a statute enacted by Congress last year which the courts held to cover Federal elections only. I also cosponsored legislation to allow 18-year-olds to serve on Federal juries, and to provide uniform absentee-voter registration and balloting.

SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

To insure that the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People fully represented the Puerto Rican community, I opposed the nomination of the chairman until I was assured that the Puerto Rican community was equitably represented on the staff and in the programs. I will continue to assure that the Cabinet Committee is beneficial to the Puerto Rican community.

SUPREME COURT

Two Presidential nominations to the Supreme Court were considered by the Senate this year. Justice Lewis Powell, nominated on October 22, was confirmed 89 to 1 on December 6, with my support. The second nomination made by the President on October 22, that of William Rehnquist, was far more controversial, and he was not confirmed until December 10 by a vote of 68 to 26. While there was never any dispute about Justice Rehnquist's professional qualifications or integrity, I believe his record indicated a lack of concern in the vital areas of civil rights and civil liberties and that for a lifetime job on the Supreme Court

I had the right to judge this question. I, therefore, voted against Justice Rehnquist's confirmation.

SELECTIVE SERVICE, DRAFT REFORM

In 1971, Congress extended the Selective Service Act for 2 years. As an advocate of the principle that an army in a democratic nation should be composed of a true cross-section of its citizens—and that a volunteer army does not meet this criterion—I was among the supporters of this legislation.

I cosponsored with Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts a number of amendments which were incorporated into the final draft reform legislation; namely, amendments to raise military pay in accordance with the recommendations of the Gates Commission, to limit the number of men who may be drafted during the coming 2 years, and to guarantee registrants the right to a personal appearance and other procedural safeguards in classification proceedings before local and appeal boards.

Senator KENNEDY and I also sent a letter—signed by 20 other Senators—to Selective Service Director Curtis Tarr, citing defects in the new regulations and urgently calling for changes to insure procedural due process rights to registrants.

GOVERNMENTAL REFORM

I vigorously supported and promoted the landmark legislation proposed by President Nixon totally to reorganize the executive departments of the Federal Government around its basic purposes. Better resolution of our problems in human resources, economic development, community development and natural resources is the essential objective of this proposal. Unfortunately, this legislation made little headway in 1971, but I intend to join in the push for its enactment in 1972.

RULE XXII

Once again, the legislative year began with an unsuccessful fight to modify filibusters by amending rule XXII—the Senate rule which requires a two-thirds vote to cut off debate. I cosponsored a rules change having wide support which would have allowed three-fifths of the Senate to end a filibuster. Unfortunately, this rules change itself was filibustered and after 6 weeks the Senate failed to end the filibuster. I will try again.

SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AGED

I cosponsored bill, S. 1173, to expand the definition of "disability" under title II of the Social Security Act, thus giving consideration to distance required to travel for gainful employment, and liberalizing the criteria for a disability qualification. I supported, as part of the Revenue Act of 1971, a tax credit to elderly Americans for property taxes paid on their homes or for rental payments; unfortunately, however, this measure was dropped in the House-Senate conference. I also cosponsored S. 1163 to provide the elderly with low-cost, nutritionally sound meals served in their local communities; it was approved by the Senate.

SMALL BUSINESS, MINORITY ENTERPRISE

As ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Small Business, I gave my active support to legislation ex-

panding the powers of the Small Business Administration to assist this Nation's 5 million small businessmen. In 1971, Congress increased the lending authority of the SBA, making possible an expansion of its direct loan program. The Senate also passed an omnibus bill permitting payment of interest subsidies to certain necessitous small businesses and establishing a loan priority for the installation of pollution control equipment. I have long advocated the development and expansion of programs to bring minority businessmen into the economic mainstream, and in this connection I supported the President's announced \$60 million annual budget increase for the Office of Minority Business Enterprise as an important step in the right direction.

VETERANS, CIVIL SERVICE

I supported three important bills during 1971 which were enacted into law to provide: First, improved medical care for disabled veterans—Public Law 92-69; second, direct home, farm, and business loans to veterans at prevailing mortgage market conditions—Public Law 92-66—and third, authorization for the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to provide mortgage-protection life insurance for seriously disabled veterans—Public Law 92-95.

In early December I gave my support to the Senate's passage of two additional bills to increase payment of veterans' disability and death pensions and to increase payment of veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation.

FEDERAL PAY

I supported the President's plan to defer scheduled Federal pay increase to July 1, 1972, because it was in line with phase I of his wage-freeze. However, once phase II was to be implemented, I supported the amendment giving comparability pay raises to Federal employees, effective January 1, 1972.

POSTAL REFORM

1971 saw the implementation of the postal reorganization bill in the establishment of the U.S. Postal Service as a semiautonomous, quasi-public corporation. I am hopeful that the end product will be a much more modern and efficient handling of the mail.

As both a father and as a public official, I am pleased to note a sharp curtailment this past year in the receipt of unsolicited obscene materials through the mails. I will continue to do all I can in the Congress to help enact constitutional and enforceable laws to deal with this problem.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL LIFE

I continued my strong efforts to have the support price of milk set as close to 90 percent of parity as possible. Because the dairy industry is important to the economy of New York State, I was pleased the administration eventually decided to maintain the support price at a level similar to that of last year. I supported passage of the Farm Credit Act, which has not yet become law, and the Rural Telephone Bank Act.

I supported the nomination of Dr. Earl L. Butz as Secretary of Agriculture after being assured by him of a deep and

abiding interest in an effective Federal antihunger program and a sensitivity to such other key agricultural policy matters as the viability of rural communities and small farms, consumer protection, and environmental needs.

NEW YORK STATE

Although New Yorkers pay Federal taxes of nearly \$23.6 billion a year, total annual Federal aid to New York State and local governments amounted to only about \$2.5 billion—a return of only 11 cents for every Federal tax dollar paid by New Yorkers. To meet this obvious inequity to New Yorkers, I strongly supported President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal to share a greater portion of Federal revenues directly with State and local governments. I also introduced amendments to the President's revenue-sharing bill to double the amount of money to be shared and to accelerate the start of this program. I will seek prompt congressional approval of this important legislation. I will also pursue a Federal tax credit to individuals for the payment of specific State and local taxes.

As part of my New York office's program of bringing better basic services to neglected communities, I helped organize the South Bronx Community Housing Corp., to act as a major housing delivery system, and the South Bronx Overall Economic Development Administration, to undertake major commercial and industrial development activities. I also helped promote project rehabilitation activities in New York involving thousands of dwelling units and various new construction projects, including the East Harlem pilot block. I also sought to improve the Federal response to educational problems in the Puerto Rican community.

I will continue to fight for larger grants for New York under State and local aid formulas, and, most important, to rewrite formulas that now discriminate against New York and other populous States.

My offices in Washington, New York City, and Buffalo continued to maintain a fine record in assisting constituents whose letters and calls are always welcome.

EBENEZER SCROOGE LIVES: OR, NIXON'S NEW ASSAULT ON FEDERAL WORKERS; PHASE II

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, in the past several years, the administration has made a series of economic decisions that have borne bitter fruit. Retreating in confusion from the devastating consequences of these mistakes, the administration has taken refuge in punitive actions on the economic front. Some of these have worked temporarily. However, significant groups of Americans have had to take it on the chin throughout all this travail. No single group has been singled out for worse treatment than the Federal

worker. It is no exaggeration to state that the Nixon administration has created and maintained a permanent open season on the Federal work force. This has taken many forms.

First and foremost, these millions of Americans and their families have been pictured as public parasites who are somehow fattening off the public while giving nothing in return. Again and again the administration has encouraged statements lending credence to such a conclusion. These people are pictured as lazy, set in their ways, bitterly opposed to progressive reforms of any type and determined to gain financially at the public expense while giving the minimum in return.

They have been pictured as the ultimate featherbedders, who hold the tax-paying public in supreme contempt. In their desperate attempts to gain some sort of equity in terms of wages and working conditions, some have gone on strike. Seizing this opportunity, the administration has utilized its entire battery of public relations hacks to strike a pose of outraged defender of the commonweal against the nasty striking Government workers. All of this is a crude, despicable sham.

In reality the average Government worker is trapped in one of the most vicious circles of American history. This is especially true of those who must struggle to earn livings in major cities where the cost of living is out of sight and climbing in spite of the freeze, which is more of a slush.

Their plight is truly heart-rending. As business profits and interest rates skyrocket, their pay scales and hopes for minimum raises, already enacted by Congress, remain frozen. No one is holding the bankers' feet to the fire of public responsibility. Hence, interest rates rise. No one is asking the major corporations to limit their profits. Not on a bet. For these are the fat cats who are swelling the administration's campaign bankroll.

While patting these poor, barefoot millionaires on the back, the administration turns around with solemn mein, declaring that pay raises for Government workers are against the public interest and must be deferred, even after the freeze-slush has run its course. And as for granting to these same workers the retroactive pay raise dating from August 15 of last year; why we cannot have that. Even though such pay raises were negotiated before imposition of the freeze, and were to go into effect during the period of the freeze, we just cannot allow that, says the administration.

Raises for Government and nongovernmental workers were negotiated in good faith by both sides before the administration in desperation slapped on the freeze. Because the game plan came a cropper the innocent working people of the Nation are to be made to absorb the economic consequences of the failure at the top.

The administration has taken a piously aggressive stand against this act of elementary justice and economic re-

ality. Well, the average worker should understand. After all, he does not have to struggle along with White Houses in Washington, California, and Florida. All he has to do is feed, clothe, educate, and house his family. All he has to do is count his pennies in the stores as he shops. All he has to worry about is whether or not the family will be able to afford an extra cut of meat, some new shoes, or tuition for a child next semester at a college.

Mr. Speaker, the average worker, particularly the Federal employee, has been thrust viciously to the bottom of the economic ladder by the very Government he and she serves so loyally. They struggle to survive in a nightmare of staff cuts, facility closings, and punitive bureaucratic actions. All are unprecedented since establishment of the civil service system in the last century.

First, last, and foremost, come the political interests of this administration. Because of their trapped status and anguished public outcries, they have become a useful scapegoat. Goaded beyond endurance by stringent economic realities, these workers and their organizations have sought merely the granting of pay raises already approved.

A mere cursory reading of the press reveals that the administration's Pay Board is approving a series of price hikes for most of the Nation's major industries. Autos and steel have just been the most recent recipients of such largesse. These workers are going to have to absorb the consequences of administration generosity. Inexorably, prices are continuing their rise, further eroding the precarious economic status of these poor people. It is outrageous in the extreme for them to receive a public battering, because of their efforts.

Whether the administration admits it or not, this Nation owes these relatively unsung public servants an enormous debt. Every day they perform innumerable functions and render us services we require. If they halted their efforts we would be in desperate straits. If they did not function effectively, things indeed would become intolerable.

Statesmanship and generosity are called for, and all we see is cheap political opportunism and favoritism at the expense of helpless, voiceless people. Has there been any attack upon some of the unprincipled industry and financial leaders who have reaped ever larger profits in these times of distress? None.

This is the state of affairs existing today. Who says Ebenezer Scrooge is dead?

FAILURE OF EMBARGO ON TRADE WITH RHODESIA

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Lynchburg News of December 10, contains an excellent column by Mr.

John Chamberlain concerning the failure of the United Nations policy of imposing an embargo on trade with Rhodesia.

Mr. Chamberlain points out that the Rhodesian economy has thrived despite the sanctions which have been in effect against that nation since 1966. The African countries of Zambia and Malawi, despite strong opposition to the Rhodesian Government, carry on trade with Rhodesia.

Now that a settlement has been reached between the British and the Rhodesian negotiators, I hope that the ill-advised boycott against Rhodesia will be abandoned.

I ask unanimous consent that the column, entitled "U.N. Boycott Boomeranged," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

U.N. BOYCOTT BOOMERANGED

The so-called "sell-out" agreement between the British and Rhodesia to put an end to their differences will be the subject of much vituperation in the United Nations, but, in the end, most of the African countries will accept it for the simple reason that they are not yet ready to go against immediate economic interests. From their point of view, the sad fact is that the British-instigated UN boycott of Rhodesia has worked in reverse. It has actually resulted in changing Rhodesia from a dependent part of the British Commonwealth, a colony in everything but name, to a self-sufficient nation in which all the old vestiges of economic and social subservience to London have been stamped out.

In the course of learning to stand upon their own feet, the Rhodesians have made themselves indispensable to their neighbors, and it would be self-destructive for President Kenneth Kaunda, of Zambia, who is just next door, to try to raise a revolution to topple the white minority that still runs the Rhodesian political system.

