H.R. 5923. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Le Fintland and Susan Fintland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 5924. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pasqualina T. Colavita and her minor child, Donato Antonio Colavita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 5925. A bill for the relief of Park Choong Kyu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 5926. A bill for the relief of Antonio Carollo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYLIE:

H.R. 5927. A bill for the relief of S. Sgt. J. C. Bell, Jr., U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

55. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to creating a national health security program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

56. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to allowing a credit against Federal income tax for slot machine taxes used to support education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. RUNNELS: Petition of the Rio Grande Compact Commission; support of S. 520: to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

41. By Mr. RUNNELS: Petition of Otero County Commission, county of Otero, Alamogordo, N. Mex., supporting the principle of revenue-sharing legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

42. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Beverly Hills, Calif., relative to Federal-State revenue sharing; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RESEARCH NEEDS EXIST IN DIET AND HEALTH

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, for some time we have heard charges, countercharges, and counter-counter charges with regard to the relationship between diet and heart disease, cholesterol, and good health.

An interesting article recently appeared in the Washington Post which shows once again that disagreements in this area still exist. In fact, says the article, "without doubt, no consensus in the scientific community about the possible harm done by unsaturated fats is in sight."

In light of constant and seemingly unchallenged statements in the past which tend to imply there was no question about the relationship between the consumption of fats and heart disease, this statement may surprise some people.

But, it is a statement which reflects the fact that a great deal of research in this area is still going on. And it is there, Mr. Speaker, where this issue should be settled. I cannot agree more with those who believe that it is time we stop trying to face complex questions of health and the public welfare through magazine ads and television promotions.

Mr. Speaker, I include the article in the RECORD:

HEART CLAIMS PROBED: FDA, FTC QUESTION POLYUNSATURATE ADS

(By Morton Mintz)

For a dozen years, Americans have been confronted with advertisements in medical and lay publications that encourage use of polyunsaturated fats, usually as margarines or oils, as a means to reduce the risk of heart disease.

Presently, claims made in such ads for margarines are under scrutiny by two federal agencies, the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission.

The agencies' investigations are under way, moreover, as medical researchers are reporting findings that heating polyunsaturates at "temperatures that are typical for family cooking" leads to resaturation of the fats—thereby possibly negating the purpose for which polyunsaturates are advertised.

One full-page ad of this kind, for a widely sold cornoil margarine, has appeared frequently in numerous medical journals.

A photograph of a boy dominates the top half of the ad. He is blowing at candles—eight of them—on a birthday cake.

"Is there a heart attack in his future?" the caption asks.

"More and more doctors," the upbeat answer in the text begins, "are coming to the conclusion that the best time to deal with coronary disease is 30 to 40 years before it is likely to occur.

"That is why they are recommending good dietary practices, especially the low-saturated fat diet—not only for the heart patient, but for people of all age groups—as a means of controlling blood cholesterol and to reduce the risk of coronary diseases later on.

"Such a regimen, of course, involves the substitution of vegetable oils for animal fats wherever possible . . ."

In publications for laymen, the manufacturer picks up the same theme, but points it directly at parents

"Should an 8-year-old worry about cholesterol?" asks the caption in an often-published ad.

Again, the answer is hopeful: Fathers and mothers who take the precaution of giving their children corn-oil margarine, Fleischman's, in this case, are acting to reduce "one important risk to coronary disease"

Over the years, such ads, along with similar messages from non-commercial sources—the appeals to physicians reinforcing those to laymen, and vice-versa, have hammered home an implied fear:

To refrain from recommending such margarines and oils may be to invite negligently the diseases of the heart and blood vessels that, each year, cause the deaths of more than a half-million Americans

For millions, meanwhile, such messages have made the avoidance of animal (saturated) fats part of the conventional good-health wisdom for millions.

In the process, an enormous market has been built up for polyunsaturated fats (mainly, corn, cottonseed, safflower and soy oils. Peanut and olive oils, which are highly monosaturated, do not alter blood cholesterol levels. Coconut oil and cocoa butter are almost completely saturated).

But is it known that lowering the levels of lipids (cholesterol or other fatty substances) in the blood helps to preserve health and life?

The Food and Drug Administration says that despite a large amount of evidence, some of it conflicting, the case has not been proved.

For that reason, the FDA requires pharmaceutical manufacturers to include an "important note" in every ad for prescription medicines that lower blood lipid levels.

It has not been established, the note reminds physicians, whether drug-induced decreases in serum lipids have "a detrimental, a beneficial, or no effect on the morbidity or mortality due to atherosclerosis or coronary heart disease. Several years will be required before current investigations can yield an answer to this question."

Many eminent men of medicine share this view. "After 20 years and several hundred million dollars," Vanderbilt University biochemist George Mann has said, "we still do not see any convincing evidence" in support of the "overpromoted and overpublicized" dietary concept of the management of heart disease.

In the prestigious Lilly Lecture before the American College of Physicians last April, Swedish research scientist Lars Werko said: "Despite considerable effort, nobody has been able to demonstrate that it is possible to reduce the incidence of . . . heart disease by lowering serum cholesterol."

Yet, in ads for foods that have the same purpose as the drugs—that is, to lower blood lipid levels—no such cautionary advice appears.

For example, a physician going through the Journal of the American Medical Association may see the "important note" on one page, in an ad for a drug. But in the pages where there are ads for cholesterol-lowering foods he never sees anything of the kind.

Yet the secretary of the AMA's Council on Foods, Dr. Philip L. White, told a recent meeting of food editors, "We are all tired by now of the unending advertisements for oils and margarines that promise to clear our arteries in much the same way a drain cleaner works."

The inconsistency of the medicine and food ads is the product of a bureaucratic division of legal responsibilities between the FDA and the Federal Trade Commission.

The FDA is able to require the "important note" in drug ads because it has responsibility to be sure that advertising as well as labeling of prescription drugs is truthful and balanced. It has no jurisdiction over the advertising of foods.

In previously undisclosed correspondence prompted by Dr. Edward R. Pinckney, a Beverly Hills, Calif., internist, FDA Commissioner Charles C. Edwards has said that his agency would not permit the claims now in the margarine ads to be made in the labeling over which the FDA does have jurisdiction.

If such claims were to be made in the labels, Dr. Edwards told Rep. L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.), chairman of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, the FDA "would regard the products as misbranded" and would seize them.

Indeed, Dr. Edwards said, "we are considering strengthening the prohibitions" on

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

claims of the type made in three sample margarine ads submitted to him by the subcommittee.

In the absence of an effort by the FDA to treat the advertised margarines legally not only as foods, but also as "drugs" promoted for the prevention of disease, possible action is up to the FTC, because it has responsibility for food advertising.

A few days after the Fleishmann margarine ad captioned, "Should an 8-Year-Old Worry About Cholesterol?" appeared in last November's Readers Digest, the commission's Food and Drug Advertising Division began an investigation.

The staff sought "to determine whether that ad and similar ads . . . were in violation of any statutes which the commission enforces. Joseph Martin Jr., the FTC's general counsel, said on Feb. 18 in response to an inquiry from Fountain.

"The staff advises me that its investigation should be completed within the next week and that it will be enforcing appropriate enforcement recommendations to the commission," Martin said.

The differing FTC–FDA policies have been but a symptom of the confusion that besets a troubled medical-scientific community as it grapples with the mysteries of coronary and atherosclerotic heart diseases.

Dr. Pinckney, the Beverly Hills internist, has assembled "ample evidence" for possibly the most ironical twist of all: that heating polyunsaturates such as corn oil tends to "resaturate" them.

Pinckney, an author and former professor of medicine at Loma Linda College of Medicine, presents his case in a paper prepared for the recent Southern California meeting of the American College of Physicians in Palm Springs.

Cooking with polyunsaturates would—"if the advertised claims for these products are accepted at face value—defeat the very purpose for which polyunsaturates are commercially promoted," he said.

Resaturation by heating," he went on, "happens at times and temperatures that are typical for family cooking."

"But the degree of saturation becomes worse if the fat or oil is reused (as is a common custom among housewives)," he continued.

"Even more dangerous—again, assuming saturated fats are as dangerous as they are commercially exploited—are the fats and oils used in restaurants and commercial cooking establishments, where this cooking media is sometimes kept at high temperatures for months at a time, or are reheated daily (new fat or oil being added, when necessary, to maintain the proper cooking level . . ."

Pinckney contends that in addition to saturating vegetable oils, heating makes them harmful in other ways. Both contentions have been disputed. But Pinckney's "main point" is:

". . . That it would seem to me to be negligence on the part of physicians to advise the use of polyunsaturated fats and oils—for the purpose of lowering laboratory-measured blood cholesterol and other fats— without stressing the fact that such oils and fats should not be heated, or used in cooking."

(The phrase, "laboratory measure" reflects evidence that stress—along with such other factors as lack of exercise and cigarette smoking—can elevate blood cholesterol.

(". . . making the patient heart-conscious every time he sits down to eat" could have a self-defeating affect, Pinckney contends. It is even "quite possible that the single act of drawing blood from a patient—especially when the patient is made aware that the blood sample is intended to reveal the condition of his heart—could alter the resultant cholesterol value to a false, elevated reading.")

As noted, the regulatory agencies with responsibilities for foods do not require either the labeling or the advertising to disclose possible hazards in heating the oils. Neither do other primary information sources.

The National Heart and Lung Institute (a unit of the National Institutes of Health), for example, has a set of printed guidelines for treating certain patients with an elevated level of blood cholesterol.

Recommend polyunsaturates for "broiling, baking, or frying," as well as for "popping corn," the guidelines urge physicians.

The American Heart Association long has encouraged the use of polyunsaturated fats to replace a portion of the saturated fat in the diet.

The organization has drawn a rebuke for this advice from the conservative American Medical Association. Dr. White of the AMA's Council of Foods, in his talk to food editors, said the American Heart Association's promotional messages sometimes have been confusing because no one really has pinned down the relation of diet to heart disease.

In encouraging use of polyunsaturated fats the AHA has not referred to evidence that heating them possibly could be harmful.

The AHA has no "rigid" position on the matter, a spokesman in New York City said. Rather, he said, the AHA, as of now, simply does not regard as adequate the evidence of possible ill effects from heating the oils.

This puts the AHA at an opposite pole from Dr. Pinckney. For the past two years, he has researched the medical and scientific literature, has exchanged letters with officials of the Heart and Lung Institute and others, and has tested his views before his peers in articles and letters in the Annals of Internal Medicine and other journals.

Pinckney's new paper is to be published in "Medical Counterpoint," which is widely circulated among internists. Its editor, Dr. Mark D. Altschule, an assistant clinical professor of medicine at Harvard, shares Pinckney's views on the possible hazards of heating polyunsaturates (and, in addition, contends that blood cholesterol "cannot have a primary role" in causing coronary heart disease).

Those who would dispute Pinckney and Altschule face some awkward statistics.

In the years 1909–65, the proportion of cholesterol in the American diet has changed hardly at all, while the rate of coronary heart disease (CHD) has skyrocketed.

Reporting this last July, Dr. Harold A. Kahn of the Heart and Lung Institute said, "The increased risk of CHD reported to have occurred over this period is not related to dietary fat changes to a very important degree."

During the more than 12 years in which physicians in large numbers have tried to control serum cholesterol and CHD through dietary changes, Pinckney pointed out:

The World Health Organization has reported an increase in heart disease.

But Japan, where there has been a large increase in the consumption of dairy products, eggs and saturated fat foods since 1955, has had a 14 per cent decrease in heart attack deaths, according to the WHO.

In a letter responding to inquiries from fellow physicians, Pinckney said that the following have provided "a direct refutation for the use of heated unsaturated fats in the diet for the proclaimed prevention and therapy of heart disease:"

Dr. David Kritchevsky, an organic chemist at the famed Wistar Institute in Philadelphia, has shown, Pinckney said, "that heating an unsaturated fat (especially corn oil) to 200 degrees Fahrenheit for 15 minutes (far less than normal home cooking temperature and time) actually enhanced atherosclerosis in animals." Pickney noted that "inferential animal studies" were the basis for the removal of synthetic sweeteners from the market.

Dr. Antoine Gattereau, director of the Nutrition Laboratory at the University of Montreal's Clinical Research Institute, has written Pinckney, "I totally agree with you" that resaturation occurs with heating.

Oils chemist Fred Kummerow of the University of Illinois' Burnsides Research Laboratory, also agrees that heating resaturates fats.

"In household operations I don't think there's much trouble," he said. "It's the restaurant friers that are dangerous because they use the same hydrogenated fats over and over again. In Germany these kinds of fats are banned."

Some householders, especially among the poor, also use fats over and over, figuring they cannot afford to throw them away.

Other scientists who say that heating saturates unsaturated fats include: Drs. Laurance M. Hursh, director of health services and professor of health sciences at the University of Illinois, and Dr. Penny Wells, director of the School of Public Health Laboratory at UCLA.

Resaturation is by no means the only concern. Questions have also been raised by researchers, for example, as to whether heating polyunsaturated fats causes the formation of peroxides, which destroy cells, or decreases the fats' content of linoleic acid—the ingredient the American Heart association considers to be what makes them valuable. Further, one study indicates the possibility that the likelihood of cancer increases in persons who depend heavily on polyunsaturated fat for a long time.

All the adverse findings cited here are sharply disputed by scientists with impressive credentials and unquestioned integrity.

Without doubt, no consensus in the scientific community about the possible harm done by the unsaturated fats is in sight.

But even among those who disagree on the possibility of harmful effects, there are many who agree with Dr. Pinckney that it is inexcusable for the federal government to, say, allow one of its agencies not to impose on food advertisers the same requirements that another of its agencies imposes on drug advertisers.

Nor is there likely to be a permanent lack of consensus on two other issues raised by Pinckney in his paper:

That answers must be found, through research, to such crucial questions as what happens to the cholesterol that diet or drugs takes out of the blood? Where in the body does it go?

That advertising promoting a dietary approach to cholesterol control and prevention of heart disease, and messages from the American Heart Association that do pretty much the same thing, are not the best way to handle one of the most serious health problems of mankind.

TURNING SWORDS INTO PLOWSHARES

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the single most destructive weapon the world has ever known is in the process of being tamed by American scientists. This front page report greeted every reader of the Washington Post this morning. Experiments have recently been conducted in order to find ways to safely contain the energy of the hydrogen bomb, and the scientists conducting those experiments not only suggest that this energy can be used most effectively for peaceful purposes, but they also state that when it

is made ready for use it will produce only a fraction of the radioactive by-products that an atomic plant does.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no greater achievement in the interests of man's humanity than to turn devastating weapons into instruments of peace and sources of energy which will not blemish our planet's environment. As the prophet Isaiah said:

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: Nations shall not lift up sword against nations, neither shall they learn war anymore.

Mr. Speaker, today's good news follows:

TEST OF H-MACHINE OPENS DOOR TO PLENTIFUL, "CLEAN" ELECTRICITY

(By Thomas O'Toole)

American scientists yesterday successfully activated a large experimental device to safely contain the energy of the hydrogen bomb in a major step toward abundant and pollution-free electricity.

The first successful demonstration of a test machine called Scyllac came at the Los Alamos Scientific Labratory at Los Alamos, N.M., when scientists were able to repeatedly enclose an electrified form of hydrogen gas that had been heated to temperatures of more than 15,000 degrees Fahrenheit.

While yesterday's experiment did not produce power or demonstrate nuclear fusion as an energy source, it was hailed as a milestone in the worldwide drive by scientists to harness the power of fusion for mankind's benefit.

We got a beautiful rosy pink glow every time we ionized the gas," said Fred Ribe, Scyllac group leader at Los Alamos and one of the world's foremost fusion experts. "This doesn't mean we're going to put Consolidated Edison out of business tomorrow, but it does mean we're on the right road to fusion."

The United States has spent almost $500 million and close to 20 years on the road to fusion, but it has rarely been the right road. For years, the machines built to contain enough gas at a high enough temperature to release the energy of fusion either failed to contain the gas or failed to achieve the desired temperatures.

"It was like some unknown law of nature was telling us we couldn't do it," said Dr. Robert Hirsch, deputy director of the Atomic Energy Commission's controlled thermonuclear fusion program. "All our experience was telling us that the plasmas were more clever than we were."

The plasmas Dr. Hirsch spoke of are the same gases that were giving off rosy pink glows in the Scyllac at Los Alamos yesterday. The first large-scale device anywhere in the world to safely contain plasma gas, the Scyllac is a $10 million machine that has been five years in the planning stage, more than two years in construction and almost seven months in testing.

"We're still firing off plasmas," Ribe said at 6 o'clock last night, more than six hours after the Scyllac was first turned on. "We've fired off hundreds so far, and not once have we seen anything but a completely successful containment of the gas."

While the scientists at Los Alamos yesterday made and contained their first plasmas, they must achieve several more milestones before reaching the longed-for goal of thermonuclear fusion.

What the Los Alamos scientists did yesterday was to fill an arc-shaped aluminum tube with deuterium gas, about a thousand trillion particles of gas per cubic centimeter. Next, they "shocked" the gas with huge amounts of power, enough to electrify the gas and create a magnetic field around the gas to pinch it down and hold it in.

It's this "pinch-and-hold" operation that has been the most critical in the past, and yesterday the Scyllac was able to squeeze the gas enough to raise its temperature to 15,000 degrees and hold the gas in pulses of as long as 30 microseconds apiece.

While 30 microseconds (30 millionths of a second) sounds like a very short time, it is almost long enough for a plasma to sustain a fusion reaction. Plasmas need only three things to reach fusion. They must be dense enough and hot enough for a period of about 250 microseconds.

The plasma in the Scyllac yesterday was dense enough, but it wasn't nearly hot enough. A temperature of 15,000 degrees is just a start. The plasma must reach a temperature of more than 50 million degrees to achieve fusion.

"We feel we're on our way," Ribe said yesterday. "We feel we've hurdled one of our toughest hurdles containing the plasma, since we've demonstrated with much smaller machines than the Scyllac that we can reach the desired temperatures."

Ribe believes that the Scyllac will be ready to produce plasmas as hot as 30 million degrees inside a month and even hotter plasmas in two months. When that's done, the present Scyllac machine will be increased to three times its present size and the goal of pure fusion will be attempted.

Scientists believe that goal is worthwhile, if only because power from fusion is the cheapest, most abundant and cleanest source of power anywhere on the horizon today.

The most likely fuel for a fusion-powered reactor is the deuterium used yesterday in the Scyllac, an isotope of hydrogen that is easily and plentifully separated from seawater.

While fusion power is a cousin of atomic fission power, it is a far cleaner and safer power source. To begin with, it won't have the troublesome waste heat discharge that atomic power plants have. Secondly it would produce a fraction of the radioactive by-products that an atomic plant does.

Finally, a fusion plant contains less than one second's worth of fuel at any instant and could not runaway from itself. Even assuming disaster—a war, an earthquake or a collision of some kind—a fusion plant would be thousands of times safer than an atomic power plant.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS TO HELP SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1971, I introduced House Resolution 140, to establish a Joint Committee of Congress on Senior Citizens. This legislation has already begun to receive strong nationwide support because it is a sign of new hope for the over 20 million senior citizens in this country who feel that they have become "forgotten Americans."

The committee would unify the fragmented jurisdiction of the three House committees which now have jurisdiction over legislation which deals with senior citizens. Namely it would replace the work now done by the Education and Labor Committee, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee, and coordinate it in the new joint committee. At the same time it would incorporate the presently existing Senate Select Committee on Senior Citizens which has done such excellent work in the past few years. This marriage of the efforts of both Houses in this new committee would result in quicker more efficient action on proposals, better planning, and would mean that finally our senior citizens will be able to register their complaints and needs in a single place. Since the new joint committee which I propose would have legislative authority, it would have power to actually introduce legislation which it recommends instead of just making recommendations as the Senate select committee does presently. It would be a potent force in helping to act on the many pressing demands which face the senior citizens of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the senior citizens in America truly have been treated as "forgotten Americans." These people who labored so long to make this country great, have serious problems in the areas of income maintenance, housing, transportation, educational services, leisure time programs, nursing home, and general health care just to name a few. These problems must be solved with comprehensive solutions, and this type of solution can only be arrived at by congressional machinery which has broad jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, there will be over 25 million senior citizens in this country by 1985, and it will not be too long before the United States, which prides itself on its youth will have a larger senior citizen population. Now is the time to take action to commit ourselves to the senior citizens of the present and the future. We must provide these citizens not only with promises for a future, but also with concrete plans. I believe my proposals for a joint committee could go a long way to help coordinate and enact plans for the future of our senior citizens.

SIERRA CLUB AGAINST WALTER J. HICKEL

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the RECORD an excellent brief for and on behalf of the Wilderness Society, Izaak Walton League of America, and Friends of the Earth as amici curiae in the matter of Sierra Club, petitioner, against Walter J. Hickel, et al., respondents, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1970, No. 939, filed by Mr. Bruce J. Terris and Mr. James W. Moorman.

The resolution of the important questions raised in this matter will determine whether or not citizens will be able, in the future, to have litigation of important questions and important environmental values and protection of citizens' rights in matters of this kind.

The brief is as follows:

[In the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1970—No. 939]

SIERRA CLUB, PETITIONER, v. WALTER J. HICKEL, ET AL., RESPONDENTS

(On petition for a writ of certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit—Brief for the Wilderness Society, Izaak Walton League of America and Friends of the Earth, as Amici Curiae)

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Pet. App. A, pp. 1–28) and the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Pet. App. B, pp. 29–42) are not reported.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on September 16, 1970, and the petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on November 5, 1970 The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether a national conservation organization has standing to sue to prevent permanent damage to Sequoia National Game Refuge, Sequoia National Forest and Sequoia National Park under statutes intended to protect these areas.

2. Whether defendants may allow the construction of a large resort and a connecting highway and electric transmission line in Sequoia National Game Refuge, Sequoia National Forest and Sequoia National Park even though such uses are inconsistent with the purposes for which Congress reserved these federal lands. More specifically, whether defendants may:

Circumvent the 80-acre limitation on long-term permits for national forests (16 U.S.C. 497) by issuing supplemental permits for 13,000 acres which are not revokable either in fact or law;

Ignore a statute (16 U.S.C. 688) requiring that all use of Sequoia National Game Refuge be consistent with the purposes for which the refuge was established;

Authorize a major highway across Sequoia National Park for a non-park purpose despite requirements that the Park be conserved (16 U.S.C. 1, 43); and

Ignore a statute (16 U.S.C. 45(c)) requiring Congressional approval of any transmission line in Sequoia National Park.

INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE

All three amici curiae are major, national conservation organizations with deep and well-established interests in protecting America's great scenic resources. They are increasingly relying upon litigation as a principal means for carrying out their purposes.

The Wilderness Society is a nonprofit citizens' organization with approximately 80,000 members. It was organized in 1935 to obtain protection for the Nation's remaining wild lands, to carry on education programs concerning the wilderness, and to conserve our natural resources.

Friends of the Earth is a nonprofit organization with 8000 members and is dedicated to the preservation, restoration and rational use of the environment in the United States and throughout the world. It is particularly interested in preserving the world's natural ecosystems and remaining wild places.

The Izaak Walton League of America is a nonprofit organization with approximately 50,000 members. Its primary goal is restoring and maintaining the quality of the environment through the protection and wise use of our natural resources.

Both the petitioner and respondents have consented to the filing of this brief.

STATEMENT

The amici curiae adopt as their statement of the case the statement contained in the petition for a writ of certiorari.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

1. The Decision Below Is In Direct Conflict With Two Court of Appeals' Decisions on an Important Issue of Standing.

The Court of Appeals held that the plaintiff, the Sierra Club, did not have standing to sue pursuant to various federal statutes which restrict the authority of the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to permit use of national park, refuge, and forest land. The court recognized the standing of "local conservationist organizations made up of local residents and users of the area affected by the administrative action" (Pet. App. 17). The court distinguished the Sierra Club on the ground that "there is no allegation in the complaint that members of the Sierra Club would be affected by the actions of defendants-appellants other than the fact that the actions are personally displeasing or distasteful to them" (Pet. App. 16).

The holding of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit is in square conflict with decisions of two other circuits and several district courts. The court below specifically rejected (Pet. App. 17, note 9) the holding in *Citizens Committee for the Hudson Valley v. Volpe*, 425 F.2d 97 (C.A. 2, 1970), that the national conservation organizations, and specifically the Sierra Club, have standing.[1] In contrast to the Ninth Circuit's holding, the Second Circuit explicitly upheld the Sierra Club's standing on the ground that the Club (425 F.2d at 102): "made no claim that the proposed Expressway or the issuance of the dredge and fill permit threatened any direct personal or economic harm to them. Instead they asserted the interest of the public in the natural resources, scenic beauty and historical value of the area immediately threatened with drastic action, claiming that they were 'aggrieved' when the Corps acted adversely to the public interest. They are . . . serving as 'private Attorneys General' to protect the public interest."

Similarly, the decision below is in conflict with *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. Hardin*, 428 F. 2d 1093, 1097 (C.A. D.C., 1970), where the Court held that national conservation organizations had standing to attack the continued marketing of DDT:

"[T]he consumers' interest in environmental protection may properly be represented by a membership association with an organizational interest in the problem.

"On the basis of petitioners' uncontroverted allegations, it appears that they are organizations with a demonstrated interest in protecting the environment from pesticide pollution. Therefore they have the necessary stake in the outcome of a challenge to the Secretary's inaction to contest the adverseness required by Article III of the Constitution."

The national organizations whose standing was upheld included the Environmental Defense Fund, the Isaac Walton League, the National Audubon Society and the Sierra Club, the plaintiff in this case. Accord, *Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. v. HEW*, 428 F. 2d 1083, 1085, note 2 (C.A. D.C., 1970). And several district courts have also upheld the standing of national conservation organizations. *Isaac Walton League v. St. Clair*, D. Minn., Civ. No. 5–69, decided June 1, 1970 (standing upheld because "the League has a long history of activity in conservation matters and natural resource preservation"); *Parker v. Unted States*, D. Colo., Civ. No. C–1368, decided December 24, 1969 (upholding, *inter alia*, the standing of the Sierra Club); *Wilderness Society v. Hickel*, D. D.C., Civ. No. 928–70, decided April 23, 1970.

It is possible that the issue of standing in this case could be overcome if this Court remanded the case to the district court to allow plaintiff the opportunity to amend its complaint. The Sierra Club has a national membership of 78,000 of whom 27,000 reside in the San Francisco area. Some of its members probably use the Mineral King Valley and the portion of Sequoia National Park affected by the proposed development.

However, the holding of the court below is of fundamental importance for the protection of the environment—possibly for this case but certainly in other cases. Environment cases increasingly raise issues which do not involve, or only incidentally involve, direct users: The protection of wilderness areas, the preservation of wildlife refuges, the survival of rare and endangered species, the integrity of natural rivers, and the natural or scenic aspect of landscape. Those who bring the suits may incidentally be users in that they or their members have walked, watched and beheld the subject of the litigation. However, such use is often incidental to the larger purpose to protect the integrity of the environment.[2] And if the only persons with standing are users no one will have standing where there is no present use (such as a suit to preserve the wilderness) or no use is possible (such as a suit to prevent the chemical poisoning of eagles).

Even where there are users, they will frequently be unwilling to sue. Nearby resident-users of a wilderness area may desire development because of the economic benefits which will result. National conservation organizations may be the only parties who will represent the national, as opposed to local, interest by opposing development. This conflict between local and national interests is particularly obvious and significant with regard to national parks, refuges, and forests which must be preserved even if local residents desire to develop them.

Furthermore, as the statute creating the National Park Service makes clear, one of the purposes for which these lands are reserved is "to conserve the scenery and the national and historic objects and the wild life therein . . . ." 16 U.S.C. 1. It follows that conservationists, as well as users, must have standing to protect the national interest in preserving the national parks. Analogous reasoning applies to national refuges and forests. See 16 U.S.C. 476, 694.

The plaintiff—the Sierra Club—and the four amici curiae—the Wilderness Society, Friends of the Earth, the Isaac Walton League, and the Environmental Defense

[1] In its petition in this case the Sierra Club noted (p. 10) corrected the conflict between the decision of the court below and that of the Second Circuit in *Citizens Committee v. Volpe*. However, in its Brief in Opposition to Petitions for a Writ of Certiorari in *Citizens Committee v. Volpe*, Nos. 614 and 615, this Term, the Sierra Club said (p. 25) that the disagreement between circuits "is not material . . . to the Ninth Circuit's principal holding and constitutes no reason for review by this Court." In fact, the Ninth Circuit's decision is in direct conflict with one of the holdings by the Second Circuit—i.e., that national conservation organizations have standing to protect the environment—and therefore fully justifies review by this Court of the Ninth Circuit case. But since both the Second and Ninth Circuits agree that some of the plaintiffs in the Second Circuit case, the local conservation organizations, have standing, there is no basis for this Court to review the Second Circuit case on the issue of standing. For even if the Ninth Circuit is correct and national conservation organizations do not have standing, this will affect only one holding, not the decision, of the Second Circuit.

[2] Two important examples other than the instant case are *Wilderness Society v. Hickel, supra* (the Alaska Pipeline case) and *West Virginia Highlands Conservancy v. Island Creek Coal Co.*, D.W. Va., Civ. No. 70–82–E (involving use of a possible wilderness area).

Fund [3]—all have as their principal interest the protection and conservation of the environment. While the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society and the Isaac Walton League are also interested in appropriate uses of natural areas consistent with conservation of the environment, this is not their principal interest. They should not be required to assert this subsidiary interest in order to obtain standing to prevent despoilment of the environment. The other two organizations do not represent users at all and cannot assert standing on that basis.

Finally, Congress, in enacting the National Environment Policy Act, has recognized the standing of national conservation organizations to protect the environment. That Act declares that it is federal policy to use "all practical means and measures" to protect the environment in cooperation with "concerned . . . private organizations." 42 U.S.C. 4331(a). Russell E. Train, the Chairman of the President's Council on Environmental Quality, which was created by the Act, has stated that (BNA Environment Reporter, 1970, p. 745):

"Private litigation before courts and administrative agencies has been and will continue to be an important environmental protection technique supplementing and reenforcing government environmental protection programs."

The Council has itself specifically noted with approval the decisions in *Wilderness Society v. Hickel, supra,* and *Citizens Committee for the Hudson Valley v. Volpe, supra,* upholding the standing of national conservation organizations. BNA Environment Reporter, 1970, p. 746.

2. The Decision of the Court Below Allowing Use of Federal Parks, Forests and Refuge Lands for Uses Inconsistent with the Purposes for Which Congress Reserved Them Raises Issues of Major National Importance.

The issues raised by this case on the merits involve actions by the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture in permitting use of Sequoia National Refuge, Forest, and Park inconsistent with their purposes as specified by Congress.

Congress has provided that the Department of Interior shall regulate national parks to conform to the fundamental purpose . . . which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 16 U.S.C. 1. Congress has provided specifically with respect to Sequoia National Park that the Secretary of the Interior has the duty to establish regulations "for the preservation from injury of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition." 16 U.S.C. 43, Sequoia National Game Refugee was established "to protect from trespass the public lands of the United States and the game animals which may be thereon" and permitted the Secretary of Agriculture only to allow uses within the Game Refuge which "may be consistent with the purpose for which said game refuge is established." 16 U.S.C. 688.

The court below has in effect ignored the well established rule that Congress has plenary power under the Constitution concerning federal lands (Article IV, § 3, cl. 2) and that defendants have only the powers given them by Congress. *United States v. California,* 332 U.S. 19, 27; *Udall v. Shale Oil Corp.,* 406 F.2d 759, 764 (C.A. 10, 1969). The defendants have allowed major, permanent uses—a large resort, highway, and electric transmission line—to be built in a national park, refuge, and forest in conflict with both the purposes for which they have been reserved by Congress and specific statutory limitations.

a. First, Congress has authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to grant permits for constructing hotel or resorts in national forests only for 80 acres and for 30 years. 16 U.S.C. 497. Nevertheless, the Secretary has given a permit for 13,000 acres for the construction of ski lifts, sewage treatment facilities and parking structures as part of the development of a large resort. The court of appeals justifies this permit on the ground that the Secretary has traditionally exercised the broad power to issue revocable permits.

It is clear, however, that the admitted power of the executive to issue revocable permits cannot be allowed to circumvent Congressional limitations on the use of land in federal forests. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot be permitted to issue what are in fact long-term permits for extensive acreage in the guise that they are revocable. If the Secretary is allowed to issue such permits, the 80-acre limitation imposed by Congress will become virtually meaningless.

The revocable permit involved here is not truly revocable.[4] The ski lifts, sewage treatment plants, and parking facilities cannot be removed and the use of bulldozers to create ski slopes will permanently damage the area. Plainly the permit is not revocable before the termination of the 30-year-permit since the developer is making a 35 million dollar investment contingent on the use of 13,000 not 80 acres.[5]

b. Congress has provided that the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to permit other uses of lands in the Sequoia National Game Refuge only "so far as they may be consistent with the purposes for which said game refuge is established." 16 U.S.C. 688. The refuge was established to protect scenically outstanding public lands and game animals and their habitat. *Ibid.* Personnel of the California Fish and Game Commission stated "that in an extensive development such as the Disney proposal, considerable wildlife habitat would be lost and wildlife would suffer" (R. 119). And the Secretary of Agriculture has neither made a finding nor could he make a finding that a large ski resort was compatible with the purpose of the refuge.

c. Defendants propose to allow the State of California to build a modern highway through Sequoia National Park purely to give access to the resort in Mineral King. This is a new modern highway which will have a different alignment than the present inadequate mountain road and will cause extensive damage to the scenery and ecology of the park, including the Giant Sequoias, the great trees for which the park is named.

The Secretary of Interior has no authority to use land in a national park for a non-park purpose—to build a road to give access to a private resort outside the park. Such use is inconsistent with the responsibilities placed on the Secretary by Congress, both as to national parks generally and Sequoia in particular, to allow uses which preserve the scenery, the trees, the wildlife and the natural wonders.

d. Congress has provided that no permit for "transmission lines" will be issued in Sequoia National Park. 16 U.S.C. 45c. Without explanation, the court below held that this section was intended to apply only to hydroelectric projects and related facilities (Pet. App. 25). This decision is directly inconsistent with the plain words of the statute.

Two of these issues, those relating to revocable permits in national forests and the construction of highway across national parks for non-park purposes, are of major importance in their own right since they apply to national forests and parks throughout the country. Indeed, as the court below noted (Pet. App. 22), so-called revocable permits seem to be frequently employed to avoid the 80-acre limitation on the use of national forest land. While the other two issues involve statutes applying specifically to Sequoia National Game Refuse and Park, they too have broader significance. All four issues warrant review by this Court due to the importance of preserving national park, refuge, and forest lands for the Congressionally specified purposes for which they were created.

3. The Preservation of Sequoia National Refuge, Forest and Park Is of Such Importance as to Justify Review by this Court.

This case involves the actions of defendants in allowing Walt Disney Productions to build a large resort in Mineral King Valley and allow construction of a highway and electric transmission line through Sequoia National Park. The Valley is in the Sierra Nevada Mountains of California and is surrounded on three sides by the National Park. While geographically and ecologically the Valley is part of the Park, Congress did not include the Valley in the Park because of the existence of mining claims. Congress did recognize its importance to the Park, however, by designating the Valley, which is part of Sequoia National Forest, as constituting, in addition, the Sequoia National Game Refuge, 16 U.S.C. 688.

If defendants and the developer are allowed to proceed, magnificent natural and scenic resources of this country will be irrevocably lost. Hotels, restaurants, parking, ski lifts, ski slopes and other recreational facilities will be spread over 13,000 acres of the Valley and nearby mountains. As many as 14,000 visitors will use the Valley daily, twice as many as now use Yosemite Valley on busy days. A major highway and transmission line will be cut across Sequoia National Park to Mineral King.

This Nation in the last few years has become increasingly concerned with the serious environmental dangers facing us, including the need to preserve the scenic and wildlife resources which are still left. Congress has recognized these dangers in several major pieces of legislation and particularly the National Environmental Policy Act. That Act, *inter alia,* places on the Federal Government the responsibility to "preserve important . . . natural aspects of our national heritage." 42 U.S.C. 4331(b)(4).

We submit that the proposed destruction of significant portions of the Sequoia National Game Refuge, Forest and Park is of such importance as itself to justify this Court in granting the writ of certiorari. Even if the decision below were not in conflict with holdings of other federal courts of appeals and raised no major issues of continuing importance in future environmental litigation, the

[3] The Environmental Defense Fund has filed a separate brief supporting the petition for a writ of certiorari.

[4] An opinion of the Attorney General in 1962 recognizes the difference between revocable and term permits by stating that a revocable permit is valid only if (1) the permit is expressly revocable at will; (2) the permitted structures are capable of being removed in case of revocation; (3) the permitted use will not permanently damage or destroy the land; and (4) the permitted use will be of direct benefit to the United States. 35 Op. Atty. Gen. 485. Similarly, Attorney General Stone concluded that a revocable patent license is only valid if "the occupancy is subject in theory and in fact to immediate termination at any time at the will of the Government." 34 Op. Atty. Gen. 320, 328.

[5] The Court below implicitly admitted both that the permit is not truly terminable "at will" and that the improvements cannot be removed by holding that a revocable permit can be issued regardless (Pet. App. 21).

subject matter of this case requires review by this Court.[6]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

BRUCE J. TERRIS,
JAMES W. MOORMAN,
Attorneys for the Amici Curiae.

NOVEMBER, 1970.

[6] While the opinion of the court of appeals is not entirely clear, it appears that the district court on remand will be obliged to dismiss the complaint because, in the view of the court below, the plaintiff both lacked standing and failed to state a cause of action. However, even if plaintiff is permitted to amend the complaint to improve its position with regard to standing (by alleging and showing that it has members who use the Sequoia National Refuge, Forest and Park) and to offer further evidence on the substantive issues, the court of appeals did deny the preliminary injunction. If plaintiff is allowed to continue the litigation, irreparable damage will still occur as the developer starts work in the Valley to build the resort and the State of California begins to construct the highway across Sequoia National Park. It is therefore essential for this Court, in order to prevent this damage, to grant the writ and either (a) hear the cause on the merits or (b) continue the present injunction until plaintiff has had the opportunity to amend its complaint in the district court and has received a full hearing on its prayer for a permanent injunction.

EYEWITNESSES ACCOUNT OF CHILDREN'S SHOW AT MUSEUM

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and appaled by the article which recently appeared in the Baltimore News American. I would like to share it with my colleagues and urge them to make known to those who devised such a shameful program that the Congress of the United States will not support such activities with taxpapers' money.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the story at this point:

[Baltimore News American, Jan. 24, 1971]

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT OF CHILDREN'S SHOW AT MUSEUM

(By Corinne F. Hammett)

This was the lure: "An experience—new, exciting, and memorable—is in store for the children when Living Stage 71 comes to the Baltimore Museum of Art."

This was the warning: "Absolutely no adults or parents will be admitted."

But there was an exception.

A prior arrangement was made with the museum and two adults were admitted—a News American photographer who remained for part of the performance, and this reporter, who stayed until the end.

And this is what we witnessed.

It was about 20 minutes prior to the 11 a.m. performance.

Children and their parents were arriving in large numbers—they were being registered, their hands were stamped and they waited in the corridor. A member of the museum's Woman's Committee for the Performing Arts for Children, whose group had arranged the day, said, "We hope this will be a very free, full and lively experience . . . it should be a good way for children to express themselves."

A few parents were reluctant to leave their children—one young mother commented, "I wish we had a one-way mirror so we could at least see them."

A museum memo had indicated the performances would be for children aged 8 to 12.

No one made any attempt to enforce this directive. As a result, at least one-quarter of the 150 at the morning performance appeared to be under 8 years old.

As the children were directed to enter a small anteroom, which opened onto a larger room, Vernon Price, the photographer and I made our way, quickly through an adjacent gallery to a doorway that opened into the large room where the performance was to take place.

The doorway was just slightly in back of the portion of the large room that the actors were to use as their imaginary stage.

Heavy, free-standing wooden partitions were placed in back of the large room to shut off the view of anyone who may have gained entrance into the anteroom, although that small room also had a wooden barricade blocking the doorway from the corridor. Several museum guards were stationed outside.

The doorway where I stood also had a wooden barricade—which I later moved ajar to get a better view of the proceedings.

The stage area was almost bare. There was a small electric piano, bongo drums and tambourines. A tall hat rack with hats, scarves and a raincoat stood in back—and there were a couple of wooden stands to serve as tables or chairs or desks.