Last summer, Kaunda had to reach what he himself referred to as a "painful decision." He had had crop failures, and his people were facing starvation. Rhodesia, forced to shift much of its agricultural production out of tobacco as a result of the UN boycott, had an abundance of maize it was prepared to sell to Zambia. Swallowing his pride, Kaunda put in a 1,500,000-bag order for Rhodesian grain. The first truckload crossed the border in August, and the "great maize lift" will continue until May of 1972. Much of it is being carried by a Rhodesian-based haulage company. This is one aspect of the current reality that has made the UN boycott of Rhodesia a joke.

I have talked with a number of recent visitors to the Rhodesian capital of Salisbury, and everyone has been struck by the "internationalization" of the local economy that has resulted from the boycott. Before the nations of the UN agreed to cut off trade with Rhodesia, British-made automobiles had held the local market. Today the streets of Salisbury are live with Japanese and French cars.

Someone is being hypocritical. As for petrol to run the cars, Rhodesia has had no difficulty in importing it from South Africa despite the official British blockade of oil terminals in nearby Portuguese Mozambique. And, of course, the Russians all along have been buying the Rhodesian chrome ore that the U.S. and Britain have piously refused to take.

In 1970, the Rhodesian manufacturing in-

dustry jumped its product by some 28,000,000 Rhodesian dollars, the biggest annual increase since 1960. The Gross National Product of the country made an 8.5 per cent rise in 1970. Textile production has doubled in six years. Despite the shortage of foreign exchange, the local Rhodesian shops are, on the testimony of returned travelers as diverse as Professor David Rowe of Yale University in America and Dr. Walter Henderson of Australia, filled with consumer goods imported from UN countries that are not supposed to be trafficking with the "wicked" Rhodesian white minority.

Besides Zambia, the neighboring country of Malawi has disregarded the UN boycott of Rhodesia.

UNIQUE EXHIBIT OF PRACTICAL EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention today to a unique exhibit of practical educational technology now on display at Sixth Street and Maryland Avenue SW., in Washington, D.C. Supported by funds appropriated by this Congress and administered through the U.S. Office of Education, the land-grant university in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has developed a new computer-based delivery system for educational services. This system includes 15 student stations and a computer housed in an expandable mobile van. For the past year the vehicle and its small resident staff have been providing refresher training to elementary school teachers in rural Pennsylvania at the rate of 1,000 course completions per year.

The present course of instruction called Care is designed to teach educators to recognize and refer children who are handicapped in one way or another to appropriate ameliorating services. The essential idea behind the Care program is to provide inservice training to teachers in ordinary classrooms so that they will be able to make an early identification of youngsters who have one or more physical or mental handicaps.

This program, initiated at the Computer Assisted Instruction Laboratory of the Pennsylvania State University, can meet the retraining needs of thousands of women teachers who are far removed from higher education facilities, and because of their dual roles of teacher and homemaker are unable to meet residence requirements on a campus for purposes of earning graduate degrees.

I hope many of you will be able to take advantage of the opportunity to see this outstanding exhibit which will be open weekdays from 8:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. until December 23, 1971. The staff at the facility includes many members of the faculty at the university who will be glad to talk with you about educational applications in your home State or area. For my part, I believe the product of the partnership between the Federal

Government and a dedicated university team will be seen as a significant development in the advancement of education. I commend it to your attention.

WITHHOLDING INFORMATION FROM CONGRESS

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, executive branch information malpractices—including denial of essential facts and reports to Congress and the American people—are of increasing concern to the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations.

Our committee already has underway a series of studies dealing with the capability of Congress to acquire, process, and apply policy-relevant information. We are now planning hearings early in the next session on executive branch implementation of provisions of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act which were designed to improve delivery of fiscal and budgetary data to congressional committees.

We will most certainly take note of the bureaucratic arrogance demonstrated by HEW—and its implications for the development of adequate legislation—on the Public Health Service facilities closing issue.

Meanwhile, so that all Members may familiarize themselves with this latest departmental attempt to carry out a strategy of deceit, I include at this point an internal memorandum on HEW plans for closing Public Health Service hospitals.

I call to your attention particularly the following paragraph, with emphasis added, from the memorandum signed by Mr. James B. Cardwell, Assistant Secretary, Comptroller:

The enclosed transmittal letter is designed to be as innocuous as possible. You will note that it does not propose any formal briefing of Congressman Rogers, et al. It is quite clear that we will eventually have to go up and explain both the proposals and our decisions concerning them to Rogers and other key Members and/or Committees. *Primarily at Steve Kurzman's suggestion, we decided that the better part of valor at this time would be to offer them as few materials as we can get away with and hold off for as long as possible a confrontation concerning what we will or will not do vis-a-vis each of the hospitals.*

Finding solutions to our pressing national problems requires mutual confidence and trust between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government. These are poorly inspired by such petty deceptions.

Following is the full text of the HEW memorandum and also news stories from the Washington Post and the Evening Star, which provide additional details of this classic example of executive branch information malpractice:

ACTION MEMORANDUM

ISSUE

We promised a number of Members of Congress that we would brief them and employee and beneficiary unions this fall on the PHS Hospital conversion. Some, if not all, of these Members know that, in addition to the actual proposals, we have consultant reports on the proposals and have asked for both.

FACTS

As a result of the discussion with you on October 28, we have decided to send the Congressmen and the unions summaries of the proposals and summaries of the consultants' recommendations with an offer of the actual proposals on request. We would not release the actual consultants' reports if there is any way to avoid it because they include unsolicited comments which would tend to open up the larger policy question again. Drs. DuVal, Wilson, and Zapp have participated in the development of these materials.

The enclosed transmittal letter is designed to be as innocuous as possible. You will note that it does not propose any formal briefing of Congressman Rogers, et al. It is quite clear that we will eventually have to go up and explain both the proposals and our decisions concerning them to Rogers and other key Members and/or Committees. Primarily at Steve Kurzman's suggestion, we decided that the better part of valor at this time would be to offer them as few materials as we can get away with and hold off for as long as possible a confrontation concerning what we will or will not do vis-a-vis each of the hospitals.

Meanwhile, we believe it is very important to move ahead and make prompt decisions concerning the two hospitals that seem to have the best potential for conversion (Boston and San Francisco). Hopefully, decisions about these two cases will be made prior to any further detailed discussion with key elements of the Congress. We will do everything we can to urge Vern Wilson to proceed quickly with respect to these two cities.

It is also important to demonstrate to OMB that we are definitely going to do something about the two cities in question—this year—here and now. As you can appreciate, OMB is hesitant to base their employment ceiling policy on an assumption that the hospitals will be converted. It would seem to be to our advantage to do everything possible to make such an assumption a part of the final employment ceiling decision. In short, all this means that we cannot postpone for very long identification of Boston and San Francisco for early conversion. This means, of course, that we have to round out the proposals affecting those two cities immediately.

Meanwhile, our idea is to submit the enclosed material and wait for Rogers, et al., to make the next move, hoping, in the meantime, that we can make further progress concerning Boston and San Francisco.

RECOMMENDATION

That you sign the enclosed letter (Tab A) and authorize the signing of identical letters to the Members of Congress and unions on the enclosed list (Tab B). Please have Mr. Rogers' letter returned after signature, to be sent out along with letter to addressees on Tab B.

JAMES B. CARDWELL.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 11, 1971]

HEW CHARGED WITH DECEIT IN HEALTH REPORTS TO HILL
(By Stuart Auerbach)

In a classic confrontation between Congress and the executive, Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D-

Fla.) accused federal officials yesterday of "premeditated deceit" in summarizing for his health subcommittee reports from outside consultants.

The officials of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare said they didn't supply the subcommittee with full reports because of "gratuitous and unsolicited comments" that opposed the HEW position.

At issue is whether the federal government should continue to operate 8 Public Health Service hospitals and 30 clinics. HEW wants to either close them or transfer them to local control; Rogers, backed by congressional resolution, wants the government to keep running them.

"I thought that those reports would be used to the disadvantage of the public interest," said HEW Assistant Secretary and Comptroller James B. Cardwell.

"They (the reports) gratuitously said, 'Congressman Rogers is absolutely right,'" continued Cardwell, who wrote a secret memo to HEW Secretary Elliot L. Richardson last month recommending that Congress be told as little as possible about the administration's plans for the hospitals.

Rogers said the memo showed "an arrogant contempt of the committee and the Congress."

HEW Under Secretary John G. Veneman denied, however, that the memo was designed to conceal information from Congress and chided Rogers for his attack on HEW officials.

"If anyone can read anything but deception and deceit from this memo they can't read the written word," said Rogers, interrupting Veneman.

Veneman again denied the memo was deceitful, but Rogers shot back.

"It's an obvious conspiracy to keep Congress from getting information."

Cardwell acknowledged that "the memo does display a bad attitude." He said that attitude developed because HEW officials felt their opinion would not receive "a fair and full review" from the subcommittee.

He said HEW consultants had been asked to merely judge between various local proposals for using the hospitals.

Instead, the consultants said they thought the hospitals should remain under federal control. This is the information that Cardwell wanted kept from Congress.

"You are afraid to come forth with that information," charged Rogers.

"We didn't want to drag in those things that were not germane for fear that they would color the basic issue," replied Cardwell.

"That is the issue," said Rogers. "Whether we close the hospitals or not."

The secret memo, attached to an "innocuous" letter drafted for Richardson to send to key congressmen, was released Wednesday by Rogers, who was leaked a copy. The memo said HEW should keep the full reports secret as long as it could.

"If we have any intent to conceal these reports from Congress," commented Steven Kurzman, HEW's assistant Secretary for Legislation, "this is a very inept way to do it."

[From the Washington Star, Dec. 11, 1971]

HOUSE PANEL ANGERED BY SECRET HEW MEMO

A confidential Nixon administration memo on tactics in dealing with Congress that fell into hostile Congressional hands has intensified an already bitter battle over the future of the federal hospital system.

"If anyone can read anything but deception and deceit from this written memo," Chairman Paul G. Rogers, D-Fla., said yesterday as he read it to his House Public Health subcommittee, "I don't think they can read the English language."

The fight centers on whether to keep the hospitals in control of the Public Health

Service or to find community-level organizations interested in using the facilities, an idea being explored by the administration. Rogers favors PHS control.

HOT ISSUE

A memo meant only for eyes inside the Health, Education and Welfare Department somehow got to Rogers.

Written by James B. Caldwell, assistant secretary and comptroller of Health, Education and Welfare, it referred to plans for giving Congress an update on the status of the "conversion process," a hot item on Capitol Hill.

Five HEW witnesses headed by Undersecretary John G. Veneman were called to defend themselves in light of the memo, which said it had been decided "the better part of valor at this time would be to offer them (congressmen) as few materials as we can get away with and hold off for as long as possible a confrontation concerning" the issue.

The confrontation prompted by the memo was climaxed when Rep. James W. Symington, D-Mo., told the witnesses, "Hell hath no fury like a congressional committee scorned."

Rogers said the memo showed a conspiracy to violate the freedom of information law by withholding essential material from Congress. He said the memo reflected an "obvious policy of premeditated deceit."

NOTHING "IMPROPER"

But Veneman replied neither HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson, "nor I think anything improper occurred, and we frankly resent any suggestion that this memorandum evidences an effort by anyone in HEW to deceive the Congress."

Veneman maintained no "final decision" has been made "concerning any hospital, including Boston and San Francisco." They were the two mentioned in the Nov. 10 memo as being those "that seem to have the best potential for conversion" from federal to community operation.

The memo from Cardwell to Richardson suggested that summaries of proposals and of consultants' recommendations be sent to Congress. But, it added, there should be no release of the actual consultants' reports "if there is any way to avoid it because they include unsolicited comments which would tend to open up the larger policy question again."

The hearing came a day after Congress formally asked the administration to keep the PHS system's eight hospitals, 30 outpatient clinics and the Lexington, Ky., center open and under PHS control until mid-1972.

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS CHRISTIANSON

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for 42 years Curtis Christianson, "Chris," has worked for the House of Representatives and now we are losing him to a well earned retirement. We shall all miss our assistant chief tally clerk and his many years of dedication and loyalty to the House of Representatives and its Members. At the same time we must all be a little saddened today, for the kind of devotion to duty embodied in Chris is indeed a rare thing and will be extremely hard to replace. I join with my colleagues in wishing Chris many, many happy years of retirement. He has been a true and loyal friend.

OPERATION DRUG ALERT

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, local efforts to control drug abuse can be quite effective.

The article follows:

OPERATION DRUG ALERT

PULLING TOGETHER

Paul M. Armstrong, chairman of the Operation Drug Alert Committee of the Kiwanis Club of Malpais, Flagstaff, Arizona, is a man who knows what he wants and how to get it.

One of the first things he did after being appointed chairman was to approach various Flagstaff groups who were interested in combating drug abuse and offer his club's help in warning young people about the dangers of drug abuse.

To his surprise he discovered that there was no coordinated effort among interested groups such as the police department, health department, school district, or the local university to end the problems of drug abuse. "I appointed myself the job of getting these groups coordinated," said Paul. "Everyone had to pull together."

Paul sought the help of the health department and with its cooperation a meeting was called of both government and private agencies—all groups that came in contact with Flagstaff's drug problem were invited. From this conference a speakers bureau was formed, a plan to intensify drug education in the schools was implemented, and a treatment and referral service was initiated.

Thanks to chairman Paul and the Malpais club, Flagstaff is fighting its drug problems on several fronts and is winning. First, the speakers bureau has brought the problem to every important civic group in the city. The physicians and health officials of the speakers bureau also go to the schools where their talks reinforce the lessons taught in health and science classes. Chairman Paul said no scare tactics are used—only the straight truth.

Since drug education encompasses the entire community, the coordinated group makes a special effort to get as much drug information material to Flagstaff as possible. For example, anyone doing research on the problems of drug abuse need only ask the referral service for its catalog, which contains a list of all available materials found in the city. The referral service also reviews all medical journals and any articles on drug abuse are condensed and mailed to all physicians in the county.

Another front that is being worked on is that of treating young people who are overdosed on drugs. A volunteer emergency squad was formed so that these people could be treated on the way to the hospital. Once they get to the hospital, the overdose cases are taken to a special detoxification room where they are kept calm and observed until the overdose has passed. All overdose patients are later referred to psychologists who attempt to straighten these young people out. Chairman Paul said the psychological referrals have had good results so far.

Flagstaff hasn't rid itself of its drug problem, but it is making inroads. Much of its success is due to the public spirit of its volunteer youth workers and the enthusiasm generated by the Malpais, Flagstaff, Kiwanis club. With an attitude like that, it's not hard to see how an entire community can pull together.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE
STATUS OF HEALTH IN THE
BLACK COMMUNITY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I attended the National Conference on the Status of Health in the Black Community. I was impressed with the involvement of all the participants as they drew up a program of action which sought to improve the health care of blacks and other minorities. The number of those attending was so great that some had to be turned away: the total number of those attending was 649 from 31 States.

I would like to call to your attention the keynote address which was delivered by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable RALPH H. METCALFE, chairman of the congressional black caucus subcommittee on health. The speech follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE RALPH H.
METCALFE

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we have come here today from all sections of our country, from different walks of life, bringing with us different levels of expertise, varying levels of concern; and representing many types of organizations and programs: Yet, we are all unified in the belief that urgent action is required to analyze the status of health in the Black community. In a real sense, we are unified in pursuit of a goal which becomes complete only when a definitive plan of action has been issued.

The tasks before us are immense, but we have faced many obstacles as a people simply surviving in even more perilous times of the past. Today, however, the challenge we face is to apply the considerable resources of the United States to promote a quality of life for all Americans which insures that sickness that is preventable is prevented; that life which can be prolonged will be prolonged—not merely for the sake of prolongation, but for the maintenance of human life within a framework that insures the basic usefulness of an individual.

It is clear that Black health is Black wealth. It is equally clear that a Nation's health is its wealth. On both counts, we are in serious difficulty; for neither is the Nation healthy, nor is the Black community healthy. In point of fact, I am certain that the Black community fares as poorly as any given segment of the American population. However, in analyzing the problem of the Black community in health, we must do so in a context that the principles which we develop will most likely be applicable to other segments of the population, including the wealthy. That is true because dollars alone are not enough to do the job we must do. More basic than dollars is commitment: A commitment that every American has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness: But that right cannot be secured without an equally fundamental right to have access to good quality health care: the mere declaration of that right as a National policy alone is not enough: The more commitment must be underpinned by those programs that are required to insure that that right is achieved by each individual citizen of our country. Therein lies our struggle. The struggle for the basic right to first class health care is reminiscent of a struggle

which still goes on in our quest for freedom.

The Black man's quest for freedom is an unending struggle in which many battles have been fought, many allies have been made and many victories have been won. But the struggle for dignity and freedom, is a continuing one, regardless of the nature of the problem.

We witnessed the campaign to stop the terror and death of lynchings: A campaign that was led by and won by the Black press. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. moved us another step toward our goal by supporting Mrs. Rosa Parks. Blacks developed a togetherness that was unprecedented when they boycotted the Montgomery Bus Company—they joined car pools—they walked—they sacrificed—they stimulated our youth to sit in—to take abuse: they marched behind Dr. King: they captured the support of most people around the world with the "March On Washington"—our Nation's Capitol. In the hundreds of thousands of faces one could find lettered college professors and laborers—the learned—the unlearned—the poor—those not so poor: men, women and children—youth and senior citizens.

We also came to realize the power of the ballot and we had the massive voter registration drive: we elected Black officials to carry out our mandate until today there are over 2,000 Black elected public servants. With the 92d Congress, the Black community witnessed the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus. It is an organization of 13 Congressmen from various states. We came together because we realized that we had a common bond and a common objective to effectively represent, not only our own district but 24 million Black people, the poor and all minorities. Each member of the Congressional Black Caucus, is also a Congressman-at-Large for those whose interests are not effectively articulated on the National level in the formation of National policy.

We worked to build our Black banks and Black businesses to serve the needs of the entire Black community. Although many battles were started at different times and with different degrees of fervor, it should be unmistakably clear that we must move on all fronts simultaneously. That is one of the chief reasons why we are here today—we now come to another battle which is a fight for the basic quality of life itself.

The increasing tenor of the National debate on health care does not harmonize with the bass voice which we must bring to bear concerning the special needs and concerns about health in the Black community. Today, Black people are in the midst of a new struggle: a fight to end misery and death far worse than even the lynchings of past years. Malnutrition is a reality which annually destroys the minds of hundreds of thousands of young Black ghetto children who cannot be expected to learn. A family structure cannot be maintained when children are unable to learn and their parents are unable to earn a basic livelihood. In short, the morbidity occasioned by preventable and controllable disease leads to early and untimely death for many. Any one of them could have contributed to the spectacular progress of this Nation were they permitted to reach the height of their individual capability.

The major struggle that we are involved in has many facets. It is a struggle to end the physician shortage in the Black community. It is also a struggle against ill-equipped and inadequate hospital facilities and clinics. It is a struggle against the death and suffering from diseases peculiar to the Black community, such as sickle cell disease which has been ignored by most researchers. It is a struggle against a systemized approach to health care questions that are anachronisms of the past. This means that charity medicine is dead. It means that no longer

can we have an approach to the care of our less fortunate through a system which perpetuates sprawling monstrosities called county or city hospitals. It means that new and innovative ways must be discovered to insure that what is good for one is good for all. Whatever the level of economic circumstances wherewithal, it means that health maintenance organizations must be designed to recognize that our urban ghettos and rural pockets of poverty do not have an independent financial base to create the new and innovative facilities and services which will be proposed at this conference. It means that self-sufficiency can only be achieved when that degree of economic stability comes to the community through programs unrelated to health which, in the final analysis, will determine a community's ability to have first class care. But today's battle, ladies and gentlemen, can and must be won.

The battle cannot be won by any single group alone. We must be together. Our collective planning efforts must reign supreme. For that reason, the political efforts of the Black Caucus have merged with the professional and non-professional expertise of the Black community. Dedicated professional men, representing the National Medical Association, the National Dental Association, Meharry Medical College, Howard University, and representatives of numerous community and national organizations concerned with the well-being of our people are all here today. We must be as concerned about the great efforts of an Ollie Neal and his colleagues in Marianna, Arkansas, as we are concerned about Brother James Haughton and his colleagues at Cook County Hospital in Chicago.

Similarly, we must be as aware of the problems at the Federal level as we are with the problems at the state and local level. We must remove elements of destructive competition from the health care system as we proceed along an aggressive course to insure that we are all of the same spirit of dedication. Such a circumstance will enable us to maintain and/or develop the fundamentals of human decency through cooperative efforts directed toward mutual goals. Countless hours have been spent by all members of our planning committee in the development of this conference in the short period of two months. Many hours of deliberation will be spent by the hundreds of you here today in pursuit of a provocative "Health Plan." The future of millions of people is at stake. You must represent them effectively. I am sure you agree with me that the urgency of the task required the uncommon zeal that has been demonstrated by the men and women who worked so feverishly to bring us up to the moment. In this connection, I would like to pay special tribute to Mr. Albert Berry, Special Assistant to President Lloyd Elam of Meharry Medical College; for the task fell upon him to coordinate the local arrangements for this outstanding collection of individuals whom you represent here today.

The unity which has been displayed by members of our planning committee has spilled over to involve each of you. Such unity is essential if we are to achieve our objective, and yet, unity of goal does not imply complete agreement on methods for achieving our basic goal. But we can uniformly agree that we have here a real coalition of spirit, a spirit which embraces every conceivable opinion, a spirit of dedication. That coalition of spirit warms my heart. There is another coalition—a coalition of forces which includes not only physicians and dentists, but other health professionals vitally concerned with the health care of our Nation. It also includes men and women who know from their experiences what type of problems we face, and who, through calm deliberation, carefully analyzing the prob-

lems presented, evaluating the ideas generated and finalizing a plan of action. Through this route a "Health Plan" will be designed to improve the quality of life of all of our people through the perceptive eyes of each of us who, although a consumer today, may be a patient tomorrow. New definitions of various types concerning various components of the health care system must be developed. Thus, it is useful to recall the basic definition used by the world health organization for health:

"Health is not merely the absence of disease, but the physical, mental and emotional well being of the individual."

In applying this definition, we must look at the problems very perceptively and have a full range of discussion on them. We must not ignore the studies of the past as we explore the programs for the future. For example, I recall the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders of three years ago which stated:

"The residents of the racial ghettos are significantly less healthy than most other Americans. They suffer from higher mortality rates, higher incidences of major diseases, and lower availability and utilization of medical services."

Those conclusions are still valid today. Recent congressional hearings have focused the attention of the Nation on the fact that health care in this country is inadequate. Four men present today have not only played key roles with our conference planning committee, but have testified before many congressional committees regarding the plight of the health of Black people in America. Dr. Emerson Walden, President of the N.M.A., Dr. Andrew Thomas, Director of Project 75 of the N.M.A., Dr. George Tolbert, Chairman of the N.M.A. on Rural Health Systems and Dr. Harvey Webb, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the National Dental Assn., Dr. John Kenny, Chairman of the Legislative Committee of the N.M.A. Each of you here today also have peculiar insights into the problem and we must address ourselves to the solutions. In addressing ourselves to those solutions, we must remember that the resources are present to implement those solutions.

This Nation has a gross national product of 974 Billion Dollars. Yet, we have recently passed a defense appropriation budget of 70 Billion Dollars. Clearly, we are able to provide adequate health care for all of our citizens, but a reordering of priorities must be made. The leadership must be shared by government in concert with the private sector. We must bring into full fruition the "partnership for Health" that was legislated several years ago. We must bring government to the people and take people to the government in order that we understand that government, necessarily, must be sensitive to the two way street which must exist to meet the needs of our people. It is a national disgrace that certain problems afflict our needy. And hence, the necessity that we reorder our priorities with great urgency.

For example, among 20 industrial nations in 1967, the United States ranked 14th in infant mortality with 22 deaths for 1000 persons. For the United States this represents 22 deaths too many. It is useful to wonder whether the statistical data and reporting systems within our own country need to be adjusted in order to better reflect the truth. I am concerned that 22 deaths per 1000 births is a statistic that does not truly reflect the situation in the Kenwood-Oakland community in Chicago which is in my district. Where there are 45 deaths per thousand live births in an area, that is 10 blocks by 10 blocks in breadth and length. Perhaps, a more relevant statistic is the fact that infant death rates are 80% higher for minority group members than they are for whites: 35.9 deaths for 1000 live births for non-whites

as against 19.7 for whites. It becomes clear, therefore, that racism is more than a matter of civil rights. It also is evident that the poor are much sicker than the non-poor when we review the extent of activity-limiting illness by family income. One fourth of all people with a family incomes under \$3,000 have activity limiting chronic conditions. Persons in the poorest income classes were nearly four times likely to have an activity-limiting chronic condition as those in the highest income class of \$10,000 dollars and over.