Slowly, rhythmically, the music, with an exotic, African beat—began. The music grew louder, faster and children reacted—some danced, some just swayed, clapped their hands—it was a promising beginning.

The Living Stage 71 troupe was composed of two young women, one of whom served as actress-master of ceremonies-and narrator, two men and a third woman who played the piano but took no part in the skits. All were black.

"O.K. . . . this performance is for you. We're doing our thing, you tell us!

"Let's loosen up (the music continued), shake your arm, now your other arm, shake your feet, your leg, now shake all over. Shake your tongue. Shake your nose. Make a loud noise . . . louder, let's pretend the world is gone away and this is the world!"

The kids loved it.

The music stopped. The music was not heard again until the last few minutes of the two hour performance.

"We can do anything we want to do. Let's make a statue. This museum is filled with art but we're going to do the kind of art today that they probably never heard of and that is much better."

She continued:

"What do you want to make a statue about? What do you most hate? One voice (I couldn't see the entire group of children from the side doorway) said something . . . then a little boy shouted, "War!"

"That's beautiful," she said. We'll do one about war, about peace."

The children, those in the front three rows, were told to "attach" to each other one at a time, in the center of the room, and "freeze."

Within minutes about 35 children were "the statue." The other children were directed" to circle around. "Is he dead?" "Let's see . . . is he a soldier . . . would you stab him? Some children later told their parents that they "got to stab someone in the war."

The statue broke up.

By now many of the younger children were restless. Some even left the large room but since their parents had been instructed to stay away for two hours the children came back into the room.

What had they learned about war? About peace? My daughter, age 7, later said "I don't know . . . we got to attach to somebody."

The actors sensed some restlessness—they urged the audience to shout, to make noises. The two men began making grotesque faces and noises, running into the group of children, like a berserk monster. One of the females got on her knees, her tongue lolled out, she made noises, a little girl faced her, they stared and gurgled at each other. Mr. Price later commented, "They seemed in a trance, like they were really going to take each other on . . . I wondered if some of the kids might have nightmares about it."

The noises stopped.

Two of the troupe, a male and female, came to center of the stage area. The man sat, legs full length, on the floor, the female leaned over, grasped his hands and they moved back and forth—the movement was slightly stylized but from the snickers among the older members of the audience it was obvious they got the point . . .the action would have been more appropriate on a bed.

"This," said the woman, "is a machine. What kind of a machine do you think it is? It could be any kind of a machine."

The two continued to move. That "machine" broke up. Similar poses were assumed throughout the performance.

A couple of the actors rolled on the floor.

The children, two-by-two, a boy and a girl, were told to get on the floor (not all of them did). The girls laid down first, the boys were told to bend and to grasp hands, and move back until their heads were above the girl's thighs . . . "O.K. freeze! Now if you should suddenly wake up like this what would you be doing?" Some snickers, some laughter, answers weren't audible to me. Some of the children just fell on top of each other—not being able to manage the "machine" pose, if that's what it was.

More "machine" poses. The troupe then told the children to lay down and pretend "you have two holes in your body. What noises would you make? Make noises." Some of them did.

A brief skit. The actors pretended to be children . . . of uncertain age. They found some "guns" in a junkyard. The guns were "old" and they had been thrown away. "What would you do with them?" Some of the children pretended to find guns and play with them.

Another skit. One of the men, again pretending to be a child, wanted a "new suit to take my girl to the dance." His mother and father talked . . . he couldn't have the suit. The skit droned on and on—it was obviously improvised, but less than creative.

The "father" told the "boy" he couldn't have the suit. A violent temper tantrum was the result . . . a lot of shouting back and forth. Finally, the "boy" stalked out, with a knowing glance, "O.K. don't need the suit, I'll wear rags . . . my girl and me, we'll do something else, don't need a new suit."

The object lesson? Fantasy? Dramatic?

My daughter didn't mention this skit at all. She did talk about "finding a gun in the street." I asked, was it loaded?

"Oh, mommy! It was old . . . somebody threw it away."

Prior to the next skit the troupe turned to the "machine" poses again . . . more laying on the floor. Some of the little children thought this was very funny.

Not too many children answered the question, "What kind of machine is this A popcorn machine?"

Mr. Price, on the other side of the room saw several of the older girls (there were about six teenaged girls together) "appear to be very interested in the machine poses"

especially the male-female ones . . . one of the teenagers later did a go-go dance during a machine pose. I couldn't see this either.

Another skit. This one was about school. One of the females pretended to be a child who hadn't done her homework, the indication was that she didn't want to do it. She was afraid to tell her teacher, because she would "yell and punish" her. The teacher did find out . . . and there was a lot of screaming . . . the "girl stormed out saying "God damn!" several times.

The actors stopped . . . the narrator stepped out of the scene and turned to the children:

"Listen, it is all right to say God damn if you want to. You shouldn't be afraid to say anything that you feel like saying. Go ahead. Let's say it . . . God damn." Some of the children said it. But not too many. "If you want to say something else, that's all right too . . . but don't let anyone tell you that you can't say something."

The skit resumed, briefly. The "girl" not only got away with not doing her homework . . . she also didn't bother to go back to class.

Parents later told the newspaper that in the afternoon performance this school skit featured the beating up of a teacher by a parent as the child looked on. The principal said it was all right.

Another skit . . . at "home" two members of the troupe were again "children" ordered to clean up their rooms. They refused. A lot of yelling between the "parent" and the "children." The scene ended. One of the actors stepped out of character and told the children:

"If your parents treat you like a rat, then you treat them like a rat, let them know how it feels to be treated like a rat. You're a person, you have your rights."

A little girl, about 9, raised her hand and repeated this philosophy, almost word for word. The narrator said, "right, that's it."

Throughout the two hours I periodically watched the faces of the children in the audience. Once in awhile I would walk back to the anteroom and peer in that way to see what the children in the back rows were doing.

I saw a lot of boredom, mostly among the very young children.

Many appeared confused but interested, a lot of the 6, 7 and 8-year-olds stared, open-mouthed. Some wandered about and talked among themselves. The older ones apparently got some of the sexual references and anti-authority suggestions; they grinned at each other, snickered or just looked at each other. One boy, the tallest in the audience, about 15, looked like he'd rather have been somewhere else. But because of the wooden barricades—all were captive. And, after all, didn't their own parents bring them?

Another skit. This was quite long, less inventive than a child's own imagination (as were all the skits), repetitive, spiced with suggestive gestures and glances between several members of the troupe and laced with sexual innuendoes.

The language, imaginary scene and general manner of the actors in all the skits had a closer affinity to back alleys and severely deprived areas. Certainly not culture—but in the interest of race relations? Education?

The skit droned on. The scene, in a "home" where a "brother" was picking on his "sister." The girl in the skit was either supposed to be mentally retarded or she was just a poor actress . . . she also appeared to be more on the make than one would expect between a "brother" and "sister."

There was talk about "cleaning up my half . . . all of it . . . then yours too. Will you play with me (this was accompanied with a sly smile and with the "sister" standing quite close to the "brother" as she stood, hands behind her back, nuzzling her head under his chin).

The "brother" went outside to play ball with another "boy."

Meanwhile the other female rolled around on the floor pretending to be "a doll." A couple of the boys rolled around on the floor with her . . . punched her, poked her stomach a few times. The audience thought this was funny.

There was a lot of conversation about "do you want to play with my dolly?" the "sister" would ask the "brother" or the other "boy." "You can't play with my dolly." Then the "doll" got up and took off after the "brother" and proceeded to kick him several times—apparently avenging his treatment of his "sister."

This skit ended with the "sister" again going up to the "brother" and slyly asking "will you play with me?" as she leaned against his chest.

Each of the skits was preceded by several "loosening up" poses, more "machine" positions and the like. Some of these gestures were beyond my vision.

Prior to the final skit the narrator turned to the audience: "We're going to improve this play, about parents and children at home . . . you know what improvise means? It means we're going to make it up as we go along, so if there's something you don't like. If you want us to do it another way, just shout. Bullshit! And we'll freeze and do it another way. Remember, Bullshit!"

I didn't hear anyone in the audience say this at this time.

But later, when I had a little talk with my daughter, saying that she knows she's not really supposed to talk like that, she said:

"Why not? They were children and they said it."

I explained they were adults pretending to be children.

"When I grow up can I?" she asked. After we had talked a little more, she said: "Well, I guess they shouldn't have done a lot of those things, I don't know why they did it. They yelled a lot . . . some of the things I didn't understand." Did you like it? "Well, oh, mommy, of course . . . I guess."

The skit went on. Two girls from the audience took part. It was about the children wanting to go to a movie on a school night and the parents didn't want them to go. Again, there was a lot of yelling. One of the actors yelled the expletive and the scene froze. The skit ended with the children going to the movie anyway.

The performance ended as it had begun, with music, and the audience filed out.

Just before the last skit, several parents began to gather around the barricades at the rear of the room. One of the actors told the children the parents were there and said: "Tell them to go away . . . we're going to say some things we don't want them to hear. "Go away!" A group of the children shouted, "Go away!" They went.

Later I spoke to several members of the museum's Women's Committee. Their children, like my daughter, had been reluctant to say much about the performance.

No one on the committee had seen a performance by Living Stage 71 prior to the museum show. But said one woman, "We investigated it thoroughly, we talked to some people and we relied on the reputation of Arena Stage."

An official of the museum later told a reporter that he had checked out the Living Stage 71 children's show with a "Washington, D.C. school principal." The principal turned out to be Robert Alexander, director of Living Stage 71, and principal of a freedom school that presently enrolls 17 children, aged 6 to 8.

Alexander was not in Baltimore on Saturday.

I failed, after repeated attempts, to talk to him on the telephone. But I was able to talk to Alan Miller, a public information official with Arena Stage.

He said: "They are part and parcel of Arena Stage, although the troupe is a separate organization . . . they perform six days a week in schools, community centers, anywhere that someone wants them.

"No adults, including teachers, are ever allowed to watch. I have seen a few performances, but I had to pretend I was a member of the troupe . . . no, I have never seen one for the younger children."

The troupe also performs for children over 12.

These, said Miller, ask for skits on "drugs, sex and parent-children relationships."

What about profanity, specifically "bullshit?"

"This doesn't surprise me. I've heard them use similar language. Personally, I think it's a little abrasive but their point is to shock. To prove to the kids that they aren't just saying do your own thing, but that they mean it. The shock value proves to the children that they can interrupt, rudely, and proves that anything goes.

"I don't think this does any long range harm, or any short range harm either."

Asked about violence, stabbing, beating up a teacher, and dropping bullets on people (in the second performance), he said: "I haven't seen those skits but I have seen them do a scene where a dope addict was beaten up. This is stylized violence, almost like a dance.

"People who criticize this don't know the real nature of drama, the real meaning of drama. We must do a certain kind of thing to get the kids, who wouldn't normally be interested in drama, to pay attention . . . we're trying to do away with the old."

Children not interested in good drama? Not true. Our daughter, at 6, attended a performance of "The Merry Wives of Windsor," at Stafford. It was her first play. She was enthralled. She laughed, appropriate times and clapped so hard that several adults turned and smiled at her.

Miller revealed that Living Stage 71, now in its third year has performed in public schools in Maryland and Washington. "No teachers were allowed to watch. Although they have also given workshops for teachers, in the techniques of improvisation."

He also said that while the troupe performs "free for inner city groups," that the Art Museum did pay ($600 seems to be the figure). Miller stated that the budget for Living Stage 71, from Oct. 19 "when they began to rehearse" through March is $50,000. "Half of that is from the National Endowment for the Performing Arts."

Miller said also: "We get many comments from kids on how much they like it . . . One boy said, 'It made school seem a little less unbearable that day.' Yes, we do get complaints from some adults. But frankly we'd think we were doing something wrong if people didn't call up and complain."

An art museum official, who, unlike Miller, was mocking and rude, said "You think that's news? People complaining . . . don't tell me about that."

News, no. Bad acting isn't news. Neither is "bullshit" news—but $50,000 worth?

SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, 1971, the CBS television network broadcast a most enlightening documentary concerning the "public affairs and public information" activities of the

military. I have been concerned for some time about the level of expenditure and activity by the military in this area, and I have proposed amendments to the military appropriations bills in the House to strictly limit expenditures for this purpose. For fiscal year 1971, those expenditures were limited to $28,000,000 by action of the Congress, having risen from an estimated $9,108,000 in 1968 to $44,062,000 in 1969.

In my judgment, even $28,000,000 is excessive spending for military information, and that amount is very likely only a fraction of actual expenditures. But more important even than the expenditures is the type of information disseminated in these programs. As the CBS documentary clearly demonstrates, much of it borders on pure military propaganda.

Mr. Speaker, the transcript of the CBS documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," written and produced by Peter Davis, with Roger Mudd reporting, follows:

THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

ROGER MUDD. Last spring American soldiers fought a two-day battle that did not get into the newspapers or onto the television news broadcasts. Very few people even knew about it. The battle was fought neither in Vietnam, nor in Cambodia, nor anywhere else in Southeast Asia. All the action took place in North Carolina. This was a military exercise, but it was also an exercise in salesmanship—the selling of the Pentagon.

SPEAKER FOR MARINE CORPS. Gentlemen, today we have shown you the individual Marine, the who implements foreign policy. He comes from all walks of life, all over the U.S.A. He's not much different from the young men we see on the street corners of America today, except he's been trained as a Marine.

He believes in what he is doing, and he's dedicated to his country and to the job at hand, whatever it may be. In short, we could say he has a lot of plain, old red-blooded American guts. Now this concludes our demonstration at this range. The escorts will now show you to your buses. Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCER: CBS REPORTS. "The Selling of the Pentagon," with CBS News Correspondent Roger Mudd.

(Announcement.)

ANNOUNCER. Here now is CBS News Correspondent Roger Mudd.

MUDD. Nothing is more essential to a democracy than the free flow of information. Misinformation, distortion, propaganda all interrupt that flow. They make it impossible for people to know what their government is doing, which, in a democracy, is crucial. The largest agency in our government is the Department of Defense, and it maintains a public relations division to inform people of its activities. In December, Congress cut the appropriations for this division, but, according to the Pentagon, it will still spend $30 million this year on public affairs, an amount more than 10 times greater than what it spent to tell people about itself just 12 years ago. Even this figure may be only the tip of the public relations iceberg. A special, still unpublished report for the prestigious 20th Century Fund estimates the real total at $190 million. The combined news budgets of the three commercial television networks—ABC, CBS and NBC—are $146 million.

Whatever the true cost at the Pentagon, there have been recent charges in the press and in Congress that the Department is using these public relations funds not merely to inform but to convince and persuade the public on vital issues of war and peace. Ten months ago, CBS News set out to investigate these charges and to examine the range and variety of the Pentagon's public affairs activities. We selected three areas for concentration: direct contacts with the public, Defense Department films, and the Pentagon's use of the media—the press and television. We sought no secret files, no politicians pleading special causes, no access to classified documents. We looked only at what is being done for the public—in public.

We began at an obvious location, Armed Forces Day on a military base. Fort Jackson, South Carolina is proud of its soldiers, and once a year the public is invited, to come out and take a look at them. At dozens of other bases, dozens of other audiences see the same show. The major event is a firepower display. But in the interests of information, they not only shoot, they also instruct.

INSTRUCTOR. The killing zone is 50 metres deep, 50 metres wide, and two metres high. However, its fragments are also effective against light-skinned vehicles.

MUDD. The weapons officer on this range claimed that the information display cost two million dollars. Later, Army public relations officials put the expense at $22,000.

The last part is known as the "mad minute." It would be hard to argue with that description.

When the demonstration itself is over, another activity begins. The ammunition is gone but the weapons are not. Some of these are turned over to children so they can get the heft and feel of the genuine article.

FIRST CHILD. All right, Jack, here's a cool tank, man.

SECOND CHILD. I'm going over to the other tank.

THIRD CHILD. Get off . . .

FIRST CHILD. What are you doing?

THIRD CHILD. I'm going to shoot you.

SECOND CHILD. Ready . . . aim . . . fire!

Colonel MACNEILL. In the Chinese view only one country has been liberated from colonialism, and that is North Vietnam. The others will not be considered liberated, in the Chinese viewpoint, until each and every one nas a Communist government.

MUDD. The Pentagon has a team of Colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy. We found them in Peoria, Illinois, where they were invited to speak to a mixed audience of civilians and military reservists. The invitation was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Company, which did $39 million of business last year with the Defense Department. The Army has a regulation stating: "Personnel should not speak on the foreign policy implications of U.S. involvement in Vietnam."

Colonel MACNEILL. Well, now we're coming to the heart of the problem—Vietnam. Now the Chinese have clearly and repeatedly stated that Thailand is next on their list after Vietnam. If South Vietnam becomes Communist it will be difficult for Laos to exist. The same goes for Cambodia, and the other countries of Southeast Asia. I think if the Communists were to win in South Vietnam, the record in the North—What happened in Tet of '68—makes it clear there would be a bloodbath in store for a lot of the population of the South. The United States is still going to remain an Asian power.

MUDD. Over the years, the Colonels have travelled—at taxpayers' expense—to 163 cities and spoken to 180,000 people. In a question and answer period, they promote American presence in Southeast Asia.

Colonel SERRELL. The bloodbath, the indications at Hue during the Tet offensive as to what might be in store for people who would otherwise have some semblance of freedom or individuality, if we did stay and protect their interests as well, admittedly, as our own.

Colonel BIRD. I personally believe by and large the college students are very sincere in their belief. I think a lot of them haven't attempted to study, to some degree, the history of other things like this . . . .

Colonel MACNEILL. Some say there are no interests at stake today, some say we had none in the beginning. I feel when we put half a million men in there, at least we placed national interest at stake when we did that.

FIRST CHILD. I want to play this one.

SECOND CHILD. Now it's my turn.

FIRST CHILD. Bob, let's see if you can do this.

THIRD CHILD. Let Danny do it.

FATHER. How many mistakes you gonna make?

MUDD. At a St. Paul, Minnesota shopping mall, an Army display emphasizes power, a recurrent theme in Defense Department public relations programs. (MUSIC) The Army Exhibit Unit has been to 239 cities in 46 states and has been seen by over 20 million people. The cost to taxpayers: $906,000 a year.

NARRATOR FOR ARMY FILM. The four M's—Mission, Motivation, Modernization and Management—summarize Army Chief of Staff General William C. Westmoreland's program for the future of the Army.

MUDD. The Army says it won't send these exhibits out unless requested by local civilians. The manager of this shopping mall told us how the Army's exhibit happened to be there.

Mr. PETERS. We were approached by Sergeant Kerr, who is the local recruiting sergeant in this area, a matter of three weeks ago, and he simply asked us would we care to have the exhibit here on our mall. We said yes. So, it's here.

ANNOUNCER FOR AIR FORCE. Approaching next will be Major Mike Kirby and his next maneuver, the exciting Wing Walk and Roll.

MUDD. The Air Force Thunderbirds flew 108 exhibitions last year in front of six million people. We were told that the Thunderbirds are supposed to attract volunteers, but what we found was a very elaborate commercial for air power.

ANNOUNCER FOR AIR FORCE. The Air Force has proved again and again its superiority against the enemy in the air war over North Vietnam. In an environment where the majority of our fighter pilots were flying tactical bombing missions and not primarily hunting for enemy aircraft, the enemy still lost three aircraft for every one of ours in air-to-air combat.

Gen. LEWIS WALT. We fought them up on the DMZ, we fought them across the Lao border, we fought them down south across the Cambodian border. But they're trying to keep the war going on—why? Because they think that we're going to give up and pull out before the job is done. That's what they've been told, that's what they read in our newspapers and our magazines.

MUDD. Tonight, like any other evening, there are between six and ten Pentagon speakers appearing in public. With military transportation at their disposal, they traverse the country shaping the views of their audiences. For years, General Lewis Walt has been the Marine speaker most in demand.

General WALT. This is what's kept the war going on. If we could have had the entire American nation in back of us, all of our Americans in back of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, this war would have been over a year and a half ago.

GREEN BERET ANNOUNCER. Please pay particular attention to the hands, the elbows, the knees, and the toe of the boot, which

are used to deliver killing blows to the vulnerable portions of the body.

MUDD. When it comes to sheer muscle, the legendary Green Berets are the Army's glamor exhibit. In 21 states last year, the Berets showed how people kill people sometimes. On one occasion, they showed about a thousand kids in New Jersey. When the Berets finished their act, the audience had its own turn.

CHILD. C'mon . . . no! Damn you . . . ow! (Crying.)

MUDD. Each year, the Pentagon runs special guided tours for over 3,000 influential civilians. The Joint Civilian Orientation Conference is the aristocrat of these tours, indeed of all Defense Department contacts with the public. For eight days 64 prominent citizens visit key military installations all over the country. To give the community leaders more sense of participation, the Defense Department outfits them in different colors that represent each of the Armed Services. Included in this exclusive party are industrialists, bankers, college administrators, newspaper publishers and broadcasting executives. High ranking generals accompanied the civilians. These two, three and four-star chaperons were available for briefing, picture-taking, and just mingling.

CBS News followed the distinguished visitors on a weekend war game in North Carolina. The purpose of these tours, according to the Pentagon, is to teach military realities. The guests are referred to as "major taxpayers." As their education proceeded, we recorded some of the military realities and part of their impact on the civilians.

The Army gave a demonstration of a massive troop airlift. An air and land assault on enemy territory was simulated for the visitors. The idea here was to show that thousands of troops can be transported thousands of miles in just a few hours. What's more, when they get where they're going, they are ready to fight.

JITTERBUG ANNOUNCER. Notice the jitterbugging action as the Cayuse make a thorough search of suspected enemy locations. Such tactics were battle-tested in Vietnam.

KENNEDY WAGON ANNOUNCER. To achieve success in combat, an infantry battalion depends upon the fighting strength of its rifle companies. The company is composed of three rifle platoons and a weapons platoon.

MUDD. The 64 civilians themselves paid part of their own costs and the official total price of this tour is only $12,000. Twelve thousand dollars, however, does not include the amount spent on elaborate briefings, the war game itself, nor the expenses of several thousand servicemen who performed for the civilians along the way.

KENNEDY WAGON ANNOUNCER. 711 tons of ammunition and 308 tons of fuel.

Dr. RICHARD CHAMBERLAIN. I for one am very grateful for this privilege of seeing how the defense of the country is being organized.

DAVID CONNOR. I found it enjoyable to talk to the enlisted ranks who are handling the weapons as we got in the tanks. I think there's been a subtle, necessary and important emphasis on talking to the manpower.

OFFICER. Of course it could carry rockets, it could substitute a rocket part for an arm. It has tremendous flexibility.

CIVILIAN. A lot of killpower though.

OFICER. Oh, yes, yes.

MUDD. Civilians were shown some of the more advanced equipment and training methods. Among the ordnance the Marines displayed were their planes, their weapons, their tanks and, of course, their Commandant, General Leonard Chapman.

OFFICER. Excuse me, General Chapman, this is Mr. Hoover.

General CHAPMAN. How are you sir, nice to see you.

CIVILIANS IN BOAT. Oh, we can use a kyack . . . That's right . . . Bob, you're getting a little too enthusiastic . . . Oh, boy, we're really making time now.

ROBERT GREENHILL. I think the message I would take back is that we have a first-class military organization led by first-class leaders and the people who carry the load on the enlisted men are some of the finest people that I've been privileged to see. I'm in the investment banking business and I travel all over the United States and I know that for a fact.

WILLARD DOVER. I think the message is that you can be proud of your boys in service.

MUDD. The Defense Department did not permit CBS News to film what many regarded as the highlight of the tour. But the civilians were not shy in talking about it.

Mr. CONNOR. At Fort Hood we all were seated in the gunner's seat of the M-60 tanks, and we fired the rifles, and were told what excellent shots we were and we were taken over to the recoilless rifles and fired rounds at armored personnel carriers and again told how good shots we were, and we fired grenade launchers and drove tanks and so on . . .

Dr. CHAMBERLAIN. We fired tank cannon and recoilless rifles, machine guns . . .

Mr. CONNOR. My gun jammed while I was shooting it and I thought, Oh my God, what a great situation to be in were someone moving on me.

Dr. CHAMBERLAIN. It was fun to actually get your finger on the trigger of some of the things like the recoilless weapons that most of us have heard about but hadn't actually seen.

Mr. GREENHILL. There is no substitute for hands-on experience.

MUDD. The Defense Department says these demonstrations are merely training exercises for war. War, however, is not fought in front of a grandstand.

MARINE ANNOUNCER. Let me remind you that the speed and flexibility which you have seen today and the maneuverability and coordination of the supporting forces is not a demonstration. It is the stock in trade of the United States Marine Corps.

Mr. GREENHILL. One of the things I can personally see from this tour is that a lot of the statements that for example Mr. Fulbright and Mr. Proxmire make are absolutely baseless.

Dr. CHAMBERLAIN. I just wish that all the American people could see what we've seen. I think we'd find much less of this carping at the military and we'd find a lot more understanding.

Mr. DOVER. I think that one part of this tour is that you won't find a George Romney statement about being brainwashed.

Dr. OLAV SOLA. As we proceeded through numerous phases where we were personally involved, my opinion has changed 180 degrees.

ANNOUNCER. CBS Reports: "The Selling of the Pentagon" will continue in a moment. (Announcement.)

ANNOUNCER. "The Selling of the Pentagon" continues.

JACK WEBB (Film: "A Day in Vietnam"): It seems ironic, that while our finest young men are fighting half-way across the world, other young men and women safe at home, openly advocate abandonment of Vietnam to communism. Perhaps they really don't know what this war is all about.

MUDD. With scenes of war protesters tinted red for emphasis, the Defense Department introduces a film on Vietnam narrated by television star Jack Webb. Over 300 films a year are made by the Pentagon. Most of them are meant originally for troop information, but a large number is later released for public showing. It is widely known that the Defense Department often helps sympathetic Hollywood producers who need troop support for their war movies. What has received far less attention is that the Pentagon itself spends over $12 million a year on its own pictures.

The annual cost of a single Army series, "The Big Picture," is $900,000 and the overall Army film budget is more than $6½ million a year. During the 1960's, at least 52 million Americans saw Pentagon motion pictures, 45,000 public gatherings viewed them and at least 356 commercial and educational television stations have presented them as part of their public service broadcast time. Facts and information—not opinions and attitudes—are supposed to be the ingredients of Defense Department films. An official Pentagon directive states: "Propaganda has no place in Defense Department Public Information programs." In preparing this broadcast we looked only at products of the last decade—all made after the thaw in cold war politics. Well-known journalists and movie stars often serve as narrators for the films as these excerpts show.

ROBERT STACK. Hi, I'm Bob Stack. As you may know, one of my hobbies is collecting guns. I've hunted on and off all my life from California to Mexico to safaris in Africa. Speaking of guns and faraway places, I've just come back from a trip to Vietnam where guns are used for an entirely different purpose.

JOHN WAYNE. The Defense Department has asked me . . .

MUDD. The Pentagon helped John Wayne make "The Green Berets." John Wayne helped the Pentagon make this film in Vietnam. Over a thousand prints are in circulation.

SOLDIER TALKING TO WAYNE. In Vietnam, revolution is a double-edged word. The enemy uses it—it's what they call the "aggressive war" they're using against people over here.

WAYNE. That's the story and there's nothing mysterious about the kind of revolution the enemy has in mind. It's the same thing we've seen in many parts of the world ever since the Communist revolution fifty years ago. Murder, assassination, terror, and over here they've killed over 20 thousand civilian leaders. And it's these same brave people, who have had the will and the guts to conduct their own revolution, a real revolution for the betterment of their people.

MUDD. Not only movie stars have aided Pentagon propaganda. For patriotic reasons, newsmen such as Edward R. Murrow, Lowell Thomas and John Daly often volunteered their talents during World War II and the cold war. The Pentagon has used many journalists to carry its message including, some years ago, two of the best-known broadcasters.

CHET HUNTLEY (Film: "The American Navy in Vietnam"): I'm Chet Huntley. To most of us, this is the United States Navy—the aircraft carrier, the cruiser and destroyer. The modern deepwater navy, extending American strength across the oceans of the world.

This is the American Navy in Vietnam, moving quickly where and when needed, displaying the flexibilty of modern sea power, controlling the seas, extending its influence on land, and holding superiority in the air—a three-way force for peace, here to meet aggression at any spot on the globe.

MUDD. "The Eagle's Talon," made in 1962, narrated by Walter Cronkite deals with America's response to Communism.

WALTER CRONKITE. Starting in World War II, the aggressive Communist tide has spread in Europe and Asia to engulf its neighbors Communist China even now has plans to dominate Asia by mass murder, destroying ancient civilizations. Right next door is the nation we freed in 1898—Cuba. A Communist tyranny holds sway and whiskers do not hide the naked face of dictatorship. Our army is face to face with Communism around the world. To meet immediate threats on any

front we must build up our land forces at home and overseas.

This soldier, guarding one of Asia's gateways against Soviet aggression, symbolizes the determination of free men everywhere to resist Communist expansion by force of arms.

MUDD. On a policy level, the Pentagon says it has discarded the rhetoric of confrontation. But city by city, public showing by public showing, the language and symbols of the early '60's are still being widely distributed in the '70's. Here in Elmendorf, Texas this month, a Baptist congregation attends a Pentagon film on Communism made in 1962. Even though the expressed policy of the United States is negotiation and not confrontation, even though Walter Cronkite and Chet Huntley may now disagree with the intent of the films they narrated, even though the roles of journalist and government spokesman are incompatible, the films grind on and on.

A Pentagon film often contains a map that seems to be bleeding. The blood turns out to be the spread of international Communism. Interpretations of communism and assessments of Communist intent are significant themes in Defense Department films. In "Red Chinese Battle Plan," an anonymous Pentagon narrator describes a foreign policy bent on world conquest.

PENTAGON FILM NARRATOR. It is a blueprint for world revolution. Red China's battle plan—divide and encircle; conquer and enslave.

MUDD. In an excerpt from a film called "Road to the Wall," the Pentagon has James Cagney tell of a Communist plan that encompasses even more than the world.

CAGNEY. The Wall is a solid fact, It stands—and will stand—wherever the road of world Communism leads. Someday, according to its builders, it will surround not merely the world, but the moon, the stars, outer space and the universe!

MUDD. In what is perhaps the Pentagon's most ambitious film, "Red Nightmare," Jack Webb presents a Russian scheme to crush American freedom.

FIRST RUSSIAN SOLDIER. Americans! They have too many freedoms.

SECOND RUSSIAN SOLDIER. That is another thing you must remember, Comrade. One day it will be your mission to destroy those bourgeois capitalist freedoms!

WEBB. Frightening, isn't it?

MUDD. The hero of Webb's film, a lathe-worker named Jerry Donovan, dreams that his town is invaded by Communists. With remarkable ease, they quickly subvert everyone except Donovan himself, who listens with shock to a Commissar's speech.

COMMISSAR. When the moral fibre of the United States weakens, and the economy collapses under the pressures of competitive coexistence, it will be your responsibility, Comrades, to purge the minds of the reactionary Americans, so that they will welcome the enlightened Soviet system and conform without resistance to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

DONOVAN (To Soldier). Hey! What do you think you're doing?

MUDD. When Donovan returns home, he finds his own daughter about to leave for a commune.

DAUGHTER. It's true, Daddy. I did volunteer for farm work.

DONOVAN. Linda, why?

DAUGHTER. The party convinced me that I should free myself of the lingering bourgeois influence of family life. I am ready. Do not interfere. It is for my own good.

RUSSIAN SOLDIER. And Comrade Donovan, do not think that your deviationist remarks will be overlooked. They will be reported to the proper authorities.

JUDGE. Comrade Donovan, you are accused of the following crimes against the state: subversion, deviationism and treason.

MUDD. Nine hundred prints of "Red Nightmare" are currently in circulation. It was first released in 1962, reissued in 1965. The film was made for the Armed Forces Directorate on Information.

JUDGE. As an ugly remnant of the diseased bourgeois class, you must be eradicated before the contagion can spread.

DONOVAN. Believe me, you Communists can't keep fooling the entire world. You can't even keep fooling your own people. Because the news about Communism is getting around—that it's only another word for slavery! (SOLDIER FIRES THE GUN . . .)

WEBB. Don't worry, Jerry. That bullet will never reach you, because it's time to bring you back from your red nightmare.

MUDD. The Department of Defense believes that one of the best ways to save Americans from a red nightmare that comes true is with films like these. Although the Pentagon labels them informational, these films contain a high proportion of propaganda, as well as an obsession with monolithic Communism. Tax money financed all of them, and they have been distributed during the Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon Administrations. It has been more than a decade since the national policy of peaceful coexistence replaced the harsher rhetoric of early cold war years. But to the filmmakers at the Pentagon, with at least $12 million a year to spend, 1946 seems to have lasted a whole generation.

(Announcement.)

ANNOUNCER. "The Selling of the Pentagon" continues.

MUDD. The Pentagon in Washington is the command post of a military establishment with a multitude of ways to get its message across to the public. Many millions of Americans are reached by Defense Department displays, tours and motion pictures. But the widest, most penetrating of all contacts the Pentagon has with the public is through the media—newspapers, magazines, radio and television. Once each day, the press and the Pentagon have a formal confrontation.

JERRY FRIEDHEIM. I think this is the first time Dr. Foster has discussed the three different kinds of SS–11s . . . That's correct, these are MRV not MIRV. . . .

MUDD. Every morning at 11:00 o'clock, in pursuit of Defense Department news, Pentagon reporters get a crack at a careful and despected adversary, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Jerry Friedheim. He does not, of course, tell all he knows; he wouldn't have his job long if he did.

FRIEDHEIM. I can't discuss that at all.

NEWSMAN. What about the size of the warhead?

FRIEDHEIM. I just don't have anything I can give you on that. We'll pursue that question.

ROBERT GORALSKI, NBC News. When did you last have three carriers on station in the Med?

FRIEDHEIM. We'll have to check back and find that date for you.

NEWSMAN. Has the Guam chopped to the Sixth Fleet?

FRIEDHEIM. Negative. It has not.

BOB SCHIEFFER, CBS News. Would she normally be going to replace one of them; is that it?

FRIEDHEIM. That has been the normal operations in the past. We've observed some nineteen Soviet combatant vessels there in recent days. The Sixth Fleet strength is roughly comparable, slightly larger.

NEWSMAN. Slightly larger?

FRIEDHEIM. That's correct.

JACK TOLBERT. It's extremely difficult for a Pentagon reporter, even a regular, to establish sources outside the public affairs arm.

MUDD. Former Public Information Officer Jack Tolbert was an Air Force Major who worked with the press at many military bases for 12 years. He believes that the Defense Department confronts reporters with numerous obstacles.

TOLBERT. The Department of Defense has so many avenues of getting its story across, around, and over and under the media, that I'm not even sure even if every reporter who covered the Pentagon was a hard-nosed reporter, that we still wouldn't get the story through.

MUDD. The vastness of the Defense establishment confronts a reporter with an almost impossibly complex task. Pentagon stories develop in many other ways besides formal briefings, but the sheer size of the building itself remains bewildering. Often it is impossible to get to a news story, even when the story does not involve national security, until the Pentagon chooses to announce it.

Going into and out of the 30,000 Pentagon offices each day are 200,000 phone calls and 129,000 pieces of mail. But very little of this communicating is done with the press. Although the Department of Defense is the biggest business in America, over 95 percent of the news bureaus in Washington do not even assign a reporter regularly to the Pentagon. More newsmen cover the pennant race than the arms race.

We asked the man in charge of all Pentagon public reactions, Assistant Secretary of Defense Daniel Henkin, if he thought the press did a good job covering the Defense Department.

HENKIN. I believe that it does. From time to time of course it gives me some headaches and I give the press some headaches. We understand that—We act professionally, as a professional relationship, not only with the Pentagon press and other members of the Washington news corps, but with newsmen who cover military activities around the world.

MUDD. What about your public displays of military equipment at state fairs and shopping centers—what purpose does that serve?

HENKIN. Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their Armed Forces. I believe that the American public has a right to request information about the Armed Forces, to have speakers come before them, to ask questions, and to understand the need for our Armed Forces, why we ask for the funds that we do ask for, how we spend these funds, what are we doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in the Armed Forces. What are we doing about the racial problem in the Armed Forces, and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions.

MUDD. Well, is that sort of information about the drug problem you have and the racial problem you have and the budget problems you have, is that the sort of information that gets passed out at state fairs, by sergeants who are standing next to rockets?

HENKIN. No, I wouldn't limit that to sergeants standing next to any kind of exhibit. Now there are those who contend that this is propaganda. I don't—do not agree with this.

MUDD. What the press wants to reveal, the Defense Department often wants to conceal. We asked the *Washington Post's* military specialist, George Wilson, who should be prouder of Pentagon press coverage, the press or the Pentagon.

WILSON. The Pentagon, by virtue of its overwhelming troops in this area, has done better in propagandizing as a whole than the press has done on exposing. I don't fault the digging reporters and there are several. What I fault is the lack of demand from the editors, both of TV and of newspapers generally.

MUDD. How hard is it, Mr. Wilson, for a single reporter at the Pentagon to discover the truth when the Pentagon doesn't want the truth to be known?

WILSON. It's difficult. They can always pull out the secrecy stamp and say it's against the national interest to give you the full explanation for what we did, but you'll just have to trust Big Daddy.

MUDD. Can't a case be made, Mr. Wilson, from the standpoint of national security, to prohibit you from printing in your paper information that the enemy wants to know?

WILSON. It certainly can. A case can be made, but my counter to that is that if it's going to be—if the weapon is going to be described in public as it was in 1969 and 1970, along with the sales job to get the anti-ballistic missile defense approved, it should be described accurately. The point here is that because the technology is reachable, that there will always be the pressure to build it. Weapons are inexorable and they're imperious, and only public challenges and public resistance can keep technology from running us right onto the road of Armageddon, and I think that points up why more coverage of the Pentagon is desirable. Editors should have a larger appetite for these weapons because they're not just nuts and bolts; they often dictate the largest policy decisions in the world today.

Radio voice (Hometown News Center): This is Army Specialist Gene Canfield reporting from Pleiku, Republic of Vietnam. . . .

MUDD. The Armed Forces do not have to wait for radio, television and newspapers to come to them. They have their own way of reaching the media. At the Army's Hometown News Center in Kansas City, a blizzard of press releases is turned out in all seasons. Each year, 12,000 radio and television tapes are mailed to 2700 radio stations and 546 television stations. Over two million printed releases are sent to 6,500 daily and weekly newspapers. In these releases, medals, promotions and re-assignments are emphasized. While transmitting legitimate information about servicemen, the News Center also functions as a publicity agency for American forces abroad. The only news from the Center is good news. The Center is commanded by Colonel Richard Stewart, who feels the operation is helpful to the Army.

Colonel STEWART. This is another way of seeing your Army in action and it's even more meaningful because the people can relate to this particular soldier. This is not just an exercise or combat operation or something of that nature but this here is Sergeant Willy Jones.

TOLBERT. There are hundreds and thousands of weeklies and small dailies in this country that live on what we call the hometown release, where the Army, Navy and Air Force maintain hometown news release centers, and are just spewing this stuff into these newspapers who accept it willingly and who print it.

STEWART. They have said time and time again when I've talked to them, they've said "Keep it coming," in effect, words like that, "keep it coming."

TOLBERT. What the press—and this is the whole press, the community press which is extremely important to this country, is giving a free ride to a military story.

Representative EDWARD HÉBERT. I'm one of those who believes that the most vicious instrument in America today is network television.

MUDD. Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the anti-military tilt of network reporting. War heroes are made available for the taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians. Here Representative F. Edward Hébert of Louisiana asks Major James Rowe, a Green Beret and former POW, what keeps the Viet Cong fighting.

Major ROWE. The support that the VC receives from the United States is the only thing that keeps them fighting.

MUDD. Later, Congressman Hébert, who is the new chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, asks Major Rowe for his reaction to a peace rally.

ROWE. I walked up and I heard one of the speakers yelling, "Down with imperialism, down with capitalism, down with the oppressive leadership in Washington. Power to the people." I heard the same thing from the Viet Cong, except there it was in Vietnamese and here it was in English. I looked around the crowd—I walked through the crowd, and I saw some VC flags flying from the flagpole of the Washington monument, I saw American flags with VC flags flying over the top of them. I saw American flags with the stars removed and a peace symbol superimposed. I saw the red flag with a black peace symbol on it and then I heard one of my Senators say that "We are here because we cherish our flag." And the only thing I could think of in answer is what flag does he cherish?