A person in the highest income category is 3½ times more likely to have a routine physical examination and 4½ times more likely to visit a pediatrician or an obstetrician-gynecologist than persons in a lower income group. Although most babies are now delivered in hospitals, as much as ½ to ⅓ of the women that deliver in public hospitals have had no prenatal care. For a woman who is poor, the cost of prenatal care may be prohibitive and access to a clinic may be difficult even where there are clinics that are accessible. They are usually not adequately equipped nor do the programs guarantee human dignity and provide a truly high standard of care.

Although medical costs during the last four years between 1966 and 1970 have risen at an extremely high rate, we are aware that, in part, it represents the break from a system of virtual feudalism where the workers at hospitals had been underpaid too long. Thus, the 71.3% increase for hospital daily service charge during the period cited reflected many things. For example, the alarming rate of inflation demonstrates that the 19.7% increase for all consumer items has a significant impact on health costs. We must seek ways to avoid economic difficulties such as these.

This group has double responsibility during the course of this conference. First, we must analyze the health care needs of our Nation and make concrete recommendations for change. Secondly, we must initiate those needed changes by making others in and out of Government aware that health care for our people is inadequate and, in the process, make everyone aware that no longer will delay in implementation be tolerated.

We have to let all Americans know that—
No longer will Black men and women sit by and do nothing while their brothers suffer and die needlessly because of inadequate health care;

No longer will they die because their mothers are receiving no prenatal care;

No longer will Black children suffer the crippling effects of malnutrition because of the inadequacy of diets;

No longer will hypertension continue to be a major cause of death to our women while, in many cases, they do not know that they suffer from this disease; and

No longer will sickle cell anemia continue to be a mystery because of lack of research money.

But to move toward solutions, we must understand that sound programs must be developed for overcoming these innumerable obstacles. We must understand questions concerning the development of allied professional fields so that we can train more minority members to pursue such occupations. We must structure manpower training programs to make upward mobility possible and eliminate dead end positions. We must increase the number of minority physicians to correct the present inequities where less than 3% of the Nation's 300,000 physicians are from Black and other minority groups; especially those who, like Blacks, are under-represented in medicine, such as Chicanos, Indians, and Puerto Ricans.

Testimony before recent hearings of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, indicates that many individuals have no health insurance at all, and, in fact, that some 20% of the

civilian population under 65 are still uninsured. Some families have their entire life savings wiped out whenever major illnesses hit their families.

Group sessions have been arranged to encompass eight broad sections enabling us to cover the wide range of questions necessary to develop a systematic problem solving approach. The individuals participating cannot be viewed as having all of the answers; Rather, they will play the role of "Devil's Advocate" and discussion facilitators. This will enable each of you to apply the widest latitude of imagination in raising issues and proposing solutions. Our job at the conference is immense and we are constrained with severe limitations of time. Thus, our concern must be at a basic level to enable us to discover basic solutions. I am hopeful that the dialogue between the professionals and non-professionals will be conducted in an atmosphere that will promote real achievement for this conference.

There is little question that the United States has the capability to do the job. But as mentioned earlier, the ordering of priorities is the key issue. I think our group today, through the various organizations and the Congressional Black Caucus, should attempt to induce what I call a crisis of conscience. A crisis of conscience to alert our fellow citizens that they are responsible for the physical agony and death of our brethren, if we sit down and do nothing. We must bring home to legislators, local, state and Federal, and to all those in decision-making positions that they are derelict in their duties if they are expending anything less than their maximum effort.

With the concerted efforts and only with the concerted efforts of us here today, we will fight and win the struggle against the genocide of Black people through neglect. For every Black man, woman and child in the United States, it is indeed a matter of life and death.

CURTIS A. CHRISTIANSON

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. ARENDS, Mr. Speaker, at the end of this session of Congress, Curtis A. Christianson, our very able Tally Clerk, is retiring after over 40 years of Federal service, most of which has been with the Congress. As chairman of the Committee on Minority Personnel, and for myself personally, I should like to express to him our very real appreciation of his diligent and loyal service on one of the most demanding of all staff assignments. It will not be easy to find his successor.

In saying this I am sure I speak for all Members, certainly for our side of the aisle. We wish him every joy in his richly deserved retirement.

Prior to becoming associated with the Congress, Curt, as we affectionately know him, served with the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He subsequently served as secretary to three Members of this House: Robert Jones, of Ohio; Henrik Shipstead, of Minnesota; and Ralph W. Gwinn, of New York.

Curt left Capitol Hill to enter the military service during World War II. He served as a liaison officer between the

U.S. Navy and Norway. He served in this capacity with such distinction that he was awarded the King Frehiths Medal by Norway.

In the Republican 80th Congress, Curt Christianson was made Tally Clerk. He was also Tally Clerk in the Republican 83d Congress. In the successive Congresses when the Democrats had the majority, Curt has been Assistant Tally Clerk, the position he presently holds. As between Tally Clerk and Assistant Tally Clerk insofar as the work is concerned, I think it can be said that they constitute a distinction without a difference.

I know this: They are two of the most exacting positions in the House. The Tally Clerks are in charge of the House Calendar. They keep the tally on all roll-call votes and are responsible for the voting records of each of us. It is a position that requires both speed and accuracy under great pressure and involves considerably more work than many realize.

Curt Christianson has proved to be an excellent Tally Clerk. To him we say "well done." He takes with him in his retirement our very best wishes.

TURNER ROBERTSON RETIRES

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 9, 1971

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we close the first session of the 92d Congress, I want to express my deep gratitude and appreciation to a man who, although he was never elected to the Congress, is as much a part of this great institution as any man could be. Indeed Turner Robinson has been a loyal aide of the House of Representatives for 32 years, having served in the House longer than all but eight Members.

Starting as an elevator operator he was engaged in almost all of the House services, including the folding room, post office, Capitol Police, as librarian of the House and finally as chief page of the House of Representatives. There are few men who know this great institution and the great men who have been a part of it as well as Turner Robertson.

There are few services more important to Members than the page service. I know of no Member who does not realize how much he depends upon the efficiency. The pages provide a necessary and critical means of communication for each Member of Congress with all other House and Senate offices as well as with the other administrative support services. Without an efficient page service it would be impossible to effectively serve our constituents or provide for the smooth administration of the Congress.

I am, therefore, sad to learn that my good friend is leaving the House. I counted him among my good friends here. While I shall sorely miss him, I wish him well. Turner deserves the opportunity to relax and do with his time what he likes, as he likes.

THE MINIMUM WAGE: A RE-EVALUATION

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, it appears we will be asked to approve new legislation raising the minimum wage from \$1.60 to \$2 per hour or more, soon after the New Year.

There are those who assume that by raising minimum wages, all employees are automatically offered better lives. To others, it is becoming increasingly evident that there has been faulty evaluation in the past of the total impact. I know from long, personal experience representing retail grocers, that unrealistic minimums can result in reduced employment, reduced opportunity for young people and part-time workers, and reduced income for other employees of a firm who would be earning more on merit if the employer were not tied to an artificial and unrealistic minimum arbitrary in its effect.

I submit an economic evaluation contained in the December letter of the First National City Bank.

THE MINIMUM WAGE, OR HOW NOT TO HELP THE POOR

The impact of minimum wage legislation has gone a long way toward proving that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. No matter how well-meaning the motives of those who supported previous increases in the minimum wage, the result has been monotonously consistent—the low-paid and unskilled have been forced into the ranks of the unemployed.

Despite a plethora of statistics supporting this perverse result, Congress apparently has not got the message. Another increase in the minimum wage has quietly moved through the appropriate Congressional committees. And once again, its proponents appear to be looking only at one side of the labor balance sheet—the income side—and ignoring the other side: employment.

While it is true that those who remain employed receive higher wages, fewer are in fact employed. The higher minimum leads employers to replace unskilled labor with machines and skilled workers, thus increasing the unemployment of the most disadvantaged portion of the labor force and increasing employment opportunities for the more mobile, skilled sector. For example, if widget makers are faced with a 25% increase in wages because of a rise in the minimum wage, they may very well invest in automatic widget machines and lay off part of their work force. This will increase the demand for skilled workers to run the widget-making machines and increase the demand for workers to produce them. But most likely the increase in employment of skilled workers will be smaller than the decline in employment of the unskilled. Furthermore, by decreasing employment possibilities, the higher minimum narrows the opportunity for on-the-job training—a route whereby the unskilled can become skilled.

Women, teenagers, nonwhites and particularly nonwhite teenagers are especially hard hit. Before 1956, when the minimum wage was 75¢, the quarterly unemployment rate among nonwhite teenagers ranged between 13% and 18%, several percentage points above the rate for whites. However, within

two years, after the minimum wage went up 33%, the unemployment rate for white teens rose to 14% while the rate for nonwhite teens jumped to 27%. Since then, three more increases in the minimum have been introduced. And the nonwhite teenage unemployment rate has risen to over 30%, more than twice that for whites.

Part of the rise in the teenage unemployment rate since the middle and late 1950s is attributable to the accelerated growth of the teenage labor force, as the postwar baby crop reached working age. Rigidities and frictions in labor markets have limited the ability of the economy to immediately absorb this flood of young workers.

The relatively high teenage unemployment rates today are partly due to the considerable slack in the economy. Some of the increased unemployment can be attributed to changing cultural values—new attitudes toward work and leisure—among teenagers. But it is difficult to ascribe all of the rise in teenage unemployment in the past 15 years to these demographic, cyclical and cultural forces. The widening unemployment differential between white and black teenagers cannot be ascribed simply to "structural" changes in the labor force. Econometric research on the impact of minimum wages is quite consistent in its findings—the impact on nonwhite teenagers is both large and negative.

In spite of this large and growing body of evidence, Congress is considering two bills, both of which would increase the minimum wage over the next two years. The Williams bill would increase the minimum from the present \$1.60 per hour to \$2.00 the first year and to \$2.25 thereafter, while the Dent bill would increase it to \$1.80 and then to \$2.00. More importantly, both bills increase substantially the number of workers to be covered by minimum-wage legislation. The combined impact could add several more percentage points to the teenage unemployment rate.

DOUBLE STANDARD—OR NONE?

Congress probably will pass one of these bills, though the Nixon Administration seems to have some trepidation about the effect. Apparently officials are sufficiently impressed with the shockingly high unemployment rate of nonwhite teens and with the effects of past changes in the minimum on this group that they have made it clear that while they favor the increases included in the Dent bill, they would like to see the rate for workers 18 and under remain at \$1.60.

There is ample evidence that such a differential, in this case 20% after one year, would have a significant effect in fostering employment opportunities for teenagers. A 1970 study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that the evidence from a variety of sources, including experience in foreign countries, suggests that "a substantial differential between youth and adult rates would increase job opportunities for teenagers." The study went on to say that 20% was a substantial differential.

But if one accepts the logic that the minimum wage makes the unemployment rate higher for some groups than it would otherwise be, and the evidence for this appears to be overwhelming, then why not go all the way and eliminate the legal minimum entirely. Clearly this alternative would run contrary to a strongly held article of political faith. The minimum wage has become an integral part of the conventional wisdom in the fight against poverty and an extensive re-education program would be required to remove it. Nevertheless, elimination of this legal floor under wages would ease the transition from school to employment and preserve job opportunities that would otherwise disappear. However, abolishing the legal minimum would in no way mean abandoning

the fight against poverty. There are more direct means of providing a sufficient income level for all families—if that is what Congress is truly interested in doing.

If that is the case, Congress should seriously consider the advice of Professor James Tobin, a former member of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Kennedy, who wrote: "People who lack the capacity to earn a decent living should be helped, but they will not be helped by minimum-wage laws, trade-union pressures or other devices which seek to compel employers to pay more than their work is worth. The likely outcome of such regulations is that the intended beneficiaries are not employed at all."

Legal minimum wages, in other words, only complicate the already difficult task of eliminating poverty.

NATIONAL TEXTILE WEEK

HON. NICK GALIFIANAKIS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. GALIFIANAKIS. Mr. Speaker, one of mankind's most basic, useful, ancient, and honorable endeavors is the spinning of fibers and yarn into the fabric required by the human race for clothing, and for shelter.

Our giant, modern day textile industry can trace its origins to the very dawn of recorded history, and its development down the centuries makes a fascinating tale.

Even before the days of the ancient Pharaohs, people in India were spinning yarn from cotton they called "vegetable lamb." In the ancient world for many thousands of years, flax was cultivated, and its fibers spun into yarn in Assyria, Mesopotamia, and Egypt.

Over 2,400 years before the birth of Christ, Chinese people were assiduously cultivating the silkworm, and devising methods of spinning thread from its cocoon in the silk manufacturing process.

The textile industry as we know it today is a product of the 19th century industrial revolution. Much of it is centered in the South and in New England, but it is truly a national industry, as well, with over 7,000 manufacturing plants producing in 42 of the 50 States.

In my own State of North Carolina, textile manufacturing ranks with tobacco as one of the two most significant industries. Thousands upon thousands of Tar Heel citizens are employed either in the direct manufacturing process, or in one of the many closely related industries.

In all, across the face of our Nation, some 3.4 million people gain their livelihoods from textiles, or in related industries.

The textile industry is the sole customer of 200,000 wool growers, and the major customer of 675,000 cotton farms. The industry annually produces some 17 billion square yards of fabric.

From this information, Mr. Speaker, I believe you, and our colleagues, can gain an added appreciation of the importance, and scope of the textile industry in our Nation, and the essential role it plays in our lives.

I am, therefore, honored to join my distinguished North Carolina colleague from the other body, Senator SAM ERVIN, Jr., in introducing a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 23, 1972 through April 29, 1972 as "National Textile Week."

It is appropriate, I believe, for all Americans to join together in tribute to an industry which throughout recorded history has contributed so very much to the basic needs of the human race—needs, which in this work-a-day-world we so often take totally for granted.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the text of the joint resolution I am introducing today in the House be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The resolution follows:

NATIONAL TEXTILE WEEK

S.J. Res. 178. Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 23, 1972, through April 29, 1972, as "National Textile Week". Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from the earliest days of recorded history, man has twisted plant and animal fibers into yarns for baskets, nets, and fabrics which have given him the clothing and shelter necessary for survival.

The making of yarn, fabric, and clothing has been an integral part of all cultures as far back as anyone can determine. We know, for example, that in ancient India, people spun yarn from cotton they called "vegetable lamb" and wove cloth from it even before the time of the ancient Egyptians. For thousands of years, flax was cultivated in Mesopotamia, Assyria, and Egypt and its fibers were spun into yarn. In China, silk manufacture began sometime around 2640 B.C. when the people experimented with the culture of silkworms and tested the practicability of using the thread from the cocoon for yarn which could be woven into fabric.

Here in the United States, an infant textile industry was spawned during the Industrial Revolution, and ever since then, it has served us well both as a provider of jobs and the clothing and shelter which has contributed to our high standard of living.

Today, textile manufacturing is one of our most basic and essential industries, providing employment for nearly 1 million people, directly, and another 2.4 million in apparel and related industries. Textile and apparel manufacturing today account for one of every eight manufacturing jobs in this country and provide an annual payroll of \$10 billion.

The textile industry is the major customer for our 675,000 cotton farms and the sole customer for 200,000 wool growers. In addition, 112,000 jobs in the manmade fiber industry depend on textiles.

The textile industry has helped make our Armed Forces the best clothed, housed, and protected in the world. The industry has been called second only to steel in military importance.

While many of our textile mills are concentrated in the Southeast and New England States, textiles is, in a very real sense, a national industry. There are some 7,000 textile manufacturing plants in 42 States turning out annually some 17 billion square yards of fabric for use by industry and consumers.

While the textile manufacture is steeped in tradition, it is one of the most modern of our American industries, contributing significantly to our exploration of outer space

and a higher standard of living throughout the world.

It is, therefore most appropriate that our Nation should recognize this industry and the contribution to a better way of life it is making day in and day out.

I am, therefore, introducing a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 23, 1972 through April 29, 1972 as "National Textile Week."

All Americans should join in paying tribute to an industry which has throughout our history contributed so much to the betterment of mankind and his comfort, convenience, and prosperity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint resolution which I am introducing today on National Textile Week be printed at this point in the RECORD together with a copy of an article entitled, "A World Without Textiles," which appeared in the fall 1971 issue of the Phi Psi Quarterly.

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

S.J. RES. 178

Joint resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 23, 1972, through April 29, 1972, as "National Textile Week"

Whereas several million workers in the United States are employed directly or indirectly in the textile industry; and

Whereas textile manufacturing historically has been one of the basic industries of the United States and has for decades contributed substantially to the economic strength of the Nation; and

Whereas the continued strength and growth of the textile industry in the United States is vital to the economic stability of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period from April 23, 1972, through April 29, 1972, as "National Textile Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

A WORLD WITHOUT TEXTILES

(By Donald F. Flathman)

We live in a world of textiles. You don't believe it? Then think for a minute what life would be like in a world without textiles.

We'd all be naked! No clothes. No underwear. No stockings or socks. Not even shoes!

Animal skins would be no substitute. We'd soon kill off all the animals for their fur and hides and even then only a few people would be clothed . . . probably no one you know.

Of course, there's always the trees and bushes. We could strip all the foliage bare to make grass skirts, and fig leaf shorts . . . but what would we do when winter comes?

No, skins and leaves are no substitutes. We'd all have to move South just to survive. Think what tremendous over-crowding that would produce! I think a world without textiles would be a world without so many people on it . . . maybe without you!

In a world without textiles our homes would be bare too. No rugs on the floor, or drapes on the windows. No window shades! Or even venetian blinds! Our chairs would all be hard wood. Our beds would be boards, cushioned only by straw or leaves. We'd have no blankets. No sheets. No pillows! We'd have to wash with our bare hands and shake ourselves dry.

In a world without textiles we'd ride to work on a horse, or in a wooden-wheeled wagon pulled by a horse. There'd be no automobiles because there'd be no air-filled tires;

no water hoses to cool the engine; no wires to carry the spark to the piston! No upholstered bucket seats. No rugs on the floor boards. No convertible tops. No padded dash or even, in some cars, air scoops, bumpers, or fenders!

In a world without textiles baseball wouldn't be played . . . not even on real grass! There'd be no football, no soccer, no basketball. No tennis, no volleyball, no badminton. Croquet would be the game . . . a wooden ball struck by a wooden mallet!

In a world without textiles there'd be no space program. No astronaut could survive without his space suit. Nor could he return without the heat shield on his rocket, or even the parachute to slow his descent! Once in the water, how would he stay afloat without the flotation collar or, in an emergency, the life raft or even his own life jacket! The fact is, he'd never leave on a space flight without hoses for fueling; wires and cables for control; seat belts to hold himself in; even the seats themselves!

In a world without textiles many people would die without bandages; sutures; sterilized gowns and masks. Damaged or diseased arteries and wind pipes would stay damaged or diseased and the patient might die because there'd be no Dacron replacement. The "iron lung" wouldn't have saved so many polio victims. The kidney machine wouldn't be keeping so many others alive today. And the artificial heart would probably be impossible!

In a world without textiles there'd be few libraries, because there'd be few books . . . because there'd be only hand-made paper. Without hundreds of thousands of tons of cheap, ready paper there'd be no newspapers, no computers, no banks, no stocks, *no business!* . . . except that which could be done directly, like trading a bushel of potatoes for a sack of wheat . . . except there'd be no sack in the world without textiles.

In a world without textiles we wouldn't have progressed very far beyond the cave-man, even after hundreds of thousands of years. Man's discovery of iron may have been important, but without the even earlier more important discovery of textiles and the simple textile process of weaving reeds or twisted grasses into mats and cloth, we'd all be wearing iron underwear, and that doesn't sound like much fun.

Just what is a textile? Anything woven or knitted or made with a fiber. Not just from cotton or wool or silk or man-mades, like nylon or rayon or polyester. But fireproof suits made with asbestos fiber! Supersonic airplane parts made with carbon fiber. Space suits made with glass fiber. Artificial tendons made with stainless steel fibers. And even more fantastic things yet to come!

Yes, we live in a world of textiles . . . and the world we live in, we live in *because of* textiles!

CURTIS A. "CHRIS" CHRISTIANSON

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Curtis A. "Chris" Christianson, one of the most loyal, faithful, and devoted employees ever to serve us in the House of Representatives, is retiring at the end of this session.

We will miss Chris, with his ever-present grin and his eagerness to do his job of assistant tally clerk to the best of his ability. The kind of dedication we have found in Chris Christianson is a rare quality these days.

Chris came to Washington from Min-

nesota in 1930 and spent 10 years in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He then served as a secretary to Congressman Bob Jones, of Lima, Ohio, and later was secretary to Senator Henrik Shipstead, of Minnesota, for 2 years.

When World War II broke out, Chris served in the Navy as liaison with the Norwegian Navy and did his job so well that he was presented with the King Frehits Medal by King Haakon, of Norway.

After the war, Chris returned to Washington and took up duties in the House of Representatives. He was tally clerk during the 80th and 83d Congresses, when the Republican Party controlled the House.

Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House applauds Chris Christianson for his long and untiring service. And we all wish him good health and happiness as he enters upon his retirement years.

NIXON DRUG BILL ASSESSED

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in view of the current crisis in our Nation regarding drugs, I am inserting a series of articles analyzing the pros and cons to determine what legislative action would be appropriate.

First, our colleague, PAUL C. ROGERS, of Florida, a man with great legislative experience in this field, has commented as follows:

[From the New York Law Journal, Dec. 6 1971]

NIXON DRUG BILL ASSESSED

(By Paul G. Rogers)

More than a decade ago the American public was given and quickly accepted a new and somewhat technical vocabulary as this nation's space flight program jumped off the drawing boards into our living rooms via the six o'clock news.

Trajectory, apogee, lunar modules. From the first A-OK to the time that the first man circled the moon, the nation was fed technical jargon that entered the language as we entered a new world—the world of space flight.

This was the result of a national program of which all Americans were keenly aware.

WORLD OF DRUGS

And during the past five years the American public has seen the uncovering of yet another world—an underground world, yet one they are now eminently more familiar and involved with—the world of drugs.

Five years ago a parent who knew the meaning of "pot" was either an adult whose children had a run-in with the law, living in the ghetto, or someone in the professional area of drugs.

The vernacular now runs to acidheads, speed freaks, mainlining, uppers, downers, narcs and on and on. The difference now is that Americans are on speaking acquaintances with these terms because we are in the midst of a national crisis involving the use of drugs.

Parents now familiar with the terms of the drug subculture are not necessarily parents of children involved with drugs. But one can

be assured that the parent of a child past the age of ten in a major metropolitan area has the fear of this subculture adding his child to its growing population.

Laws were examined and at first were amended to make them more punitive. Then the question of what marijuana really did to the individual was posed and the scientific body was split at best on its estimates of the harm done by this ancient product. Some state laws were relaxed and the Congress relaxed federal penalties for possession. A Presidential Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse was formed to afford the question of marijuana a truly scientific examination.

MORE FRIGHTENING

But hardly had this effort got off the ground when lines of communication from the subculture started throbbing a new and much more frightful story.

Heroin, an absolute tyrant over man's body and mind, was spreading and spreading fast.

Unlike marijuana, there was no question about heroin. Marijuana is relatively cheap, a take-it-or-leave-it item. But a man embarking on an adventure with heroin is doomed to a slavery more insidious than anything practiced 100 years ago.

Reports from Asia indicated that large numbers of American servicemen were becoming addicts. And because of inadequate treatment and rehabilitation, these men were being sent back into society with "a monkey on their backs." The overwhelming number of heroin addicts must turn to crime to support their habit and no matter what statistics are used, this amounts to millions of dollars and thousands of crimes against society.

GI USE STUDIED

I and other members of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment went to Vietnam earlier this year to investigate the extent of heroin addiction among our servicemen stationed there. Our findings were not encouraging. We found that heroin addiction has crippled from 15 per cent to 40 per cent of some units.

Heroin became a recognized national problem. The President, on June 1, sent to the Congress a legislative proposal to create a Special Action Office to combat this situation and the bill was referred to the House Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment.

Congress and the President recognized heroin as a national problem, and earlier in this session of Congress, legislative proposals designed to combat the admittedly fragmented and under-funded attempts to treat and rehabilitate addicts were improved.

SHADOWY DIRECTIONS

Essentially, the bill called for a director to coordinate the various agencies already responsible for the educational programs, treatment and rehabilitation of the addicts and gives him somewhat shadowy direction to effect policy on military activities in the area of drugs, but is silent on law enforcement effort activities.

I believe efforts to coordinate treatment and rehabilitation are necessary, and I support the concept of the formulation of a Special Action Office to assist in this effort. Nevertheless, I view the President's legislative proposal as an interim measure which principally attempts only one sector of the approach necessary if an effective national effort is to be mounted.

To me this represents a totally "after-the-fact" attack. This office would treat and rehabilitate, but it would not go on the offensive to mount an effective national program against drugs.

An addict represents the final product of drug operations. To halt the use of drugs, the problem must be attacked prior to the addiction stage where treatment is required. The addict represents the evidence of an unsuccessful effect to combat drug traffic.

There could be no addict without an addicting drug. We know where heroin is grown and refined. Should not then a national strike force program include provisions which would allow us to direct efforts at halting the growth of heroin which is grown exclusively abroad?