HÉBERT. Let me congratulate you, please, sir. It's an honor to have had you on this program with me, and I only wish to God we could have more people wearing the uniform privileged to speak as you've spoken, because the silent majority will and must be heard.

MUDD. The war is covered extensively not only by the civilian press but also by the Defense Department's own camera crews in Vietnam. Their product is distributed to American TV stations and networks. This is a soccer match played by North Vietnamese prisoners of war and filmed by the Defense Department. It is intended to supplement regular network news coverage. But the Defense Department can hardly be said to be a disinterested observer in Vietnam. Recently, there have been charges that some of the Pentagon's footage was staged. In fact, the cameraman who filmed this soccer game told CBS News that the prisoners had never been permitted to play soccer before but were trotted out for this match when his crew arrived. The cameraman, former Air Force Sergeant Thomas Demitor, spoke about his filming experience shortly before leaving the service after 16 years.

DEMITOR. In many stories that were filmed in Vietnam, with my team, we staged a number of stories of the Vietnamese. We were propagandizing the war and an example of it was a story titled "U.S. and South Vietnamese forces patrol enemy infiltration routes." We went out with the Vietnamese in the Riverine patrol, went down the river until we found an area that was suitable for our landing. Because I knew it wasn't an actual combat situation I had no fear—I was off the boat on the land before the Vietnamese infantry came up, so that we could get a shot as the boats came onto the shore. They proceeded inland about three-quarters of a mile or half a mile while we were getting shots of them running through the rice paddies. They didn't fire any shots. There were no traces of Viet Cong.

We were told, when we thought we had a sufficient amount of footage exposed, to tell the Vietnamese and they would turn around. When someone turns around and asks you, "Well, do you have enough film?" and you say, "Yes," then it is definitely staging.

MUDD. Later, while filming the same story, Sergeant Demitor shot real combat footage involving American troops.

DEMITOR. In the final release, we see none of the actual combat footage of the Americans. We see all of the staged footage of the Vietnamese, and it would lead someone to believe that the Vietnamese were doing the majority of the work. The staged action got in. The actual action did not get in.

HENKIN. We are trying our best to provide information. There undoubtedly have been times when certain actions have been staged. I think this is true of all TV news coverage; after all this interview here is being staged.

MUDD. How so?

HENKIN. Well, props were set up, arrangements were made. You and I did not just walk into this room cold. Arrangements were made for it.

MUDD. Well, we wanted to film in your office, but your people said, "Let's go into the studio," so—we didn't stage it.

ARMY BRIEFER. We are conducting limited-duration protective reaction air strikes . . .

MUDD. Defense Department information machinery is well established in Vietnam, where a special language has developed that takes some time to learn. "Protective reaction" means the United States resumed the bombing of North Vietnam. "Selective ordnance" means napalm. "Defoliation" means nothing will grow there any more. A "civilian irregular defense group volunteer" is a mercenary. "Population resettlement" means getting villagers out of their villages, and "Military Assistance Command Daily Press Briefing" means this scene right here, which is popularly known among newsmen in Saigon as the Five O'clock Follies. The most popular phrase at these sessions, however, needs no explanation.

ARMY BRIEFER. No comment. Nothing further to say.

FIRST REPORTER. Well, can you please tell us . . .

ARMY BRIEFER. I have nothing further to add to the statement read.

SECOND REPORTER. Why don't you answer my question?

ARMY BRIEFER. I repeat I have no comment.

MUDD. Often the press is an unwitting partner in its own deception. Former Information Officer Tolbert once took great pride in utilizing the media. He's not so proud of the record anymore.

TOLBERT. A network was coming over to cover and do a documentary on the air war over North Vietnam. They were going to film it out of Danang, where I was the information officer. So in preparing for them we tried to pick out the most articulate, the best-looking pilots that we could, to be able to describe through their eyes what the air war was all about. We briefed the pilots so that they would understand that we were trying to present our views in a one-voice concept; we didn't want divergent views coming from a variety of the different pilots that might raise questions concerning whether they understand, or whether they were satisfied with the way the air war in the North was being fought.

MUDD. And the cast of characters that you made available to those network men was such that they never heard any dissension or criticism about the bombing mission?

TOLBERT. No, no, never. You know, being an insider, knowing fully what was going on, if I was absolutely candid with them, and opened all of our closets to them, yes, they would have come out with a lot more balanced report. I could have helped them do that.

MUDD. What was the result of that network team's journalistic efforts?

TOLBERT. Frankly, it was just great. It represented the pilots, it represented the way we conceived that the air war in the North was being fought by very professional people, and it was as good as if we had done it ourselves.

MUDD. Well, I'm duty-bound to ask, I've got to ask you which network it was. Will you tell me?

TOLBERT. Yes, yes, I will.

MUDD. Which one was it?

TOLBERT. It was CBS.

MUDD. Well, taking that incident you had with CBS and applying it, Mr. Tolbert, to your 12 years as a public information officer, what effect do you think incidents like that have on a democratic society which is supposed to enjoy a free press?

TOLBERT. I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers it's able to present its viewpoint to the American people, I think this attitude it was able to develop allowed Vietnam to happen. Had we

not been able to convince the American people prior to Vietnam that a military solution was a correct solution, without a doubt and not to be questioned, we couldn't have had a Vietnam. I feel that if we allow this pervasiveness to continue, that frankly it could lead us to another Vietnam.

MUDD. We have reported tonight only a fraction of the total public relations apparatus belonging to the Pentagon and supported by taxpayers. Indeed, the news restrictions on the current invasion of Laos raise the question whether the public's right to know is being served or thwarted.

On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology, Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world. Not only the public but the press as well has been beguiled, including at times, ourselves at CBS News. This propaganda barrage is the creation of a runaway bureaucracy that frustrates attempts to control it.

Last November 6, President Nixon sent this memorandum to executive agencies, criticizing what he called self-serving and wasteful public relations efforts. He directed an end to what he described as "inappropriate promotional activities." The President specifically ordered, in his words, a curtailment of "broadcasting, advertising, exhibits and films."

Just since the memo was written the Army's Golden Knights, a parachute team, have performed for the public in Nevada, California and North Carolina. Other Army exhibits have travelled to 59 different locations. Air Force displays, like this Hound Dog-Quail missile, have appeared in at least 36 shopping malls and municipal centers since the memo was written.

We went back to the Pentagon and asked what effect the Presidential directive would have. We were told there will be cuts in personnel, not activities. There may be some disagreement, of course, over just what constitutes an "inappropriate promotional activity," but to date not a single activity shown on this broadcast has been eliminated. Tomorrow morning, according to Defense Department schedules, there will be an Army show pushing the ABM in Mountain View, California; an Air Force missile will turn up in Houston on Friday; the Pentagon's travelling colonels will be in Hampton, Virginia, March 8; and next week fifth graders at the Hill Elementary School in Davidson, Michigan, will get to see the Navy's propaganda film on Vietnam.

FARMERS NEED ADVANCE PAYMENTS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last week several Members greatly concerned about the problems of the farmer, the problems of agriculture, and the problems of rural America took to the House floor and in an extended debate tried to enlighten the membership as to general and specific needs of this entire sector of our Nation.

The reception our efforts got was a mixed one. It ran the gamut from benign indifference through mild interest to vital concern. This notwithstanding, I was pleased and gratified when I was afterward approached by a few Members and asked to expand on the summary views I so briefly stated during the course of the general discussion. While I was glad to do so and still remain ready to talk with anyone interested in learning more about the problems of rural America, I said then and I say now that remedial action, not talk, is really what I am after.

To those who say, "How do you help the farmer? How do you help agriculture? How do you help rural America?" I say stop talking and take a serious look at the many bills designed to accomplish exactly these purposes that have already been introduced in the 92d Congress. For my own part, I have introduced eight of my own.

H.R. 1031—requires imported meat and meat products to be labeled "imported" at all stages of the food distribution chain.

H.R. 1228—imposes a quota on imported lamb—fresh, chilled, frozen, or preserved.

H.R. 3141—transfers funding of the FHA operating loan program from the Federal budget to the private money market.

H.R. 3142—raises the outer limit of the FHA operating loan program from $35,000 to $50,000.

H.R. 3306—gives businesses a tax credit to offset part of the expenses attached to their conducting job opportunity programs.

H.R. 3504—creates new rural job opportunities for young people as well as for older persons interested in bettering themselves.

H.R. 3678—creates new legal conditions wherein needed numbers of good, solid, and attractive homes could be built utilizing cost-saving techniques such as prefabrication, modular construction, and other technological innovations.

H.R. 4399—reforms the Federal inheritance tax system as it affects small farms, ranches, and businesses.

In addition, I am introducing still another today.

Mr. Speaker, as it stands now USDA regulations operate to prohibit feedgrain farmers from receiving payments running 32 cents per bushel on corn and 29 cents per bushel on grain sorghum until after July 1, 1971.

In my mind if this July 1, 1971, date is adhered to the payments farmers receive will come too late to help them in their most critical period of need, a period coming up in the next few months. Farmers will soon have to make critical decisions about what and how much to plant, how many people to employ, what kinds of new or rebuilt operating equipment to use and what kinds and amounts of supplies to stock up on. To think about these decisions takes time, but to make these decisions takes money, money that is awfully hard for the farmer to come by considering current financial conditions.

To remedy this situation, to give grain farmers some extra operating capital, I am introducing legislation to enable feed grain farmers to receive at least half of their duly allotted payments in April, shortly after program sign-up time. This money is money that the farmer has coming and is entitled to; my bill merely gives part of it to him earlier when he has the greatest need for it. Moreover, this bill would extend advance payment requirements to any diversion payments and public access payments which might be made under the farm program. Finally, it would require advance barley payments to be made if the Secretary of Agriculture should designate barley as a feed grain under the 1972 or 1973 program.

If this proposal is enacted, and speedily so, I can assure all my colleagues who represent urban or suburban constituencies that our Nation's farmers will be better able to continue to supply abundant, high quality, and reasonably priced food and fiber for the tables of nonfarm dwellers. I can assure you that Americans can to be well fed for what amounts to only 16.5 percent of their disposable income, a percentage unmatched by any other country in the world.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out although my proposal covers only feed-grain farmers, I am in the process of drafting similar legislation for cotton and wheat producers. This will complete greatly needed advance payment coverage for the producers of three crops vital to American agriculture and the Nation.

FROM THE MOUTHS OF BABES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, it is fashionable these days to criticize the misguided protestations of our Nation's young people against decisions and values of their elders which they find lacking. On the other hand there are those, whom I join, who recognize and are grateful for the vision of our young people who refuse to accept unquestioningly the supposed wisdom of our generation which sometimes asserts that bad is really good and wrong is really right. A touching example of the kind of naïvete which will be the salvation of our troubled society is embodied in the following letter sent to me by a grade school constituent of mine. I commend her letter to all my colleagues, and ask you how you would answer her melancholy unstated assumption that all of us are too busy and too uncaring to understand and deal with problems which even a child can understand. The letter follows:

MARCH 5,1971.

Representative ABNER MIKVA,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I know you're very busy with letters from grownups, and I'm sorry if I am bothering you.

Yesterday in our class we were discussing how we can make this world better, and then we started talking about what we thought about going to the moon. I think we should

help the poor first instead of putting all that money into the space capsule.

Some children my age don't even know what the moon is because they cannot afford going to school.

To some grownups it doesn't really matter but I hope you care.

Sincerely,

MARIE CLAUDE NADY.

P.S. (Please answer my letter).

FEDERAL CONTROL OF LOCAL POLICE BY THE NEW AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, throughout the constitutional history of the United States the administration of public justice has always been considered as reserved to judges at the State and local levels. Federal court trials were limited to disposing of Federal questions.

The passage of the controversial civil rights laws in recent years has usurped Federal power for unelected Federal judges, at their whim or at the behest of an unelected bureaucrat, to preempt jurisdiction over many cases which traditionally would have been heard by local and State judges.

Under this new dual system of jurisdiction which in effect makes Federal judges overseers of local and State courts, we see the U.S. Justice Department intervening to secure indictments in Federal courts of local policemen for violation of the civil rights of suspected criminals.

A pattern is now discernible whereby the Federal Government is using our valiant local police officers, just as the same Federal Government is using our brave servicemen, schoolteachers, and students, as guinea pigs to achieve political objectives as well as to gain national control over local police.

Police Chief Edward M. Davis of Los Angeles has denounced the Federal civil rights indictment of five Los Angeles policemen as a cheap attempt to use policemen by President Nixon's "Eastern Republican Party" to get minority votes in the most populous State in the Nation.

FOP National President John J. Harrington, an outspoken defender of the rights of local policemen, has explained why many police officers may have to stand by helplessly while crimes like murder, rape, and kidnaping are committed. Mr. Harrington has said that many officers are subjected to a fear that in preventing crimes they nevertheless might be subjecting themselves to indictment by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential local police have broad popular support to keep them independent. Local law enforcement officers are the first and last line of defense against crime, anarchy, and insurrection. A strong, armed, and independent local police force is an impassable barrier to the advance of communism as well as crime. They historically have carried a gun so the citizen does not need one.

For these reasons Communists, their dupes, and allies seek to make ineffective, if not to harass and destroy local police forces. They use several means of attack. One calls for the establishment of civilian police review boards so as to intimidate the individual police officer by making him afraid to do his duty for fear of punishment. Another method is to use policemen to play the role of social worker or tour director instead of law enforcer and require policemen to undergo human relations or sensitivity training so as to make them oversensitive to and understanding of criminals.

Yet another method is to centralize control over police from the State, regional, and eventually national level. Federal control of local police can but lead to a national police force—the antithesis of the American peace officer.

Now we have the latest threat, repeated instances suggestive of a design to use Federal Courts and the Justice Department to intimidate local police action.

I have introduced in the 92d Congress several bills which would, in addition to accomplishing other things, help unhandcuff local police from Federal control. I ask the support of my colleagues for the following bills:

H.R. 383—A bill to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

H.R. 384—A bill to repeal the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

H.R. 385—A bill to repeal the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Apparently until we repeal these viciously misused rights acts, our bureaucratic justice apparatus will continue officious intermeadling with local police affairs instead of prosecuting criminals.

I insert a copy of my letter dated February 22, 1971, on the matter of Federal prosecution of local police officers to the U.S. Attorney General, to which letter I have as of this date received no reply, and several newsclippings:

FEBRUARY 22, 1971.

Hon. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Like many other Congressmen and concerned citizens, I am beginning to question what is taking place in our Justice Department with the growing number of federal prosecutions of police officers.

Since it is possible that many of your subagents in the Justice Department may be acting without your full knowledge, I am enclosing a newspaper clipping from the Columbus, Ohio "Dispatch" pertaining to prosecution of Robert Morgan, a white police officer, and a photocopy of the February 18 "Washington Post" article concerning prosecution of a Negro sheriff in Alabama on like charges.

Certainly the inference being created is that the Justice Department is more interested in prosecuting local law men than in actions against known communists, anarchists, and criminals.

I would greatly appreciate your office advising me as to what is taking place in the Department of Justice.

Very truly yours,

JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress.

PETITION TO ABSOLVE PATROLMAN BEING CIRCULATED BY COMMITTEE

More than 9,000 copies of a petition asking the U.S. Justice Department to drop civil rights violation charges against Columbus police patrolman Robert A. Morgan are being circulated.

Warren Hayes of 5282 Crawford Dr., chairman of a civilian committee supporting Morgan, said the petition will be circulated Saturday in the area's major shopping centers and forwarded Jan. 14 to U.S. Reps. Samuel Devine and Chalmers Wylie.

Morgan, 34, was indicted by a U.S. District Court grand jury last month on charges that he inflicted summary punishment on an 18-year-old burglary suspect Morgan trapped and killed in the basement of a West Side home Jan. 1, 1970.

Morgan has pleaded innocent to the charge. His trial is pending.

The petition intended eventually for U.S. Atty. Gen. John Mitchell, states Morgan's indictment is a "travesty." It is "blatantly obvious that such an indictment can only serve the best interests of the criminal element," the petition asserts.

Hayes, father of Lee Hayes—one of 88 crewmen held captive for 11 months after North Korean naval forces captured the USS Pueblo early in 1968—said his committee has the support of the Fraternal Order of Police, the American Legion, the United Hard Hats of America, the Support Your Local Police Society and building and construction trade unions.

The elder Hayes was an unsuccessful candidate for city council in 1969 as a member of the arch-conservative American Independdent party. Hayes asserted the fact that Charlie James Cook Jr., who fell under Morgan's machine gun bullets, was a black has no bearing on the support petitions.

"Color, race or creed has nothing to do with it. The fellow (Cook) in that basement was a criminal. He had no rights when he broke into that house. Morgan was acting for you and for me and for every law abiding citizen," Hayes said.

Hayes said he is not a personal friend of the indicted policeman. "I never set eyes on the man until the day he was arraigned in federal court," he said.

POLICEMAN'S INDICTMENT DENOUNCED

WASHINGTON.—The Fraternal Order of Police (FOP) complained Wednesday that the federal indictment against Columbus Patrolman Robert A. Morgan is "against the interests of law enforcement."

FOP national President John J. Harrington registered his complaint with U.S. Atty. General John N. Mitchell.

Harrington said he spoke for 120,000 police officers in asking for an explanation of the "unusual" indictment against Morgan.

Morgan was cleared under Ohio law in the shooting death of a burglary suspect he accosted in a private home Jan. 1, 1970.

Said Harrington:

"If police officers who kill criminals while trying to prevent felonies—and murders, rapes, kidnapings and muggings are in this category—they may feel that they have to stand by helpless while crimes are committed.

"If they take action, they might kill or injure the criminal and consequently be liable to indictment by the federal government."

FOP sources indicated the group intends to make the defense of Morgan a national issue.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 18, 1971]

NEGRO SHERIFF IN ALABAMA INDICTED FOR BEATING BLACK PRISONER

(By J. M. McFadden)

MONTGOMERY, ALA., February 17—After four years in office, Alabama's first black sheriff

since Reconstruction has been indicted for beating a Negro prisoner.

Sheriff Lucius D. Amerson of Macon County and a deputy, Richard Coleman Jr., were released on $1,000 bond each by U.S. Commissioner Calvin Pryor.

The federal grand jury indictment against Amerson used the language that has often indicted white Southern sheriffs on similar charges:

". . . Acting under color of laws of the state of Alabama, did willfully beat, strike, injure and assault Wilbert Dean Harris, a citizen . . ."

Amerson, who took the oath of office in Tuskegee in 1967, and Coleman are charged with assault "with the intent of imposing summary punishment," thereby depriving Harris of his civil rights.

The indictment does not specify a date or place, but on Aug. 22, 1970, Harris was charged with staging a wild shootout in Amerson's county jail

Harris was charged with four counts of intent to murder, two of disturbing the peace, one count of destroying public property and one of carrying a concealed weapon, all stemming from a fracas in the jail.

Amerson said Harris pulled a gun while he was being booked for driving while intoxicated and without taillights on his car.

Amerson said Harris disarmed the deputies in the room and allowed them to leave, whereupon Amerson and the deputies ran outside. The sheriff said Harris was subdued after an exchange of gunfire.

Amerson and Coleman returned from signing their bonds to find a parking ticket on their automobile in front of the Federal Building.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 4, 1971]

POLICE INDICTED IN L.A. SHOOTING

LOS ANGELES, March 3.—Four policemen were indicted here today for violating civil rights in the so-called "mistake shooting" deaths of two Mexican nationals last summer.

In addition, a federal grand jury indicted two policemen and a civilian for plotting to burglarize a woman's home and another officer with forcing a female suspect to disrobe in his patrol car.

In the shootings last summer, police had contended that a series of mistakes—compounded by the fact that none of the men in an apartment raided by officers spoke English—led to the deaths of the two Mexicans.

The indictments, involving six policemen and three separate incidents last summer, were announced in Washington by Attorney General John N. Mitchell.

At the same time, Mitchell announced the Justice Department had found no violations of civil rights in the separate deaths last summer of Mexican-American journalist Ruben Salazar and Jerry Lee Amie.

Salazar, a columnist for the Los Angeles Times, was killed by a tear gas projectile fired by a deputy into a bar where he was sitting during a Chicano disturbance in East Los Angeles. Amie, a Negro Vietnam veteran, was shot to death by Los Angeles police.

Police Chief Edward M. Davis said it was a "day of infamy" for the Justice Department. "I believe that the motivation in these indictments is political to gain minority votes," he said. He termed them a "cheap attempt to use policemen for political gain."

In the shootings, the grand jury indicted Los Angeles policemen Marshall F. Gaines, Jeffrey J. Fedrizzi and Hector R. Zepeda, and William Kinsella of the San Leandro, Calif., police department.

They went to a skid row apartment in search of a murder suspect wanted in San Leandro.

The gunfire erupted when one officer said he thought one of the Mexicans in the apartment was charging him with a gun.

Policeman Peter J. Lupton was indicted for requiring a Chinese woman, May Ling Lu, to disrobe in his patrol car so he could search her.

The burglary conspiracy allegedly involved Los Angeles policeman Edgar Brown and Gaines, one of the officers indicted in the shootings.

It was charged that Angelo Direienzo, a police informant, burglarized a home and gave the officers photos of antique silver he stole. The silver eventually wound up in the possession of attorney Lester Berman, who was then arrested by the officers for possession of stolen property.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 4, 1971]

CHIEF SCORES NIXON, GOP AS FIVE POLICE ARE INDICTED

(By Bob Rose)

LOS ANGELES.—Police Chief Edward M. Davis has angrily denounced the federal civil rights indictment of five Los Angeles policemen as politically inspired by President's Nixon's "Eastern Republican party."

"This is a day of infamy as far as the U.S. Department of Justice is concerned," Davis told a news conference. "It's an attempt by the Eastern Republican party to get the minority vote in the most populous state in the nation. . . . This is a cheap attempt to use policemen for political gain."

Three of the policemen—Sgt. Marshall Gaines and officers Jeffrey J. Fedrizzi and Hector R. Zepeda—were indicted in connection with the shooting deaths of two unarmed Mexican nationals last July 16 during a hunt for a murder suspect.

The officers were charged with manslaughter and felonious assault, but the charges were dropped in Superior Court because of lack of evidence.

In the other two indictments, Lt. Edgar Brown was accused of planting evidence on a narcotics suspect and officer Peter Lupton was accuesd of making a female narcotics suspect disrobe in the back of his squad car.

"The accusations against Lt. Brown are a dirty, infamous lie. He came through several lie tests with flying colors," Davis said.

"I told (Atty. Gen. John) Mitchell that on the phone Monday."

The chief said Lupton was making a search and "acted unwisely" but has been disciplined.

All five officers and a San Leandro policeman, William Kinsella, involved in the shooting were indicted on charges of depriving others of their civil rights.

Mitchell said the federal government moved in after a "failure of local police" to take action.

U.S. Atty. Robert Meyer said in Los Angeles, "We do not take any pleasure in indicting police officers. These are indictments of individuals. We are very impressed with the performance of the Los Angeles Police Department."

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 7, 1971]

LOS ANGELES ACTS TO DEFEND POLICE IN RIGHTS KILLING

LOS ANGELES.—The Los Angeles City Council has voted to defend three police officers indicated on federal civil rights statutes in the mistake slaying of two Mexican nationals.

The 8-to-5 vote followed a 2½-hour session Friday during which Chicano militants shouted insults.

The three officers, and a fourth from San Leandro, were indicated by a federal grand jury for an incident last June 16 when officers raided an apartment in search of a murder suspect from San Leandro.

Police later said the shooting was the result of a "tragic chain and combination of circumstances." Manslaughter and assault charges were filed against all officers involved in the case, but those charges were dismissed in Superior Court.

Richard Cruz, state chairman of the Chicano Law Students Association, said the council's action would require Mexican-Americans to "pay for the legal defense of murderers of our own people."

John A. Daly, chief executive assistant city attorney, told the council the action was "unprecedented." But, he said it was legal for the city to provide the defense for employes if the employes acted in good faith, without malice and in the best interest of the city.

TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an excellent statement by EnAct, Environmental Action for Survival, of the University of Michigan presented by Mr. Alexander Woodle at the hearings on the environmental impact statements required by section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act.

This excellent statement by EnAct sets out further reasons why the Trans-Alaska pipeline should not be built and why the environmental impact statement in its draft form is hopelessly inadequate and does not meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act:

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER WOODLE, REPRESENTING ENACT—ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION FOR SURVIVAL

The preliminary draft of the environmental impact statement of the proposed Trans-Alaska pipeline leaves many questions unanswered and raises others concerning the pipeline's impact on the Alaskan environment. It is in the interest of EnAct and other concerned people at the University of Michigan to discuss these problems and arrive at some conclusions concerning the proposal.

EnAct is not against development of resources, but insists that there be proof of a legitimate need for the development of the pipeline in addition to an environmentally sound plan for its construction based on the possible impacts of such a development.

Firstly, we must look at the possibility of oil leaks. It is reassuring, on the one hand, to know that detection of large leaks will be instantaneous, but, on the other hand, how much oil will be spilled at any one rupture of the pipeline? The report talks about block valves at intermediate intervals, yet even if they are spaced ten miles apart for the length of the pipeline, approximately five million gallons of oil could conceivably be spilled. The southern portion of the pipeline passes through a seismically active area and terminates at the warm water port of Valdez. The use of seismic equipment will enable the pipeline to be shut down, but what pipeline can survive in an area subjected to earthquakes of an intensity which

would cause tremendous structural damage to any community? The recent disaster in the Los Angeles area vividly shows what havoc can befall man and his structures in a seismically active area.

The Department of the Interior report says in reference to the active Denali Fault (which crosses the proposed pipeline route), "The geologic and geophysical evidence suggest the future occurrence of large earth quakes accompanied by large surface displacements." The report also mentions the six meter vertical surface displacement which occurred during the 1964 earthquake disaster.

Contingency plans for such emergencies and clean-ups should be submitted before the pipeline is constructed, and *not* six months prior to initial pumping of oil. This will permit time to assess the adequancy of these plans.

Other questions arise as to how the storage tanks at Valdez which will initially store over 7.5 million barrels (or 315 million gallons) of crude oil will survive a severe shock? Can spill containment dikes withstand an earthquake if a storage tank ruptures? What kind of contingency plans are available to handle a clean-up job of this magnitude especially if the oil reaches Prince William Sound?

Secondly, we must look at the difficulties of adapting a pipeline to Alaska's terrain. Terrain problems include solifluction, removal of vegetation, and permafrost. The study admits that many questions remain unanswered as to the mode of construction to be employed on portions of the buried pipeline due to a lack of geologic data on permafrost conditions. EnAct believes that construction should not proceed until all questions are answered and unknown information collected. Research at The University of Michigan, Department of Civil Engineering, reveals that removal of vegetation from slopes and other disturbances can quicken soil creep and trigger sudden mass-soil movement. The impact statement recognizes that mass-wasting is common along the route, but pushes the problem aside by saying these areas will be avoided "wherever possible." This is hardly reassuring yet such terminology is used continuously.

Thirdly, we must examine the impact of an oil pipeline on fish and wildlife resources. The study admits that information on probable impacts of the pipeline on fish and wildlife resources is incomplete and that some adverse effects are inevitable. Removal of wildlife habitat, destruction of spawning beds, and disturbances of behavioral patterns of wildlife (especially those intolerant of man and his activities) are some of these effects expected in the vicinity of the pipeline. Some of the species mentioned are not only intolerant of man, but also appear on the endangered species list. Yet, the report only states that these animals will most likely migrate out of the area and may or may not return. Also, the effect on caribou migration cannot be conclusively determined. EnAct feels that more research is needed to ascertain the long term effects on not only endangered fish and wildlife resources, but also its implications to the Alaskan natives who are so dependent on this animal life as a life support.

The report mentions the importance of the fishing industry to Alaskans, yet nowhere does it determine the effects of pipeline construction and oil spills on the fishing industry. This area should also be studied in depth.

Large oil spills that reach a river or other body of water are a threat to fish and wildlife in that vicinity. The report states (page 122), "extensive habitat damage or spills at certain times could decimate a population of the species in the spill area for many years or perhaps permanently." The report readily admits to the inevitability of oil spills, and to the adverse damage to the marine environment. The tremendous amount of oil to be shipped at Valdez and the increase in tanker traffic increases the probability of oil spills and tanker collisions in the foggy waters of Prince William Sound.

Fourthly, we should view what effects the pipeline could have on the Alaskan Natives. The environmental impact statement reports that adverse effects to culture groups that live off the Alaskan environment are "negligible" and yet the report itself mentions several facts that would make the effects on the natives considerably more than "negligible." Page thirteen of the study states, "Most Natives live in an economy based on subsistence fishing and hunting and have little cash income. More than one-half of the work force is unemployed most of the year and median per capita income for rural natives with income is extremely low." Like other natives of North America, the Alaska Natives lived adequately within their environment. It was only after the economic push of white entrepreneurs that the "extremely low income" occurred. We do not suggest that time be turned back, that these facts of life can vanish, that we forget the oil on the North Slope. The point is that if most Natives live in an economy based on "subsistence fishing and hunting," it is incumbent on the oil developers to be *certain* the effect the pipeline will have on these subsistence-oriented cultures. We can guess about economic ventures, perhaps, but not about the subsistence and existence of entire culture groups. North Alaskan Eskimos still follow the migrations of caribou over the Brooks Range, still fish in the plentiful streams that run from the mountains. If the migration and spawning patterns and the floral growth for the animals is upset, even by a 48 inch pipeline, the delicate perma frost ecosystem is irreparably upset.

Many will raise the argument that the oil companies will bring economic prosperity to the native Alaskans. This has not been so. A Task Force investigation in the late 1960's found that in regards to hiring in the oil fields, only 8 out of 800 jobs were held by natives (*Indian Affairs* July-September, 1969). Also, as glossed over in the statement itself, for those natives in mixed-culture villages especially, an influx of wealthy pipeline workers may have a depressing effect. It would be, if alternatives were not found, just another example of white extractive culture upsetting and at least partially destroying another culture, replacing it with nothing but a newly found poverty and cultural despair.

Finally, we must analyze the impact of the pipeline on the national security interests of the United States. One of the main conclusions of the report is that "there appears to be a compelling need for developing North Slope oil as long as it can be transported with adequate safeguards to protect the environment." As we have tried to show above, we do not feel that adequate safeguards have as yet been developed to protect the Alaskan environment. We also take issue with the statement asserting the "compelling need for developing North Slope oil." This conclusion is based on consideration of the national security interests of the United States. However, EnAct feels that the interests of national security require that the entire range of possible alternatives be fully explored. Alternatives to the immediate development of North Slope petroleum reserves may, in the long run, prove to be more consistent with our national security needs. We are not yet ready to acknowledge "the unequivocal need for the early delivery of substantial volume of Alaskan North Slope oil to the United States domestic market."

We agree that U.S. domestic supplies will be severely taxed in the future. Given this fact, might it not be better to safeguard our future national security by saving our reserves of crude oil through government underground stockpiling and maintaining North Slope petroleum deposits undeveloped. An alternative that should be considered is cutting back on domestic crude oil production and increasing oil imports now, while we still have free access to foreign supplies. This could be done by eliminating present import quotas. In this way we would be certain of having adequate domestic petroleum reserve capacity in the event that part of our foreign supply gets cut off in the future.

Immediate extraction of Alaskan oil by pipeline will have just the opposite effect, rapid depletion of our Arctic reserves. The reason for this is that the high costs of transportation by pipeline from the North Slope require that oil be extracted and transported in a large enough volume to cover these costs. It would not pay to build the pipeline and then not utilize it at full capacity. None of the Alaskan oil would be saved as an emergency reserve, and we would find ourselves in the future even more dependent on foreign imports than we are now. If one agrees that this is very undesirable from a national security standpoint, then perhaps we should leave the North Slope oil fields undeveloped, for utilization, should the need arise.

A point that is not considered in the environmental impact statement is the reliability of the pipeline as a source of oil during periods of global conflict. How well does the Prudhoe Bay to Valdez transportation route form the answer to our national security needs for oil? How is the pipeline to be protected from sabotage and bombing? Could we really depend on this oil which is being transported by pipeline over many miles of rugged wilderness terrain during a time of war? Finally, to get the oil to market we must rely on tankers from Valdez to the West Coast. Dr. M. A. Adelman, Professor of Economics at M.I.T., stated in the 1969 hearings on the Petroleum Industry by the Senate Subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly, that in a conventional war, "The sea lanes would be the vulnerable target, including Gulf Coast to East Coast or Alaska to West Coast."[1]

In short, EnAct does not feel that national security considerations lead inevitably to the conclusion that immediate extraction of Alaskan crude oil and transportation via pipeline and tanker to West Coast markets is the most desirable alternative. The arguments contained in the environmental impact statement have failed to adequately take into account other possible alternatives to provide the United States with maximum national security gains from our crude oil reserves. We feel that the social costs of delaying the construction of the pipeline for several years, during which time we can develop better alternatives, are minimal compared with the social costs of proceeding with construction at this time.

The construction of the pipeline through areas subject to processes of mass-wasting and severe earthquakes would not be compatible with the environment.

The report instead of answering the questions actually raises more serious ones concerning the long-term effects the pipeline would have on the delicate ecosystems of the Arctic. It is obvious that much more intensive research must be carried out in the Arctic environment in order to develop Alaska's resources in a way that will bring the fullest benefit to man and the environment. The statement seems to imply the

[1] U.S. Congress, Senate Subcommittee on Anti-trust and Monopoly of the Committee of the Judiciary, *Hearings on the Petroleum Industry, Part I, Economists' Views*. 91st Congress, 1st Session, 1969, Senate Resolution 40, page 16.

desirability of extracting the oil as rapidly as possible. EnAct can only conclude that there is neither adequate scientific knowledge nor technology at this time to construct a pipeline which would have a minimal impact on the environment.

Respectfully submitted for the official record.

ALEXANDER WOODLE,
Chairman, Alaska Pipeline Subcommittee, EnAct.

PROPOSED RAIL PASSENGER PLAN NEEDS RESTUDY

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since last fall, when the Department of Transportation first moved toward developing a national rail passenger system to be operated by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, I have been concerned that the proposed pattern insure that major areas throughout the country will have adequate service.

My immediate concern, of course, is the service east and west from my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

But, as I emphasized in my representations to the Department and to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I feel that the overall pattern is the key to the success of the system.

In looking at specific areas around the country, it seems to me essential that we take into account the pattern of traffic both inbound and outbound in the directions of the prime usage by the general public.

BILL TO GET FULL CONSIDERATION

The chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS), has assured me that legislation which I introduced in January will receive full consideration at an early date by his committee.

My bill, H.R. 709, proposes a 6-month postponement of the inauguration of the system in order to permit a restudy of recommended routes.

This bill is similar to one which I introduced in the closing days of the 91st Congress.

I am well aware that the new national system must start from a base, but I think that we in the Congress have a responsibility to insure that the original system is adequate to provide a practical demonstration of how the system can operate both economically and for the convenience of the general public.

EXCELLENT INTRASTATE PLAN

Referring again to our own situation in western New York and the city of Buffalo, the recommended system proposes a route connecting Buffalo and New York City over the old New York Central Railroad—now Penn Central—tracks by way of Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany. This is an excellent and essentially needed intrastate route to serve the citizens of our State.

However, there is no provision for travel west from Buffalo, nor is there any provision for travel east from Albany. These are vital omissions, in my opinion and in the opinion of many with whom I have talked, because one of the principal needs for railroad passenger service is a direct route between Boston and Chicago, with key stops en route.

There are two ways in which service can be provided between Buffalo and Chicago.

First, the Penn Central route could be utilized around the lakes by way of Cleveland.

Second, since the proposed rail passenger system also provides a route between Detroit and Chicago, it would be a simple and convenient addition to the system to connect Buffalo and Detroit over the trackage through Canada, a shortcut route which has had considerable traffic in years past.

When the Department of Transportation was considering the rail passenger system several months ago, the State of New York filed a formal report with the Department and I am incorporating with my remarks pertinent excerpts from that State report, as follows:

NEW YORK CITY-CHICAGO

In the selection of the end points of New York City and Chicago, the Secretary has wisely identified a long-haul corridor which we believe has the potential for becoming one of the more profitable within the basic system.

As a practical matter there are presently two routes employed by Penn Central Transportation Company to provide service between these end points. One route utilizes the former New York Central through Buffalo and Cleveland, while the other utilizes the former Pennsylvania tracks via Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Travel requirements between the cities of New York and Chicago could probably be satisfied by the operation of only one of these routes. However, a large proportion of the travel is presently to, from or between intermediate points.

Thus, we believe it is essential that service be provided between New York City and Chicago via Buffalo as well as via Pittsburgh. If the Pittsburgh route were to be omitted, it would be impossible for persons to travel from New York City to such points as Altoona, Pittsburgh, and Fort Wayne.

On the other hand, if the Buffalo-Chicago route were omitted, it would be impossible for persons to travel between New York City and any of the large metropolitan areas located along the Empire Service corridor, on the one hand, and, on the other, such large metropolitan areas as Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit and South Bend.

This omission would also disrupt travel between all upstate New York points and the western United States via the Chicago gateway.

It is the considered position of New York State that both the Buffalo and Pittsburgh routes are essential and should be employed to provide service between the New York City-Chicago terminal points. It is our understanding that the regulatory commissions of Pennsylvania and Indiana also support our position that service over both routes is essential and that neither route is an adequate substitute for the other.

POINTS OMITTED FROM BASIC SYSTEM

Buffalo - Cleveland - Toledo - Chicago—Although the Secretary has designated New York City and Chicago as terminal points of a long distance route, this is no assurance that any trains will actually be routed via Buffalo.

New York State believes it is essential that rail passenger service be maintained between New York City and such large population centers as Cleveland, Toledo and South Bend. Likewise it is equally essential that service be assured between upstate New York points (Poughkeepsie through Buffalo, inclusive) and Cleveland, Toledo, Detroit and Chicago.

Failure to specifically include service west of Buffalo in the system could result in the cutting off of the entire population of upstate New York from an outlet to the western United States via the Chicago gateway.

New York earnestly requests that the Secretary specifically designate Buffalo-Chicago—as well as Buffalo-Detroit—as end points in the basic system so as to *ensure* the continuation of service in this territory by the corporation.

Although most service over this route would probably be through service operated in conjunction with the New York-Buffalo corridor, the corporation might also find it profitable to operate additional short-haul service between Buffalo and Cleveland as well as between Cleveland and Chicago.

Since all of the cities along this route now have established intercity rail passenger service for which roadbeds and signal systems are maintained to passenger standards and passenger station facilities exist, the immediate need for the corporation to expend large sums of money for capital improvements would be obviated by the use of this route. Furthermore, with the assistance of the State of New York, Penn Central has recently constructed new modern passenger stations with abundant parking facilities to serve the cities of Albany, Schenectady, Amsterdam and Syracuse.

Penn Central's service has in recent years been characterized by poor on-time performance, misleading and incomplete timetables, unheated and unairconditioned cars and other features which by design or otherwise have artificially depressed patronage on the Buffalo-Chicago route. It is almost incredible that trains operating between New York City and Chicago consume more running time today than in 1952 despite the fact that fewer station stops are made today. One reason for the longer running times is layovers of great duration which take place at certain intermediate points. For example, passengers on Penn Central train 51 between Buffalo and Chicago are subjected to a one hour and fifty minute layover at Cleveland, along with an additional twenty-six minute layover at Toledo.

Summary—In terms of the criteria used by the Secretary, New York State believes that these end points qualify for inclusion in the basic system.

Particular attention has been called to the large population centers at each end point, the extraordinary scenic value of the route, heavy corridor travel, the present service by four daily trains, and the availability of the Canadian rail system by inclusion of the Montreal end point.

Preservation of this historic route of international commerce would have the additional advantage of enhancing relations with our Canadian neighbors.

BOSTON-ALBANY SEGMENT

New York State is concerned over the omission of the present Boston to Albany service from the basic system.

At the present time, the Penn Central offers a connecting service at Albany to and from Boston for the west by means of Trains 427 and 428. Of special significance is the comparatively large proportion of users of this service which transfer at Albany to or from Trains 61 and 62.