UTILIZING THE FBI

The second step in the heroin chain is the distribution system which carries it from the fields to the street corner. Should not a national effort have as part of its machinery provisions for increased detection and enforcement? A ready asset exists through use of the FBI, with its thousands of highly trained agents and vast expertise, in addition to the current force within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. Under the existing proposal the FBI is not called upon to act in this national effort, and the BNDD would be outside the guidance of the special action office.

Naturally, education, rehabilitation and treatment are necessary. But I do not think we can call a coordinated treatment-rehabilitation program a national effort against drugs. If we are to find a solution to this nation's drug crisis, coordination efforts must include not only treatment and rehabilitation, but also controls over international aspects of narcotics production and trafficking and domestic law enforcement. The legislation proposed by the President, if enacted unchanged, would be more correctly titled "Special Action Office for Coordination of Treatment and Rehabilitation of Drug Addicts."

CHAIN OF COMMAND

A diagram of the program which I envision as necessary would have a director in a box with lines going directly down to three other boxes. These lower boxes would represent deputy directors for Enforcement, Rehabilitation, and International Affairs.

This program would not take from existing departments and agencies their drug-related activities. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs would not be lifted from the Department of Justice. Nor would the FBI, nor the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Nor would the Bureau of Customs be removed from the Treasury Department.

The deputy in each of the boxes would not have absolute power over these areas. But they would have responsibility in these areas and provisions for proper budgets would come under the director's purview.

As an example, the Deputy for International Affairs would meet with those in the Department of State who are on the Far East Desk. He would oversee their efforts at negotiations to reach agreements with the governments of Laos, Thailand, Burma and Vietnam to halt the production, refining and trafficking of heroin.

FUNDING ACTION

This might require financial commitment, and the deputy would recommend this to the director for approval and budgetary action.

If we are determined to organize a strike force against drugs, then we will have to do more than simply go to the area of rehabilitation. For such an effort would soon collapse under the weight created by non-action in the area that produces the addicts.

The Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment is now writing the final legislation in response to the President's recommendations. I believe that we will give the President the authority he has requested to coordinate treatment and rehabilitation programs. But I also believe that the subcommittee will make it clear that this is to be viewed as an interim measure—and only a partial attack on heroin.

The final measure must represent a total commitment to this fight, marshaling the total resources of this nation.

A GHOST TOWN IS A GHOST TOWN EVEN WITH SEWERS AND WATER

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, when a giant corporation moves into the agricultural production business, it generally means the death of family farms in the area. But the family farm is not the only one who suffers.

A study in South Dakota showed that while the State was losing 6,027 farms in one 5-year period, there were 1,101 business establishments closed.

The corporate farm is bad news to all of rural America.

Mr. Speaker, this was very clearly pointed out in a recent editorial in the *Lamberton News* quoting the NFO reporter.

I would like to insert this editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to give my colleagues a clear picture of what is happening to rural America as we lose our family farms. And I would like to point out that we have the same dire results whether we lose the farms because of the competition from a corporate giant or because they can no longer continue because of lack of parity for what they produce.

The editorial follows:

A GHOST TOWN IS A GHOST TOWN EVEN WITH SEWERS AND WATER

"The thought of one giant corporation controlling all of the agriculture wealth of Sumner County should provide a lifetime of nightmares for our merchants. Small town insurance firms wouldn't have anyone to insure. Realtors wouldn't have anything to sell to anyone. Implement dealers could forget it. Petroleum dealers would go out of business or out of town, or like most of us, both." From the *Wellington, Kansas, Daily News*.

The editorial paragraph above has been widely quoted in the press, and by a United States Senate Committee, to put into a verbal capsule the importance of the corporate invasion of agriculture to small business.

As farmers disappear, so do businesses in communities serving the farmers, including the franchised retail outlets like Penney's, Western Auto, Gambles, etc.

The Department of Commerce, in a survey in South Dakota, showed that while the state was losing 6,027 farms in one five year period, there were 1,101 business establishments closed. The study confirmed what the manager of the Custer, S.D., Chamber of Commerce had long contended, all the way from his home town to Washington, D.C., that the fight to save family farming is just as much the rural townsmen's fight as it is the farmers' themselves.

The Senate Small Business Committee recently cited as an example of what happens when a big corporate operation moves in a \$250,000 farm equipment purchase by the Shinrone Corp. of Sac County, Iowa. It was bought from factories at Brantford, Canada, Detroit, Mich., and Algoma, Wisc. No one in Sac county ever got to bid on it.

The studies pile up which show that giant farms will destroy, not just opportunities for American citizens to have farm enterprise of their own, but also opportunities in every town and city that serves agriculture.

One of the first such studies was made a quarter of a century ago by Walter Goldschmidt in the towns of Arvin and Dinuba, California, two communities of about the

same size surrounded by Central Valley farming resources of comparable capacity. One area was peopled by family farmers, the other by corporate farming giants.

The small farm community had 62 businesses compared to only 35 in the other. Retail trade ran \$4.4 million from the family farmers but only \$2.5 million from the big farm wage hands.

The quality of life contrasted equally sharply. Housing, streets, schools, churches, business and social clubs, were better and more numerous where the family farms predominated.

The fight to stop corporate integration or take-over of agriculture by giant conglomerates is not one for family farmers alone. Main Street has an equally direct stake in it.

Multi-billion dollar rural development schemes—sewer and water loans and grants, rural housing grants, etc.—are all very well. But unless there is farm income in the hands of family farmers who do business close to home, instead of Brantford, Canada and Detroit, the small town businessmen, as the *Wellington, Kansas Daily News* has said, may just as well forget it.

A ghost town with sewers and running water is still a ghost town.—NFO Reporter.

GOALS OF THE SOUTHERN REGIONAL GROWTH BOARD

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, recently a meeting was held in the Research Triangle Area of my State as the beginning of an effort toward regional planning which can have a great importance in the South and the States beyond that part of our country. As a result of initial steps taken at that gathering a number of States, under the interim leadership of Governor Holton of Virginia, are forming a Growth Policy Board which will work toward the maximum development of human and natural resources in the American South. We in North Carolina are proud of the leadership of Governor Scott and former Gov. Terry Sanford in this program and grateful for the encouragement of other leaders of our region, particularly Governors Carter of Georgia and Moore of West Virginia and Lieutenant Governor-elect Winter of Mississippi—all of whom participated in this initial meeting. The goals of this historic movement are best summarized in the following speech made by Terry Sanford, who is now the president of Duke University:

ADDRESS BY TERRY SANFORD

A series of remarkable inaugural speeches this year by Southern governors has preceded this meeting. Now I am aware of the pitfalls in quoting governors out of context but in this instance I defend that sometimes troubling practice for it seems to me that these excerpted thoughts represent the reason we are here today.

Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia said: "No poor, rural, weak, or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job, or simple justice . . ."

Governor John West in his inaugural speech said: "We can, and we shall, in the next four years eliminate hunger and malnutrition and their attendant suffering from

our state. We can, and we shall, in the next four years initiate new and innovative programs which in our time will provide adequate housing for all our citizens. We can, and we shall, this year initiate far-reaching programs to provide more doctors, nurses and health personnel as well as better systems for delivery of health care to each citizen . . ."

Governor Linwood Holton said: "It is clear that problem solving . . . has become the focal point of politics, both in Virginia and in the nation . . ."

There is agreement then in this series of statements. On the one hand, there is identification of problems. On the other, there is assertion that solving problems is principally the responsibility of government.

Against this background, there are other quotations which establish a different point of view. After the governors' conference of two weeks ago, David Broder of the Washington Post wrote that the governors are being ". . . put down by the other wielders of power in American society . . ."

And of that same conference, D. J. R. Bruckner wrote in the Los Angeles Times ". . . Talking with and listening to America's governors during their annual conference, you had to wonder whether it is a good idea to continue state government at all . . . Governors like to say that they could govern better if they had access to more revenues, but that is doubtful. The functions of national life that most affect people have simply outgrown the capacity of states . . . In terms of function, the states are already in fact being abolished . . ." so said Bruckner.

Mark Twain was in London in 1897 when he read his obituary from American wire service. He cabled the Associated Press that reports of his death had been greatly exaggerated.

And I think we are assembled here today in the belief that state governments are not only unready for the mortician, but they are in fact, it seems to me, a singular source of government innovation. There can be this and more. Functioning cooperatively they, the states, can constitute a rational and decisive response to complexity and change. The difference in state government and Mark Twain is that he knew where to send the wire asserting that he was still alive. Our difficulty would be in finding the right addressee. And so I'm suggesting that we send this telegram to ourselves.

There is no question that the relationship between the federal government and the cities is highly visible. There is no question that through this conduit moves the response to crises. Ten days ago the familiar litany repeated itself in a report from the National Urban Coalition's Commission on the Cities. The report said that housing is still the national scandal it was four years ago, schools are more tedious and turbulent, rates of crime and unemployment and disease and heroin addiction are higher, welfare roles are larger. The commission found that the most disturbing point is lack of faith in the system as a protector or a provider.

The cities with massive federal assistance must confront the crises, but how do we avoid the build-up of the crises? How do we keep a Newark or a Detroit or a Los Angeles from happening? We look in vain for the joint city-federal mechanism in the United States with the capacity to anticipate crises and to impose order on the growth of population and technology.

What government warned of, or planned for, the massive movement of people from the farm to city that has altered our patterns of life so radically? What government foresaw the consequences of random industrialization that begrimes our air and makes our water unusable? It is imperative that we develop the capacity to see in advance the results of our actions—or inactions.

It is not necessary in this audience to itemize governmental inadequacy. That is

the agenda which sits on your desks with brutal regularity. Our purposes here are to confront a horizon that is more restricted, and hopefully more intelligible, than American cities. The horizon we face is the South, and we meet at a time of powerful possibilities for the Southern region.

"It can be argued," wrote Dr. Thomas Naylor, of the Center for Southern Studies at Duke, "that Southerners have had very little to do about their own destiny at any time in the past one hundred years . . ." And this is true and can be demonstrated—but our future, it seems to me, is at last in our hands.

The South is the most written about part of America, and yet so little is really known. The South is no longer hypnotized by the war we lost and the era of destruction we suffered. The new leadership across the board is looking forward; not backward.

In the last ten years something unique has happened to our region. We have made industrial progress and we have brought in new industry; we have reversed the out-migration trend and our per capita income has moved up to 78% of the national average; but that kind of material progress has been experienced before by other parts of the nation and is still going on elsewhere. It is true also that we have made more progress in schools, leading the rest of the nation in complying with the requirements of desegregation, raising in a decade the number of high school graduates from one-third of the adult population to one-half, and almost doubling per pupil expenditure; but this is also the general direction of the rest of the country. What, then, is unique?

In the past ten years the unique development in our region has been both in the way we view ourselves and perhaps more important, in the way the nation looks at us. There is a rising participation of the black citizen in the political affairs of every state in the South. The mood, the rhetoric, the policies and the character of every Southern institution has been sensitized to the needs of the poor, black and white, and concerned with the individual aspirations of people in ways that we have never seen before. A new cast of governors is moving to the forefront, shunning the dishonest demagoguery that pits race against race, that capitalizes on bitterness and meanness and that has sapped the energies of the region for decades; and they are now responsive to new issues like abolishing hunger, promoting decent housing for all, and opening opportunities in education and employment; issues that earlier politicians denied even existed at all.

Perhaps it might be said that the very term "Southerner" has changed—no longer white and defiant, but black and white and committed to the South and demanding a saner future. The South is no longer the step-child of America—called bigoted and outlandish, often a captive of its worst spokesmen, too often its image painted by the writers who were enthralled by the stereotypes. The unique change is that we view ourselves differently and we have much to offer a troubled nation that is in need of much. As the North struggles against the time-bomb of sullenness and despair ticking away in its cities, the South is about to catch the wind for the horizon. Our destiny at last belongs to us.

Population growth underlies much of what is to come. I suggest that our stance is not that we are seeking growth—we are attempting to cope with it. Although this country and this region are apparently blessed with smaller numbers than other nations and regions, there is small comfort to be drawn from this ostensible advantage. Every child born in the United States will use 30 times more of the basic life support systems of the earth than the average child born in India. Are we to wait until this relentless increase overtakes our finite resources?

A bewildering acceleration of forces and

events is about to come upon the South, as it has long since fallen upon the urban industrial areas of the North. We know there are lessons we can draw from their errors of experience.

Our need is to analyze our problems and design our approaches and make useful findings common knowledge among the states of the region. We can help shape our own destiny, and perhaps even contribute, by the example of our search, to solutions of the nation's problems as well.

Now in looking at our future and in deciding what to do and the approaches that we might want to consider we can each decide to go it alone, each city bouncing from crisis to crisis and crying for federal funds to alleviate and correct but hardly to prevent crises breeding more crises.

We can go it alone as individual states, with limited resources to see the future results of present policy decisions and actions.

We can go it alone with the starts and stops that are part of the democratic process in each individual state, or we can put together a means and a way that will provide continuity for the region and for each state within it.

I know that all of us care deeply about meeting the future well. We have been through too much together to do less than we can now. We have moved through one-crop farming, low skill, low paying industry; through periods of taxing our own poor to offer incentives to industrialists to come without regard first for social consequences.

But now we have before us, in this diversifying region, a wonderfully open field on which to build an economy and a style of life. With our minds impressed by the mistakes of others—and ourselves—let us determine that when we have put our land and our cities to their full use, there will be a quality of development here that can serve as a model.

That is why it has become increasingly clear to me that we should not go it alone, but we should build our joint hopes on our common heritage, setting up a Southern Regional Growth Board (or maybe we should call it the Southern Growth Policy Board) that would bring the resources of all our states to bear upon those questions that are bound to affect us generally in the coming changes. Such a board would need and have no power to act. Instead, it would undertake or coordinate fact-gathering and research, studies and analyses, to make available to all the states of our region the best information on matters of basic concern that the best minds in the South are capable of assembling. Ultimately it could be the clearinghouse and data bank to serve the informational needs of governors and legislators for facts, forecasts, ideas and common experience.

The scope of this board's inquiry could be as broad as the common regional interests—transportation, tax structure, population groupings, health, industrial location. It could operate as specifically and limited as a research examiner compiling comparative policies governing cable television, or as broadly and theoretically as a task force assessing innovative tax and social policies to resist the trend toward bankrupt cities housing only the poor.

The board's objective would be to make available information and practical thought on the widest range of problems the region's leadership can perceive; not to be so much as just a brain bank as a sleeves-up participant in the search for answers to the hardest problems, and a preventive agent for trauma before it happens. In sum, the proposal is to bring the combined mind of the South to bear on the expression and fulfillment of its destiny.

The elected leadership of the Southern states can work cooperatively in deciding what sort of future we want and need, how to get there, and then get on with the business

of getting there. I think this is the difference between what we now look to and the early efforts made in the South and the region, particularly by Howard Odom. Then it was not possible to involve the elected leadership in planning for this kind of future. Now it is possible and that is the difference. It is possible to put the task on the elected leadership with full confidence that they have the capacity, that they have the spirit, to look to the future. This interstate compact organization, run by elected officials, will establish a forum, a convening authority, a broker between knowledge and action. It will serve to harness the intellectual resources of our region to the problems of our region. And through the Board, this knowledge will be politicized, become part of the governmental world of action; action guided by the best knowledge and the best of organized forethought.

We need to gain insights from others' experience as we look to what this board can do and that's communication. We need to know what our problems are before the deluge of symptoms overwhelms us—that's research. We need to know what we are about and what our goals are and that's priority setting. We need to know what the mechanisms and programs are, or might be, to aid us in achieving these priorities—that's programming. And we need to know how to translate all this into effective government action—that's politics.

Communication, research, priority setting, programming and politics are the elements of what the Growth Board is about. It is all these as an aid to the states. It is all these as the salvation for emerging cities. It will be for the governors and the legislatures, the mayors and the city councils, the county commissioners and the school boards to carry out the activities of government—with the added resource which a Growth Board can provide.

The compact as drawn in tentative form to be considered this afternoon charges the Board with preparing and keeping current a Statement of Regional Objectives. The Objectives will not be easily formulated, but they will form the heart of the Board's mission, as these Objectives will keep before the South's leadership mutually agreed upon goals and values that all the states feel must guide the South. The Statement of Regional Objectives will provide the framework for the Board's activities, and will give rise to the hope that governmental activities in the South, be they state, or federal, or local, will be guided by these set principles. To answer the question of whether we as a people in a democracy have control over where we are going, this Statement and its continuing re-evaluation may go far in providing the proof that we can provide sensible, sensitive, responsive, responsible government by the people.

The Board will also be charged with the power to make or commission studies and investigations—without any real constraints on the subjects to be covered. The tenor of the compact document, our discussions to date, the needs of the Southern states, suggest that there are few limits on agenda. It is in this area that I see the real opportunity for the Board to marry knowledge and action, and in doing so, equipping the political process for the decisions it must make. I see task forces of Board members and academics, jointly exploring the issues we need to understand better. These task forces can focus the issue, seek the goals, develop the alternatives and suggest the answers—and, because of the nature of the task force membership, carry their experience back to their institutions and governments so that both the world of

action and the world of knowledge can be enriched.

There is today, in spite of all the problems, in spite of all the people that are disillusioned, there is no call to resign ourselves to the drift of men and power into tightening knots that threaten to strangle the life Americans want to live. There is a better way. We can break down the components of the problem now so clearly evident and begin to solve them piece by piece here in the South where we still have time to think before we follow along a troubled path.

It is an article of faith that we can find ways in America to have green grass and pure water; good schools and clean houses; food enough for a child to eat and wages enough for a father to clothe and shelter him without despair; parks to play in and streets to walk in without alarm; ways to move from one place to another without the waste of delay; means to shield one's family from illness. All this, and more. It is one of our title deeds that we can, through effort, keep a brotherly regard for one another in this land, and improve the lot in life for each by improving the quality of life for all.

That is what this proposal for a common instrument of inquiry is about. We have the time, if we have the will, to think and to plan. Still facing our great period of industrialization which is coming on we do have many advantages. But as Joel Fleishman of Duke's Institute of Policy Sciences has noted, "To the extent that our (Southern) cities are different from other cities in the country, and to the extent that these differences are potentially advantageous to us, the main reason for the difference is time . . . what time has given, time itself will take away."

If we see the time we have, the answers we get, the policies we suggest, the programs we create may lead us, as the South, into a truly post-racial society. And we in the South can show the way to the nation, and for that matter the world, to put aside the bitterness that divides us, and build on the strengths at our command. It is time for the South to lead, not to follow.

C. A. "CHRIS" CHRISTIANSON

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this month, C. A. "Chris" Christianson leaves the employ of the House of Representatives after 42 years of Government service.

I have known Chris since I first came to the House in 1963. He has always been attentive to his duties and I have been impressed with his diligence in carrying out his assigned duties. Chris is a storehouse of knowledge on House rules and procedures. Each time I have asked him a question, he has given me prompt and accurate information.

All Members who have come to know him are sorry to see Chris leave, but we respect this personal decision he has made to seek a quieter life with less pressure. I want to extend to him my very best wishes for many, many more years of happiness and fulfillment and to express my thanks to him for a job well done.

TYRANNY'S TIMETABLE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, the lead editorial in the largest newspaper in my district, the Santa Ana, Calif., Register, entitled "Tyranny's Timetable," made a chilling prediction for the next 12 years in America—from now until 1984, the future year already made famous in George Orwell's well known novel.

I am not sure the predictions in "Tyranny's Timetable" are accurate. Certainly I hope they are not. But in view of what has already happened this past year, in view of this House's action December 10 in extending the President's power to control our Nation's trillion-dollar economy with just 33 votes cast against it, I believe this editorial deserves the most serious and thoughtful consideration. If every Member of this House read it carefully and thought long and hard about what it says, there would be a much better chance that its predictions will not come true.

TYRANNY'S TIMETABLE

In the interest of history, we suggest parents clip this editorial and preserve it for their children.

We are persuaded now that a timetable for the complete replacement of American freedom by a dictatorship can be diagrammed with reasonable accuracy. We do not mean a camouflaged dictatorship, but an open, brazen establishment of rule by supreme edict.

When the Nixon years are reviewed by future historians, he will be characterized as the architect of the "New America." He will not actually establish the new order completely, but his trail-blazing actions will mark the path for his successor who may be the last duly elected President of the U.S.A.

Mr. Nixon has already fearlessly shown that the American President may disregard the traditions of his party and his country. He may repudiate his promises, and by executive order replace the freedom by control boards whose members received not a single vote from American tax payers.

And he has proven it can be done with scarcely a whimper from the people.

The major obstacle remaining is the powerful labor union bosses who see their own demise in the new scheme of things. But minor concessions will be made to this power base until Mr. Nixon is secure in his second term.

The myth of "success" which will be ballyhooed effectively during the second Nixon term, will bring other "phases" and it will be effectively shown that labor unions, as such, will be obsolete.

With the complete reorganization of the Federal government, a new kind of Presidential cabinet will provide a bureaucracy to establish not only wage and price limits, but job placements with Federal work cards directing who shall work at what job and when and where . . . after all, why should there be two people seeking the same job?

Individual determination will be "proven" wasteful and not in the national interest. This program will start among the unemployed, move into the common labor pool and progress eventually to the professions in-

cluding doctors and lawyers. Lawyers will be the last to go.

Industry, already feeling tighter government controls, will quietly fall into line. Initial steps will be Presidential orders eliminating "costly competition."

Newspapers, of course, will have to be brought into the age of enlightenment, and this transition can be smoothly engineered through government control of the manpower. Critical newspapers will be permitted to survive for a few years as effective barometers to test the mood of the people.

Americans, already moving to such countries as Australia, Canada and Israel will begin to move in larger numbers until "in the interest of national security," a Presidential order will prohibit such departures.

Meanwhile, as Nixon's current economic phase anesthetizes the public, a group of U.S. senators is currently at work to set aside the two-term limit for Presidents. It will be effectively "proven" that by limiting a President to only two terms, he becomes a "lame duck" in the second term and therefore loses effective influence.

This will be such a great idea that Representatives and Senators will become "lifetime public servants," just as are Federal judges.

The people who demand elections are reactionaries. It's a waste of money and energy to stage these charades every two years. After all, when you have a "good man" in office, why try to change?

With those little technicalities out of the way, Mr. Nixon will bow out of office, and with tears and appreciation of a grateful nation, he will call for continuing efforts to move America ahead along the enlightened pathway he has courageously established.

The election of the new President will be a vigorous drama in which failure to vote will bring criminal indictment. The new President will call for renewed sacrifices to keep America aggressively active in the rebuilding of the world community, hand in hand with our gallant allies in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

By the end of his second term, it will be effectively "proven" that the madness of periodical elections is costly and unnecessary. After all, congressmen and judges serve for life, do they not?

The taxes which pay for major party campaigning can be eliminated simply by accepting the idea that the President should continue in office so long as he wishes to so sacrifice his personal life.

And there you have it.

The elapsed time in this schedule is approximately 12 years.

Does that seem too soon?

The date will be 1984.

CURTIS CHRISTIANSON

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 10, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, although I have been a Member of this body for only 5 years, in that period of time I have developed a deep respect for the dedicated and efficient work of a man from my Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, Curt Christianson, our loyal and conscientious tally clerk.

Curt has worked for the U.S. Government for 42 years, including 2 years in the U.S. military service. Truly, he is deserving of a rest.

But hard work is no stranger to the Christianson family. Curt was one of seven children born on a farm near Dawson, Minn.

A brother Theodore, a newspaper publisher in Dawson, served as Governor of Minnesota for three terms and in the House of Representatives here in Washington for two terms.

I join with my many colleagues in wishing Chris and his charming lady the best of health, happiness, and continued success in his retirement years. He most certainly deserves them. His leaving will be a great loss to the Congress he has served so well. His legion of Minnesota friends join me in this tribute.

THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTMAS

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the words of Alfred Tennyson suggest something of the beauty with which the advent of Christmas is clothed. As Christmas comes down to us today, it is a rich heritage of customs, traditions, folklore, and legend, drawn from every age and time, and from many lands and peoples. To unravel its mystery is a fascinating and inspiring experience—the story, in essence, of the deepest desires of the human heart, that universal longing for spiritual renewal and refreshment. The words are:

"The time draws near the birth of Christ.
The Moon is hid; the night is still;
The Christmas bells from hill to hill
Answer each other in the mist."

The idea of celebrating on or about December 25 was born among ancient peoples long before the birth of Christ, peoples who were close students of astronomy and who knew that the last days of December were the time of the winter solstice when the sun dwindled and the powers of darkness seemed to be gaining over the forces of light. December 25 was the turning-point at which the sun began to reassert itself, and its power gave new promise of life and fruitful harvests. In Rome, it was the dies natalis invicti solis—the birthday of the unconquered sun.

Inevitably, the Christian community found this venerable symbolism highly appropriate for heralding the coming of Christ, the "light of the world" which has overcome the darkness of despair. So it was that gradually the light of Christ in men's hearts and minds found its expression in the customs of the sun-feast, now transformed and hallowed by the faith and prayer of the Christian commonwealth.