The inclusion of east-west service to

Boston, with its metropolitan population in excess of a million, would permit the basic system to be operated as a truly national integrated system. The Boston-Albany line operates in an east-west direction across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and as such draws passenger traffic from the far-reaches of northern New England. The inclusion of this link is essential to properly tap the large New England travel market.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I also would like to include the text of my letter of February 23 to Chairman STAGGERS requesting early consideration of my bill, H.R. 709:

FEBRUARY 23, 1971.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On January 22, the first day in which the bills could be introduced in the 92d Congress, I introduced H.R. 709, a bill to provide additional time for review of the basic National Rail Passenger System.

About a week later, Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe designated the basic system of cities between which intercity rail passenger service will be provided by the National Rail Passenger Corporation.

My concern about the final proposal by Secretary Volpe, notwithstanding the changes which were made from the preliminary plan, is that I feel some key segments still ought to be added to the over-all system. My immediate concern, of course, is service to my home city of Buffalo, New York. However, many of my colleagues have expressed concern about the provision of service for their areas in the final plan.

So far as Buffalo is concerned, the plan provides for a route between New York, Albany, Syracuse, Rochester, and Buffalo, located entirely within the State of New York. This is an excellent and much-needed route, and we certainly have no doubt about the necessity for this route in any national system.

Our question pertains to service west from Buffalo, and this would apply likewise to Albany, Rochester, and Syracuse, covering all of the upstate New York areas.

There is definite need for service west from Buffalo because it would permit connections to points in the west and the south. We also have need for a direct route to the south, but this has not proven acceptable and the support would probably not be adequate.

However, with regard to extending the route from Buffalo west by way of Cleveland and/or Detroit to Chicago, the demand is very clear.

I would commend to you the comments and recommendations made by the State of New York, in filing with the Transportation Department on December 31, 1970, with regard to service between New York City and Chicago. For your convenience, I am enclosing copies of these three pages of the report.

The State very wisely points out that the Penn Central now has two passenger routes between New York and Chicago; one over the old New York Central tracks through Buffalo and Cleveland, the other over the former Pennsylvania Railroad tracks by way of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

While through traffic between New York and Chicago could be served by either route, upstate New York will have no service past Buffalo under the adopted plan.

As your Committee is organized, I hope that you will give early consideration to H.R. 709. I hope that your Committee can schedule a hearing to consider the over-all plan as adopted.

Since the plan was scheduled to go into effect on May 1, there is a sense of urgency if any action is to be accomplished.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

T. J. DULSKI.

FEDERAL BUDGET ARITHMETIC: FISCAL 1972

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, each year, because of the deep concern of my constituents about the contents, the amounts, and the priorities of the Federal budget, I have prepared an extensive analysis of administration budget proposals. My analysis seeks to highlight priority judgments in the budget items, particularly focusing on the proposed expenditures of controllable funds, as opposed to uncontrollable expenditures and trust funds which are inflexibly earmarked for special purposes.

Last month, I issued a two-part analysis entitled "Federal Budget Arithmetic" which analyzes the fiscal 1972 proposals and compares the results with similar analyses of the fiscal 1970 and 1971 budgets.

I feel these results are of interest to other colleagues and to all Americans who share the increasing concern with the spending judgments which are exercised at every level of government.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I will include the full text of "Federal Budget Arithmetic" at this point:

FEDERAL BUDGET ARITHMETIC: HOW MUCH SHIFT IN PRIORITIES IN FISCAL 1972?

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the first of a two-part series on Federal Budget Arithmetic analyzing the fiscal 1972 budget proposed by the Administration. The second article will examine controllable and non-controllable expenses.)

When President Nixon submitted his $229.2 billion budget for fiscal 1972 to Congress last month, it was heralded by the Administration as "an indicator of the reordering of the nation's priorities."

Outlays for human resources will be the highest in 21 years, the Administration said, and although spending for defense will increase dollarwise it will drop percentagewise.

To support these statements, the Office of Management and Budget prepared for public distribution a colorful "pie chart" which shows where the budget dollar will go:

"National defense, 34%; human resources (including education and manpower, health, income security and veterans benefits and services), 42%; physical resources (including agriculture and rural development, natural resources, including pollution control, commerce and transportation, and community development and housing), 11%; interest on the public debt, 8%; and other categories (including international affairs and finance, space research and technology, and general government), 5%.

While the President's budget for fiscal 1972 does indicate some real reordering of the nation's priorities away from defense and some innovative proposals for solution of domestic problems, the turnabout is not, unfortunately, as substantial as the Administration's pie-shaped chart would lead us to believe.

For included in the President's $229.2 billion pie is $53.8 billion from Social Security and Highway Trust Funds. These trust funds are not collected from income taxes and little spending discretion can be exercised over them by Congress or the President.

While Social Security benefits contribute to the income security of older and disabled Americans, they are not paid out of revenue from income taxes but out of a trust fund made up of payroll taxes. These funds are not subject to discretionary spending on a year-to-year basis.

These Social Security expenditures are necessary, but they cannot fairly be included with other programs in the "human resources" category which contribute directly to health, education, manpower training and other innovative or social action purposes.

I believe the interpretation of the budget for fiscal 1972 which I have prepared gives a less distorted view of the spending picture. It looks at the budget by income and corporate tax outlays of the federal government. These are grouped into 14 functional categories according to the general purposes served.

These 14 categories totalling $181.3 billion include an outlay of $4.0 billion for the proposed general revenue sharing programs but do not include either the $53.8 billion for Social Security and Highway Trust Funds or any adjustment for special allowances.

When we look at the budget in this way, it totals $181.3 billion, instead of the $229.2 billion figure which included the trust funds. The following table shows how much of each $100 of individual income tax and corporate tax money would be spent on various government functions for fiscal 1972. In addition, these figures are compared with those for fiscal 1970 and 1971:

THE $100 TAX PICTURE

	1970 [1]	1971 [1]	1972 [1]
National Defense	$48.90	$45.67	$42.77
International Affairs and Finance	2.53	2.24	2.23
Space Research and Technology	2.39	2.12	1.74
Agriculture and Rural Development	3.93	3.32	3.20
Natural Resources	1.53	1.55	2.34
Commerce and Transportation	3.08	2.72	3.40
Community Development and Housing	1.87	2.34	2.48
Education and Manpower	4.64	5.05	4.86
Health	8.16	9.28	8.83
Income Security (excluding Social Security)	4.14	5.27	6.46
Veterans Benefits and Services	5.34	5.26	5.87
General Government	2.22	2.55	2.74
Interest	10.98	11.04	10.86
Allowances	0.29	1.59	
Revenue Sharing			2.22
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00

[1] Figures do not include allocations from the social security and highway trust funds, which are not collected from income taxes.

This table is evidence of a shift in priorities. Proposed percentage outlays for defense and space research and technology have been reduced. Percentages for natural resources, commerce and transportation and community development and housing have been increased.

If adopted, increases in these areas will help spur a partial conversion of industry to these domestic pursuits and will help make up for loss of jobs in the defense field.

However, some additional areas upon which I have placed high priority in the years I have been in Congress—education and manpower, health and agriculture and rural development—show a decrease in their share of the $100 tax picture.

Our states and localities presently face bankruptcy because they cannot meet the financial burdens imposed by the mounting costs in the fields of education, health and employment. Revenue sharing, if enacted, will mean some increases in these areas, but not enough.

Any real reordering of our nation's priorities must include greater outlays in the crucial areas of human resources as well as the physical resources.

These adjustments should be made during review of the budget by Congress and any increases for education or other categories must be deducted from lower priority expenditures.

FEDERAL BUDGET ARITHMETIC: CONTROLLABLE AND UNCONTROLLABLE EXPENSES

(By Congressman FRANK HORTON)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: This is the second article of a two-part series on Federal Budget Arithmetic. Last week's article looked at the priorities established by the Fiscal 1972 budget.)

At this time of concern over the financial crisis of government and the burdens of taxation, it is important to take a realistic view of the federal budget—to examine how much financial assistance the federal government is actually able to allocate to states and localities and how much money it can spend on solutions of domestic problems.

Last year, in analyzing the Fiscal 1971 budget on the basis of controllable and uncontrollable expenses, I noted that only $22.3 billion in controllable budget funds were allocated for domestic purposes. This amounted to 11% of the total $200.8 billion budget for Fiscal 1971.

In analyzing the Fiscal 1972 budget, I can report that the news is brighter, but the controllable funds available for domestic purposes still may not be enough to meet the mounting financial crisis.

In this budget, $28.1 billion in controllable funds amounting to 12% of the total $229.2 billion budget, is available for domestic use. This is an increase of $5.8 billion over last year.

What few people realize is that 66% of the total 1972 budget figure, or $152.2 billion, is categorized as Uncontrollable or relatively uncontrollable expense. This means, briefly, that the President and Congress have little flexibility or choice in the expenditure of 66% of the budget.

This compares with $138.4 billion, or 69% in uncontrollable expenses in the 1971 budget.

Included in uncontrollable budget items are such programs as Social Security, medicare and other social insurance trust funds. These alone amount to $55.8 billion for Fiscal 1972.

Military retired pay, interest on the Federal debt, veterans benefits, medicaid and welfare assistance grants to states, farm price supports, operating costs of the legislative and judiciary branches of government and obligations to carry out prior-year contracts make up the remainder of the 152.2 billion in uncontrollable expenses.

None of these budget items is subject to administration discretion in the sense that existing legislation requires the expenditures of funds for these programs. But of course, changes in Social Security laws, veterans benefit laws, treasury borrowings, interest rates and other factors can have an upward or downward effect on these expenditures.

With 66% of the budget allocated to uncontrollable items, what discretion is left to the government to allocate money for so-called "controllable" categories or programs?

In Fiscal 1972, the total of "controllable" budget items requested by the President is $77.0 billion or 34% of the total budget. Theoretically, this is the figure the President and Congress can work with in setting budget priorities and in allocating funds for new programs.

This is an increase of 3% over the controllable budget estimate for Fiscal 1971, during which $62.4 billion, or 31% of the total budget, was allocated for controllable expenses.

Those concerned about the need for new and costly domestic programs in the areas of revenue sharing, housing, education, transportation, job training, pollution control and welfare reforms would, at first glance, feel that $77.0 billion would provide enough leeway to make room for some or all of these needed items.

However, a closer look at the controllable side of the 1972 budget paints a different picture. Of the $77.0 billion controllable budget dollars, the 1972 budget requests $48.9 billion or 64% of the controllable budget for defense expenditures.

This leaves $28.1 billion for civilian programs, which is even further reduced by a portion of the $7.8 billion in intragovernmental transactions between Federal agencies.

In Fiscal 1971, of the $62.4 billion in controllable expenses, $46.7 billion, or 75% of the controllable expenses, were allocated for defense.

President Nixon's proposed budget for Fiscal 1972, therefore, does show a significant shift in priorities from defense to domestic programs. Defense spending has been cut 11% from the 1971 level as a proportion of the controllable budget. This decrease is represented by an increase of 11% in spending for domestic programs such as revenue sharing, welfare reform and environmental quality.

The table below, however, showing the breakdown of controllable and uncontrollable budget items for 1970, 1971 and 1972 illustrates in dollar terms how slowly this change is occurring.

[Fiscal years, in billions]

Controllability in 1972	1970 actual	1971 estimate	1972 estimate
RELATIVELY UNCONTROLLABLE OUTLAYS UNDER PRESENT LAWS			
Open-ended programs and fixed costs:			
Social Security, Medicare, and other social insurance trust funds	$45.2	$53.6	$55.8
Interest	18.3	19.4	19.7
Veterans benefits: Pensions, compensation, education, and insurance	6.6	7.8	8.4
Medicaid program	2.7	3.3	3.8
Other public assistance grants	4.7	6.4	7.6
Farm price supports	3.8	3.2	3.6
Food stamp program	.6	1.5	2.0
Military retired pay	2.8	3.4	3.7
Postal Service	1.5	2.4	1.3
Legislative and Judiciary	.5	.5	.6
Other	2.1	2.9	3.6
Outlays from prior year contracts and obligations:			
National defense	24.9	22.4	22.4
Civilian programs	16.6	19.2	19.6
Subtotal, relatively uncontrollable outlays	130.2	146.0	152.2
RELATIVELY CONTROLLABLE OUTLAYS			
Allowances for pay raises:			
Department of Defense		.9	2.4
Civilian agencies		.5	1.0
National defense:			
Proposed volunteer army program			1.2
Other	52.3	49.6	47.7
Civilian programs:			
Proposed added amounts for revenue sharing			4.0
Proposed social security benefit increase		$1.1	$3.0
Other	$20.5	21.5	24.5
Allowance for contingencies		.3	1.0
Undisturbed intragovernmental transactions	−6.4	−7.2	−7.8
Subtotal, relatively controllable outlays	66.4	66.8	77.0
Total budget outlays	196.6	212.8	229.2

Source: Taken from p. 527 of the Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 1972. Estimates for fiscal 1971 have been updated and are, therefore, higher than used in the body of the article and taken from the table published with last year's analysis of controllable and uncontrollable expenses.

THE ETHNIC AMERICAN

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, very recently I read an article in "The Polish Women's Voice" entitled "The Ethnic American". The paper is published by the Polish Women's Alliance of Chicago.

The author, Barbara A. Mikulski, is presently an assistant professor of urban affairs at Community College in Baltimore. I was deeply impressed with her candid analysis of life in ethnic America, and I commend her for her insight into this problem.

The article follows:

THE ETHNIC AMERICAN

(By Barbara A. Mikulski)

The ethnic American is forgotten and forlorn. He is infuriated about being used and abused by the media, government, and business. Pejorative epithets such as "piks" and "racists" or slick, patronizing labels like the "silent majority" or "hard hats" are graphic examples of the lack of respect, understanding and appreciation of him and his way of life.

The ethnic Americans are 40 million working class Americans who live primarily in 58 major industrial cities like Baltimore, Chicago and midwest. Our roots are from Central and Southern Europe. We have been in this country for one, two or three generations. We have made a maximum contribution to this country, yet received minimal recognition.

The ethnics came to America at the turn of the century through the '20's, until we were restricted by prejudicial immigration quotas—65,000 Anglo-Saxons to 300 Greeks. We came looking for political freedom and economic opportunity. Many fled from countries where there had been political, religious and cultural opposition for 1,000 years.

It was the working class who built the Great Cities—constructed the skyscrapers, operated the railroads, working on the docks, factories, steel mills and in the mines. Though our labor was in demand, we were not accepted. Our names, language, food and other cultural customs were the subject of ridicule. We were discriminated against by banks, institutions of higher learning and other organizations controlled by the Yankee Patricians. The conditions under which we worked were horrendous. There

were no protective mechanisms for safety, wages and tenure. We called ourselves Americans. In return, we were called "wop," "polak" and "hunky."

For our protection, we formed our own institutions and organizations and clung together in our own neighborhoods. We created communities like "Little Italy" and "Polish Hill" in which to live and raise our families. The ethnic parish church and the fraternal organizations like the Polish Women's Alliance and the Sons of Italy became the focal points for the preservation of our culture and provision of community services. It was these institutions that helped set up citizen classes that established nursing homes for the elderly sick and provided educational opportunities for the young.

These neighborhoods were genuine "urban villages." Warmth, charm and zesty communal spirit were among their chief characteristics. People knew each other and related to each other in a personal way. This was true not only of relatives and friends, but of the grocer, politician and priest. The people were proud, industrious and ambitious for their children. All they wanted was a chance to "make it" in America.

We created our own Savings & Loan Associations to allow our neighbors to buy homes and start businesses. Money was lent on the basis of a man's character, rather than on the status of his job. Ethnics organized and fought to get their own political representatives. We knew these measures meant jobs and services coming into the community. Workers banned together into labor unions, fought for a New Deal and sought various routes of mobility. Government responded by instituting Social Security and the minimum wage. We haven't heard from it since then, except when our men get their draft notices.

Here we are in the 1970's, earning between $5,000–$10,000 per year. We are "near poor" economically, with no one listening to our problems or appreciating the contribution we have made to American life. The President's staff responds to our problems by patronizingly patting us on the head and putting pictures of construction workers on postage stamps. The media stereotypes us either as gangsters or as dumb clods in dirty sweat shirts. The status and value of manual labor has been denigrated to the point where men are often embarrassed to say they are plumbers or tug boat operators. This robs men of the pride in their work and in themselves. Society chooses to ignore the fact that architects would be helpless unless there are carpenters and brick layers to make their plans a reality; that manufacturers and their engineers would be powerless unless there are men to work on the assembly line and in the tractor trailers. In many instances, the ethnic working class is treated like the machines they operate and viewed only as objects of production.

The Ethnic American is also losing ground economically. He is the victim of both inflation and anti-inflation measures. Though wages have increased by 20 per cent since the mid '60's, true purchasing power has remained the same. Simultaneously, he is hurt by lay-offs due to cutbacks in production and construction. Tight money policies strangle him with high interest rates for installment buying, mortgages and home improvements. He is the man who at 40, is told by the factory bosses that he is too old to be promoted and there are no opportunities to be trained for something new. The old job is often threatened by automation. At the same time, his expenses are at their peak. He is paying on his home and car, probably trying to put at least one child through college and probably facing the responsibility of supporting an elderly parent. Some respond to their financial problems by moonlighting or by having his wife going to work. Family tension and conflict often arise.

He feels trapped and rejected. All of his life he has been taught that the "system" is good if only you work hard, not be demanding and obey the law. He has followed all of these rules. Yet, when he looks to government figures for help, he finds that his political representatives are not interested in listening to him. Nor are there any programmatic responses to his needs.

Paying the bureaucratic bill through inequitable taxes and getting little in the way of return seems to be his fate. In pursuing his treasured dream of home ownership, he finds that it becomes a millstone rather than a milestone in his life. Since FHA loans are primarily restricted to "new" housing, he cannot buy a house in the old neighborhood. He has to choose whether to get a conventional loan, which requires a much higher down payment, or move into an over-priced, homogenized housing development. As a home owner, he is forced to bear the brunt of spiraling property taxes—the major source of revenue in his city as a wage earner. He has no silk stocking lawyers or fancy lobbyists getting him tax breaks.

He believes in the espoused norms of American manhood like "a son should take care of his mother" and "a father should give his children every opportunity." Yet, he is often torn between putting out $60 a month for his mother's arthritis medication or paying for his daughter's college tuition. Nobody in the richest nation in the history of mankind should have to make a choice like that.

When the ethnic worker looks for some modest help, he is told that his income is too high. He's "too rich" to get help when his dad goes into a nursing home. If his wife suffers a major illness, his neighborhood isn't poor enough to qualify for free homemaker services. Colleges make practically no effort to provide scholarships to kids named Colstiani, Slukowski or Klima. Bewildered and embittered, he wonders what happened to the American Dream that he had at Iwo Jima and Pork Chop Hill.

The one place where he felt the master of his fate and where he had status was in his own neighborhood. Now even that security is being threatened. He wants new schools for his children and recreation facilities for the entire family—not just the token wading pool for preschoolers or the occasional dance for teenagers. He wants his street fixed and his garbage collected. He finds that the only thing being planned for his area are housing projects, expressways and fertilizer factories. He's told that those things represent "economic development" and "community progress." This makes him furious. Whose economics are developed and whose community is progressing? It is certainly not his. When he goes to City Hall to make his problems known, he is either put off, put down or put out.

Liberals scapegoat us as racists. Yet, there was no racial prejudice in our hearts when we came. There were very few black people in Poland, Lithuania or our other homelands. The elitists, who now smuggly call us racists, are the very ones who taught us the meaning of the word; however, their bigotry also extended to those of a different class or national origin. He is tricked by the political rhetoric of the illusionary funding of Black-oriented programs. Government is further polarizing people by the creation of myths that Black needs are being met. Thus, the ethnic worker is fooled into thinking that the Blacks are getting everything.

Thus, old prejudices and new fears are ignited. The two groups end up fighting each other for the same jobs and competing with each other so that the new schools and recreation centers will be built in their repective communities. They are falsely told that these resources are limited. What results is angry confrontation for tokens, when there should be an alliance for a whole new agenda for America. This agenda would be created when Black and White organize separately in their own communities for their own needs, but come together to form an alliance based on mutual issues, interdependence and respect. This alliance would develop new strategies for community organization and political restructuring. From this, the new agenda for America would be generated. It could include such items as "new towns in town," innovative concepts of work and creative structures for community control.

What is necessary is to get rid of the guilt of phony liberals, control by economic elitists and manipulation by selfish politicians. Then, let us get on with creating the democratic and pluralistic society that we say we are.

GOOD CITIZENSHIP AWARD

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, I am currently conducting a Good Citizenship Award competition in the high schools of Norfolk and Portsmouth, Va., as a means of recognizing high school senior students who have been contributing toward a better community by working with their school, organizations, and civic groups.

The award is given in cooperation with Norfolk School Superintendent E. L. Lamberth, and Portsmouth School Superintendent M. L. Alford, and the mayor's committee of Norfolk Mayor Roy Martin and Portsmouth Mayor Jack Barnes. The award is an all expense paid day in Washington as my guest, and a tour of the Capitol. The two winners will be a "Congressman for a Day."

The selection will be made on the basis of volunteer work, leadership or participation in a community service project such as a chuch, scout, civic or political organization, and leadership or participation in school activities.

A faculty committee of each school will select the school winner. The names of these nominees will be forwarded to the mayor's committee in each city, who will select the final winner.

This is the second annual contest, and I am sure the selection of a student from each Norfolk and Portsmouth high school will again prove to be not an easy task, and the selection of the final winner for each city will again be most difficult.

Recognition for students contributing toward a better community and interested in public and civic affairs is something we all recognize as a worthwhile undertaking. An award, such as the Good Citizenship Award, can perhaps bring to the public's attention that the majority of our students have appealing qualities and are interested in the orderly growth of our cities.

THE THREATS TO UNITED STATES AND FREE WORLD SECURITY

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Report which has been made public by the Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Melvin Laird, is a very important document. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the status of defense problems worldwide. It analyzes Communist capabilities in unusual detail and it provides a clear picture of the need for modernization of U.S. and free world forces in the period immediately ahead. I find much of particular interest in a section of this report which is entitled "The Threats to U.S. and Free World Security." I feel that this section should have careful study and I earnestly recommend that my colleagues in the Congress not overlook its significance.

I include the material as follows:

THE THREATS TO U.S. AND FREE WORLD SECURITY

The threats to U.S. and Free World security obviously were a central factor in planning forces and programs to implement the new strategy. Before discussing specific force planning under the strategy, let me review briefly the current and projected security threats. Admiral Moorer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will provide a more detailed analysis of the threat in his statement to the Committee.

This section summarizes the major threats we and our friends and allies must confront, primarily in terms of the categories of potential conflicts: stragetic and theater nuclear, theater conventional and subtheater. Also included are discussions of different dimensions of the threat: communist military assistance and the technological challenge. Tables 2 through 8 in the Appendix amplify the following summaries.

Although the various military forces are shown in specific categories for ease of understanding and clarity of presentation, such structuring does not mean that these forces can be neatly allocated specific roles in the spectrum of conflict. Just as is the case for U.S. forces, many of the force elements shown or discussed in this threat section could have multi-mission roles, could be used in theater or subtheater conflicts, or could be delivered to other countries under an assistance program.

THE STRATEGIC NUCLEAR THREAT

The primary strategic threat to the U.S.—the capability of the Soviet Union to deliver long range, nuclear weapons against targets in the United States—has been a matter of grave concern to us. Shown on Table 9 are our estimates of Soviet strategic offensive and defensive weapon systems in the near term. U.S. strategic forces are shown for comparison on Table 3. Although projections beyond those shown become progressively less certain, especially where they extend beyond the production and deployment leadtimes of the weapon systems involved, we must make such projections for future defense planning.

The Soviets have built up their ICBM forces at a rapid rate during the past five years, and as of the end of 1970, had some 1,440 operational launchers. There are indications, however, that construction on new silo starts has slowed during the past year.

The SS–11 deployment of launchers appears to have leveled off at the present time, with over 900 missiles, part of which are associated with the MR/IRBM fields. The deployment rate of the SS–9s decreased during 1970, even though deployment continued. Work on some sites may have been suspended and work has slowed on several others. The deployment rate of the SS–13 continues as it has for the past four years, with some indication that it may be slowing.

The implications of these trends are still not clear. The Soviets may have completed new starts for a programmed force of SS–9 and SS–11 missiles, or they may have slowed silo construction in order to proceed with retrofit of some existing silos with improved, modified or MIRVed missiles. Alternatively, the explanation may be that the Soviets are preparing to deploy new ICBM systems. We will, of course, be examining the situation carefully in order to get more precise indications of where they are headed.

However, we expect the Soviets by mid-1972, if they elect to continue work on those sites where construction has slowed or stopped, and to maintain the older systems at the current level, to have over 1,500 operational ICBM launchers, part of which are associated with the MR/IRIBM fields.

Beyond 1972 our projections of Soviet ICBM launchers and reentry vehicles (RVs) become less firm. As was the case last year, there is still no agreed estimate on what the size and characteristics of the Soviet force will actually be in the period after 1972, or on where it may level off.

It should be kept in mind that although the Soviets probably have no MIRVed missiles operational at the present time, MIRVs have been tested many tiems on the SS–9 since August 1968.

It is evident that the Soviets could have over the next few years, several distinctly different forces depending on their objectives and force decisions. Regardless of the direction in which they proceed, a key question would remain about the accuracy of the RVs in their ICBM force. It is estimated that the accuracy of the SS–9 could be substantially improved by 1975/76. With this improved RV accuracy, the projected Soviet SS–9 missile force could pose a serious threat to the future survivability of undefended MINUTEMAN silos.

The Soviet ICBM threat is augmented by a substantial nuclear-powered, ballistic-missile submarine fleet, that is presently the fastest growing element of the threat. The most capable component of this fleet is the Y-class, which, like the U.S. Polaris, has 16 tubes for launching missiles. There are now at least 17 such subs operational—capable of launching at least 272 missiles with a range of 1,300 nautical miles. The additional ballistic missile capability in older Soviet submarines gives them a total of more than 350 launchers in the operational inventory. Another 15 or more Y-class submarines are in various stages of assembly and fitting out. At the current production rate of 7–8 SSBNs per year, the USSR could develop an operational force of Y-class submarines by 1974, comparable in size to the current Polaris force. A longer range submarine launched ballistic missile is under active development. We cannot estimate deployment at this time.

The Soviet intercontinental heavy bomber force, which now numbers around 200 aircraft (including about 50 tankers) continues its slow downward trend of the past few years. Although we believe the Soviet medium bomber force of several hundred aircraft is targeted primarily against the Eurasian area, we cannot ignore the fact that these aircraft do have a one-way mission capability against the United States. The Soviets also have a new swing-wing bomber under development. Its future role has not been determined, but it is estimated to have intercontinental range capability.

With regard to the strategic defensive forces of the Soviet Union, there is extensive deployment of aircraft defenses, as well as an ABM system deployed around Moscow. The Soviets have a large inventory of radars numbering in the thousands and a force of over 3,000 interceptor aircraft. There is a slight trend towards a reduction in the number of these interceptors, but the quality of the force has improved. Four new interceptors have been added since 1964, and these newer models make up a substantial part of the force. In addition, four different SAM systems, with about 10,000 launchers, are presently deployed for air defense. There is concern by some of my technical experts that the SA–5 SAM might be capable of adaptation for certain ABM roles.

The Soviets now have four Moscow ABM complexes (ABM–1) operational. They are continuing construction of surveillance radars which could be a part of an ABM system, and are actively working on R&D related to development of new ABM system components, including a new missile. Further details are shown on Table 3.

As for the strategic nuclear threat of the Peoples Republic of China, their progress toward achieving in ICBM capability is continuing. The sophistication of Chinese missile programs was clearly indicated by the launching of China's first satellite in April 1970, probably using stages of an IRBM now under development. We believe that the Chinese could attain an initial operational capability (IOC) with ICBMs within three years after flight testing commenced. The start of testing has not yet been confirmed, but a reduced range test of an ICBM may have occurred in late 1970. Thus the earliest possible date for deployment would be 1973, but it is more likely that the Chinese ICBM will not attain IOC until a year or two later, and they probably could not have significant numbers of ICBMs deployed until late in the decade.

Further details on Chinese strategic systems are provided in Table 4.

THE THEATER NUCLEAR THREAT

The theater nuclear forces of the Soviet Union include large numbers of ballistic missile launchers (including short, medium, intermediate, as well as variable range missiles) and tactical surface-to-surface missile launchers assigned to their ground forces. In addition, their large medium bomber force of about 700 aircraft in Long Range and 400 aircraft in Naval Aviation is capable of carrying nuclear weapons, as are a substantial number of light bombers, fighter bombers and fighters in the tactical air forces. Soviet naval forces, both surface and sub-surface, also carry nuclear-capable missiles.

Theater nuclear capabilities of the Peoples Republic of China probably are limited currently to medium bombers, but limited deployment of the Chinese medium range ballistic missile (MRBM) may have occurred. The emphasis in Chinese R&D appears to have shifted in 1970 from the MRBM to development of an intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM). The Chinese MR/IRBM development efforts have also provided important experience for their ICBM program.

By mid-1971, the Chinese are expected to have a small number of MRBMs deployed. Their IRBM could attain IOC within the next year or two, and by mid-1972, the Chinese are expected to have operational a modest number of missiles, with a mix of MRBMs and IRBMs. This will, of course, provide an additional nuclear threat to the free nations of Asia.

China's primary aircraft for nuclear weapon delivery is the BADGER, now in series production. They now have a few of these aircraft operational and are expected to have a significant force by mid-1972.

THE SOVIET AND WARSAW PACT THEATER CONVENTIONAL THREAT

Over the past year, we have seen the Soviet and other Warsaw Pact forces continue their growth both in quality and in quantity. The Soviets now have at least 160 divisions including motorized rifle, tank, and airborne. This total includes divisions deployed along the USSR–Chinese border.

It should be borne in mind that Soviet divisions are appreciably smaller than their U.S. counterparts, and that the Soviets allocate a considerably smaller proportion of their manpower to combat and service support functions than we do.

Admiral Morer will discuss Soviet ground forces in greater detail in his presentation to the Committee.

Ground Combat. The Soviets probably will continue for the next few years production of the T–62 medium tank, with modifications.

In other categories of equipment we believe that the Soviets will gradually equip infantry units in at least some of the divisions with a new amphibious armored infantry combat vehicle. Furthermore, the Soviets are almost certainly experimenting with improved conventional weapons and within several years the Soviets could have sizeable operational inventories of improved conventional artillery shells, bombs, and missile warheads in theater force units.

We believe the Soviets will retain their current family of tactical missiles and that the number of tactical launchers will continue to grow.

Tactical Air. In tactical aviation, a gradual buildup probably will continue for the next few years. Over the longer term, the total aircraft inventory probably will decline as newer aircraft models reduce the requirement for large numbers of older fighters and light bombers. As of 1 January 1971, we believe that the force consisted of over 4,500 aircraft, including reconnaissance and support types. Almost half are capable of delivering nuclear weapons, though some of these aircraft at the present time are assigned to units that do not have a primary ground attack mission.

The Soviets have developed several new aircraft which could satisfy their requirement to replace obsolescent ground attack and light bombers and improve their air defense capability. One of these aircraft became operational in 1970, and another may be operational now in Soviet tactical aviation. A third, FOXBAT, recently was deployed with strategic defense forces as an interceptor, and may enter the tactical aviation inventory in 1971. If employed in tactical aviation, it is believed that the FOXBAT will retain its primary role as an interceptor and fulfill a specialized secondary reconnaissance role.

Air Defense. We expect the Soviets to continue to expand and improve their theater air defense systems, including the command and control systems and the tactical missile systems. The SA–4 GANEF missile system which has been in service with Soviet forces in the USSR and Eastern Europe since 1967, is now entering service with several of the subordinate armies, and the SA–6 GAINFUL is currently being deployed to upgrade Soviet capability in this category.

Naval Forces. It is obvious that an open-ocean navy has been developed by the Soviet Union. Already having the largest submarine force in the world, the Soviets have introduced several new, advanced classes of submarines since 1968. The Y-class SSBN already has been discussed. The introduction of nuclear-powered, cruise missile attack classes has added a new dimension to submarine warfare.

By the mid-1970's, the replacement of older diesel-powered, cruise missile and attack submarines with new nuclear-powered vessels could result in a quantitatively smaller but qualitatively improved submarine force.

Concurrent with this massive submarine construction and development program, the Soviets have introduced new and advanced naval missile systems.

Over the next five years, we expect the composition of the Soviet's major surface combatant fleet to change significantly as new missile-equipped combatants replace older ships armed with guns. Whereas in 1970, missile-equipped surface combatants accounted for 23 percent of the major surface combatant fleet, by 1975, we project that some 40–50 percent of the fleet will be missile-armed.

Lift Capability. With regard to lift forces the Soviets have increased their military air transport capability to include the AN–22/COCK heavy logistic transport, a number of which are operational with transport units. The new AN–22 can carry nearly 100,000 pounds of cargo to a radius of 2,800 nm or 175 troops to a radius of some 5,000 nm.

General—Warsaw Pact. With regard to future developments in forces of other Warsaw Pact nations, we believe that there will be qualitative improvements in general purpose forces over the next decade, but we see no trends which indicate substantial changes in their contribution to Warsaw Pact capabilities. Barring disruptive political developments, we believe the Soviets will continue to place heavy emphasis on East European forces opposing NATO.

THE IMMEDIATE THREAT IN THE MIDDLE EAST

We are hopeful that the initiative for peace in the Middle East will be successful. The President has described this area as ". . . the most dangerous . . . with its vastly greater potential for drawing Soviet policy and our own into a collision that could prove uncontrollable."

The situation in the Middle East can be fitted into potential categories of possible conflict only with difficulty. This illustrates the point I made earlier that forces which we have included in one category—such as the Soviet theater conventional threat—also represent capabilities that could be used in other types of conflict. The immediate threat in the Middle East, of course, consists of the potential for war between Arab states and Israel, but the possibility exists that such a conflict could involve the Soviet Union and the U.S. The balance of power in the Middle East obviously has a vital bearing on the U.S. security interests in that area. Moreover, the Soviets are deeply involved with and in some of the Arab states in the area.

Thus, we are striving to prevent the outbreak of a war that has a chance—however slight—of leading to a U.S.-Soviet confrontation, and we are trying to help obtain a peace settlement that will promote economic and political stability in the area. As the President has explained, our assistance programs are designed to preserve a balance of military power in this area.

The combined military forces of the Arab countries which are likely to be involved in a conflict—those of Egypt, Syria, and possibly Jordan and Iraq—are numerically superior to the Israeli forces. As before the June 1967 war, however, the qualitative superiority of the Israeli armed forces offsets the numerical difference.

E. THE THEATER AND SUB-THEATER THREAT IN ASIA

Our Asian allies and friends are faced with a threat that differs somewhat from that posed to NATO by the Warsaw Pact. The forces of the Peoples Republic of China, North Korea, and North Vietnam are able to engage in subversive and small-scale guerrilla attacks in bordering states, as well as being capable of mounting full-scale conventional attacks in adjoining countries. These forces, therefore, pose both a potential theater conventional threat, and a sub-theater threat. This should be kept in mind as we address the total forces available to China, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

In addition, the Soviet forces in Asia, which were covered previously, must be considered as part of the theater threat in Asia.

Communist China, however, poses the principal general purpose force threat in Asia. The Chinese army consists of approximately 2.5 million personnel, organized into a total of more than 140 combat divisions. The air force (including the Navy's air arm) consists of more than 4,000 aircraft, of which most are jet fighters, and a small fleet of about 300 jet bombers. The Navy's main offensive strength centers upon a growing force of more than 40 attack submarines, a number of which are of the medium-range R–Class; and increasing numbers of guided missile patrol boats. Chinese production of army ordnance, new guided missile destroyers and advanced jet fighter aircraft are contributing to a rapid modernization of the general purpose forces.

The Peoples Republic of China could conduct major offensive operations in four non-Communist areas: South Korea, Taiwan, Southeast Asia and India. While the Chinese have the largest land military force in the world, a commitment of forces in conventional military operations on more than one front would impose serious burdens on their available logistic resources, and is considered unlikely today, given China's limited logistic capabilities and its border problems with the Soviets. Such an effort would be possible only if there were no interdiction of China's lines of communications (LOCs) and capacity to make war.

Of course, in addition to the potential of its regular combat forces, China has significant ability to promote and support subversion and insurgency in peripheral areas.

North Korea poses another significant threat in Asia. The country's general purpose forces are relatively modern in structure and equipment and have attained a high state of combat readiness. The Army consists of some 360,000 personnel and about 25 division equivalents and could probably engage in initial offensive operations without external assistance.

The North Korean Air Force has more than 550 aircraft in its tactical air inventory, including MIG–21s. The air force also has a number of transport planes (including helicopters), and a small number of light bombers and 70 trainer aircraft.

The Navy includes a small submarine force, guided missile patrol boats, and a sizeable number of motor torpedo boats.

Any sustained conventional offensive operations would require considerable materiel and possibly military personnel assistance from North Korea's Communist allies. However, North Korea is capable of mounting a wide variety of unconventional warfare operations.

The North Vietnamese theater and sub-theater threat in Southeast Asia is significantly different from other threats in Asia since a portion of its force already is engaged in actual combat. We must, however, recognize the full dimensions of the military threat that could be posed by the North Vietnamese in Southeast Asia.

The Army has a total in-country strength of 315,000 and is organized into 13–14 division/commands. The Navy is relatively small and consists primarily of motor gun and torpedo boats. The North Vietnamese have a total of more than 200 fighter and attack aircraft in the Air Force. While most of these are MIG–15/17/19s, a significant number are MIG–21s.

The actual deployment of the North Viet-

namese Army outside its territory will be covered in the next section.

A brief summary of the threat in Asia is shown in Table 8.

THE IMMEDIATE SUB-THEATER THREAT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The actual deployment of a substantial portion (roughly half) of the North Vietnamese Army in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, along with the North Vietnamese support of local communist forces (Viet Cong, Khmer Communist, and Pathet Lao) in these countries, provides the immediate threat to our friends and allies in Southeast Asia. In South Vietnam we believe there are a total of at least 240,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese personnel actually deployed.

The major threat to friendly forces in South Vietnam continues to be posed by those VC/NVA forces just north of the DMZ, in the southern Laos Panhandle and in the northern two provinces of MR 1. The principal Communist threat in South Vietnam is the enemy's continued capability to launch a major, multi-regimental-level operation. In other areas, we believe the enemy will retain the capability of causing serious but temporary disruptions by launching significant, isolated attacks if he commits the bulk of available forces. Additional information on the security situation in South Vietnam is covered in Section I, Chapter II, of this report.

Communist strength in Cambodia is estimated to be over 55,000 VC/NVA forces and Khmer Communists. Communist activity here has been characterized by persistent light-to-heavy military pressure against population centers, increased acts of terrorism, communication throughout the countryside. Current Communist strength in Laos is estimated at about 145,000 North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao.

The present threat to Thailand is primarily one of insurgency. Although the insurgency continues to expand, it is not yet considered a serious threat to the internal stability of the Royal Thai Government. This assessment was given me by Thai officials during my recent visit there. Insurgents along the Thai/Malaysian border are under the direction of the Communist Party of Malaysia (CPM). The remaining insurgents are under the direction of the Communist Party of Thailand and receive some support from the Peoples Republic of China, North Vietnam, and Pathet Lao.

COMMUNIST MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Communist military assistance programs are another important aspect of the threat to Free World security interests. Soviet and Communist Chinese aid to North Vietnam, North Korea and the Warsaw Pact countries clearly increase the military threat which we and our allies must face. Moreover, Communist military assistance programs to non-Communist countries can, as in the case of the Middle East, pose a real threat to the maintenance of regional military balances. We do not have precise and complete data or means of measuring and estimating Communist military aid programs, but the information we have does indicate their overall magnitude and direction. We have not included economic assistance, which can, in some cases, be as effective as military assistance, and which we believe is substantial.

INTRA-COMMUNIST MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Our current best estimates are that military aid among Communist countries approximated $15 billion in the 1955–1970 period, with more than 85% provided by the Soviet Union.

The largest amount of intra-Communist assistance has gone to North Vietnam. More than 70% of it has been supplied by the Soviets, and virtually all of the remainder by Communist China. Between 1966 and mid-1970, Soviet aid to Southeast Asia has been concentrated on North Vietnam, and in that period, Hanoi has received substantial military equipment.

North Korea is also a major recipient, with the Soviet Union supplying all except a small amount provided by Communist China. During the period from 1966 to mid-1970, the Soviets provided North Korea assistance for the maintenance and modernization of North Korean forces.