In the same manner, other customs, originally of pagan origin, have been assimilated into our Christmas heritage—the decorative tree, the glowing candles, the stories of Santa Claus, stockings by the fireplace, greeting cards,

yule logs—all are now associated with the birthday of Christ.

In our own day the keeping of Christmas has often been commercialized beyond recognition of its spiritual essence and identity. Yet, while allowing for the excess that exists in any institution or custom, the Christmas commerce we so often deplore does, in fact, mean a livelihood for millions of people and often the difference between success or failure in business. Christmas is, when all is said and done, the birthday of Jesus who spent much of his life in honest commerce as a carpenter, sharing, we may presume, in the economic support of his family. Like the very parables he told, His life is an example of an earthly story with a heavenly meaning. So it is with Christmas. Whatever the excesses of its commercialization, it has probably stimulated more people to help the poor and to care for others than has any other holiday in the calendar. So long as Christmas serves to make children happy, the presence of Christ will hallow it.

It was one of Christianity's wisest moves to maintain the older midwinter festival and to transform it in the spirit of Christ. The variety of ways in which Christmas is celebrated tells us that its appeal is universal. Even those outside the Christian faith are able to share in the spirit of Christmas in the generosity of giving, the exchange of greeting and song, the sense of life to be renewed. For Christians, the feast has a special and precious meaning, set forth in the old carol:

"God rest ye merry gentlemen; let
nothing you dismay;
Remember Christ Our Saviour was
born on Christmas Day . . .
O tidings of comfort and joy!"

May the spirit of Christmas enter our hearts and bring us all "even unto Bethlehem" to behold his birth and to heed the ancient song of "peace on earth, good will to men."

OPERATION NOEL

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, quoting "Service Stripe," Walter Reed Hospital's newspaper:

You can always tell when the Christmas Season is bearing down. That's the time when "Operation Noel" gets underway and Congressional secretaries hurry to complete plans for a gala patient party.

Last Wednesday evening, Operation NOEL held its third, biggest and best Christmas party for servicemen in Washington area military hospitals. Many of us were there, joining with military leaders to wish our servicemen "Merry Christmas." I came away from the party, as I am sure my colleagues did, with a special feeling that this is

what Christmas is all about—showing others that we care about them.

Operation NOEL could not be the success it is without the help of some very outstanding people, and I would like to share with my colleagues just a few of the hundreds who gave of themselves to insure that last Wednesday there would be "No One Ever Lonely." The officers of Operation NOEL worked extremely long hours and deserve our sincere thanks—Joe Westner, HUD's congressional office; Fran Westner, secretary to JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER, Nebraska; Kathy Pierpan, secretary to BOB BERGLAND, Minnesota; and Jayne Gillenwaters and Pat Rinaldi, secretaries to JOHN SCHMITZ, California.

Their efforts, however, would have been in vain without the support of the Members of Congress and their staffs, and I particularly want to say a special "Thank You" to JOHN McCOLLISTER. The text of a telegram sent by the President says it best:

Hon. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER:

Mrs. Nixon joins me in sending our warmest best wishes to you and your colleagues in the Congress as you express, in a very personal way, this Nation's gratitude to our hospitalized servicemen.

In this season of giving, we become especially aware of the great gifts of those who have served our Country at the cost of personal sacrifice. Regardless of one's views on the cause they served, there can be no disagreement on the honor they have earned. And, as Operation NOEL suggests, there must be no question in their minds that we will continue to remember and to honor them.

This thoughtful Christmas party is one way of saying "Thank You" to our brave men. In addition, all of us must pledge them our continuing efforts to build a world of peace and goodwill which is worthy of their sacrifices.

RICHARD NIXON.

Operation NOEL, as a nonprofit charitable organization, is solely dependent upon the good will of people at Christmas, and their fundraising efforts this year have had tremendous success. Thanks to H. Ross Perot, of Dallas, Tex.; Anheuser-Busch; the American Medical Association; Mutual of Omaha; Communications Satellite Corp.; 116, Inc.; Hal Brown, Jr., of Los Angeles, Calif.; Julius Lansburgh Co.; Giant Food; and Narragansett, for their very special support.

Last but certainly not least are the hundreds of congressional secretaries who were hostesses the night of the party. These charming young ladies, selected by Chris Negley on the staff of BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, of New York, made sure that there was No One Ever Lonely the night of the party. And a special thanks goes to Joe Dougherty, a Capitol policeman who brought special cheers to the servicemen as he portrayed Santa Claus for the second year.

Not many of us are aware that after the party, Operation NOEL prepares 1,500 gift packages for distribution to the hospitals in this area, as another way of saying "Merry Christmas."

The most suitable way to end my remarks, Mr. Speaker, would be to quote

from a letter written to Joe Westner, president of Operation NOEL, by Adm. T. H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend as I was in Europe on NATO business. It goes without saying that, except for this commitment, I would certainly have been on hand for this wonderful tribute to our hospitalized servicemen. Please express my deep appreciation to all who give so much of their time and effort to make this splendid project a success.

MULTIPLE-USE MANAGEMENT IN OUR NATION'S FORESTS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago a two-part series of articles was published in the New York Times followed by an editorial concerning the management of the 187 million acres of Federal forest lands contained in the national forest system and administered by the U.S. Forest Service, an agency of the Department of Agriculture. These articles which raised serious questions about the manner in which the forests are being administered contained information which, I personally believe, was misleading and certainly was subject to a great deal of misunderstanding.

The points raised by the New York Times in the series were clarified by Forest Service Chief Edward P. Cliff in the letter to the Times dated December 1, 1971. I felt that Chief Cliff has set the record straight on many of these issues and since the original articles were published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 29, I thought it appropriate to share Chief Cliff's comments with my colleagues in the Congress, because I know well of their interest in all aspects of multiple-use management of the national forest system.

Therefore, I place in the RECORD at this time the complete text of Mr. Cliff's reply of December 1, 1971, to the New York Times articles:

WASHINGTON, D.C., December 1, 1971.

EDITOR
New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: During the past few years, the public has been awakened to the cause of conservation, largely as a result of a growing national concern for the quality of our environment. The U.S. Forest Service encourages and supports this concern. There has been good in-depth reporting on today's issues of environmental concern, but there has also been much reporting based on emotional statements, not fact.

Such is the case, I believe, with much of the content of the articles about National Forest management that appeared in the New York Times on November 15 and 16, and an editorial of November 21.

I agree with you that "It is necessary to get the facts better known." The articles and editorial did not achieve that goal.

Through the liberal use of quotations based on opinions of others, your reporter has done a good job of identifying the wide diversity of interests in the National Forests and the simultaneous mounting pressures for more timber and a better environment. Unfortunately, some statements are incorrect or quoted out of context and need correcting. For the sake of brevity, I will only cite a few:

In one article, the writer says: "Bulldozers and tractors are boring into some of the last remnants of pristine wilderness." Obviously implied in the imminent disappearance of wilderness because of roads and logging.

The Forest Service took the first steps to establish wilderness areas, and, today, 9.9 million acres of the 10.1 million National Wilderness Preservation System are in the National Forests, administered by the Forest Service.

Adding primitive areas and other specially designated areas set aside in National Forests as restricted from commercial development, the total soars to more than 15 million acres. These 23,400 square miles cover a bigger area than the combined expanses of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. Hardly a "last remnant."

Nor will the establishment of wilderness in National Forests stop with the reclassification of primitive areas. The Forest Service is currently reviewing all undeveloped areas in the National Forests to select those which should have future intensive study for possible new wildernesses. The public has been invited to participate in these reviews.

Your reporter also says: "... The only Federal land permanently dedicated to public use is the 28 million acres in the National Parks." His implication is that this is the only Federal acreage set aside for noncommercial public use, and that recreation is the only legitimate public use of public lands.

This, of course, is not the case. The Congress clearly stated in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960 that the National Forests are established and shall be administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and fish and wildlife programs—all for the public benefit. The National Forests provide more public recreation use, measured in man-days, and in greater variety than any other of the Federal lands.

The writer also stated flatly that clearcutting was adopted in 1964. Actually, clearcutting has been used for many years in the western United States and there are literally thousands of examples where the reproduction which followed has produced excellent new forests. Clearcutting was applied in the East in the early 1960's after extensive research showed that this method could provide satisfactory reproduction.

Again through the reporter's use of quotes, he attempts to establish the point that National Forest timber is being overharvested, and that multiple use management is not being practiced.

These general implications are not true. Annual allowable cuts are established area-by-area on the basis of conditions in each National Forest, not on national averages as implied in the article. These cutting ceilings are adjusted at least every 10 years to account for changes, such as tree planting, losses from fire or other causes, increased growth from improved forestry measures, withdrawals for wildernesses or other uses. In the very few instances where "overcutting" has been done to combat insect epidemics, salvage of fire-killed or windblown timber, or for other reasons, it is compensated for in subsequent planning periods.

Increases in timber harvest that occurred over the years were justified, by better utilization, improved technology, and increased growth.

Land-use planning is not a precise science, but the Forest Service system of multiple use planning is as advanced as any system, applicable to large land areas, in use today. As a result, the National Forests are producing more goods and services for the use and enjoyment of the American people, and in greater variety, than ever before.

The Times editorial contains a basic flaw also. Completely unfounded is the implication that President Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot—the fathers of American forest conservation—would have endorsed efforts to diminish the intensity of multiple use forest management. Farthest from their minds was, as Pinchot himself described it, "forest preservation." He faulted the forestry associations of the time for giving very little attention to the forest as "a permanent producer of timber."

Later, he adds in his book, "Breaking New Ground:" "It had not dawned upon them that timber can be cut without forest destruction or that the forest can be made to produce crop after crop for the service of man."

Despite the dismissal by the Times of re-

cent efforts of the Forest Service to bring its programs and policies into line with current public demands, they are aggressive efforts, subject only to budget limitations. The public is being brought in on every sensitive front to assist in reaching management decisions. Research is devoting massive efforts to improve means of harvesting and regeneration. Long-term efforts to get balanced funding for all uses of the forest are beginning to achieve results. Because forestry is a discipline dealing in decades and centuries, the evidence on the ground of these actions is still not dramatically seen, but it is coming rapidly.

Forests, like air and water, are a national heritage that must be used, improved, and conserved in balance. All three are subject to damage by excessive use resulting from unlimited population growth. The Forest Service is dedicated to managing the Nation's forests wisely, enhancing their amenity values so that future generations can continue to benefit from their use and enjoyment.

I would be pleased to discuss all matters relative to these subjects with you and your writers at any time.

Sincerely,

EDWARD P. CLIFF,
Chief.

PRESIDENT ANNOUNCES LAND-MARK PENSION PROGRAM

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 14, 1971

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, almost every American has an older loved one who, through no fault of his or her own, has become a burden on his or her family. That is why I am so pleased by the landmark pension program President Nixon has just announced. By assuring every citizen of the opportunity to create for himself a serviceable pension program, it will relieve the burden so many families now face when their parents and grandparents become unable to continue working.

Helping those who help themselves has gone out of style in many parts of America. I am glad that it has not gone out of style in the Nixon administration. Because this latest program follows in that fine tradition, I am pleased to give it my fullest support.

SENATE—Wednesday, December 15, 1971

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, King of Kings and Lord of Lords who hast made the weak to confound the strong and the small to redeem the great, may the spirit of Bethlehem's babe pervade the whole earth. May His spirit, enthroned in men's hearts, break down all barriers which separate man from man. As His spirit radiates throughout the world may justice and good will prevail. Now rule in our hearts and claim our love. And may our gift to Thee be clean minds and pure hearts, steadfast in faith, wholly dedicated to Thee.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 184) extending the dates for transmission of the Economic Report and the report of the Joint Economic Committee.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2891) to extend and amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the dis-

agreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11731) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 1938. An act to amend certain provisions of subtitle II of title 28, District of Columbia Code, relating to interest and usury.

S. 2429. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act in order to conform to Federal Law, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8312. An act to continue for 2 additional years the duty-free status of certain gifts by members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, December 14, 1971, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) is now recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT'S RADIATION STUDY ON CANCER

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the investigation by the Health Subcommittee staff of the University of Cincinnati's radiation treatment program for certain terminal cancer patients has raised many immediate and disturbing questions.

I am reluctant to discuss these issues in the absence of the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee (Mr. KENNEDY); however, I believe that a public statement is warranted before the Congress recesses.

In mid-October, staff members visited the University of Cincinnati Medical Center on behalf of the Health Subcommittee and shortly thereafter the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee labeled this program "an incredible infringement of individual liberty." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of October 12, entitled "Medical