More than half of the intra-Communist assistance in the 1955–1970 period is accounted for by aid transfers among the USSR and Eastern European countries. The Soviets have, of course, provided the vast bulk of this aid, but Poland and Czechoslovakia have also had fairly sizeable programs. Soviet assistance to Eastern European Communist countries has averaged over $500 million annually in the last ten years, and has included some of their most sophisticated aircraft and missile equipment.

The other two major Communist recipients of Soviet military assistance since 1955 have been Cuba and the Peoples Republic of China. Soviet assistance to the CPR totalled about $1.3 billion before it was terminated in 1960. Soviet military aid to Cuba has averaged about $20 million annually, and it is likely to continue at about that level for the next few years.

2. Communist Assistance to Other Countries

Communist countries have provided, in addition to the intra-Communist flow of military assistance, about $8 billion in military aid to other countries in the 1955–1970 period. The bulk of it, over 85%, has been provided by the Soviet Union, and the remainder by Eastern Europe (12%) and the CPR (2%).

Middle Eastern countries have received the largest proportion of this military aid (almost 55%), and this area is expected to remain the major recipient of Soviet aid to non-Communist countries. The UAR and the Soviet Union reportedly concluded a new military aid agreement during 1970, which probably covered the introduction of the SA–3 surface-to-air missile system into the UAR. Since 1967, the Soviets have also concluded military aid agreements with Iran which amount to over $300 million in value.

The Soviets have also provided significant amounts of military aid to the countries of South Asia, particularly India and Afghanistan. Soviet efforts to upgrade Afghan capabilities and increase their influence in India and Pakistan are expected to keep Soviet assistance to this area at relatively high levels in the next few years.

Soviet military aid to Indonesia was virtually cut off in 1965 after the fall of the Sukarno government. Since that time. Soviet aid to Indonesia has been limited to the sale of small quantities of spare parts for equipment previously supplied.

The Soviets have also provided smaller but still significant amounts of military aid to African states. Soviet aid in Africa has emphasized areas in North Africa and along the Red Sea which are adjacent to the major recipient countries in the Middle East.

The Chinese have provided substantial amounts of military aid to Pakistan and Tanzania in recent years.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL CHALLENGE

Forces in-being and military assistance are only part of the military threat to our nation's security. The technology behind the capabilities of our potential opponents, particularly the Soviets, is of severe concern to us. With the continuing technological effort on their part, we must expect the Soviets will be capable of reducing our technological lead in some areas, and at some point in the future, we could even lag in certain critical areas.

Since 1968, the Soviet RDT&E budget has increased at 10% to 13% per year, while that of the U.S. has remained essentially constant. Our estimates indicate that the Soviets are now spending, in 1968 equivalent dollars, some $3 billion more annually on military and space research and development than we do. The Soviet level of military and space technological effort appears to be significantly larger than that of the U.S.

With a technological effort of that size, our analyses indicate that the Soviets could reduce our technological lead of several years by approximately one year with the passing of every three years. Towards the mid-to-late 1970s, we may find that we have no technological lead at all—or worse—we may lag several years behind the Soviets in some critical areas by that time.

Although these comments relate primarily to our estimates of funding associated with Soviet research, the same general trends are evident with regard to other measures—manpower, facility growth, and basic research efforts. Given the fact that theirs is a closed society, if the Soviets were to take the technological lead, it would be much more difficult for us to guide our intelligence collection activities, to interpret the information we do acquire, and to make confident decisions based on this information.

The earlier part of this chapter points out the highlights in the growth of Soviet technical capabilities. As I mentioned earlier, there may be other, perhaps dramatic changes as a result of this Soviet momentum, which could emerge unexpectedly from their closed society, and which could create urgent problems for us in the future. These surprises and consequent problems could occur across the spectrum of capabilities—as unexpected threats to strategic force survivability, as new tactical weapons and surveillance systems which we might not understand or be able to cope with, and as other improvements in existing systems.

I mentioned earlier our review of U.S. R&D programs, our reasons for the increases we are proposing in R&D for FY 1972, and some of the R&D initiatives we are taking. In the next chapter, I will discuss many of the major development programs contained in the Defense Budget, relating to force modernization and improvement.

We cannot guarantee that technological surprises and problems will not develop, but unless we increase our research effort and improve its application, we can be increasingly confident that they will. Dr. Foster will discuss the technological challenge in greater detail when he appears before the Committee.

MARION, IND. PAL CLUB

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Police Athletic Club of Marion, Ind. is helping to create better communications and relationships between the youth and the police officers of this fine community.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the Marion PAL for its outstanding work and wish it continued success for the future.

It is interesting to note that the PAL director and the mayor of the city of

Marion credit the help of the Federal Criminal Justice Planning Agency with playing a big part in making this program the success that it is.

I submit for the RECORD a letter from PAL Director Ron Mowery and Mayor Gene O. Moore:

POLICE ATHLETIC LEAGUE,
Marion, Ind., March 2, 1971.

Congressman HILLIS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HILLS: I would first like to thank you for your interest in our local Police Athletic League.

Your taking time from your busy schedule to attend our Open House on Sunday, February 28, 1971, was very much appreciated.

I am sure you noticed at our Open House, the local support we are getting from the Community in creating a better communication and relationship between the youth and our police officers, is very great.

Although local contributions and donations have been overwhelming, PAL would not have been possible without the assistance of the Federal Government and the Criminal Justice Planning Agency. This Agency was most helpful in preparing the Grant request in the amount of $16,000.00.

I am sure that I speak for the whole Board of Directors in expressing a BIG THANKS to you and all who made it possible.

Respectfully,

RON MOWERY,
Police Athletic League Director.
GENE O. MOORE,
Mayor.

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE TALENT SEARCH HONORS THREE STUDENTS FROM THE SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's achievements in science and health in recent times can sometimes be taken for granted. One of the barometers of a sustaining devotion to scientific endeavor is in the activity of this country's youth. Three hundred young men and women were recently named to a select honor group in the 30th annual National Science Talent Search sponsored by the Westinghouse Educational Foundation. I take great pride in congratulating all the members of the honors group and especially commending the three outstanding students from my congressional district for the award projects they completed:

Clement Balanoff, of 9204 South Phillips Avenue, Chicago; a student at James H. Bowen High School. Project: Compact and connected spaces.

Lynn Janice Strauss, of 8754 Euclid Avenue, Chicago; a student at James H. Bowen High School. Project: Antibacterial activity of human saliva on escherichia coli.

Dennis James Trevor of 14225 South Wentworth Avenue, Riverdale, Ill.; a student at Mendel Catholic High School. Project: Co(III) covalent bonding interactions observed in absorption spectra.

THE ALASKAN PIPELINE—SOME NEW INFORMATION

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, recently I placed in the RECORD the text of the Jorgenson report, a reasoned and thorough statement which criticized the Interior Department's environmental impact statement on the Alaskan pipeline. The main author of the report was Harold T. Jorgenson, then in the Bureau of Land Management. It seems that there was an attempt on the part of some Interior officials to keep the Jorgenson dissent quiet until after it became the subject of a Jack Anderson article and after I placed the report in the official record of the Interior Department's pipeline hearings in Washington on February 16.

Today I am placing in the RECORD another excellent report—this one written by the Alaskan Army Corps of Engineers—which criticizes the Interior Department's impact statement. Again, this report was the subject of a Jack Anderson article and, again, it appears that there was a conscious attempt—by the Pentagon, this time—to keep the report secret.

Among many other good points, the Corps of Engineers' report criticizes the Interior Department impact statement for:

Failing to "fully comply with the letter and spirit of the Environmental Policy Act," which requires a full report of the expected ecological consequences arising from a proposed project.

Assuming without sufficient data that immediate development of the Alaskan oil deposits is necessary for the national security.

Agreeing to stipulations which "are too general to support the positive assurances given throughout the report that adverse ecological changes and pollution potential will be eliminated or minimized by these stipulations."

I urge you to read this important report, which follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
ALASKA DISTRICT,
CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
Anchorage, Alaska, February 5, 1971.

Memorandum to NPAEN.

Subject: Review Comments—Interior Department Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

Chief of Engineers, ATTN: ENGCW.

1. Forwarded as requested are review comments on the draft of Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline (Incl. 1). These comments were jointly prepared by the Alaskan Command, North Pacific Division, and the Alaska District.

2. During our review of this impact statement, it became evident that comments could not be limited to our regulatory responsibilities for a comprehensive treatment of this document. We found it important to introduce discussion on matters where it appeared that the information contained in the statement did not conform to OCE instructions for preparation of similar statements on Corps of Engineer projects or did not seem consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Your particular attention is invited to Part 1, general comments A, B, and C, covering a general statement, legal sufficiency, and Department of the Army permit requirements.

3. We must emphasize that the time allocated for this review was insufficient to properly assess and prepare commentary of sufficient depth required on a project of this magnitude and with the potential for environmental change it could introduce. Although considerable effort and expense were incurred in developing the attached comments, we do not consider them as the comprehensive analysis required by the Environmental Policy Act. In this respect, we find that compliance with the Act in the review capacity will introduce a need for separate funding. This subject will be further developed in additional correspondence.

4. The definition of navigable streams in Alaska, particularly as it applies to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline project requires immediate attention. It is our judgment that a policy statement that can be used in all situations, but particularly as it would apply to this project is an urgent necessity. We cannot over emphasize the importance with which we view the need to define navigable streams and our associated responsibilities.

5. The limited reviev period together with "operation minimize" seriously curtailed our communications and allied coordination with the North Pacific Division. In order to reflect complete understanding, you will note that some comments by NPD have been included although they closely parallel other similar discussions. We felt it important that all aspects of these comments be presented, but limitations noted did not allow coordination of them into combined statements. We understand that comments from the Alaskan Command would be forwarded directly to the Department of Defense. However, we received comments from them and they have included their views under separate headings.

PAUL BAZILWICH, Jr.
Lieutenant Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Acting District Engineer.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT, TRANS-ALASKA PIPELINE

PART I. GENERAL COMMENTS (BASED ON LIMITED REVIEW)

A. General

1. Our review of the impact statement results in the general conclusions that the draft statement is deficient because it fails to fully comply with the letter and spirit of the Environmental Policy Act. Section 102(C) of the Act, requiring preparation of environmental impact statements, is followed by the express requirement in paragraph (D) that all Federal agencies shall, "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources."

These requirements clearly contemplate an active, objective inquiry into the environmental effects of proposed Federal projects, and bona fide consideration of these effects in making basic decisions at every stage of project planning. The Department of Interior's draft statement does not appear to accomplish this to the degree that we consider the law requires. The document, therefore, in our opinion is quite vulnerable to challenge.

2. Although the statement presents much information on the physiography of the pipeline route and on similar non-controversial matters, it contains limited detailed analyses of the proposed construction and operation of the pipeline. While the reason

for this is known to those close to the project, without this information, conclusions on environmental effects appear to be unsupported opinions which; in fact, in many instances they indeed are. It is very important that this statement include a reemphasis on the point that no construction will be permitted until such time as design analysis, plans and specifications are in such a stage of development as to be acceptable to the Government agencies that are charged with responsibility for the protection required by Environmental Acts.

The statement's consideration of alternatives is also unconvincing. Some subjects which appear least practicable are discussed in detail, while others which warrant equal or greater considerations are summarily dismissed.

3. We recognize the difficulty of developing an adequate environmental impact statement on a controversial project of such scope and complexity. We are aware of the problems inherent in correlating technical data with less quantifiable ecological concepts. Even with allowances for these obstacles, we do not believe the draft statement meets the standard of inquiry contemplated by the Act.

B. Legal sufficiency

1. The statement of alternatives to the proposed pipeline construction may not be legally sufficient to meet the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Section 102(2)(C)(iii). Read in the context of the Act, this requirement will probably be interpreted to impose a duty of very comprehensive consideration of alternatives. Of the range of alternatives considered, one should be deferral of construction or nondevelopment.

2. The injunction presently barring issuance of the pipeline permit was granted by a United States District Court in part because the Department of Interior failed to file a detailed environmental impact statement pursuant to the Act. The injunction will remain in effect until a statement is filed in conformance to requirements of the Act.

3. There appears to be an analogy to the case of Udall versus Federal Power Commission, decided by the United States Supreme Court on 5 June 1967. Interpreting the Federal Power Act, the Court held that Federal Power Commission had failed to consider all alternatives properly in determining whether private power companies should be licensed to build High Mountain Sheep Dam on the Snake River.

a. Relevant provisions of the Federal Power Act merely required the Commission to show that private power development was a satisfactory alternative to federal development. Mandatory areas of consideration were not indicated specifically, as they are in the NEPA. Not withstanding this comparatively broad discretion in the Commission, the Court held that failure to consider specific matters, including the consequences of nondevelopment, barred issuance of the license.

b. The Court stated, "implicit in the reasoning of the Commissioner . . . is the assumption that this project must be built and that it must be built now . . . But neither the Examiner nor the Commission specifically found that deferral of the project would not be in the public interest or that immediate development would be more in the public interest than construction at some future time or no construction at all."

c. The Commission did find that Pacific Northwest power companies needed additional power and would be able to use it as soon as it became available from the proposed dam. However, the Court held that the inquiry should not stop there, but should proceed to detailed exploration of other issues pertinent to whether the project would be in the public interest. These issues included "whether deferral of construction would be more in the public interest than immediate construction and whether preservation of the reaches of the river affected would be more desirable and in the public interest. . . ."

4. As noted the above case was decided prior to passage of the NEPA. In view of the latter statute's express requirement that alternatives be considered, it seems reasonable to believe that the courts would interpret it as strictly as the Federal Power Act.

5. Interior's statement of alternatives is based on the premise that domestic petroleum needs, according to present projections, will grow; that without North Slope oil it will be impossible to meet these needs without increased imports of Eastern Hemisphere oil; and that dependence on such imports would be detrimental to security. This may well be true as far as it goes. But it is not a statement of the consequences of nondevelopment as an alternative. The basic question would seem to be, rather, the consequences if supply failed to meet energy demands.

C. Permit program

1. Paragraph B-9 of the proposed stipulations requires the applicant to obtain any permits required by Federal law. Among these would be the Department of the Army permits issued under authority of Sections 10 and 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. These permits would regulate structures, and discharges or deposits, in navigable waters, and would cover pipeline streambed crossings, gravel extraction, and terminal construction.

2. Engineer Regulations implementing NEPA expressly require preparation of an environmental impact statement in connection with permit issuance, when the activity to be permitted would significantly and adversely affect the quality of the environment. Interior's draft statement admits on pages 121, 124, and 145 that Prince William Sound is a valuable fishery, and may be gravely damaged by chronic low-level pollution and marine oil spills. Clearly issuance of permit for the Valdex terminal would require preparation of an environmental impact statement.

3. We understand that the subject draft Statement is intended to cover the pipeline project as a whole, including terminal construction. If this is correct, the terminal should receive far more detailed treatment than it has.

4. A marine facility handling from 600,000 to 2,000,000 barrels of oil and 23,3409PM to 38,9009PM of oil ballast water poses different problems than a pipeline on land.

a. Ballast water treatment and precautions against oil spills are closely dependent on water and harbor characteristics such as currents, tides, seasonal variations in water volume, etc. These characteristics should be discussed.

b. The statement on page 8 that floating booms and skimming devices will be used to retain oil spilled at the docks is phrased in such a way as to suggest that this system is recognized to work effectively. It should be recognized that there are numerous technical uncertainties in cleaning up marine oil spills and that complete recovery of spilled oil is not likely. The statement should include data on projected cleanup costs and who will bear them.

5. The Corps of Engineers cannot and will not abandon its regulatory responsibilities under the Rivers and Harbors Act. Data in the Department of Interior's draft impact statement is totally inadequate for use by the Corps in determining the environmental impact of proposed activities under permit in navigable waters. In the present absence of detailed design date, there can be no assurance to the Department of the Interior or to Alyeska Pipeline that the Corps will issue permits for this work.

a. Acceptable design, design analysis, plans and specifications, procedures, and quality controls, together with all other supporting data required by the Corps of Engineers for permit processing under Sections 10 and 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, must be presented timely to the Corps, and to Interior for development of the final environmental impact statement.

b. Issuance of a pipeline permit by the Department of the Interior does not guarantee issuance of permits by the Corps under Section 10 and 13 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. This should be made clear to the Interior Department, Alyeska Pipeline, and the public to avoid a possible impasse for which the Corps could be severely criticized.

6. Either the environmental statement for the pipeline project should cover the terminal in depth, or the Corps should prepare a separate environmental impact statement on the terminal. Because of the inevitable duplication of separate statements, we recommend the former course, provided the final statement includes all the necessary data described above.

D. Safety

1. Recommend that proposed U.S. Labor Department Standards, under Construction Safety Act of 1969 as finally adopted, be utilized on all sections of the lines.

2. Enforcement of safety standards should be designated as the responsibility of the Authorized Officer.

3. References to ANSI B 31.4, 1966, on page 2 of the impact statement and on page 16 of the Environmental Stipulations, should include ANSI reference addendum ANSI B 31.4a, 1969, and all addendums that may be current at time of design approval.

4. Applicable Code—Refer to: Part I, page 2, Project Description, Pipe and associated Elements, lines 12 and 13, (2) the Department of Transportation's proposed regulations on "Transportation of Hazardous Materials by Pipeline."

Part B, General, page 16, paragraph 10, Pipeline Standards, ii The Department of Transportation's proposed regulations on "Transportation of Hazardous Materials by Pipeline."

It is recommended that at the two above referenced places in the Environmental Impact Statement that the words "Transportation of Hazardous Materials by Pipeline" be deleted and that in lieu thereof the reference at both places be amended and the following language be substituted:

"Code of Federal Regulations, Title 49, 1969 Ed.), Chapter 1, Part 195 Transportation of Liquids by Pipeline, with the following exceptions: Delete subparagraph 195.1(b)(4) in its entirety." (NOTE: The Alyeska Pipeline transports crude petroleum in rural areas, except for minor segments of pipeline, between a production facility and the point where the petroleum is received by carrier. It therefore is exempt from Part 195, except for Subpart B, Accident Reporting.) It is recommended that the provisions of Part 195 be made applicable to the Alyeska Pipeline except (1) that all materials shall be constructed to be suitable and safe against damage in storage, in construction, and after installation in the pipeline when subjected to temperatures in the range to which it will be exposed, (2) in paragraph 195.248 add new subparagraph 195.248(b)(3) with the language, "soil types and seismic occurrences described in subparagraph 195.248(c) are present or are likely to occur during the anticipated life of the pipeline."

E. Real estate

1. The stipulations contained in this Impact Statement provide that the issuance of permit for construction will be subject to valid existing rights already granted to oth-

ers. It is assumed that PLO No. 3520 dated 5 January 1965, withdrawing 8,958,720 acres of land as a Power Site Classification (No. 445) is such a valid right; however, there exist no specific conditions in the stipulations alerting the Permittee to potential impact of crossing this area. Similarly, the question of future designation of streams and rivers as navigable within the meaning of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 is not specifically treated in the current stipulations.

2. It is noted that both of the above subjects, i.e., future designation of Dams and Reservoirs and future designation of Navigable Waters, were treated specifically in the Proposed Pipeline Stipulations, July, 1969 draft, by Department of the Interior.

3. The public should not be required to bear the expense of any pipeline relocations or modifications necessary to accommodate future public projects, such as dams and reservoirs, which might be located on public lands. To avoid any possible disputes and future litigation on this subject, it is recommended that the financial burden of any such relocation or modifications of the pipeline necessitated by future public projects be specifically stated as the obligation of Permittee by reinstatement of the following clauses in any permit (stipulations) governing construction of the proposed pipeline:

(a) Relocation or modification of the pipeline necessitated by the future designation of streams, rivers and lakes as "Navigable" within the meaning of the Rivers and Harbors Act of March 3, 1899, as amended, shall be at the sole expense of the Permittee.

b. Relocation or modification of the pipeline which might be required in planned or future damsite and/or reservoir areas shall be at the sole expense of the Permittee providing any such projects are constructed partially or fully with Federal funds or grants.

F. Stipulations

1. The technical and environmental stipulations presently contained in the statement are too general to support the positive assurances given throughout the report that adverse ecological changes and pollution potential will be eliminated or minimized by these stipulations. We do not find that the stipulations in themselves can guarantee adequate protection of environmental matters. While the stipulations do establish guidelines for the purposes of this statement and for design, construction, and operating considerations, we believe that it will be absolutely necessary for the Government to insist upon specific construction features and operating characteristics which are based upon the actual design details. We find that the last sentence on page 11 of the technical stipulations does not adequately encompass matters other than those now contained in the stipulations but which may later be found necessary for environmental protection. We recommend this wording be revised as follows and made a condition of the right-of-way permit:

"Plans and specifications, design analyses procedures, and quality controls, together with all supporting data, including but not limited to exploration and test data that will ensure compliance with the Environmental and Technical needs shall be presented and be acceptable to the Authorized Officer prior to any construction."

G. Secondary effects

1. The impact statement alludes to the fact that secondary effects are likely, but that they should each be examined individually at such time as they occur. The Corps of Engineers today finds itself under criticism for its civil works projects. Many of these projects in themselves created little or minor environmental impact, but they did change or create economic considerations in such a manner that the overall effect introduced conditions now found to adversely affect environmental values. We believe this impact statement must analyze secondary effects similar to those discussed in much greater depth. Without such a searching analysis and quantifying where possible, this project could establish conditions which produce pressures that seriously curtail the ability to effectively reduce the impact of future significant ecological changes or pollution potential. In any case should this project be found to be in the overall interest of the Nation, the comprehensive analysis would enable immediate commencement of long-range planning for the other developments that will be necessary or desirable in accordance with section 102(B) of "The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

a. The development of this major oil field and its allied transportation system to world markets will undoubtedly introduce a major population increase in South-central Alaska under boom conditions. The impact statement, by limiting consideration only to the work force the pipeline construction itself, presents an entirely different impact on population growth and its effect on Anchorage, Fairbanks, and Valdez than most people anticipate. The experiences in the United States and other areas of the world have been that such development does introduce major changes in the economic climate which in turn brings about other development. The potential change of Valdez from a small fishing village into a major industrial port seems imminent. We find that Anchorage within the past two years has developed the characteristics of a developing major city. Fairbanks is experiencing similar changes. We believe the impact statement, must under the purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, address itself to such matters. We suggest that by so doing all government bodies and the oil industry itself can institute planning functions, funding, controls, etc., that will be necessary to maintain a quality of life envisioned under the act. These are considerations commonly found in comprehensive design memorandums.

b. The impact statement fails to mention in a comprehensive manner the development of the North Slope oil resources; its construction requirements and effect; the short and long term population for the area and its effect. Likewise, the terminal(s) in the lower 48 states should, it seems, be included in the statement for a comprehensive understanding in the magnitude of this undertaking. All these matters together with the shipping lanes to market hold major potential changes in environmental matters. It seems only logical that they be fully explored. These types of investigations were also normal to development of Corps of Engineers projects before passage of the environmental acts.

H. Environmental stipulations

1. Environmental stipulation No. 16 does not adequately cover the problems inherent in deactivation of the pipeline and its future impact on the environment. We believe additional thought should be given to removal of the underground pipe. The effect on the environment should also be covered in the impact statement.

I. Contingency plan for recovery and disposal of crude oil spills

1. The environmental stipulations covering the contingencies plan for recovery and disposal of oil spills require the permittee to prepare a detailed plan for acceptance prior to commencement of operations. However, the impact statement describes a method using trucks which we do not find adequately meet environmental needs in the case of massive spills. For such spills we recommend consideration be given to reintroduction of the oil back into the line in the immediate area of the spill by tapping the pipe and pumping.

J. Thermal relief and pressure disposal

1. The crude oil transportation pipeline system, must be provided with adequate pressure relief devices and pressure disposal piping. Drawings, specifications and design analysis should clearly delineate disposal methods, where the protection will be installed, and details for the construction.

L. NPD comments

1. As shown by letter of 22 July 1970 to the attorney for the Wilderness Society: (See attachment No. 1.) Army permits are required where this pipeline involves navigable waters of the U.S., as well as easements in military reservations. Also, it shows that many of those permits have been issued. No compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act is indicated.

2. Cumulatively, if not individually, issuance of those permits significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Under the Tentative Guidelines of the Council, the lead agency should prepare the statement. Interior is the lead agency so its statement should satisfy the requirement of the National Environmental Policy Act, but will only do so if its statement adequately covers the Corps, Army and Defense actions.

3. The "proposed action" page 1, is limited to application for right-of-way over Federal lands, presumably Interior's. It should also cite application for easements across military reservations, and permits for work, discharges and deposits in navigable waters of the U.S. from the Army.

4. The statement notes that about 350 rivers and streams will be crossed by the proposed pipelines. As noted in paragraph E(3) of the stipulations, most such crossings will be underground. Of the major rivers listed, the Corps presently considers the Yukon, Tanana, Tolovana and Koyukuk as being navigable. This is subject to change. All crossings over or under U.S. navigable waterways which involve structures, activities or alterations covered in Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, 33 U.S.C. 401 and 403, will require permits from the Corps.

5. All possible river sites for excavation of gravel and other construction materials are not covered in the environmental statement. Permits from the Corps will be needed under 33 U.S.C. 403 before such material is removed from the bed of any navigable waterway of the United States.

6. The environmental statement mainly covers the pipeline itself, mention is also made of secondary effects, such as required port facilities at Valdez. All such facilities constructed below mean high water at Valdez Harbor will require a Corps permit under 33 USC 403, and the statement must clearly cover the impact of such construction and associated navigation.

7. In issuing permits in the above situations, the Corps must impose additional provisions for the protection of the environment as may appear necessary, including provisions related to those contained in stipulations F, G, H, and O.

8. Stipulation H, "Small Craft Passage," does not appear to be warranted. Any obstruction to navigation on U.S. navigable waterways must be authorized by the Corps, and said stipulation implies that obstructions of craft over 40 feet is all right. In addition, it would be up to the Corps to decide if obstructions to boats under 40 feet would be reasonable in processing the required permit application, so the absolute prohibition is unjustified as to such craft.

9. The determination that this source and mode of transportation of oil is necessary for national security should be made and supported by Department of Defense or the Executive Office.

10. It will be near impossible to stay within the 54 ft. wide pipe right-of-way unless it is directly adjacent to the road. The stipulations page 34, paragraph F-6 direct the contractor to stay within the right-of-way.

11. Attachment 1, page 32, paragraph 3, Water Crossings. Clarify with respect to timing of stream bed excavation.

12. Attachment 11, page 8, paragraph 4 deletes the word 'reasonable" from fifth line.

13. Attachment II, page 9, paragraph 4a (2). Clarify by indicating the cover in channel crossings is 120% of computed maximum scour but not less than 4 feet.

M. Comments by Alaskan Command

a. The last sentence of the second paragraph on page 10 indicates the military comprises about 11 percent of the total population of Alaska. This should be changed to reflect the Department of Defense military and civilian personnel, and their dependents, comprise 23 percent of the total population of Alaska. The breakout of figures to support this is based on January 1, 1971 data as follows:

Military, 29,986.
Military Dependents, 32,865.
DoD Civilians, 5,178.
DoD Civilian Dependents, 3,826.
71,855 divided by 313,000 equals 22.96%.

b. The impact statement should stress that specific stipulations applicable to Military Real Estate will be contained in the permit authorizing construction on lands controlled by the Department of Defense. These stipulations will contain provisions peculiar to the military operation as well as all of the Interior Department's Environmental Stipulation which do not conflict with the military missions.

N. Alaskan Air Command comment

1. The stipulations for the proposed Trans-Alaska Pipeline, prepared by the Department of the Interior, appear to provide safeguards that will minimize degradation of the environment in areas of pipeline construction and operation. We concur with the evaluations on page 196 of this document

PART II. SPECIFIC COMMENTS—BASED ON LIMITED REVIEW

A. *Page 2.* Line 14: This paragraph is inaccurate and requires rewording. We recommend the following:

"The pipe is manufactured to American Petroleum Institute Specifications 5LX and 5LS, modified to provide greater ductility at the low Arctic temperature. The steel pipe has an outside diameter of 48 inches and is furnished in two wall thicknesses, 0.462 inches and 0.562 inches, and in three strengths, (1) 60,000 psi. minimum yield and 75,000 psi. minimum tensile, (2) 65,000 psi. minimum yield and 77,000 psi. minimum tensile, and (3) 75,000 psi. minimum yield and 82,000 psi. minimum tensile in 0.462 inch wall thickness only. The specifications additionally require fine grain, fully killed steel and Charpy impact tests to control toughness and ductility, in recognition of the exposure conditions. Ultrasonic, radiographic, and hydrostatic testing, including a 20 second hydrostatic mill test at 95% of minimum yield strength, and a 24 hour pressure test at 125% of maximum operating pressure in the as constructed condition, are required. The pipe coating selected is 10 mil powdered epoxy resin that is resistant to flame, funginert, and resistant to chemicals normally present in soils. The coated pipe would be cathodically protected after burial by impressed current devices that operate successfully in cold climates. This dual protection would minimize "the adverse effects from external corrosion to the pipe."

B. *Page 3.* Pump Stations: The number of pump stations cannot be finalized until stresses in the pipeline have been thoroughly evaluated since stresses due to internal pressures are additive to bending, seismic, and other stresses; Therefor, we recommend restating the last sentence on page 3 as follows:

"Preliminary design indicates that the line———."

C. *Page 4.* Marine Terminal: We recommend the discussion of the marine terminal indicate that the initial stage construction is to accommodate two 250M D.W.T. tankers plus one 120M D.W.T. tanker simultaneously and provide for processing 23,340 gpm of ballast, and that the future construction will accommodate four 250M D.W.T. tankers plus one 120M D.W.T. tanker simultaneously and provide for processing 38,900 gpm. of ballast.

D. *Page 4.* Marine Terminal: No provisions for cathodic protection of either dock or tank facilities.

E. Under pipeline monitoring system Pages 6 & 7.

1. Small leak detection discussed but inadequate. System is adequately only for major line leaks.

2. Air patrol is described and associated with leak detection—Not true unless major leak—Air patrol is helpful to observe changes in line cover, land slides, and washouts. It is also helpful to determine encroachment on line right-of-way by various other construction activities—Page 7.

3. The discussion concerning the proposed system design to detect pipeline leaks and to control the volume of oil that may escape the pipeline leaks or breaks does not seem adequate to fully weigh the potential impact on the environment. The following tables showing volumetric content of the pipeline should be included in the Statement to show the potential excapement that could occur between isolating valves at various spacings. A maximum valve spacing should be considered as well as a requirement to locate valves at closer spacings in particular sensitive areas:

TABLE II.—PIPELINE, VOLUMETRIC CONTENT, 48-INCH O.D. × 0.562-INCH WALL THICKNESS

Pipeline distance		Volumetric content	
Lineal feet	Miles	Gallons	Barrels
1	----------	89.6533	2.1346
10	----------	896.533	----------
100	----------	8,965.33	----------
1,000	----------	89,653.3	----------
5,280	1	473,369.	11,271.
	10	4,733,690.	112,710.
	25	11,834,225.	281,775.
	50	23,668,450.	563,550.
	100	47,336,900.	1,127,100.
	789	373,488,141.	8,892,819.

This distance will be laid with pipe having two wall thickness, i.e., 0.562 inches and 0.462 inches. Accordingly, data shown in this table being for 0.562 inches wall thick pipe, actual total volumetric content of the as-built pipeline will be somewhat greater than the volumes shown. Furthermore, the distance of 789 miles is a tentative distance. Actual lineal feet of pipeline to be laid will be unknown until the as-built measurement becomes available. Consequently, volumetric content shown is tentative and will be subject to being adjusted when the as-built measurement becomes known.

PARSELL LAYS OFFICER'S DEATH TO LAXITY IN GUN PROSECUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. Mike Maza, News staff writer, in an article appearing in the Detroit, Mich., News of Saturday, February 20, 1971, entitled "Parsell Lays Officer's Death to Laxity in Gun Prosecution."

Perhaps a reading of this article will lead some of the proponents of legislation to restrict the right of a citizen to own and use firearms for legitimate sporting and defense purposes to the conclusion that better enforcement of existing laws might well be their effort at this time.

It is my feeling that if existing laws were appropriately enforced, there would be no need to strip free American citizens of rights carefully set out by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution to own and use firearms for legitimate defense and sporting purposes.

If 20,000 laws on the books do not protect American citizens how is one to expect that criminals will be deterred in their nefarious ways by disarming the law abiding?

The article follows:

PARSELL LAYS OFFICER'S DEATH TO LAXITY IN GUN PROSECUTION

(By Mike Maza)

The head of Detroit's police union has charged that laxity in prosecution and sentencing of persons carrying guns illegally is responsible for the off-duty death of a Detroit policeman and the city's soaring homicide rate.

"It is common knowledge in Detroit that, while drunk drivers go to jail, anyone can carry a gun through the courtesy of the prosecutor's office and the courts," said Carl Parsell, president of the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA).

The criticism, leveled at the Wayne County prosecutor's office and Detroit Recorder's Court, was Parsell's second blast at the two agencies this year.

"The murder of Officer Edward Coleman," a 43-year-old patrolman shot to death while visiting friends yesterday, "could not have been prevented by police," Parsell said.

Because the man police are holding in connection with Coleman's death, Walter L. Carson, 33, of 8651 Roselawn, has no felony record, Parsell said, "the prosecutor and the courts would not have prosecuted his illegal conduct before he shot and killed someone."

Parsell said Carson had no permit to carry a gun.

"Under an agreement between the prosecutor's office and the courts, police would not have been able to obtain a warrant for this potential killer had they stopped him before the murder," Parsell said.

Replying to Parsell's earlier criticism of court policies, Recorder's Executive Judge Robert E. DeMascio said:

"We are required by law to judge each case on its merits."

DeMascio said he wouldn't send a man to jail for carrying a gun illegally if the man had no criminal record and if it were shown that the man feared for his own or his family's safety.

"The prosecutor's office screens these cases carefully, as it should," DeMascio said.

A spokesman for the prosecutor's office said guidelines have been adopted so that persons without criminal records will not be prosecuted for carrying concealed weapons under the felony statute but for failure to present a firearm for safety inspection, a misdemeanor.

Parsell said yesterday the policy is responsible for Detroit's "fast becoming known as Murder City."

SMOKESCREEN OBSCURES FLORIDA BARGE CANAL ISSUE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, promoters of the discredited Cross-Florida Barge Canal have raised a series of

smokescreens to try and obscure the critical environmental considerations which led President Nixon to call a permanent halt to the project.

The latest stratagem is to falsely accuse the President of making his decision solely on political considerations—a charge laden with irony since President Kennedy's agreement to fund the long-dormant project was admittedly a political one.

Basis for the attack on President Nixon is a selected excerpt from a memorandum canal supporters say was sent from Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality, to the White House. The advocates have repeatedly quoted out of context from a single paragraph of the document.

This memorandum would be a privileged communication, and canal supporters will not say how they obtained it. If it is authentic and we accept their quotation of the fourth paragraph of the memorandum, it is only fair and reasonable that we be allowed to examine the entire document.

I have managed to obtain a copy of the memorandum from which canal advocates are citing a select passage as evidence that the President "played politics" in halting construction of a 107-mile ditch across the middle of Florida.

I can see why they cite only the portion which they believe supports their case. I can understand why they have not released the entire document. For the memorandum fully supports the President's determination that continuation of the nearly $200 million project would result in irreparable damage to Florida's environment and pose a serious threat to the State's water supply.

This is not the message canal advocates are trying to publicize.

True, the last point considered in the memorandum is of the possible political consequences of halting the project. And it notes, quite accurately, that the majority of Florida residents do not support the canal. As I have said previously, if reexamining programs in light of the public's determination to preserve our great natural assets is "playing politics," then let us have more of it.

Since canal advocates give great credence to this memorandum and publicize select portions which they believe serve their purposes, I feel strongly that the American people are entitled to the full text of this document so they can judge for themselves whether the President acted wisely in halting a project of marginal economic benefit and of serious environmental impact.

Here, then, is the entire text of the memorandum being used by canal supporters:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY,
Washington, D.C.

Memorandum for Mr. Whitaker.
Subject: Cross Florida Barge Canal.

I recommend termination of the Cross Florida Barge Canal, rather than the partial realignment proposed by Army, for the following reasons:

1. This project could seriously affect the environment in Florida by degrading water quality, altering the water supply in central Florida, vitally affecting the fish and wildlife of the area, and combining what are now separate ecological systems. Potential pollution from the project may be transferred to the Florida aquifer, setting off a destructive chain reaction affecting the water supply for many users. Many unique ecological features would be destroyed. This would pose a serious threat to the survival of rare alligators, panthers and wild turkeys through the alteration of their habitat. The Canal could add to the spread of pests from the Gulf to the Atlantic Coast where they would spread virtually unobstructed throughout the East Coast Waterways.

2. The project itself is marginal from an economic point of view and hence very undesirable in the face of the potential and actual environmental problems it presents.

3. The estimated sunk cost of this $179 million project is from $71 to $77 million. If the project were abandoned, annual benefits of $1.2 million would still accrue. The budget savings this year and in subsequent years for this marginal project is a strong reason in itself for stopping it.

4. I believe there are probably more political advantages than disadvantages in stopping the project, compared to a partial realignment, I have been told that if the project were voted on as a referendum by the people of Florida, it would be defeated. Essentially, only a small minority of people in the Tampa and Jacksonville areas have a real interest in it. As you know, Governor Kirk backed away from the project in the last election and the Governor-elect opposed it. Although this certainly is not a detailed analysis of the political situation, I conclude that the benefits nationally of dropping the project would greatly outweigh the benefits of continuing it. I further believe that a bypass over only 20 miles of the project would be considered "tokenism" by conservationists and many others.

Because of these reasons, I believe that termination of the project would bring maximum political benefits, would prevent potentially significant environmental problems and would save a great deal of Federal money for a marginal project.

Attached is a draft Presidential statement on cessation of the project.

RUSSELL E. TRAIN,
Chairman.

IMPORTANCE OF BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT RAPPORT

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the February, 1971, issue of "Nation's Business" contains a very interesting article by the president of the Chase Manhattan Bank.

In this article, Herbert P. Patterson makes the very telling point that—

It is hard for a chief administrative officer to argue that he doesn't have time to go to Washington because he is so busy at the home office. It behooves him to get to know more about how the decisions that will affect his company are being made and to provide the technical information that will help to share these decisions along consructive lines.

The article is a thought-provoking one that warrants the consideration of all businessmen and indeed all community leaders, and I include it, as follows:

CUTTING DOWN ON LOST CAUSES
(By Herbert P. Patterson)

Ordinarily, a period of high interest rates and tight money would seem like the worst possible time for a banker to go calling on Senators and Representatives on Capitol Hill.

But I started doing it a year ago when money was at its tightest, and I've been at it at least once a month since then. I've invariably been received with a gracious blend of cordiality and curiosity. I've found the legislators more than willing to listen to my side of the story of money, credit and banking, and eager to question me on virtually every aspect of the current economic scene.

One day, talking with a Cabinet member, I spoke of what turned out to be my unwarranted fears of criticism and described the searching but friendly questioning that customarily took place at my sessions with the Congressmen.

The Cabinet officer said that, contrary to what bankers and other business executives often believe, people in the Legislative and Executive branches of government welcome the expert opinions these men can offer, either in private conversations or in testimony at legislative hearings. It adds significantly to the dialogue, he said, and contributes to the development of forward-looking legislation in the national interest.

I have heard similar assessments from many Washington officials.

In essence each has made the point that the trouble with many businessmen is that they go to Washington only at the last minute when some issue, critical to their interests, is about to reach a final vote. By then there is almost nothing they can add or subtract from the measure.

Even worse, some businessmen remain silent all through the legislative process then write scathing letters to Congressmen on how bad a bill was, as finally enacted.

Such people, said one lawmaker wryly, remind him of the fellow who rushed into his doctor's office and said he needed an immediate operation to remove a silver coin he'd swallowed five years earlier.

"Why," asked the doctor, "have you waited five years? Why didn't you attend to it the day you swallowed it?"

Replied the patient: "I didn't need the money then!"

UNNECESSARY BATTLES

This attitude explains, in part at least, why business and government frequently find themselves engaged in pitched battles over issues that might well have been settled equitably before enactment of punitive legislation that must be lived with for years.

Instead of dissipating its energies fighting lost causes, business might better have joined with government in constructive efforts to temper and improve changes that were inevitable anyhow.

Business and banking are increasingly dependent upon being understood by government, which provides and enforces rules of conduct, determines business climate and has, in the end, a good deal to say about day-to-day operations. Unfortunately, though, government officials often have little direct contact with business. The same applies to many businessmen with respect to government. A number of avenues are available to remedy this situation.

One is the array of organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, whose activities have played an important part in the development of constructive legislation. The Chamber has staff executives representing all facets of business and industry and it makes frequent appeals for executives to testify personally during hearings on important legislation.

There are aslo other organizations representing individual industries—the American Bankers Association as an example.

Our own bank maintains a small but very active Washington staff because at Chase Manhattan there has long been an effort to make our official staff more readily available to members of Congress who wish to know about our business.

Managers of our branch banks in Greater New York keep in close touch with the Congressmen who represent their areas.

Officers of our United States Department, which handles our banking on a national scale, make frequent trips to meet with Representatives and Senators—not only those from New York State but from all states where we carry on correspondent banking activities or are involved with the financial aspects of industry.

With all these people involved directly, you might wonder what reasons there are for me to spend a dawn-to-dusk day in Washington each month. It seems to me there are several.

AN "EARLY WARNING" SYSTEM

For one, there is the realization that as many decisions are being made on the future of business and banking in the halls of Congress these days as in corporate board rooms. Legislation on automobile safety, packaging requirements, cigaret advertising and other issues has had a profound impact on scores of businesses.

In view of this, it is hard for a chief administrative officer to argue that he doesn't have time to go to Washington because he is so busy at the home office. If behooves him to get to know more about how the decisions that will affect his company are being made and to provide the technical information that will help to shape these decisions along constructive lines.

No matter how many "confidential" reports an executive reads, he cannot possibly absorb the feel and the mood of Washington the way he can by actually being on the scene. Regular contacts with Congressmen and Cabinet officers frequently provide an "early warning" system of legislative trends that can be enormously helpful in evaluating future courses of action.

Not the least important lesson an executive can learn from regular visits to the capital is that Senators and Congressmen are dedicated human beings, far removed from the cartoonist's stereotypes and the comedian's quips. They grapple each day with an almost impossible job. They are expected to pass judgment on hundreds of different issues ranging from health care for the aged to the best way to get to the moon.

The men and women in the two houses of Congress whom I have met represent a high level of competence and devotion to duty. Most of them are serving at great financial sacrifice. The $42,500 salary is far less than most of them could earn in any one of a number of careers in the private sector.

Neil H. McElroy, board chairman of Procter & Gamble, who was Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower Administration, expressed very well what I have found to be true.

"From my own experience in government," he said, "I know that the vast majority of men and women employed there are conscientious public servants. Most are receptive to facts properly presented to them and most are readily approachable.

"We in business need, more than anything else, to learn to communicate better with them, and to take the time and make the effort to do it."

A number of companies and groups already do an excellent job of communicating.

My banking colleague, A. W. Clausen of the Bank of America, is no stranger to Capitol Hill. Men like Edward Cole of General Motors, John Connor of Allied Chemical and Charles Myers of Burlington Industries, among others, have made a real effort to provide legislators with information, to discuss with them problems of mutual interest, and to give them their best judgment as to how particular issues can be handled in the national interest.

Unfortunately, though, there are not enough business executives doing this, and the rank-and-file are like the patient with the coin. Over the longer run, their woes are bound to mount because inevitably there will be more and more legislation coming up for consideration that could plague their business lives.

NO TIME FOR LEISURE

Lest anyone think the Washington visit is a leisurely round of luncheons and cocktails, I can assure him it is the hardest of hard work. The hours are long, the appointments scattered over considerable acreage. A regular routine of jogging as preparatory conditioning would not be amiss.

Often, as I've crossed and recrossed Capitol Hill for tightly scheduled appointments, I've thought a motorized golf cart would be useful.

On each visit I face 10 or 12 appointments that have been intricately organized by the Washington representative of Chase Manhattan. He spends untold hours making my schedule dovetail with those of the Congressmen. A recent schedule:

8:30 a.m., Arrive National Airport; 9:15 a.m., Sen. Ernest Hollings of South Carolina; 9:45 a.m., Rep. William Widnall of New Jersey; 10:30 a.m., Sen. Warren Magnuson of Washington; 11:00 a.m., Sen. Alan Cranston of California; 11:45 a.m., Rep. Gerald Ford of Michigan, House Minority Leader. (I'm asked to note that if he's delayed at a White House conference the appointment will be rescheduled for 3:45 p.m.); Noon, Luncheon in House dining room with Rep. Leslie Arends of Illinois, the House Minority Whip, and Rep. Harold Collier of Illinois; 1:30 p.m., Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington; 2:00 p.m., Sen. Wallace Bennett of Utah; 2:30 p.m., Sen. Robert Packwood of Oregon; 3:15 p.m., Rep. Hale Boggs of Louisiana, the House Majority Leader; 3:45 p.m., Rep. Gerald Ford (who was delayed at the White House).

Also on the schedule, if time permitted and they could break free, were Rep. Benjamin Blackburn of Georgia and Sen. William Brock of Tennessee.

Some might question the usefulness of this hurly-burly of appointments in terms of providing constructive information. But even such brief encounters, it seems to me, afford an opportunity to make key points and to further the dialogue between government and business.

The personal contact also helps break down the barriers of suspicion on both sides by demonstrating that businessmen don't wear horns and Congressmen don't have hooves.

The importance of this personal element was vividly demonstrated on a recent visit to a Senator who had had trouble with a bank credit card.

He had tried to make a purchase at a high-grade store with his card, but the clerk declined to give him credit. The Senator walked out with something less than a favorable image of banks and bank credit cards.

Soon afterward, I dropped in on him. You can imagine the reception—and who did most of the talking!

Yet the mixup was the result of a perfectly human misunderstanding. The Senator was from a Western state, and several of his identification cards bore his Western address. But his credit card was issued through a Maryland bank, and his home address was given as Washington. From a credit standpoint, admittedly confusing.

I telephoned a bank associated with the credit card group and one of its key executives responded immediately. Happily, the matter was smoothed over and the Senator is now, I hope, satisfied that the banking industry really wants to provide good service.

THEY WANT TO KNOW

Perhaps the most impressive aspect of my monthly visits has been the keen interest exhibited by various members of Congress in economic and banking matters.

They want all the information they can get about things like interest rates, loans and mortgages. Beyond these more technical aspects of banking and monetary matters, I find these men and women sincerely interested in urban affairs and minority problems.

What, they frequently ask, is my bank doing to help combat urban problems in the nation's largest city? What are we doing to assist in the employment of minority groups? Do I think this typical of banking in general?

What future plans do we have and does the industry have for establishing a forthright policy of making funds available for minority entrepreneurs?

These are not mere points of conversation but penetrating examinations of how banking is meeting its social obligations. There is no doubt that the answers are being carefully filed away in the Congressmen's minds; to be used at some future period when legislation on these subjects comes to the fore.

As for myself, I've learned a number of things from my Washington visits.

I have a much keener appreciation than before of the problems the legislators face. I also have a better understanding of how greatly concerned government is, at all levels, with the many facets of the economy.

Given this concern, we in business and banking have a special responsibility of helping to see that the facts about our economy and our businesses are presented and understood.

If this is done, the chances are much better that our lawmakers will find workable solutions to the problems we face.

Instead of looking upon government as a hobbling nuisance or a hostile force, we must come to regard it as a partner in the achievement of national aspirations.

There is one final point that comes clear: Business and banking are likely to fare much better in Washington if they emphasize the things they are for, rather than everlastingly stress what they are *against*.

Curiously, when you strip away the outmoded attitudes of opposition and the ritualistic rhetoric, you find that what most businessmen are *for* is pretty much what the country at large is seeking today: To achieve lasting peace in the world, to provide a meaningful opportunity for all citizens to achieve a rewarding place in our national life, to safeguard the purchasing power of earnings and savings, to strengthen the growth of the economy, and to stimulate programs for meeting our urgent needs in health, education, welfare, and public safety.

In short, most businessmen are *for* responsible actions to bring about a better life for all Americans.

And they can achieve these goals far more readily, in my view, by spending less time "fighting City Hall" and more helping our legislators and other public officials to deal constructively with problems involving the quality of our lives and the character of our society.

AN ARM OF CONGRESS

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up to my recent remarks on the future of the ICC, I would like to recommend to the attention of the House the following editorial:

AN ARM OF CONGRESS

It has been difficult for members of the trucking industry to find an area of agreement with Sen. Mike Mansfield since he began marshalling congressional forces for a move to abolish the ICC. But one thing he said last week certainly will win the endorsement of virtually all supporters of ICC regulation.

Sen. Mansfield, although he is again advocating legislation for the abolition of the ICC, had the grace to admit that "part of the problem the ICC now faces is that they are no longer, in realistic terms, a regulatory arm of the Congress."

"Their existence and activity," he explained, "are too dependent upon the budget arm of the Executive Branch. The Interstate Commerce Commission must have sufficient funds to carry out their responsibilities."

Coincidental to Sen. Mansfield's move was the introduction by Sen. Lee Metcalf (D-Mont.) and Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.) of legislation to permit the ICC and similarly situated agencies to bypass the Bureau of Management and Budget in the submission of requests for appropriations.

Over the years the handling by the bureau of the ICC appropriations request has had the effect of placing a ceiling on the agency's budget well below the amount the ICC believed it needed. The reason for this is that, as a matter of policy, Congress has rarely appropriated more than the bureau recommended.

Some observers have felt that this situation tended to make the ICC subservient to the Executive Branch and to negate its role as an arm of Congress. If this was the case it would be well to remember that Sec. 8 of the Constitution confers on Congress the power: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states. . . ." That this power was delegated to the ICC and other regulatory agencies does not take from Congress the responsibility for its effective use.

It is not surprising, therefore, that prominent members of House and Senate are expressing concern as to whether the ICC has been accorded the consideration due it as an arm of Congress. In a sense this is self-examination because clearly the successes or failures of the Commission depend on how well its actions are monitored by Congress.

"ELEPHANT'S ROAR" DOES NOT SPEAK IN AN OFFICIAL CAPACITY FOR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on March 2 an item was inserted in the Extensions of Remarks by my colleague, Mr. ANDERSON of California. In it he quoted from a publication calling itself "The Elephant's Roar—A Gazette for Republican Leaders." The article quoted was an all-out assault on President Nixon's revenue-sharing plan. The impression given—wittingly or unwittingly—was that a bona fide organ of the Republican Party was opposing one of the most innovative, forward-looking proposals offered this Congress in many a year.

I have no quarrel with my colleague in this matter. As he stated in prefacing the article:

I do not know if this publication always speaks for the Republican Party . . .

My purpose is to point out that the Elephant's Roar does not speak in any official capacity for the Republican Party. It is a small, privately owned tabloid that consists mainly of advertisements and reprints of political handouts. Although many people solicited by "The Elephant's Roar" may think they are contributing to a legitimate party publication, it has no official status.

In view of these facts, I would urge anyone who reads or quotes from "The Elephant's Roar" in the future to remember that it is, at the very best, an "uncertain trumpet"—and in no way an official voice of the Republican Party.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I read an Associated Press article yesterday which indicated that Secretary of Agriculture Hardin is considering a dairy price support announcement of $4.92 per hundredweight. I think this price is too low for our Tennessee dairy farmers. It is, I feel sure, too low for any dairy farmer.

We all know the importance of milk in the diets of all people—and most importantly the diets of children. An adequate supply of milk is absolutely necessary for the health and welfare of our Nation. Our national supply of milk has fallen fast since 1964—from 127 billion pounds in 1964 to 117 billion pounds in 1970. Our number of dairy farmers has declined dramatically to the point where we now have less than 400,000 dairy farmers in the United States—down from 2 million just 20 years ago.

By 1980, the Department of Agriculture predicts there will be only 200,000 dairy farms and only 110 billion pounds of milk production.

I think that all of us should be vitally concerned about this press release and the possibility that Secretary Hardin just might do what is reported—that is, not to increase milk price supports to 90 percent of parity—the maximum allowed by law. Even at 90 percent of parity our dairy farmers would not be receiving a decent return on either their 7-day a week labor or their tremendous capital investment. Many of my Tennessee dairy farmers work more than 100 family hours per 7-day week for considerably less than $10,000 net income per year. Most dairy farmers do not even receive the minimum wage for their labor.

Farmers in general have long been on the short end of our economic ladder—we just cannot let this most important segment of our economy continue to suffer so long. I would like to urge all of my distinguished colleagues to study the facts concerning our dairy farmers and this milk price support situation. We need a viable dairy industry—nothing can completely reverse the long-term trend in decreased dairy production, but 90 percent of parity would certainly help.

This contraction of numbers is expected to continue. This trend is summarized in the following table:

Number of U.S. farms selling milk and cream

Year:	Thousands
1950	1,959
1955	1,475
1960	1,032
1964	641
1969	400
1980	200

Thus, there are now only 400,000 dairy farms in this country. Four-fifths of the dairy farms operating in 1950 have gone out of business. The Department of Agriculture considers that in 1980 there will be only one-tenth as many dairy farms as there were in 1950.

This contraction has not simply been a consolidation of dairy herds into larger farms. The number of milk cows on U.S. farms has also been declining sharply. In 1950, there were almost 22 million milk cows on American dairy farms. By 1970, this number had decreased by nearly 10 million cows to a total of 12.5 million. By 1980, milk cows on farms are expected to decrease by another one-third or some 4 million cows, to a total of 8 or 9 million.

Decreases in cow numbers have been offset in part by increases in milk production per cow. Thus the decreases in numbers of farms and cows does not always mean an absolute reduction in milk production. In the early years of the downtrends in numbers, offsetting increases in efficiency have tempered its impact upon output. Yet efficiency gains are increasingly hard to come by. As the number of cows decreases, capacity to maintain aggregate output becomes more difficult. Dairy cows cannot be replaced quickly and inexpensively and it is increasingly difficult to increase output per cow.

All of these factors are reflected in the steady downward trend of milk production during recent years. It is a remarkable fact that 1970 milk production of 117.4 billion pounds was no higher than the production level of 1950—despite the expansion of the American economy. Moreover, annual production of milk has declined from the 1964 high of 127 billion pounds by approximately 10 billion pounds in the past 6 years. The following table illustrates the declining trend in milk production since 1960:

MILK PRODUCTION AND PER CAPITA MILK PRODUCTION (UNITED STATES 1960-70)

	Total milk production (million pounds)	Per capita milk production (pounds)
Year:		
1960	123,109	681
1961	125,707	684
1962	126,251	676
1963	125,202	661
1964	126,967	661
1965	124,173	638
1966	119,892	609
1967	118,769	597
1968	117,234	583
1969	116,345	573
1970	117,436	572

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the Department of Agriculture does not intend to sit idly by and watch our dairy industry decline into oblivion. Unless

dairy price supports are set at a level high enough to guarantee 90 percent of parity, that is exactly what we are inviting.

GOVERNOR DUNN OF TENNESSEE URGES PRESIDENT NIXON TO RELEASE FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR TVA

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have recently called on the President and the Office of Management and Budget to release appropriations by the Congress for construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of the Normandy and Columbia Dams in the TVA system. I have spoken to Director Shultz of the OMB concerning the need for these funds—especially in view of current economic conditions and the administration advocacy of full-employment at this time.

In this connection I was pleased recently to note in the Tennessee press that Gov. Winfield Dunn of Tennessee, a Republican, has called on President Nixon to release the $4.3 million appropriated by the Congress for these projects on the Upper Duck River in Tennessee. These funds have been frozen and impounded by the Bureau of Management and Budget by administrative action.

I welcome Governor Dunn's support of my position on this most important matter. I commend the Governor for his helpfulness and cooperation in the public interest.

Governor Dunn, in his letter to the President, said:

> Let me respectfully recommend, Mr. President, that these funds be released so that this well-conceived and most needed project can really get off the ground. I would personally appreciate your serious consideration of this request.

Commenting on the Governor's statement, the Tullahoma News and Guardian charged that the Bureau of Management and Budget has exceeded its authority in impounding funds for TVA appropriated by the Congress.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place this editorial in the RECORD herewith:

The editorial follows:

[From the Tullahoma (Tenn.) News and Guardian, March 5, 1971]

THE GOVERNOR HELPS

Gov. Winfield Dunn has joined Rep. Joe L. Evins in urging President Nixon to release funds to permit work to be started on Tennessee Valley Authority dams at Normandy and Columbia.

We hope now that Senators Howard Baker Jr. and Bill Brock will raise their voices as well on behalf of a needed project for this region and against the dangerous growing power of the executive branch to hold up spending of funds duly authorized by the Congress.

The thanks of the people of the upper Duck River valley should go to Gov. Dunn for a forthright statement to the President, which called the dams "well conceived and most needed," and for his request that funds be made available to permit an immediate work start in accordance with a congressional mandate. Our two senators, since they are of the same party as the President and thus part of his administration in many ways, also can play a key role in getting the project going.

The seriousness of the conflict between the Congress and the Office of Management and Budget has been emphasized by criticism from prominent senators, who have charged, as Rep. Evins did last week, that the White House budgetary review staff is overstepping the bounds of its coordinating authority by holding up more than $8 billion in funds voted by both houses of Congress.

Sen. John Sparkman of Alabama called the actions "a serious breach of faith with Congress," while another respected legislator, Sen. Sam Ervin of North Carolina, criticized "the use of the impounding practice to avoid or nullify congressional intent.

This misuse of spending management is affecting, not only the Duck dams, but housing and public works programs throughout the nation that could make a difference in alleviating widespread employment.

Clearly the time has come for our two senators to raise their voices, for the good of this area and for the nation generally.

"THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Aaron R. Einfrank wrote a letter to the editor of the Washington Post which was highly critical of the CBS TV special, "The Selling of the Pentagon." This fact, in itself, is not remarkable. Nor is the fact that the Post published that letter on March 2, 1971. Many people have written to the Post condemning the program and several have been published.

The remarkable thing about this incident is that Mr. Einfrank can be considered an expert in the field of journalism and, therefore, highly qualified to distinguish between good and bad reporting. Mr. Einfrank is the Washington bureau chief of the Toronto Telegram. He is also the former Moscow bureau chief for that newspaper.

In view of his expertise in the field of journalism and his experience in determining what is impartial reporting and what is biased propaganda, I am submitting, for the information and edification of my colleagues, Mr. Einfrank's letter to the Post and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

"SELLING OF THE PENTAGON"

Your reporter, William C. Woods, in his story (Feb. 26) on the public reaction to CBS Reports' "The Selling of the Pentagon," writes off public criticism of this show by saying that "the (telephone) calls were largely critical as though viewers were outraged by a news team delivering news instead of propaganda."

I would offer that the criticism expressed in these phone calls is based on a different premise: that many viewers felt as I did that the show was purely anti-Pentagon propaganda of an outrageously biased and dishonest nature. The same criticism might be leveled to a lesser extent in the case of Mr. Woods' story.

Perhaps one way to solve the problem would be for the respective organizations of Messrs. Mudd and Woods to post them to Moscow. Then perhaps these gentlemen would understand why a Pentagon is a necessity for free people and why the Pentagon must maintain informational and other links with the free people it defends.

AARON R. EINFRANK.

WASHINGTON.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conduct a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships awarded. The winning speech from South Carolina was delivered by an attractive, talented young lady from my hometown of Rock Hill, S.C., Miss Susan Tibbets. While Susan did not win the national contest, she is a top winner in my book and her speech is worthy of study and consideration by Americans of all ages.

I insert, Mr. Speaker, the Voice of Democracy speech of Miss Tibbets in the RECORD:

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

(By Miss Susan Tibbets)

This nation, our America, is unique among the nations of the world. It did not grow by accident or by conquest, but was carefully constructed, principle upon principle, by the founding fathers. They passed on to us their masterpiece of building—our heritage of freedom.

Our heritage is passed on to us, a legacy which carries with it no responsibility, to be used or neglected as we please. Or is it? As in Jesus's parable of the talents entrusted to the servants, the neglected gift gains nothing. Our forefathers bequeathed to us their most precious possession to hold in trust for later generations. Unless we have increased our inheritance when we are called to account for it, we become like the unworthy servant; we will have betrayed the trust of our ancestors and cheated our own descendants. The hidden talent benefited no one; neither does freedom, taken for granted, grow. Instead, it tarnishes and loses its value. To make the best use of any heritage, one must protect it and nurture it in order for it to survive and grow. It is the responsibility of every citizen to do his utmost to protect that legacy for which men died—and are dying yet. Lexington and Concord, Bunker Hill, Valley Forge, and Yorktown were not the end of the American fight for freedom. Even today Americans are defending the ideals of freedom at Phnom Penh—the Mekong Delta—yet most citizens take their inheritance for granted, not pausing to realize that it is precious and rare; for in what other country exists so valuable a heritage? And in how many countries is repression and tyranny the only birthright? Our heritage was created because men cared and were concerned with providing their fellow-citizens with a life without repression. Can we do less than our forefathers for the cause of liberty? Without the care

and concern from which it was born, freedom will die. And if we do not provide the careful attention to freedom's growth, who will? Freedom is a legacy to each of us as an individual; it is therefore the responsibility of every citizen to protect and increase his own inheritance.

Freedom is the right to do whatever we want without regard to any consideration other than our individual desire. Or is it? What kind of society would we have if everyone followed his inclinations without regard to the rights of others? At best, chaos would reign; at worst, tyrants would come to power. When the long-standing Roman Empire began to crumble, the foreign provinces were abandoned. A bewildered Britain was among the forgotten possessions. No longer did the power of Rome enforce laws. Each man was totally free from any sort of restraint. This unlimited freedom catapulted Britain into the Dark Ages, a time of anarchy and fear. On today's college campuses some people feel that they are above all laws and regulations. They protest. They march. They disrupt classes. They riot. They deny to all others the freedoms that they, supposedly, are demonstrating for. Confusion reigns supremely. When Julius Caesar took the law into his own hands by crossing the Rubicon in defiance of commands from his superiors, he took the first step on a road that led him to the dictatorship of Rome. This one violation of regulation led to one man's absolute power over the known world. The Communist Revolution plunged the vast land of China into a period of lawlessness. There was only one hope for regulation of the chaotic conditions—a strong leader. Chairman Mao came to power and proved himself to be strong—strong enough to remain in complete power for decades, strong enough to impose his very thoughts on a large proportion of the world's population. While each of us must carefully guard and preserve his own rights, he must also take pains not to infringe on the rights of others; for their rights, as well as his own, are bound up in the total fabric of freedom. If he destroys the slightest freedom of another, he also destroys a bit of his own. In the words of John Donne:

No man is an island, entire of itself; Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. Any man's death diminishes me because I am involved in Mankind.

No man's freedom is safe if one man's freedom is denied. Every citizen must assume the responsibility of ensuring the basic rights of all men.

The heritage of freedom is a legacy to us all. It concerns each of us personally and all of us as a nation. We must guard and care for both our individual rights and the rights of all citizens, for these basic privileges are our inheritance. This legacy is not yours alone, nor does it belong solely to me. It belongs to us all—Our Heritage of Freedom.

REORGANIZATION TIMELY

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased I am that the President has provided us with such a thorough and logical executive reorganization proposal based on the purposes of Federal Government. It is indeed timely.

Each year there are more Americans. Approximately 2 million more. And that means each year our old ways of serving the public and their needs become less effective.

We all know that international agencies criticize American consumption of the world's natural resources. What we perhaps do not realize is how rapidly we are devouring, and, to a great extent, wasting the vital natural resources of our own land.

Today the average American is using 25 tons of basic materials each year. This is excluding air and water. And, more important, this usage is climbing by a ton a year. If this trend continues, in 10 years we will be using twice as much energy, in 18 years we will be using twice as much water, and in 22 years twice as much metal.

We cannot start too soon to plan to replenish these supplies where possible and to find new sources of energy, water, and metals.

I urge the prompt consideration of legislation to establish a Natural Resources Department to coordinate Government programs for consumption, conservation, and enjoyment of our natural resources.

THE STATE OF THE WORLD MESSAGE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Karl von Clausewitz said in 1830:

Now, this improvement from without can be nothing else than a change in political relations; either new alliances spring up in favor of the defender or old ones directed against him collapse. This is, therefore, the aim of the defender, in case his weakness does not permit him to think of any important counterstroke.

The above would seem to be the major premise of the foreign policy of the United States as outlined by the President in his recent state of the world message. The goal of partnership is basically a hope that our allies will in the future be able to defend themselves from the advances of the world Communist movement, as we are no longer going to attempt to directly contain Communist expansion in many areas of the world. The containment policy adopted in 1947 is a recognized failure, as it logically had to be since it ceded to the enemy not only a secure rear area, the Soviet Union and its colonies, but at the same time allowed them to initiate conflicts at the time, place, and level of their own choosing.

Instead of recognizing this failure as a call to adopt a forward strategy designed to emancipate the areas under Communist totalitarian rule, we are slowly retreating and hoping to pick up and strengthen allies on the rearward march. In order to console ourselves as we retreat from greatness, new words and concepts have been developed to smooth the slide downhill. Soviet gains, like those recently made in Chile, Libya, Somalia, and so forth, are now put under the category of diversity rather than free world loss. The prevailing illusion is that a generation of peace can be evoked by something less than American superiority in all fields. The cold war era has seen America decline from a position of global spremacy to that of the other great power. The cold war is neither over, nor is this decline to be reversed. What follows is a very brief elaboration of some parts of the President's message.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

The President attempts to make a case for not seeking a military victory. He is unsuccessful. The fruits of military activity designed to eliminate the enemy's power to wage aggressive war have already been shown by the excellent and successful allied thrusts into enemy held areas of Cambodia and now into the enemy held areas of Laos. These operations have saved lives and significantly interfered with the enemy's ability to carry on the war as he wishes. The same results would be achieved on a greater scale by directing certain types of military activity against the base from which the enemy is striking. One extremely efficacious and low-cost approach which the administration is continuing to study, would be a naval blockade of Haiphong Harbor, through which flow practically all of the materials needed by the enemy to carry on the war.

NATO

Our military policy toward Western Europe is the one vaguely hopeful statement of intent in the message. Since NATO has never been able to muster more than about 26 divisions to hold an area stretching from Finland to the Caucasus border of Turkey, while the Soviets and Warsaw Pact can mobilize up to a hundred divisions and concentrate them on a small front, the President has recognized the vital need for both tactical and strategic nuclear capabilities on hand in Europe.

AFRICA

The United States will continue activities directed toward forcing the pro-Western sectors of Africa to conform with policies which are completely unacceptable to them. We will continue the embargo against Rhodesia regardless of the fact that we are becoming increasingly dependent on Soviet sources of strategic chrome ore by denying American firms access to Rhodesia's vast deposits and also regardless of the fact that since the embargo went into effect in 1967 the Soviets have doubled their prices to us. We will continue to deny arms to South Africa and discourage American investment in the South African protectorate of Southwest Africa. We will also continue to deny armaments to the Portuguese for use in defense of their African territories of Guinea, Angola, and Mozambique against Communist led and supplied insurgents.

This is all done in the name of criteria which do not seem to be applied to other sectors of the world. The President is planning to vastly increase trade, guarantee American investments, and extend credit to places like Rumania where there is no political freedom whatsoever.

LATIN AMERICA

Although the President says that he would prefer governments in this area which are based on democratic principles, when a nation like Chile goes over to the Soviet camp we do nothing about it. This is known as "accommodating diversity" in the new American foreign policy lexicon. It is said to be in the best interests of the United States. But how it can be in the best interests of the United States for the Soviets to have a nuclear submarine base in Cuba and a possible Soviet naval base in Valparaiso, Chile, which would give the Soviet subs coverage of our West Coast as the base in Cuba does our East, is not elaborated upon.

It is most unfortunate that the spirit of determination revealed in the allied thrusts into enemy-held areas of Cambodia and Laos is not reflected in most of the areas of foreign policy outlined in the State of the World message. Easing tensions and defense are not compatible concepts when there is an avowed and powerful enemy seeking to extend his dominion over the entire planet. We must not tie our star to diversity and sacrifice our essential security.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., EARNS "ALL AMERICA CITY" TITLE

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the city of Birmingham, Ala., has long held the spotlight as one of the nation's leading centers of trucking, railroad, and industrial activity. The 38th largest metropolitan area in the country, Birmingham is also considered the fourth largest metropolitan market in the Southeast.

Often referred to as the "youngest of the world's great cities", the Birmingham area population is well over 650,000 persons.

Last week, the impressive credentials of this proud city received additional recognition when Birmingham was selected one of 11 winners of the National Municipal League and Look magazine All America City Contest.

Earning an "All America City" title was not an easy, overnight achievement for Birmingham. For years, the stigma of a city torn by racial strife hindered Birmingham's reputation as a progressive community. Concerted effort by many Birmingham citizens, however, has served to erase this obstacle with the result that people of all creeds and nationalities have closed ranks to help Birmingham to earn this national honor.

Having been born and raised in Birmingham, I feel especially proud of the fact that this vigorous, hard working Southern community has been chosen to share such a distinction along with 10 other American cities.

A NATIONWIDE EMERGENCY PHONE NUMBER: 911

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable J. EDWARD ROUSH, our colleague from the State of Indiana, is the author of legislation which if passed is destined to save lives of innocent victims of crime in this country as well as victims of accidents.

Mr. ROUSH has proposed that "911" be the emergency number for America so that wherever you might be in this Nation, dialing those three digits would connect you immediately with emergency service.

Congressman ROUSH is entitled to the gratitude of every one of us for his clear and incisive thinking with respect to this matter.

On March 7, 1971, at the fifth annual Conference of Regional Councils, Congressman ROUSH delivered the following remarks. They are indeed words of wisdom:

OUR EMERGENCIES RUNNETH OVER

(By Congressman J. EDWARD ROUSH)

It is a pleasure and an honor to be here today and to participate in this panel. I hope I can clearly indicate to you the reasons why I have supported "911" as the single, nationwide, emergency telephone number and how this came about. In the process, I also hope I can ignite a similar interest in some of you and that you will carry this back to your local communities and regions.

Three years ago, the TODAY SHOW depicted what they called a "horrible fantasy" showing what could happen in an area that had a number of emergency telephone reporting numbers when, as Joe Garagiola put it, "fate really decides to sock it to you". And it went like this:

"Suppose a madman breaks into your home and shoots you in the leg. Now this startles you and you drop your cigarette on the sofa, setting it afire. Calmly, you call an ambulance for yourself, the fire department for the burning sofa, and the police to take away the madman. But wait, in the excitement, your dog runs into the street and is killed by a car. The car goes out of control, knocks over several trash cans and a fire hydrant. The trash clogs the sewer entrance and the water begins backing up into your cellar. Groggy but game, you call the animal collection people to take away the dog, the Water Department to fix that hydrant, and the Sewer Department to unclog that sewer. Now you are undecided as to who will take care of the overturned trash cans, so to be on the safe side, you call both the trash and the garbage people and the street cleaners. And oh yes, you'd better call another ambulance for the people in that car.

"Now, things are so bad that the madman is more depressed than you are and he threatens to kill himself. So still holding on to the tourniquet on your wounded leg, you dial the emergency Mental Health Service and you ask them to come to talk him out of it. But he won't listen; he takes poison. Now you have to call the Poison Control Center. The whole thing has been just too much for your old aunt who chooses this moment to have a very bad asthma attack. That means calling the Health Emergency Information Service and maybe another ambulance because the two you already called are getting pretty crowded by this time.

"But you can now relax because you have run out of emergency numbers and nothing more can happen to you."

This account may sound like a sequence from LAUGH-IN, but I actually had a letter from constituent several years ago which described an equally harrowing experience when the lady's lawn caught on fire and she was unable to locate her bifocals. The situation from the TODAY SHOW is laughable, because it is ridiculous. However, the events described are not ridiculous in that they never happen. What is ridiculous, is the fact that the most advanced technological society in the world provides the average citizen with such an archaic, duplicated maze of telephone numbers when emergencies occur.

Those of us who support the implementation of "911" as the single, nationwide emergency number, believe that this simple, easily remembered three digit phone number, may just be the answer. And since I am not a recent convert to this belief, it gives me special pleasure to be here today and to listen to the reports of city officials whose communities are now actually functioning on "911". Four years ago when this all began, I would have said that the progress that has now been made could not be accomplished. I am glad to say that I would have been wrong.

So first, I would like to tell you a little bit about my own experiences, the genesis of my own belief in "911".

My personal interest in this issue goes back to 1967 when I was a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. My sub-committee assignments were Advanced Research and Technology, Science Research and Development. This Committee appointment predisposed me to take an interest in and support the application of new technology, improved technology, new scientific information to solving the everyday needs of the average American citizen. During the period of the development of the space program, I watched abstract information become concrete instruments, equipment, and vehicles for space travel. I also observed the new medical and technical inventions that resulted, which served the practical interests of earth men. And, of course, communications technology was and is an important part of the whole space program.

Also, in 1967, the crime issue was paramount, and in that year, the President's Commission on Laws Enforcement and Administration of Justice issued a multi-volume report on the nature, the incidence of crime, and crime prevention and control in America. Noting the "bewildering array of police telephone numbers", the Task Force Report on Science and Technology recommended a technological improvement:

"Wherever practical, a single number should be established, at least within a metropolitan area and preferably over the entire United States, comparable to the telephone company's long-distance information number."

The Commission on Civil Disorders and the Federal Communications Commission also expressed concern over the need for an adequate emergency reporting system.

That same Task Force Commission Report on Science and Technology discussed in some depth, the importance of "response time"; that lapse of time between the occurrence of a crime and the arrival of officers on the scene. The faster the police arrive, or the shorter the response time, the more likely an arrest will be made.

As Mr. Louis Mayo of the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice noted at a Conference on Law Enforcement, "We know that once the criminal leaves

the scene of the crime, the probability that he'll ever be apprehended is very small."

The indisputable conclusion is that the faster a person who sees a crime or suffers one calls the police, and gets the right precinct, the greater the possibility of arrest. This in turn acts as a preventative as well as a control on crime after it has transpired, for the offender can assume that he or she will be arrested.

Putting together my interest in the practical applications of scientific know-how with the communications need in the crime field, I began to ponder what could be done. It occurred to me that the American citizen should have access to a simple, easily remembered, short telephone number for reporting emergencies; a number to be used anytime, anywhere, by old and young; a number not just for crime, but fire, and poison, and other health emergencies. London, England has had such a number, "999", since 1937. It seemed to me that a single universal, emergency number, with no more than three digits, would take care of the special problems of travelers and children. It would resolve the problem of finding emergency numbers for those who cannot read, either because they are illiterate, blind or dependent upon glasses which are not immediately available. It would also solve the problem of uncertainty as to which agency to contact, for example, the police or ambulance in the case of a drowning? It would solve the problem of panic which results in confusion and reduces the average person's ability to handle the necessary details of summoning assistance.

I brought the problem to the attention of Bell Telephone through Indiana Bell. I asked them what could be done, could we not have a simple emergency number like the information number, 411? At first, as Mr. Shepard will relate, although he was not present at those conversations, officials at AT & T told me that dialing "O" for Operator was the fastest, surest, and most effective method for reporting emergencies. Well, if we can send men to the moon, and now they can even talk with the President from the lunar surface, it seemed and seems to me that we should be able to offer the American citizen something better than a long wait for the Operator to answer, take the information, hunt the proper agency, relay the call, or the information. I do not blame the Operator, but emergency calls constitute a minor fraction of about 1% of their work, about 40,000 out of some 14 million daily. They simply cannot be expected to move as fast as someone trained especially for emergencies.

So I persisted. Besides acting as an advocate, I also pursued this issue as a legislator. In May of 1967, I introduced legislation stating that it was the sense of Congress that the United States should have a uniform, emergency nationwide telephone number.

Meanwhile, unbeknownst to me, Commissioner Lee Loevinger, Defense Commissioner of the Federal Communications Commission, had also begun to question and to push for a solution.

Leaving out a lot of details, suffice it to say that in January of 1968, AT & T announced that they would provide a single, nationwide, emergency, 3 digit number. This could be provided as quickly as communities decided that they wished to go over to the new number, "911". AT & T would bear the main burden of the cost, estimated at some $50,000,000. After this welcome announcement, I re-introduced my bill to specify "911" as the single, nationwide, emergency number.

My home town of Huntington, Indiana, population, 18,000, was the first in the Bell System to adopt "911" and I was there to make the first call from the Indiana Bell Telephone Company to the Huntington Police Department, which received that call on a specially installed red telephone.

But that is ancient history. Today, 108 communities already have "911" and that means that about 15½ million Americans are now enjoying this emergency service. Meanwhile, we have learned a great deal about "911" from actual experience and from the symposiums and conferences that have been conducted.

The record of success is inspiring. In New York City, the Commanding Officer of the Communications Division, New York City Police Department told me recently that "'911' gives the citizen access to the police with unprecedented speed". He went on to say that in New York where it is a fire, police, and ambulance number, "it has proven to be one of the great successess in law enforcement".

The Franklin Institute Research Laboratories with the National Science Foundation undertook a study to determine if a need existed for a single emergency telephone number and if the implementation of such a system were feasible. They issued a report in March of 1970. The report noted a lengthy questionnaire that had been sent to a select group of metropolitan fire and police chiefs, sheriffs, poison control centers and small town police and fire chiefs. The results were as follows:

"A study of responses to questionnaires and discussions with persons in all phases of emergency work have led FIRL to conclude that a single emergency telephone number is feasible and should be implemented nationally."

Over the last two years, the National Service to Regional Councils has sponsored two outstanding symposiums, at Chicago and Omaha, bringing together those interested in the single, emergency number. These Emergency Telephone Communications Workshop brought out many of the problems and also a lot of the victories. The NSRC also selected 6 pilot regions to work with, and Washington, D.C. is one of these. I am anxious to see the Capitol City a "Model City" in every respect and I think the adoption of "911" would be an important step in that direction. I do know that discussions are well underway and I expect the Washington Metropolitan area to work out whatever jurisdictional problems exist in the near future.

I think the Department of Justice has indicated a real interest in "911", as would be expected after the President's Commission report. They have been willing through their National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice to help fund those two symposiums, and another symposium in 1969, recognizing and analyzing the importance of response time.

I was especially interested in the fact that Attorney General John Mitchell in his Banquet Address at the 1970 Third National Symposium on Law Enforcement Science and Technology clearly endorsed "911" and went on to indicate another important use it serves. He said:

"One of the major problems in apprehending offenders is often the reluctance of ordinary citizens to come forward and tell what they know. The Institute is interested in investigating the barriers to citizens reporting of crime. It's interested in improving citizen-reporting systems . . . and also in implementing the nationwide emergency telephone number—911. That number is already in use in a number of places . . . There's no question that it would be of help in making it easier for citizens to report crimes to the law enforcement agency best equipped to deal with the situation."

As the Attorney General indicated, one of the problems in law enforcement is that of persuading citizens to report crimes, especially those that they simply observe; that do not happen to them. The simplicity of "911" can be expected to encourage citizen reporting of crime.

Over the last two years, I have been on what I call a "sabbatical" from the Congress, brought on by the fact that I was redistricted in the midst of my last term of office, and had to run against an incumbent Congressman. However, I was returned to the Congress in the fall elections last year. One of the very first priorities I established, was renewing my interest in the Nationwide implementation of "911". I find we have come a long way, but not far enough.

In this Congress, I have introduced a different kind of bill, reflecting the changes in the situation since 1968–9. On February 10, 1971 and again on March 4, 1971, with 40 co-sponsors, I introduced a bill that would amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

This so-called Safe Streets Act sets up funds, primarily for the states to allocate to local communities to improve a whole range of crime prevention and control activities. Projects are first developed and prepared by the local governments and adopted by states, then included in the annual state comprehensive plan, subject to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration review.

Under the present law, it might be possible for funds to be spent to encourage the implementation of "911", but none have been so far and so I have introduced legislation that would make that authorization explicit.

My bill amends the Safe Streets Act to provide Federal assistance to State and local governments for the purpose of developing and improving communications procedures and facilities for the prompt and efficient dispatch of emergency services. The bill calls for funding of $5,000,000 in fiscal 1972 and $7,500,000 for fiscal 1973.

The purpose in this bill is not to actually shoulder the costs of setting up "911"; providing money for additional or different or coordinating the same trunk lines; or to physically install "911" in a community. Actually, as you probably know, the costs of implementing "911" itself are very moderate. In Jackson, Mississippi, it is $100 a month; in Springfield, Massachusetts, $250 a month; and in Suffolk County, New York, there is an actual saving of $600 per month, although I am sure this is not typical. In this case, centralization eliminated duplication. However, this is not the "911" picture. In many cases, communities have antiquated communications systems or they need to better coordinate communications within agencies or among agencies. These costs run very high. Often renovation of existing communications facilities were needed before the community became interested in "911", but the desire to adopt "911" sometimes brings this need into clearer focus. The funds I would ear-mark would be for this kind of renovation, coordination of existing facilities to make the adoption of "911" possible and most effective.

Indeed, as far as crime is concerned (but the same is true of other emergencies), there is no point in speeding up the first part of "response time", namely that period of time between the incident and the citizen calling the proper agency, if then there is a long lapse of time until help arrives, the lapse resulting from poor inter or intra agency communications and dispatch.

Not only would this bill I propose provide funds, but I believe it also expresses a national concern and interest. Allocating money is one sure way of indicating priorities. And it is a way of saying that in the United States we will no longer neglect using our technology to help the average citizen in the continous fight against crime and fire and health emergencies.

Certainly, there will be problems for you people to solve, jurisdictional and telephone exchange problems. I have not emphasized these; they are too obvious to need my elaboration. But in this matter I agree with the National Service to Regional Councils' Summary Report for July, 1970:

If "911" is desirable for the community, the key responsibility of emergency agency officials should be to work together to overcome these problems. If "911" is to be a service to the citizen and not to the agency, some method or alternative must be found to achieve implementation."

Commissioner Loevinger asked whether the "burden of coping with emergencies" and the "confusing and conflicting complexity of government agencies" should be imposed upon the public or the agencies established to serve the public. I think we would all agree on the answer to that rhetorical question.

DEFENSE CHALLENGE OF THE 1970'S

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the Honorable DURWARD G. HALL of Missouri, addressed a meeting of the Springfield, Mo., Rotary Club.

Speaking on the subject "The Challenge of the 1970's," Congressman HALL set forth in clear language this Nation's military posture as compared to that of the Soviet Union. He also stressed the importance of continuing a strong, defense related, research and development program so as to maintain the superior technological position that the Armed Forces of the United States has always held.

At this time, I would like to offer Congressman HALL's remarks. I feel that they will make interesting reading and I commend them to your attention:

CHALLENGE OF THE 1970'S

Just a few short months ago (last September to be exact) I participated in a *little publicized,* but none-the-less highly important colloquy, with the late chairman of the House Committee on the Armed Services, L. Mendel Rivers.

The debate, which eventually included 22 Members of the House, served to lay out in the clearest, most concise terms I have as yet encountered, just where this Nation stands in relation to the other great "super-power", the Soviet Union.

To those of you who automatically evoke an "oh, no, not that again", mental attitude at the mention of the word Soviet, Russian or Communist, my answer is simply this:—the worst disservice that can be done to this Nation, at this time, is to ignore the fact that we *are* locked in a struggle with the Soviet Union, ideologically as well as physically. Unfortunately, the eventual winner, *if* it ever comes to that, will be in the position to determine whether or not the smaller nations of this world will be subjugated by outright takeover, or left to determine their own destiny. One needs but study the sorry plight of the now "captive nations."

I might selfishly add that my concern for the smaller nations is based not so much on what will happen to *them,* but rather, what effect their falling into the Communist orbit would have on the security of these United States. I've never had an answer to: if not us—whom? If not there—where? And if not now, when?!! I use as a case in point, the island of Cuba, and more recently, the nation of Chile. And yes, I am aware that the Chilean people used the ballot to accept a Communist leader. But don't you doubt for one minute that it will be Moscow, or worse, Mao, who will play the tune. And if you think this is all well and good, go back to the newspapers of a few months ago and reread the story of Czechoslovakia.

I am certain that there are those of you here today who will construe my remarks as the shrill cry of a "hawk", whose talons are curled and ready for combat. That would be a misconception. If I leave you with that impression, I will have failed in my mission. I am here, if not to sound a warning, to at least do my best to lay before you one side of the story that you'll seldom read of or hear about. It is based on the most accurate and highly distilled information—known as military intelligence!

I would remind you that although our daily news is sprinkled with references to "hawks" and "doves" there is yet another bird that deserves equal time. I refer to the eagle, that gallant and magnificent creature that symbolizes the strength and honor of this nation. He soars above the crags of world politics and has a vista of wider horizons. I am sure that you are aware that the American eagle which graces our national emblem, clutches in its left claw the arrows of war, while its right is curled around the olive branch of peace. I call your attention to the fact that the eagle's head (by executive order of President Truman), is turned toward the sign of peace, thus the premise of my remarks today: While the search for peace is a continuum, the strength to insure and preserve, must follow the same path.

The remarks that I have prepared for delivery today have emerged not only as a result of the debate that I mentioned a bit earlier, but they are also the reflections of one who has spent eleven years as a member of the committee on armed services, the overseeing by daily legislative oversight of three presidents, and the constant communications with the people who constitutionally make our defensive policy, as well as those delegated to carry it out.

When I first entered the Congress back in 1960, it was possible to make a speech with only a passing reference to Asia.

It was possible to speak of our across-the-board strategic superiority, over the Soviet Union in nuclear weapons systems.

Although tension existed in the Middle East, that area was relatively quiet.

Communist China had not yet developed a nuclear capability.

The Soviets had not attempted to establish a missile base in Cuba.

Unfortunately, the same situation does not hold true today.

About 1964, the gradual intensification of the war in Vietnam and the launching of an accelerated Soviet land, sea, and air construction program, caused the threat to peace and security to begin to mount. This is easily done in a dictatorship where a "first amendment" is unheard of, and the people are cowered in fear and devoid of individual freedom! ! !

In the five years since 1965, the Soviet Union has *surpassed* this nation in land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles. Five years ago, our ICBM's outnumbered theirs, 4 to 1. Today, we have 300 fewer than they.

Where we once maintained a 4 to 1 superiority of submarine-launched missiles in 1965, we now find our lead has shrunk to 2 to 1, and estimates for 1975 project us to trail 600 to 900.

It was only in 1964 that the Soviet Navy began continuous deployments in the Mediterranean; now, since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, a flotilla of nuclear submarines and missile-armed surface ships has been continuously operating there.

The Russian Mediterranean presence has at times attained a strength of 65 naval vessels, including submarines and support ships.

As a consequence, today, Soviet Naval forces constitute a major political and *Military Presence* in the Mediterranean. This was the reason why President Nixon, on his recent European visit, made it a point to board the flagship of our 6th fleet, to impress on the world our intent not to be shoved out of that body of water by any show of strength. However, if we do not hasten to update and revitalize the ships of our Navy, by 1980, the Mediterranean could become a private Russian-U.A.R. Lake.

The Russian naval presence has also been extended into the Indian Ocean, and the farthest reaches of the Atlantic and Pacific. Soviet submarines and warships equipped with missiles now operate boldly off the coast of the United States and in the Gulf of Mexico, as well as in the Caribbean and the coast of Africa and Southeast Asia. Think how their deployment turn-around time has decreased and their effective patrol time has been increased by the Cuban resupply base at Cienfuegos.

The Soviet surface fleet now includes two helicopter carriers, about 24 cruisers, 35 guided missile destroyers, 50 gun-armed destroyers, more than 100 destroyer escorts, and literally thousands of smaller ships, minesweepers, coastal escorts, support craft and intelligence collectors.

In addition, the Russian nuclear submarine construction capability now is about 20 units a year based on working one work shift a day; by working three shifts a day, they have the ability to produce 35 nuclear submarines a year. Today, they are building at the rate of 10 to 14 a year. They have perfected a quiet running submarine—we have not!

By contrast, the United States today has roughly 147 operational submarines of which 88 are nuclear-powered, and of which only 47 are configured as submarines primarily designed to combat the Soviet submarine threat. The other 41 nuclears are our Polaris missile firing submarines.

A recent report from the comptroller general had this to say about our Navy: "Approximately 80% of the major ships in the Atlantic fleet are over ten years old, and 50% are over 20 years. In April, 1969, the average age of the ships of the 6th fleet (Mediterranean) was 18.3 years."

So much for the Navy.

The United States Army, now numbering 1.3 million men, will probably decline to around 750,000 by 1975. The Soviets are expected to maintain 2 million men under arms.

Although the number of battleworthy tanks is classified information, I can tell you that the over-all total has dropped by several hundred in the past five years. We know that the Soviets are increasing their tank forces and are expected to have three times as many as we do by 1975. (20,000 tanks & exercise "okeon", February, 1 year ago-snorkels, etc.)

We have something like 9,500 helicopters, 8 times the Soviet count. However, the U.S. ground forces in order to utilize that mobility, would have to have absolute air supremacy over a battle area. Theirs have greater lift capability than ours and they have enough to deploy some to North Vietnam.

The Soviets are building and testing new models of aircraft at the rate of one every eighteen months. They have in operation an advanced fighter interceptor, the MIG–23 (Foxbat), with a top speed of 2,200 mph, nearly twice as fast as any in our inventory. We are soon to "flight test" the new F–14 and F–15's, but full scale production of these planes is still a couple of years away.

Our combat aircraft now number about 8,500. The Soviets have nearly 10,000. Although the Air Force does not wish to declassify its projected capability, I can safely tell you that it will be under our present figure by 1975.

These are sobering comparisons and if any

bright spot can be found, it is in the fact that the military hardware we are able to produce is still superior to anything that the Soviets have been able to mount. The trick will be to keep it that way.

Most authorities agree that at the present time, we are two to four years ahead of the Russians in every important area of weapons technology. In strategic forces, we have better ICBM's, better ABM technology and better equipment at every level of detail that is important. The Soviets have larger missiles now because they have chosen to go that way, not because their technology is better. We still have better ships and better submarines across the board, in nearly every area. Our weapons are better simply because we developed a substantial lead in technology during World War II, and we maintained high enough levels of research and development to stay ahead ever since.

There may be another "Sputnik" now-and-then to flash into our future and scare the daylights out of us, but it will pose no danger as long as we maintain our lead in technology. If we ever lose the lead we now have in all major areas of military technology, we will face the prospect of having to accept Sputnik, not just in one or two unimportant areas now and then, but the prospect of a Sputnik in every important area of military weapons—in strategic nuclear forces, in naval forces, and in conventional ground forces. No responsible administration official, or any responsible Member of Congress can afford, in my opinion, to take that gamble with the future security of our Nation and the future safety of our people. Hence my letter to the commander in chief and the Secretary of Defense saying:

"Recent cutbacks in the Department of Defense have unfortunately caused equivalent cuts in vital research and development programs."

It is common knowledge that from World War II to 1960, our military research and development was by far the major part of the total technological effort of this nation. In 1960, for example, the Department of Defense budget for R. & D. was $5.6 billion out of a total Federal R. & D. outlay of close to $9 billion.

The space program, together with expanding defense research, brought the total U.S. Government research and development expenditures to a peak of about $13 billion in 1966 and '67; defense was about half of that.

Today, the total Federal research and development has gone down to a level of about $11 billion, with both space and defense declining rapidly and with defense still about half the total. That is one big reason why the administration is seeking more money for the Department of Defense in the latest budget. Another is the known Russian % increase in theirs!

It is important to remember that when we speak of research and development, we are not talking exclusively about nuclear bombs, SS–9 missiles, and the like.

Since the end of World War II, research and development, supported by the Department of Defense, has provided the major support for expansion of nearly *all* U.S. technology.

It, along with the will, know-how, and patriotism of the U.S. worker, has been responsible for the rapid development of radar, new communication technology and computers.

In addition, a great deal of the technical progress in civil aviation has come from the defense supported R & D. All turbojet and turbofan engines used in commercial aircraft have evolved from military programs. The Boeing 707 was derived directly from the Air Force C–135. Light observation helicopters developed for the Army have found many civil applications.

Defense has played a tremendous part in the development of new materials. *Aluminum* is found today in thousands of everyday products, but it was developed from a rare and costly metal to its widespread use today by work founded on the military need for aluminum in aircraft. Similiarly, the current titanium industry is a direct consequence of Department of Defense sponsored materials research and development. Even the new Lockheed C–5 can blame part of its cost overruns on the need to develop a new and lighter alloy for its construction.

Today, titanium and beryllium alloys are used in both military and civilian aircraft as airframe structures and in the compressor stages of the engines. Without titanium, no supersonic transport would begin to meet its operational demands. The corrosion resistance of titanium has put it into such civilian applications as food and chemical processing, and titanium uses in the near future will include desalination plants, steam power generating equipment, and equipment for the entire transportation industry.

The development of glass-reinforced plastics was the first important product in the class of materials known as "composites". Rocket cases for both stages of the Polaris missile, as well as for the third stage of the minuteman, utilize this material.

Military development of these glass-reinforced plastics has spurred the civilian use of these materials in boats, truck cabs, trailer bodies, fishing poles, shotgun barrels, pipe, battery cases, and many other items.

The use of satellites for communication, navigation, mapping and weather observation was initiated by the Department of Defense, and as usual, this technology rapidly found its way into the civilian sector, as well as overseas, where all their intelligence agent needed to do is buy the latest copy of Scientific American or Popular Mechanics where we proudly announce each breakthrough, complete with blueprints!

I give you these examples only to point up the great harm that can result, not only in the area of national security, but in the advancement of technology as well, if there is a serious cutback in research and development funding. I don't propose to reject out of hand requests by the Department of Defense purely on the "say-so" of individuals who are running for President, not on their record, but against the military. These same individuals would have you believe that a few kind words would solve all the ills of the world. I say—let them tell that to the Hungarians or the Czech's, or the Poles!

The record will show that we have been engaged, for some time now, in strategic arms limitation (SALT) talks with the Soviet Union in Helsinki and Vienna.

We are talking with the Communist Chinese in Warsaw.

We meet almost daily with the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong in Paris.

We are at work trying to help negotiate a cease-fire and lasting peace in the Middle East. But it is important to always keep in mind, in the arena of world politics and negotiation, it's common knowledge that you can't win by negotiating something that you don't already have. A weakened nation is a "sitting-duck" for all comers.

Probably one of the most quoted phrases in the history of this Nation came out of the farewell address made by Dwight Eisenhower. It was in that speech that he coined the term, "military-industrial complex". As frequently is the case, the other things that the late President had to relate, in that very same speech, went, for the most part unnoticed. Let me refresh your memory. Ike said: "A vital element in keeping the peace is our Military Establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction. We face a hostile ideology, global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transistory sacrifices of crisis, but rather, those which enable us to carry forward, steadily, surely, and without complaint, the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle, with liberty at stake."

On these words, I rest my case knowing that properly informed, you and the rest of America will do your part.

TESTIMONY OF H. R. RAINWATER, COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 9, 1971, the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs heard Commander-in-Chief Herbert R. Rainwater of the VFW testify.

Chief Rainwater outlined the VFW's legislative program for 1971. It is my hope that every Member of Congress will take the time to read the testimony of this great leader of such a gallant organization.

The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF H. R. RAINWATER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this great Committee to present the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

I note that there are some new members on the Committee—and regretfully, that some long-time members are missing. I refer to Congressmen William H. Ayres of Ohio, and E. Ross Adair, of Indiana. During their terms in Congress, these two distinguished gentlemen never failed to be present on this occasion.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is deeply appreciative of their efforts in behalf of veterans' programs during their twenty years of service on this Committee. They will be missed by all of us.

As you know, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is the oldest major veterans' organization in America—having been initially formed by veterans of the Spanish-American War, in 1899.

From that small beginning, we have grown steadily in membership and service—until today we have over 1,600,000 members. This is 110,000 more than we had at this same time last year. We expect to close out the current year with an all-time high of 1,750,000 members. This will make the nineteenth consecutive year that we have achieved a substantial increase in our membership.

The men who are with me this morning are primarily responsible for this continued growth. Through their efforts and leadership, the great purposes and programs of the Veterans of Foreign Wars are being carried out in all the states of this great nation.

One of these is our Voice of Democracy Program. It is a scriptwriting contest, whose theme this year is: "Freedom—Our Heritage."

The winners of that great patriotic contest are the young and handsome people you see just a few rows behind me. We are extremely proud of these young Americans. Five of them will receive college scholarships, totaling $22,500, at our Congressional Banquet tonight. We will have the privilege

of hearing the first place winner deliver his or her speech. The first place prize is a $10,000 scholarship.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is determined each year by our delegates at our National Convention. Approximately three hundred separate resolutions dealing with veterans' rights and benefits; national security; and Americanism are weighed in the process.

Thereafter, our National Legislative and Security Committees meet here in Washington for the purpose of reviewing these resolutions and recommending a Priority Legislative and National Security Program.

That Priority Program for 1971 has been printed in an attractive brochure and distributed to the Congress, the Executive Branch, the news media, and to the public.

It would be deeply appreciated, Mr. Chairman, if a Digest of the Resolutions approved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars delegates attending our Miami Beach National Convention, and a copy of our Priority Legislative and Security Goals, may be made a part of my remarks at the conclusion of my statement.

When I assumed office as Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, last August, I immediately announced operation "Prisoner of War." This was a petition-signing effort to incite and develop citizen opinion and action throughout the world, against the treatment of our men who are being held prisoners by the Communists in North Vietnam, the Viet Cong in South Vietnam and the Pathet Lao in Laos. Our members came through with flying colors. They gave me petitions carrying four million signatures. I later asked them to send 25 million letters to the North Vietnamese representatives in Paris—where I had been unable to deliver those petitions.

Immediate release of our men is our primary objective. But short of outright release of all prisoners of war, identification, adequate food and medical care, humane treatment, and the release of the sick and disabled, are obligations of the North Vietnamese Government under the terms of the Geneva Convention.

Looking optimistically toward the day when that release is effective, I have recommended to the Secretary of Defense and to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs that specific plans be developed to provide for the treatment and readjustment of these gallant men when they are returned to us. I am pleased to report that the Secretary of Defense has assured me that appropriate programs will be ready and operative when needed.

This Committee is to be commended for taking the initiative during the previous Congress in developing and gaining approval of legislation which has provided close to three-quarters of a billion dollars in additional assistance to veterans and their dependents. I refer, of course, to the general cost of living increase, and the 35 per cent increase in the GI Bill rates, and other VA educational programs.

Despite these increases, however, the inflationary costs of living continue to spiral—and it will not be long before additional increases are mandatory. VA compensation and pension checks never keep pace with the ever-mounting costs of today's economy. Certainly they have never yet anticipated the increased costs of the future. To this extent they both remain a game of "catch-up", in which the veteran is always behind on the economic ladder.

The Veterans of Foreign War has always maintained that there is a distinction between the honor of being buried in a National Cemetery, and the economic assistance provided through the veterans' burial allowance. This is the reason we have so long held to the position that there should be at least one National Cemetery in each state.

The continuation of the National Cemetery System, including Arlington National Cemetery, is a priority goal of our organization. We strongly support bills before this Committee which will carry out these purposes.

We in the Veterans of Foreign Wars are deeply disturbed at the use of drugs by many of our young servicemen. Many identified as marijuana users have been summarily discharged with undesirable discharges which bar them from VA treatment for this condition, as well as all other veterans benefits. For more than two years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been urging the Department of Defense to review existing policies with a view toward treatment and rehabilitation rather than punishment. We view the recently revised Defense Department policy in so far as marijuana users are concerned as a step in the right direction. At least it is an excellent first measure on the road to reform.

The establishment of the first of thirty planned drug treatment centers by the Veterans Administration is still another program which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has long advocated.

We believe the Congress of the United States has the obligation to look ahead, just as it does in matters involving National Defense, and be prepared at all times to balance the equities and inequities which repeatedly occur in the Veterans Administration Program.

Realistic compensation and pension payments for the disabled veteran and his family, or survivors; increased GI Bill assistance for returning Vietnam veterans; practical job assistance and training for those who do not use the GI Bill; preservation of veterans' preference in Federal employment, including the new Postal Corporation; and complete elimination of the pauper's oath for veterans seeking VA hospital care, are musts, in so far as the Veterans of Foreign Wars is concerned.

Important as these are, there is one veterans program which deserves even more attention. I refer to the VA hospital and medical program. During the past several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has devoted its major effort to obtain additional badly needed funds for this program. Your distinguished Committee, Mr. Chairman, provided the leadership which added $155,000,000 to the VA hospital budget for last year.

Despite this, however, it appears that we failed to make a dent in the Office of Management and Budget. In spite of the fact that the Office of Management and Budget knows full well that the extra $155,000,000 was almost literally jammed down its throat by the Congress after overwhelming evidence indicated that much more was needed, it does not seem to have been impressed. For the VA budget for hospitals and medical care for fiscal year, 1972, is based on a substantial reduction in the medical care program for veterans. It contemplates taking care of 6,823 less veterans per day, starting next year, 79,000 patients per day, as against 85,935 on an average daily basis at the present time. Obviously this will force the VA to increase its rejection rate.

In other words, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, it perpetuates a vicious circle. Each year the VA is given less money than it needs by the Office of Management and Budget. The VA is forced to reduce the number of patients on an average daily basis in order to live within this inadequate budget.

Then when the record shows that the average daily patient load is down, operating beds and other facilities are curtailed. Needed personnel are not hired. And the quality of medical care is reduced.

The next year the Office of Management and Budget forces the VA to accept a still smaller budget based upon this fictitious reduction, or perhaps I should say enforced reduction, of the daily patient load for the previous year.

It is very easy to predict the ultimate destruction of the VA hospital system if the Administration, through the Office of Management and Budget, continues this policy of starving the VA hospital and medical system.

I can assure this Committee and the Congress that the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is well aware of the downward skid of VA hospitals since 1965. That was the year the then Bureau of the Budget tried to close 32 VA facilities. The Veterans of Foreign Wars stands ready to fight to the last ditch to save our VA hospitals.

Even the $155,000,000 that the Congress so wisely added to the VA hospital budget for this year was used in a manner which kept it from becoming a continuing budget item for successive years. Practically all of it was spent on equipment, maintenance, and other one-time budget items. It was not used for additional personnel and badly needed services. Yet it is the lack of sufficient personnel to provide essential services in our VA hospitals which has reduced their quality of medical care to veterans of this nation's wars.

The President, in his message to Congress on February 1, entitled, "Resubmission of Legislative Proposals", included a rehash of proposals to eliminate statutory payments for service-connected disability caused by tuberculosis, and the $250.00 burial allowance to which every veteran is now entitled. This message was obviously the creature of the Office of Management and Budget.

There are many ways in which money can be saved without saving it at the expense of veterans—especially those who were disabled while on active duty in the service of our country.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars strongly recommends that bills implementing these proposals to eliminate veterans rights be rejected by this Congress. It is our fervent hope that they will die when the 92nd Congress finally adjourns.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, there are other areas which greatly disturb the members of my organization. Two of these are the processing of veterans' claims in regional offices, and jobs for veterans. There has been a constantly rising case load of claims under the GI Bill and readjustment programs, compensation, and pensions in the VA. The Veterans of Foreign Wars commends the dedicated VA personnel who are doing a tremendous job in keeping up with this sharply rising work load during the past few years. We have sought in every way possible to call attention to the need for additional personnel. The proposed budget will add approximately 257 employees to these 57 VA regional offices. But here again, an additional 257 employees will not be be enough.

The Congress took note of the sharp increase respecting the need of veterans for information and assistance by authorizing an outreach program, which is the 1970 word for an expanded contact program. Yet last year's VA budget did not have one cent in the VA appropriation for the newly-authorized expanded outreach services as provided in PL 91–219. Nor does there appear to be any money in this year's 1972 appropriation for that program. Without additional, competent personnel to advise veterans and their families respecting their rights and the assistance to which they are entitled, this program is completely nullified. Additional outreach personnel must be provided for if veterans and their dependents are to be advised about the assistance Congress has authorized for them.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has com-

mitted itself to lending all possible assistance to the problem of obtaining jobs and job training for all veterans, and more particularly for veterans returning from Vietnam. We are cooperating with the President's Jobs for Veterans Program, and have our own continuing program to assist veterans in obtaining jobs.

Last, but far from least, Mr. Chairman, we are concerned about the recommendation to eliminate the most successful veterans program ever established by the Congress. I refer to the direct home loan program. It is inconceivable to the Veterans of Foreign Wars that this program, which is the only veterans program which has ever made money for the Government, should be earmarked for elimination.

The need for additional housing is on everybody's tongue. We all know that in our small towns and rural areas it is next to impossible to obtain a housing loan. That is why the Congress established the direct home loan program. It has experienced few losses. It is a paying program making its own way. Yet unless the Congress acts this veterans' program will come to an end. The 1972 budget calls for the expansion of various subsidized housing programs and includes the continuation of the direct loan program, handled by the Small Business and Farmers Home Administrations—yet the veterans direct loan program will be deleted.

I have not endeavored to deal with National Health Insurance and all of its implications respecting veterans hospitals. There is no question, however, that a true National Health Insurance program, as contemplated by the bills introduced in this Congress would swallow up VA hospitals at least in part. Should such a system be established, we will need the wisdom and leadership of this great Committee if we are to continue to provide medical care and hospital treatment for veterans in separate facilities.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars will continue to oppose any attempt to eliminate these separate facilities, as we now oppose the efforts being made by the Office of Management and Budget to curtail service to America's veterans.

These, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, are a few of the areas of intense concern for 1971 in the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

May I again express my sincere gratitude for this opportunity to appear before this distinguished Committee. Many of us will be visiting with you individually throughout the remainder of the day.

We are hoping to return your courtesy by being your hosts tonight at our annual Congressional Banquet at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. All members of Congress have been cordially invited. The dinner will begin promptly at 7:00 P.M., with a reception beginning at 6:00 P.M.

Thank you for your attention.

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF REVENUE SHARING

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my pleasure to meet with Erie County Education Association members and New York State legislators to discuss legislative proposals in the education field. At this legislative session the Erie County Education Association adopted a resolution in support of the administration's revenue sharing proposal to allocate $3 billion to elementary and secondary education and give States greater latitude in meeting local problems.

The text of this resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, President Nixon has requested the Congress of the United States to approve a special revenue sharing plan in the amount of $11,000,000,000 to be distributed to each state in the nation, and

Whereas, the amount of $3,000,000,000 is specifically allocated for assistance to education throughout the nation,

Be it resolved; That the Erie County Education Association, meeting on February 17, 1971 does hereby give its wholehearted support to President Nixon's revenue sharing plan, specifically in the area of aid to education, with the following contingency, That the bulk of the $3,000,000,000 be specifically earmarked for aid to elementary and secondary education in each state.

LOS ANGELES TRADE-TECHNICAL COLLEGE LAUDED

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, in the 21st District of California, which I represent, there is a unique example of close cooperation between industry, education, business, and labor. Eleven hundred advisers on 70 college advisory committees work closely with the college in initiating and maintaining quality vocational training programs at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College.

Trade-Tech is currently the largest vocational community college in the country and offers training to 5,500 full-time day students and 10,000 evening students. Even in the current economic downturn the college is able to place nearly 100 percent of the graduates. According to a recent article in the Los Angeles Times:

One graduate was recruited by a New York firm that paid him a starting salary of $12,000 a year and picked up the tab for his moving expenses.

Not only have the members of the advisory committees given counsel and advice but through their efforts nearly $2 million in equipment has been donated.

The membership of advisory committees is comprised of selected representatives from management, labor, professional organizations, technical societies, suppliers and agencies that are interested in the instructional programs.

The demands of industry determine the various phases of technical and trade training carried on by the college. Placement and successful progress of students are the measures of effectiveness of the preemployment training. Increased productivity, job satisfaction, and advancement of the employed trainee attest to the effectiveness of the trade extension program. For these reasons all training is developed and carried on with the advice and assistance of local trade advisory committees and industrial consultants who are familiar with industrial needs and practices.

These advisory committees meet on the invitation of the college administration, at least once a year and on occasions when considered necessary. They give counsel and advice in regard to evaluating training programs, approve plans to meet current training needs, review past accomplishments, and forecast trends affecting training and employment.

Members of the various advisory committees are an important part of the educational program of the college. The people who serve on the committees are selected because of their leadership in the economic life of Los Angeles. The advisers bring to the college expert advice and sound thinking on trade and technical problems. Thus the work of the classroom reflects the rapid changes in community and industry.

"U.S.A. AND U.S.S.R. SPACE PROGRAMS COMPARED"

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 10, 1971]

RUSSIA QUIETLY PUSHES ITS SPACE TECHNOLOGY, THREATENS U.S. LEAD

(By Jonathan Spivak)

WASHINGTON.—Almost unnoticed in the excitement over American lunar exploits, the Soviet Union is making significant strides in space—and threatening to outdo the U.S. in years ahead.

Though the Russians' achievements are less dramatic than putting men on the moon, they're chalking up solid progress in the number and duration of space flights and in the development of sophisticated hardware.

"Unless we reverse the current trends in the U.S. space program, we must be prepared to give up our lead," acting space administrator George Low warns. "I wouldn't be surprised to see a whole string of (Russian) space firsts," adds a Defense Department official.

WHAT ARE RUSSIANS UP TO?

Russian intentions are difficult to divine, but U.S. space specialists speculate:

—Instruments may be landed on Mars to acquire information on the planet's chemical composition and on surface conditions that might help determine the possibilities of life there. The Russians, it's felt, might achieve this landing well in advance of U.S. efforts, which are planned for 1975. Soviet scientists predict that roving, remotely controlled surface exploration vehicles will be dispatched to Venus and Mars sometimes in the future.

Manned earth-orbital flights in the Soyuz spaceship may extend as long as 30 days, about twice the Apollo craft's current capabilities. The Russian voyages would be aimed at developing the technology for op-

erating a permanent space station, which might be formed in orbit by joining together a number of spaceships.

The Russians may achieve a manned landing on the moon within a few years, perhaps by rendezvousing lunar spacecraft components in orbit about the earth, rather than the moon as the U.S. has done. Meanwhile, Soviet exploration of the moon will be conducted by automated craft that can rove the surface and return small amounts of moon material to earth.

MILITARY VENTURES

Though Moscow's military space ventures are even more obscured from U.S. view, experts expect the Russians will continue development of an orbital bombardment system, designed to avoid U.S. radar defenses, and a spaceborne satellite-inspection system. What worries U.S. military men more is the uncertainty over what else their Soviet counterparts are up to.

The expressed concern of Washington officials, both civilian and military, about the Russian space program isn't exactly selfless. During most of the last decade the U.S. Soviet "race" to the moon sustained a high level of public interest—and heavy congressional appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Now NASA's dollars are dwindling, and officials hope to reverse the decline.

The Russian progress, in any case, is real enough. In 1970, the Soviets launched no less than 88 spacecraft, manned and unmanned, against 36 for this country. (Until the mid-1960s, the U.S. enjoyed a two-to-one advantage in space launchings.) The Soyuz spaceship has made the longest manned flight, 18 days in earth orbit. Lunokhod 1, an automated roving explorer now on the moon, and Luna 16, an unmanned craft that has brought back material from the moon, are more sophisticated than any probes the U.S. has developed.

"Both countries have strong programs, roughly the same, but different in detail. At this point their program is going stronger in flight hardware," sums up Charles Sheldon Jr., the Library of Congress' space specialist who closely monitors Soviet efforts.

A $7.5 BILLION PROGRAM

"The USSR has kept pace with the U.S. in the continued development and improvement of general capabilities that made possible the U.S. moon landing," Foy D. Kohler, former ambassador to Moscow, and Dodd I. Harvey of the University of Miami recently wrote in Science magazine.

While exact figures are hard to come by, the Soviet civilian space budget is believed to be $5 billion a year, compared with current NASA outlays of $3 billion. If military space activities are added, Soviet space spending probably equals the peak U.S. outlays of $7.5 billion in 1966. Total U.S. space spending now is about $4.5 billion a year, and it will probably drop further.

Soviet progress has made possible the first meaningful cooperation in space between the two nations. Besides an exchange of lunar soil samples, an agreement was recently reached to develop compatible rendezvous and docking systems for spacecraft. Both nations use a snout-like probe on one craft to fit into a receptacle on the other, but the dimensions are different.

"The docking talks seem to have indicated a new approach . . . a reasonably fundamental change in our relationship to date," says one U.S. official. The Soviets have already provided detailed engineering and design information on some of their space hardware, disclosures that they rigorously resisted in the past. In the early 1960s, when the U.S. sought space agreements with Moscow, only a modest exchange of weather pictures and other data ensued. Some experts theorize the Russians may be more cooperative now because they are increasingly confident of their space capabilities.

AMBITIOUS JOINT EFFORTS

The docking arrangements could lead toward ambitious joint efforts, like plans for space rescue operations or exploration of the moon and planets. NASA men conceive of a U.S.-Soviet space station in orbit about the moon for months at a time; it could launch missions to rescue astronauts of any nation stranded on the moon. But such initiatives are far in the future and will depend mainly on international political considerations.

Unlike NASA's well-publicized civilian operations, the Soviet space program is conducted under military supervision, and many details remain secret. "The information coming to the free world is minimal," says one U.S. analyst. The Russians don't give advance notice of specific launches or reveal their future plans except in broad outline. They tell especially little about their rockets, all of which apparently have some military application. From the Western world, only French emissaries have been allowed to visit Soviet launch sites.

Even though the U.S. has won the race, Russia is believed still interested in putting a man on the moon. Their timetable may have been slowed by the U.S. success, however. "I think it won't be too long before they go to the moon," asserts Charles Mathews, a NASA official.

But the Russians' 14,500-pound Soyuz craft lacks complex electronic navigation and guidance systems, and it isn't adequate for manned flight to the moon. More significantly, the Soviets lack a mammoth booster rocket, like the U.S. Saturn V that launched the Apollo spaceships.

The Soviets say their manned space program now is focused on orbital flight designed to develop space stations and space launching platforms. They mention a variety of objectives, including weather observations, mapping of the earth, mineral surveys, repair of other spacecraft and study of the stars and interstellar space.

"For the present time there are no rigid timetables for man's flight to the moon; our main purpose is the construction of the orbital stations," Vitali I. Sevastyanov, a member of the Soyuz 9 crew, recently told a press conference in Houston.

Indeed, the Russians now may be farther along in space-station work than the U.S., which plans to launch a three-man station called Skylab in 1973. More than two years ago, two manned Soyuz craft were linked in earth orbit, forming, in effect, a primitive space station.

Like Apollo, the Soyuz spaceship consists of three units; the crewmen live and work in two, while the third provides propulsion and supplies. Defense Department experts suspect the Soyuz spacecraft might be used to detect inter-continental-missile launches and to perform other military duties.

Many of the Russians' unmanned Cosmos flights (there have been 399 to date) are sent aloft for military purposes. The Soviets continue periodically to test a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System designed to avoid U.S. radar defenses, which are positioned to guard against missiles coming from the north. This lethal satellite would approach from the south, discharging its warhead before a full orbit was completed and thus apparently circumventing the international ban on weapons in space. Its limitations are lack of accuracy and a smaller payload capacity than missiles that take a shorter over-the-pole route.

The Russians also appear interested in developing earth satellites to detect and destroy enemy spacecraft. Six Cosmos flights have been directly devoted to testing a space inspection system. The U.S. Air Force experimented with a similar project several years ago, but canceled it for lack of money.

On the civilian side, Soviet scientists predict more sophisticated instruments, including optical telescopes, will ultimately be placed on the moon's surface, an ideal observing post free of the distortions caused by the earth's atmosphere. "Lunokhod I is the first step toward such a lunar observatory," writes a Russian academician in Soviet Life, an English-language propaganda magazine.

REPRESENTATIVE JIM ABOUREZK

HON. GEORGE McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Rapid City Guide, one of the finest weekly newspapers in my State, has published an excellent biography of my fellow South Dakotan, JIM ABOUREZK. The biography, written when JIM was involved in a primary election for the Democratic nomination for Congress, goes a long way toward explaining why JIM became the first Democrat in 36 years to be elected from South Dakota's Second Congressional District.

The same remarkable energy and concern for the underdog which brought JIM from a Lebanese immigrant household on the Rosebud Indian Reservation to the U.S. Congress has already marked him as one of the most promising new Representatives in the House.

I ask unanimous consent that this biographical sketch of my friend and colleague, Representative JIM ABOUREZK, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DRIVING ENERGY PROPELS SON OF LEBANESE PACK PEDDLER TOWARDS U.S. HOUSE SEAT

(By Bill Wagner)

With only a few short days left until the primary, Democratic contender for the U.S. House of Representatives Jim Abourezk should have every reason to sit back and relax a bit.

Two successive South Dakota Polls have shown him with a commanding lead over his two opponents.

A private poll showed him leading his principal opponent, Elvern Varilek, by a margin of two to one.

Besides that, his small army of door to door volunteers report a heavy outpouring of support and enthusiasm among the rank and file Democrats pointing to an Abourezk avalanche.

But at the moment as far as Jim is concerned, he leads by only one vote: his 76 year old cousin Eli Abourezk, a resident of a Rapid City nursing home, cast his vote last week via absentee ballot and the word around Abourezk headquarters is that Jim got Eli's vote.

Nothing is taken for granted.

The Abourezk strategy is not to let up, to continue with the relentless pace and boundless energy that have been the hall mark of his campaign until election day, hoping to pile up a big enough margin of victory to show that he is not only the overwhelming Democratic choice for the congressional candidacy but that he can win in November.

His tactics are simple enough: hard work and a dedicated organization.

His approach is basic: a thorough grasp of the issues and a willingness to meet them head on.

His manner is simple and straight forward as he goes about the district, making personal appearances, shaking hands and making speeches.

His budget is threadbare, which he hopes to offset by the efforts of the hundreds of high school and college volunteers who make up his campaign staff.

Although the campaign has been waged at a hectic pace with little time to rest up for the next day's foray, it's obvious to the observer that Abourezk loves every minute of it. He is one of those rare persons who relishes nothing more than to roll up his shirt sleeves and wade into the bear pit of partisan politics.

Abourezk carries with his bulky, semi-squat frame the mannerisms of a finished politician: a friendly smile here, a whispered confidence there and an intense attention to whomever happens to have his ear at the moment. In Rapid City, it's hard to say he walks down the street: rather, his ambling from here to there is a series of broad smiles, friendly waves, brief chats with passersby and longer, more intimate conversations.

But politics is more than a game with Abourezk. Like everything else he does, he works hard at it. He's deadly serious. He thinks he has some ideas and the ability to present an alternative to what he calls the "tired and trite" Republican representation of the past. Abourezk is convinced that he has something to offer, but what's more important to him is that he has always been urged to assume the mantle of leadership.

Abourezk started developing notions about the nature and role of government while growing up as a boy on the Rosebud Reservation, but he credits Adlai Stevenson with his maturation as a politically involved citizen. To this day some of his statements have a Stevensonian ring. For example, he expresses concern for the poor and disadvantaged growing out of what he calls a "deep philosophical conviction that civilization will survive when the time comes that we try to accept the implications of the Biblical reminder that not even a sparrow falls to the earth unheeded."

But over the years, he has studied and worked for other leading American political figures as well. Maybe the most telling mark of his campaign is the hundreds of young people throughout the district who are hard at work as Abourezk volunteers, a boast no other candidate for high office in either party can make this year. It is hard to explain the rapport Abourezk enjoys with the young, unless it is to say he understands their concerns and tells it like it is.

"I sit down and listen to them and talk with them a great deal," says Abourezk. "What the young people seem to be saying is that we adults are allowing our society to slip into a period of brutalization and that we are doing very little to correct it. They point to the examples of the brutalizing war in Indochina, the continued mistreatment of racial minority groups and the problems of hunger or poverty without any real concern for how to end them. They are tired of the lack of any meaningful effort to put an end to crime."

"Most college students," he continues, "are opposed to the radical minority bent on the destruction of property. They believe, as do those active in my campaign, that they've never really given the political system a chance to work with their involvement with something they believe."

Maybe the key to the Abourezk success with the younger set is that he listens to them and when he talks to them, he does just that—he doesn't speak at them. Whenever he speaks to a youthful audience he points out the folly of destructive demonstrations but calls on youth instead to give the system a chance by taking a part in it instead of standing on the sidelines. The success of his exhortations are the hundreds of young Abourezk volunteers who have taken the fight to the streets—but not for destruction. Instead, they armed with brochures and campaign literature.

Abourezk appears to be at home with his youthful army, whether it is pitching in and lending a hand in stuffing envelopes or picking out a tune on a guitar for the volunteers during a sing-a-long at his home after a wearying day on the campaign trail.

Jim has long been interested in the welfare of youth. He is one of the founders of the Great Pumpkin Ministry here which operates an ecumenical coffee house where young people may gather and enjoy themselves free from the influence of liquor and bars. The coffee house has the backing of priests, ministers and detectives from the city narcotics squad.

Aside from the bevy of high school and college students hard at work on his campaign throughout the district his wife, Mary, is in charge of hundreds of housewives who have been stuffing envelopes and preparing campaign literature for distribution. His daughter, Nikki, 16, a sophomore at St. Martin's Academy, is in charge of the local activities of the young volunteers. Jim himself personally handles their efforts in other parts of the district as he makes frequent swings across the state. His sons Charlie, 17, and Paul, 10, help out by distributing literature in nearby towns in the evenings and on weekends.

His family is working hard in the campaign not only to help to win, but to help to avoid, as Abourezk puts it, "the stress of abnormal life created by a campaign." During the last weeks of the primary fight, he has all but given up his law practice. The last several weeks he's handled his law office on a "catch as catch can" basis in the evenings and on the weekends to put enough bread on the family table.

Abourezk has been gearing his campaign to the Fall, trying to make the case with Democrats that he can win in the general election. He has made a point of speaking whenever possible, in contrast to the probable Republican nominee, Lt. Gov. Jim Abdnor who has come across as so inarticulate that his Republican mentors have had to keep him off the public podium as much as possible out of fear that he loses votes whenever he speaks. If nominated, Abourezk is expected to exploit this Achilles heel in the Republican front runner to the hilt. Many Democrats see Abourezk as the best hope for that reason.

He also looks good by contrast to his principal Democratic opponent, Elvern Varilek of Geddes. Although Varilek has been in the South Dakota House of Representatives for years, so far in the primary he has displayed a knack for losing potential votes wherever he goes. Speaking to union members in Lead, Varilek got lost in his own confusing rhetoric and told the miners right to their faces "anyone who carries a sign should be put in jail." It wasn't too long before the grizzled union leader Linus Wampler stood up and commented: "Mr. Varilek, I'd like you to elaborate on that point you just made because I've been hit on the head a couple of times while out on the picket line." It isn't expected that Varilek will fare too well among the miners.

On the other hand, Abourezk has discussed the issues with compassion and concern and an awareness of all their subtleties and nuances. He speaks from his lifetime in the district as a student, rancher, civil engineer and presently a practicing lawyer.

Jim was born 39 years ago in Wood on the Rosebud Reservation. His father had immigrated to the United States from Lebanon in 1895 and worked as a peddler in the area, tramping from house to house with a heavy laden pack on his back until he could afford to buy a horse, then a buggy and finally a store in Wood. After his father achieved some degree of prosperity, he returned to Lebanon where he married Jim's mother. He returned to South Dakota and hoped to save enough money to bring his wife and two children, Chic and Helen, to the United States but World War I intervened and their arrival was postponed until 1920. By this time the elder Abourezk was a well known and revered figure on the Rosebud Reservation by the Indians and whites alike. He was one of the few white men still remembered for not exploiting the Indians.

Jim's earliest recollections are of the drouth and the great depression, when he saw first hand the poverty and hardship the people went through. Looking back on those days, Abourezk says "we didn't have any money but we probably had more to eat than the average person because my father owned a small grocery store. I can still remember the terrible deprivation the people experienced . . . I remember watching grown men in the town of Wood walking along the railroad tracks picking up coal. My father never had much money because he never could turn down a grocery order even if he knew they couldn't pay him back . . . it was a time of terrible frustration," he sums up. To this day, many people in the Rosebud area cherish the memory of the elder Abourezk as the man who saved them from possible starvation during the depression. When he died, the Indians lined the streets in mourning.

Aside from helping around the store as a tyke, the young Abourezk learned the meaning of a hard day's work early in life. During the summers, he worked on farms for a dollar a day from 5 a.m. until 10 p.m. While working on a farm near Mission, when he was 15, as fate would have it, he met Mary Ann Houlton whom he didn't see again until he was home on leave from the Navy and was later to marry.

He didn't know it then, but he was to marry her not once, but three times. "So far as I know, I'm the only politician who has been married to the same woman three times without being divorced." The first time was in a civil ceremony in Pierre, then in a Syrian Orthodox ceremony and finally last summer in the Roman Catholic Church at the Mother Butler Center here. Abourezk laughingly recalls that at the Mother Butler ceremony Police Capt. and Mrs. Roger Theunissen stood up for him but sometime during the ceremony, Mary's purse was stolen.

After serving what he terms an uneventful hitch in the Navy in Japan during the Korean War, Abourezk tried his hand at several successful callings on the Rosebud including ranching, helping manage the family store and operating a used car operation but came to the conclusion there wasn't much of a future there. He had a chance to borrow some money to attend the School of Mines and jumped at it. So he and Mary and their two children—three by the time he graduated—hied themselves off to Rapid City where Jim earned a degree in civil engineering.

While a student at the Mines, Jim worked his way through by teaching Judo which he had learned from the world's champion while a seaman in Japan and held various other jobs during his collegiate career. He also organized a Young Democrats Club at the School of Mines. "It struck me that there was so much to be done and that people really didn't seem to care."

After his graduation from the Mines in 1961, he worked as a rough and tumble construction engineer, but his heart wasn't in it. When he got a chance to go to law school in 1963, he snapped up the chance. "It was

something I always wanted to do. I felt I could help to achieve many more improvements in our society as a member of the legal profession because it is easier to become involved in public service. Quite frankly, I thought engineering was a fine job but it was just 40 hours a week and got to the point where it got quite boring. The sawdust pit of the law profession seemed to offer a way to greater fulfillment." That was to prove true in Abourezk's case. Beside developing a highly successful law practice in his four years here since graduating from the University of South Dakota School of Law with honors, Abourezk quickly became a force to be reckoned with in the political life of the state, especially when it concerned the farmer, the consumer, the Indian and the poor and downtrodden.

Abourezk made his debut on the state political scene in 1968 when he was the Democratic nominee for attorney general. It was a campaign without precedent: heretofore in South Dakota politics, candidates for constitutional offices were considered hard campaigners if they followed the gubernatorial candidate around, sat at the head table and mouthed a few platitudes before the leading candidates spoke. Abourezk spoke on the issues and was recognized as a comer in the Democratic party and in state politics.

During that campaign he laughingly told his audiences his name wasn't a household word. Then he would pause to tell his listeners he was "considering changing it—to Spiro T. Abourezk." But like Spiro's, his name did get to become a household word that summer when he was named co-chairman of the drive to refer Gov. Farrar's Gas and Utility Consumer's Council law, which the state's rural electrics felt would destroy them, especially in view of the contents of the law and the public statement of Farrar that he was out to "get" the REA's. His drive resulted in 55,000 referral signatures with the result that the 1970 session of the legislature quickly repealed the controversial measure.

"I sincerely believed it would have choked off the rural electric cooperatives and I don't think there's on single thing that brought the farmer the degree of prosperity he has as low cost power. I believe when rural people prosper, the city prospers as well. I can still remember the day when we had to read with kerosene lamps and hand pump water. I was very happy to do battle with the governor." And to win too, he might have added.

His success in the referral of the utility measure led many to urge him to run for governor. He toyed with the idea for a while, but felt he could best serve the party, state and nation with his expertise on national issues as a candidate for the Congress.

He's always maintained what he calls a stance in "favor of the common man." He cites his efforts made against the "unscrupulous lending agencies" and his work as attorney for the South Dakota Consumers League in exposing some of the inequities of the Uniform Commercial Code which was, he says, "proposed by the lending lobby which would have doubled and tripled the interest rates." The measure was buried by the last session of the legislature because of adverse publicity.

Abourezk has always had a special rapport with the weak and downtrodden and they for him. He was elected a member of the board of the directors of the Western South Dakota Community Action Program and served on the board but was forced to turn down a second term because of the demands of the current campaign. But, he says, "one of my proudest moments was when I was elected to the board of directors of the Community Action Program by the poor people themselves."

In his tenure on the board, he developed some pretty strong notions about poverty and what can be done to combat it. "We've got an excellent program going," he says of current efforts, "but it does not go far enough in erasing poverty. Since the largest percentage of people on welfare are children and mothers, our great attack in untangling welfare is to break the cycle of welfare so that these children can breathe the fresh air of an environment without poverty. Day care centers should be expanded so that welfare mothers can be trained and permitted to work, as should Head Start so that children who know nothing but poverty can learn that another and better kind of life exists."

Throughout his public career, he has championed unpopular causes. "It raises my hackles to see someone treated unfairly," he says intensely.

"I call them slum-lords," he once publicly described property holders in Rapid City who rent blighted dwellings to the poor, mostly Indians. "How can they call this the Proud State when the only difference between the ghetto here and slums of Chicago and New York is that we don't have rats running across the floor."

From his early days, Jim had the profound conviction that the lot of the state's Indians can and should be bettered. He believes this will only come when the Indians are given full voice in the management of their own affairs. His law practice was hurt when he called for a sweeping investigation of conditions in jails here and near the reservations. Everything seemed to point to police brutality toward Indians. The charges were denied, but Jim was ready with affidavits to back up his claims. He is currently a board member of the Rosebud Reservation's Legal Aid program.

His political chances have also been hurt recently by his law practice because of some of the clients he has represented, particularly those charged with drug offenses. Jim can shrug these charges off as most lawyers do as simply a hazard of the profession. He knows he's taken an oath which requires him to give a client the best possible defense regardless of what he feels about the client. "The lawyer has the obligation to defend the man. Once he starts being the judge and jury he stops being a lawyer. I believe so much in the jury system that if an accused is really guilty and the police and prosecution do their job he'll be found guilty." However, he was disturbed recently when he was denounced in a letter to the editor because he represented someone charged with a narcotics violation which implied that somehow Abourezk was involved in his client's alleged misdeeds. It was especially hurting to Abourezk because he consistently cautioned his children, his young followers and youthful audiences about the inherent evils of drug use.

He also likes to mention two cases where it was clearly shown at preliminary hearings that his clients were innocent. One case involved a black officer at Ellsworth Air Force Base charged with unlawful possession of drugs. It came out at the preliminary hearing that a police informant had planted the drugs on the officer's car because of some grudge. The case was dismissed on the motion of the states attorney. Another case involved a man who had been extradited from the far west on a bad check charge. At the preliminary hearing, the storeowner testified the accused was not the man who wrote the check.

Abourzek has been running his campaign on a pretty tight budget. The bulk of his war chest came from a fund raising reception held early last spring. He's spent the money on buttons, but mostly on 52,000 brochures. No opportunity is missed to save money; the brochures would have cost more if they would have been folded at the printing plant, but to save money, Jim put his volunteers to work folding them. He does plan a limited amount of radio and television campaigning in these last few days before the primary.

The issue most voters express concern about to him is the war in Indochina. "Almost everyone wants out but the people are confused about how because of the conflicting arguments." Abourezk makes no bones about the fact that he believes the war is "perhaps the most serious foreign policy blunder in the history of the United States. We are fighting a land war in Asia—something that military strategists have warned us against for years—a war that has no national security interest for the United States in any regard." Part of his conviction about the Indochina involvement was picked up while he was stationed in Japan, where he learned first hand the low esteem Orientals place on human life.

He is also concerned about the economy and national priorities: "While nobody likes the regimentation of price and wage controls, as an alternative they are better than inflation and unemployment. We are facing the worst of two worlds—continuing rise in prices and at the same time a slowdown in the economy to the point where many people are being put out of work.

"The approximate $25 billion per year being spent on the war in Southeast Asia can be better put to use on domestic programs urgently needed at home. The problems of crime, poverty, hunger, lack of quality education in many areas all deserve more attention, but instead, we find ourselves halfway around the world fighting an isolated jungle war in an effort to support a government that does not have the support of its own people.

"An immediate reordering of our priorities is essential. We need to establish the basis of a common interest and goals of government in all Americans of good will rather than emphasizing their differences to drive them apart and against one another. We have to bring the country back together again. We have to reconcile the deep divisions that divide us. We can't go on hating each other because they're of a different color, age group or economic class."

Abourezk is particularly concerned about programs for South Dakota. "I love this state. I want to see it prosper" and proposes to do more than offer lip service if elected to Congress. He believes the voters are shrewd enough to elect a man with moxie who can not only hold his head above water in the topsy-turvy world of Washington but one who can impress his fellow congressmen enough to support his programs, where respect is gained by ability. It is one thing to be for the farmer, he points out, and another thing to convince an urban dominated Congress that the sound family farm is in the best interest of not only the farmer but of the nation. Abourezk backers are saying this is Jim's strongest asset: while others are saying they will do what they can for the district, Jim is the one with the ability to get the job done in the dog eat dog atmosphere of the nation's Capitol.

Like his father before him Jim Abourezk has packed a pretty heavy load on his back.

Why?

"If a person has the ability and opportunity to serve in an area of public life where he can get sound ideas across to other people there is a satisfaction there greater than any amount of money can buy," Jim says.

He believes, with the late Robert F. Kennedy, that "the future does not belong to those who are content with today, apathetic toward common problems and their fellow man alike, timid and fearful in the face of new ideas and bold projects. Rather, it will belong to those who can blend passion, reason and courage in a personal commitment to the ideals and great enterprises of American society."

BOMBING IN THE CAPITOL—A YOUNG REACTION

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, with last week's bombing of the Capitol Building, I am sure many citizens felt the need to pause and reflect upon the meaning of such an act against one of the great citadels of democracy. Evidence of this fact can, I am sure, be seen in the mail of any Member of Congress. I have received some thoughtful reactions from some of my younger constituents. Some youngsters in the Russell School at Conrad, Mont., felt the need to speak out against such a symbolic act against their freedom and their national history:

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
CONRAD, MONT., *March 2, 1971.*

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: I am sad that the Capitol was bombed. I hope the F.B.I. can track them who has been doing the damage about the Capitol. I hope the bombers can't take our freedom and government away from us. I hope the crack is not too bad. How much will it cost to fix the Capitol? What will you do about this. If you find the bombers, how long will you put them in jail?

Sincerely yours,

DALE BELL.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 2, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think the bombers who bombed the Capitol are trying to take away our government. I hope the Capitol isn't damaged much. I wish the bombers would leave our country so we could have freedom.

Sincerely yours,

KRISTI DENZER.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 2, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: I don't think that bombing is right because they are taking away our freedom and trying to take away our Government. I hope the F.B.I. finds the people that are bombing the capitol. I hope that the people that did it get put in prison for a long time. Maybe that will teach them a lesson. I do think the people should be punished for the damage they did.

Sincerely yours,

RONNIE NEWMILLER.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 2, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: I am getting upset because people are bombing the capitol and taking my freedom away to have a government. I think the police should put the people who bombed our capitol in jail for a life time.

Sincerely yours,

KATHY BARTON.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 1, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: I am getting upset with the people that are bombing the Capitol! They are hurting the government and we will have to pay more taxes. Some of us do not have too much money. To punish the bombers we should put them in jail for their life time.

Sincerely,

JANET RIEWER.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 2, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: I am upset the Capitol was bombed. They are taking away our freedom by bombing. I think there should be an end to this bombing. I hope you catch the bombers. When you catch them you should put them in jail for their lifetime.

Sincerely yours,

PAM BETTERMAN.

RUSSELL SCHOOL,
Conrad, Mont., March 2, 1971.

Congressman RICHARD SHOUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SHOUP: The people that bombed the Capitol are bothering quite a lot of people that want freedom. I hope you catch the bombers that bombed the Capitol. I'm glad nobody got hurt. Maybe if the police force catches the bombers they should be put in jail for a very long time.

Sincerely yours,

HOLLI HIGGINS.

MAKING GOVERNMENT MORE RESPONSIVE

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, in the President's state of the Union address, he outlined a truly revolutionary program for reshaping the executive branch of the Government to better serve the needs of the American people.

I heartily support such an effort and look forward to receiving his legislative proposals. I am particularly interested in finding a way to make Government more responsive. Right now our population is so large and our needs so very great that our present Government structure cannot cope with the legitimate requirements of our citizens.

The American people have a right to expect quick and effective Government responses to their needs. If a family is unemployed, it needs adequate sustenance until members of the family can receive job training, or until children are grown and educated, or until unhealthy members of the family can be adequately cared for and restored to active lives.

We all want a responsive Government. Yet, right now the maze of Federal offices defies the patience and abilities of those who most need our help. When constituents write for assistance, we now refer them to numerous offices capable of providing similar, if not identical, services.

When citizens write to one or another departmental office too often the correspondence is shuttled to a different office. Expensive long distance phone calls are transferred from one administrator to another before a question gets an answer or a need is met.

This 92d Congress can eliminate the confusion. Government can be clear and direct. It is our job to so simplify, Government functions that every American can get a direct and prompt answer to his problem.

WHEAT GROWER MATURITY

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Association of Wheat Growers held their annual convention in Portland, Oreg. The convention's resolve once again served notice to the Nation that the Wheat Growers Association is a responsible voice for the wheat industry and agriculture. Their statesmanlike efforts regarding agricultural legislation and policy are effectively summarized in a recent editorial that appeared in the Southwestern Miller. Mr. Speaker I commend this well-written and much deserved editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

WHEAT GROWER MATURITY

The vision of the wheat producer as a man of the soil concerned only with the weather and the price at the country elevator is quickly erased by a perusal of the activities at the recent annual convention in Portland of the National Association of Wheat Growers. That convention, the 21st in the history of the organization, reflected a feverish pace that moved the producers from consideration of federal tax policies, to import-export questions, to promotion, research and education, and to the expected requests in regard to administration of the Agricultural Act of 1970. A grower group that displays the type of statesmanship that has marked N.A.W.G. deliberations in recent years has attained a level of maturity that is highly satisfying to the producers' associates throughout the entire breadstuffs industry.

While major attention centered on the wheat farmer's stand in international wheat negotiations, since that is the main question at hand in view of the current Geneva negotiations of a new pact, many other aspects of the meeting were of importance. In one area alone, that of promotion and research in behalf of wheat foods, the N.A.W.G. decided on actions that should be emulated by both millers and bakers. For example, the recommendation was made that $100,000 be allocated from the budget of the National Wheat Institute for support of Day of Bread and August Sandwich Month during the next three years. In a voice that has more legislative power than any other segment, the growers recommended enactment of legislation to establish the Wheat and Wheat Foods Foundation. Consideration was also given to legislation that would aim at making $2,000,000 available on an annual basis for spe-

cific promotion and research in support of the wheat industry.

The best sign of wheat producer maturity came in the emphasis given by the convention delegates to the importance of producing qualities of wheat needed in domestic and export markets. Frequently, the charge is heard that growers are solely interested in bushels without regard for quality. That that is not the case was made eminently clear in Portland. "The quality of the wheat produced and marketed is of vital concern to all wheat producers and this emphasis should be one of the foremost activities of the National Association of Wheat Growers," it was stated. That policy represents maturity merged with wise judgment, a combination to be envied in any organization.

OUR DETERIORATING POSITION IN OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gaylord A. Freeman, Jr., chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago, has been intimately engaged in international finance and trade for many years and in such capacity and experience, his advice is sought often in this important area of our economy.

A short time ago he made some remarks about our deteriorating position in our balance of payments over the past two decades, and he phrased them in language that we can all understand. I should like to share his presentation with my colleagues:

NOTABLE AND QUOTABLE

Our country's position is a little like mine would be if I invited four or five of you in to play poker and got out the cigar box full of chips and sold you each $10 worth. If I lost hand after hand for perhaps 20 hands and continually reached into the box to replenish my own pile of chips, you might begin to wonder whether I would have the cash to redeem all of the chips piling up on the table. Then, after an hour or two of this, if I said that I could no longer redeem all of the chips and asked you not to cash any in, but to just keep on playing, you, as a friend, might say, "Okay—for a while." But as the hour grew later and I continued to lose every hand and constantly put more chips on the table, the time would come when you would say, "We aren't going to play any more unless you can make those chips good—or at least begin to bring some more money into the game."

As you know, our country has (with only two exceptions) had a balance of payments deficit in every year since 1950. That is, we have lost 18 hands in the Big Game between nations and have just continued to issue more dollars. At first we were not greatly distressed. As the world's banker, our nation—perhaps like your bank—recognized that we could not escape borrowing short and lending long, thus incurring a degree of illiquidity.

But the analogy is not all that good, for our country's long-term assets are not government assets but private assets. Privately owned factories abroad are not available for the payment of foreign-held claims for which foreign central banks can ask the U.S. government to pay in gold.

As the deficit continued, the problem became more aggravated. We will have another balance of payments deficit this year—and again will finance it by issuing more dollar claims—more chips.

Since we can't redeem all of those foreign-held dollar claims, we have since early in the 1960s asked Germany and our other foreign friends not to ask for gold for their dollars but to wait a while. They have waited and waited and waited. Meanwhile, our position has deteriorated every year.

Our time is running out.

BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the importance of a favorable balance of payments to the economic well-being of our country recently has been questioned. It has been urged that we adopt what has been called a "passive" payments policy and end our concern with the outflow of dollars.

Such suggestions are dangerous and unrealistic. There can be no doubt that continued payments deficits give rise to serious economic problems. The New York Times recently has printed two articles dealing with this subject. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS LOOM IN U.S. PAYMENTS—FEDERAL RESERVE BANK HERE SAYS DOLLAR MAY SUFFER IF DEFICIT IS NOT REDUCED

(By H. Erich Heinemann)

"Major problems" for the dollar could develop in world money markets unless the United States succeeds in reducing the deficit in its international balance of payments, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York warned yesterday in its annual report for 1970.

Alfred Hayes, president of the bank, said in his transmittal letter that "the easing of credit at home imposed a heavy new burden on our international payments position."

Mr. Hayes, who begins his final five-year term as president of the bank today (he will reach the normal retirement age of 65 in 1975), said that "although no serious repercussions developed during 1970, it became increasingly clear that our international payments problems will require close official attention in 1971."

NEW OUTFLOWS SEEN

Furthermore, it was understood that the New York reserve bank believes that the "exceedingly steep" drop in short-term interest rates in recent months has contributed to new outflows of dollars that "have been worrisome to our foreign friends."

For this reason, the bank believes that some slowing down, or stabilization, in short-term money costs would be useful.

The Federal Reserve Bank here believes, according to authoritative sources, that there is "always a possibility" that the Federal Reserve Board will decide to reduce the reserves that its member commercial banks must hold against their deposits.

The effect of such an action would be to supply reserves to the banking system—and thus promote further monetary expansion—without putting the sort of downward pressure on short-term interest rates that would result from the Reserve System supplying the same amount of reserves through additional purchases of Treasury bills.

A SCARCITY OF BILLS

There is a scarcity of Treasury bills in the money market at present, which the Federal Reserve Bank of New York believes has been "troublesome" in pushing short-term rates downward.

The impression gained from these viewpoints was that the Federal Reserve Bank of New York would be likely to oppose a substantial further easing of credit, on the ground that it could complicate the international problem of the dollar.

The Federal Reserve bank here would also like to see the Federal Reserve Board—which has authority over such matters—take the opportunity to suspend entirely the interest rate ceilings on bank certificates of deposit of more than $100,000. Such ceilings are already suspended for deposits maturing from 30 to 89 days, and in any event money market rates are well below the ceiling levels at present.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York, it was understood, believes that present Federal Reserve policy is one designed to be "accommodative" of the economy's needs for funds, and geared to setting the stage for a "reasonable recovery" in gross national product this year.

The likelihood of achieving the average of $1,065-billion for the gross national product that the Nixon Administration has set for a target is "not great," the Federal Reserve bank head believes. The bank rejects the notion of a "forced draft" expansion in the money supply designed to produce such a rate of growth in the overall output of goods and services.

The chances favor a continued gradual economic improvement in the months ahead and in the opinion of the New York Reserve bank, "that kind of outcome is the most you can hope for." To try to achieve the Administration's G.N.P. target the bank believes, would involve risks of rekindling inflation that were too great.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

The Federal Reserve bank here believes that, over-all, control of domestic inflation is the key to securing the international position of the dollar. A new international money crisis of the sort that troubled the world during 1967, 1968 and 1969 is not imminent, the bank believes, and indeed there is a welcome lack of speculative activity in foreign exchanges at the moment. But, over the long run, foreign holders of dollars could get to the point where they would want to see the holdings settled "one way or another."

In its annual report, the Federal Reserve bank said that 1970 was likely to be labeled a year of "mild recession," but it said that, "sad to relate progress in slowing the rate of price increases was disappointingly modest and uncertain."

As Mr. Hayes put it, "we relearned the lesson that curing inflation becomes a progressively more painful process the longer that cure is delayed."

UNWANTED U.S. DOLLARS SHARPEN EUROPEAN MONETARY DIFFICULTIES

PARIS.—The monetary conflict between the United States and Europe is growing sharper as unwanted dollars pour into European central banks and aggravate the difficulties the European authorities are having in curbing inflation.

In the last six days, the West German central bank has absorbed $800-million. Additional funds have been moving into Britain, the Netherlands, Belgium and France.

Under the monetary rules, foreign central banks have an obligation to support the dollar. They do this by purchasing from the market dollar overflows that would drive the dollar exchange rate below 99 per cent of its official parity.

NO LIMITS ON INTERVENTION

There are no limits on these market interventions. When the rules were written a quarter of a century ago at Bretton Woods, the dollar was by far the world's strongest currency.

But nearly uninterrupted balance-of-payments deficits over the last two decades have weakened the dollar's position.

Some authorities, such as Dr. Robert Triffin, the Belgian-born Yale economics professor, believe that a negotiated ceiling on dollar balances held by foreign institutions may now be written into the rules.

The record American payments deficits last year and the disparity between American and European interest rates have aggravated the tensions on the monetary front.

While the United States has been trimming interest rates rapidly to try to stimulate economic activity, the major European central banks have refused to follow the same pattern.

Their rates have come down somewhat but are still at relatively high levels.

This is because they are still hotly engaged in the inflation battle. But in the process of acquiring dollars, the supply of the Europeans' currencies is increased, which makes the inflation battle harder to fight.

WARY OF GOLD PRESSURE

The Europeans are reluctant to demand American gold, realizing that any massive withdrawals from Fort Knox would probably be met by the formal suspension of gold convertibility.

And this in turn, as Professor Triffith observed in a recent article published by the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, would "trigger chaos in a world monetary system now anchored on a paper dollar, already largely inconvertible de facto, even though not de jure."

The United States, under pressure from the Europeans, has quietly moved in recent weeks to try to mop up some of the excess dollars in Europe.

Measures have been taken to discourage the repayments by American banks of dollar loans from their European branches.

The money had been borrowed during the severe credit squeeze in the United States and has been repaid at a fast pace as interest rates have fallen in the United States.

Furthermore, the Export Import Bank, which helps finance American exports, has been a heavy borrower recently in the market of foreign held dollars otherwise known as the Euro-dollar market.

RATES MOVE UP SLIGHTLY

Dollar interest rates in Europe moved up slightly at the end of last week as a result of a borrowing of $500 million by this institution.

Since the start of this year, some $1.5 billion has been borrowed by the Export-Import bank in Europe.

A third method of mopping up dollars has recently come to light. While the New York Federal Reserve Bank has refused comment on the matter it is widely believed to have recently begun intervening directly to curb the build up of German dollar balances.

It has been doing this by selling marks for future delivery. This tends to make it more costly to shift dollars into marks.

ANNIVERSARY OF MIDCONTINENT FARMERS ASSOCIATION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend special congratulations to the Midcontinent Farmers Association on their 57th anniversary today, March 10.

Recognition should be given to MFA President Fred V. Heinkel, MFA Vice President Clell Carpenter, and the many others in their organization who have continually worked to assure the interests of America's farmers are heard in Washington.

The Midcontinent Farmers Association provides valuable assistance and cooperation with Members of Congress to seek the most equitable legislation for our agriculture community.

I commend their service and efforts in behalf of our Nation's farmers.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in company with many of our colleagues I have had grave doubts that general revenue sharing is the answer to the problems of the cities. I wish to set forth three main objections to the President's program which have emerged from my own study of the proposal.

First, the proposed formula for allocating the money for general revenue sharing produces some strange and inequitable results. The allocation is based on population and the revenue raising effort of local governments. Figures from the Treasury Department have permitted me to calculate the per capita share of revenue which each of the communities in the Fourth District of New Jersey would receive. The per capita return to municipalities in my district ranges from a low of $1.10 for Lebanon Township in Hunterdon County to $16.10 for the city of Trenton in Mercer County. By itself this range is not disturbing, for no one would dispute the fact that Trenton has a greater need for tax relief than rural Lebanon. It is only when we compare the return to communities of more nearly equal population that the inequities appear. For example, both Hackettstown in Warren County and Hopatcong Borough in Sussex County have populations of slightly more than 9,000. Hackettstown would receive $2.70 per capita, while Hopatcong receives $3.30. The borough of Princeton is less than a third larger than either of these cities, but would receive more than twice as much—$6.90 per person—from Federal revenue sharing. The town of Phillipsburg in Warren County—population 18,000—would receive $11.90 per capita, while Lawrence Township in Mercer County—population 19,000—would receive only $7.20.

It is obvious from this sample that if two cities are of equal population, the one which is already wealthier and able to raise more revenue will be the one which gets more money from Federal revenue. In short, the rich get richer and the poor remain poor.

Second, I have serious questions about how the money from revenue sharing will be spent by some municipalities. For one, the only restriction on the expenditure of the money is that it cannot be spent in a racially discriminatory manner. There is no practical way this can be enforced. For another, it is likely that many local governments will spend their share for those programs which benefit the most powerful political constituency rather than for the more urgent needs of the entire community such as pollution control or aid for the poor. I believe strongly that it is the role of the Federal Government to set national priorities and to use its revenues to insure that those priorities are met.

Third, I cannot agree with the administration as to the proper means of raising the money to pay for general revenue sharing. The President maintains that a growing economy and an end to the war will produce a growth-and-peace tax dividend which will finance his revenue sharing program with no loss to any other program and no new taxes—a neat trick if he can do it.

But there is no economic growth, and there is no peace. We are faced only with a widened war in Cambodia and Laos, with inflation, with unemployment, and with no real economic growth in the last year other than inflation. Our first concern must be to reorder our economic priorities to curb inflation, lower the unemployment level, and end the war. Then, and only then, can we afford to talk about how to spend any peace and growth dividend.

These, then, are the reasons why I am opposed to general revenue sharing at this time. In the meantime, I recognize that something must be done to ease the financial stress on the overburdened State and local governments. I would advocate that this be done by a gradual Federal takeover of welfare costs. This will serve the dual purpose of relieving some of the most excessive State and local governments' costs and freeing money for revenue sharing within the States.

In addition I favor full funding of the present categorical aid programs as the best means of providing aid to the State and local governments. The President is undoubtedly correct that guidelines for these categorical programs have in some instances become too complex. However, this should not be a call for dismantling the programs, but rather a signal to rationalize their administration. At the same time, the local governments could be given more flexibility in how they are permitted to use the Federal money. These changes would provide the local governments with easy access to the wherewithal with which to satisfy local needs in accordance with national priorities.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon proposed in his state of the Union address that Congress accept the very considerable task of legislating the reorganization of executive branch departments and agencies.

Reorganization of Government functions is absolutely imperative as the United States approaches its 200th birthday—a model of democracy for the entire world. This is indeed an appropriate time for analyzing and significantly improving the way we conduct the business of Government.

For Government to be effective, it must be orderly. In the next 30 years the population of this country may increase as much as 50 percent. This means the institutions of Government will be serving an additional 100 million people. We must streamline the present functions of Government. We must prepare for the influx of needs in the years ahead.

Confusion in Government offices benefits no one. Too often, neither legislator, administrator, nor citizen is able to get swift and effective action from the interlaced ambiguities of Federal offices. When the bureaucracy of Government defeats and frustrates the efforts of good people then it is time for action.

SAFE ELECTRICAL ENERGY

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on February 15, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) released a set of questions and answers setting forth some of his views on our energy problems, and announcing his intention to submit legislation. In particular, he described nuclear power hazards, alternative sources of energy, and some possible solutions to the so-called electricity versus environment dilemma.

I have long studied the electric utilities, and have a particular interest in the views of my colleagues on the subject. In my opinion, Mr. GRAVEL's ideas are provocative and well worth our consideration. Therefore, I am pleased to ask unanimous consent that his news release called "Nuclear Power and Alternatives," be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

NUCLEAR POWER AND ALTERNATIVES

FEBRUARY 15, 1971.

Senator Mike Gravel has announced plans to introduce legislation which will remove preferential treatment for nuclear power plants, and give new attention to safer ways of making electricity.

One provision of the bill will be repeal of the Price-Anderson Act, which presently provides special liability limits in case of nuclear power-plant accidents; repeal of the Act may bring construction of nuclear plants to a halt. Gravel's bill will provide job insurance for the affected workers—both private and government—and indemnification for the affected businesses if construction of nuclear power plants stops.

"It is not fair—in the nuclear business, or in the defense, space, or aircraft businesses—to make people suffer for having done just what the government urged them to do," Gravel said. "On the other hand, it is not fair to the public to have allowed the construction of nuclear plants which are so potentially dangerous that a single accident might contaminate 150,000 square miles or fifteen states the size of Maryland."

The major substance of the bill will establish an Energy-Environment Commission instead of an Atomic Energy Commission, and will provide funds to develop safe methods of generating electricity, such as clean fossil-fuel technology, magnetohydrodynamic generators, fusion, solar, and geothermal energies. Research on nuclear fission plants would also continue as one division of the new Energy-Environment Commission.

Gravel's announcement coincided with the broadcast of the NET television program, "The Advocates" in which he argued in favor of a moratorium on the construction of nuclear power plants. His statement deals with the following questions:

1. Why is it advisable to stop building nuclear power plants?
2. What might be the consequences of a major nuclear accident?
3. Are the damage and casualty figures upper-limits on the very worst accident which could happen?
4. Some nuclear enthusiasts refer to the Brookhaven Report as a fanciful exercise; is that true?
5. Isn't the chance nearly zero of such an accident ever occurring?
6. Is the chance of an accident growing larger or smaller?
7. Why do utilities advertise nuclear power plants as safe?
8. Is a move against makers of electricity a move against progress?
9. We already have power shortages; won't the lights go out for sure if we have a nuclear moratorium?
10. Will a nuclear moratorium cause chaos and unemployment in the power industry?
11. What alternatives are there to nuclear electricity?
12. Will a nuclear moratorium increase air pollution by forcing us back into coal and dirty fossil-fuels?
13. Will a nuclear moratorium just delay the nuclear plants we'll need sooner or later anyway?
14. Is it possible to generate electricity without pollution?
15. How many years away are these alternatives to nuclear power?
16. Is the government investing equally in all the alternatives?
17. Would the cost of household electricity have to go up to pay for this energy development?
18. How long might it be before a National Energy Commission is usefully in operation?
19. Is there anything which can be done in the meantime?

1. Why is it advisable to stop building nuclear power plants?

The possibility of a major accident at one of our nuclear power plants is undeniable. One really serious accident could release as much long-lived radioactivity over the countryside as 100 Hiroshima bombs, or more. The consequences could bring this country to its knees.

2. What might be the consequences of a major nuclear accident?

If we use the AEC's own Brookhaven Report, we must figure the following possibilities:

Fifteen States the size of Maryland might be contaminated; agriculture restricted or forbidden; water supplies contaminated; other power plants contaminated.

Half a million people might need evacuation fast. These radiation refugees would have no place to go, and probably no one would want them.

Perhaps another 3½ million people might have to have their outdoor activity restricted to keep them from receiving high radiation doses.

There might be general panic, and people might demand that all the nuclear plants in the country be shut down—which would extend the economic chaos even further.

In addition, there might be 3,000 or 4,000 people dying from acute radiation overexposure.

Plus another 50,000 people dying later from radiation-induced cancer, which is a horrible way to die.

3. Are the damage and casualty figures upper-limits on the very worst accident which could happen?

No, the figures cited above could be significant *under*estimates for several reasons:

(a) Nuclear plants are now being built and planned 5 times bigger than they were when the Brookhaven Report was written in 1957; that means that they produce 5 times more radioactivity per year.

(b) Because the nuclear fuel is cleaned less often now, long-lived radioactivity is given more time to accumulate inside the reactor. Therefore, at the moment of accident, a 1000-megawatt reactor may contain *more* than 5 times as much radioactivity as the 200-megawatt reactor postulated in the Brookhaven Report.

(c) The human casualties depend, of course, on how much exposure to radiation is received; if we do not succeed in evacuating up to half a million people fast enough, the casualties will go up.

(d) The Brookhaven Report postulated an accident at a small nuclear power plant located about 30 miles from a city. Huge reactors are now being built 24 miles from New York City; 12 miles from downtown Gary, Indiana; 4 miles from New London, Conn.; 10 miles from Philadelphia; 5 miles from Trenton, New Jersey. Evacuation will be both more complex and more urgent.

(e) These figures also exclude all casualties caused by radiation exposure below 50 rads, which is a high dose (about 500 times more than our annual dose from natural radiation). Obviously, there *will* be additional cancers coming later from doses below 50 rads, but they are not even included in these figures. A dose of 1½ rads to a woman during pregnancy seems to increase the chance by 50% that her child will get cancer before the age of ten.

4. Some nuclear enthusiasts refer to the Brookhaven Report as a fanciful exercise; is that true?

The utilities take the AEC's Brookhaven Report so seriously that they have insisted on the Price-Anderson Act to limit their liability.

The AEC takes it so seriously that in 1965, the Commission admitted in writing that the consequences of accidents could be even more serious than was indicated in 1957.

If the utilities and the AEC take it seriously, we should, too.

If the utilities do *not* take the Report seriously, then of course they will have no objection to repeal of the Price-Anderson Act.

5. Isn't the chance nearly zero of such an accident ever occurring?

We are told that the chances of such an accident occurring are extremely remote or negligible. That's theory, not human experience. The chance might be one chance in ten, and we would not necessarily know it yet from our accumulated experience.

The declaration of long odds—like one chance in 300 million for such an accident—is one of the most irresponsible lines being used today on the public. That's a phony figure, both in terms of the frequency with which statistically "impossible" accidents *do* happen—like the sinking of the Titanic on its maiden voyage—and in terms of our experience so far with nuclear power plants.

We have about 100 reactor-years of experience—or some people claim 600—but we would need about 100,000 reactor-years of

experience to assess odds like *one chance in 200*, if we plan 500 reactors in operation.

What were the statistical odds that the Tacoma Narrows Bridge would fall down? Surely "extremely remote". What were the odds that two airliners would collide in mid-air over the Grand Canyon? "Negligible".

Or that a bomber would run into the Empire State Building?

So far, we've been lucky with a few reactors. It seems that the utilities are telling us, "Look, we haven't killed anyone yet, so give us a *chance.*"

The chance belongs to the American people, to decide whether or not they want this gamble taken with their lives and their country.

If a nuclear accident is *possible*, and they tell us it *is*, then the chance of its happening sooner is just as great as of its happening later.

6. Is the chance of an accident growing larger or smaller?

We've already got 20 of those radioactive power plants in operation, and any one of them *might* have an accident at any moment.

If we build more of them, the chances of accidents will increase instead of decreasing. It's not necessary to be an expert in radiation or engineering to see that humans can and do make mistakes in design, in manufacture, in construction, and in operating machines. Reactors are no exception, and we've already had some close calls with a few of them. The very act of building and operating more, allows more chances for mistakes. Especially because they are behind schedule, and rushing.

Edward Teller has warned us wisely when he said, "With the greater number of simians monkeying around with things that they do not completely understand, sooner or later a fool will prove greater than the proof even in a foolproof system."

Stopping construction will prevent the accident risk from increasing, while giving us time to consider such possibilities as building all nuclear reactors underground, or developing other kinds of power.

7. Why do utilities advertise nuclear power plants are safe?

Obviously, there is a puzzling contradiction between the utilities' advertisements which claim radioactive power plants are wonderfully safe, and the utilities' testimony to Congress that they would not build them unless Congress relieved them of almost all financial responsibility for accidents. If "nukes" are as safe as they claim, why do they worry about financial responsibility for *accidents?*

If the utilities won't even risk their *dollars* on the safety of nuclear power plants, why should the people have to risk their *lives?*

We should not wait for the Price-Anderson Act to expire in 1977. Repeal *now* is a minimum objective.

8. Is a move against nuclear electricity a move against progress?

Progress in technology might be defined as something which *enhances* human health and survival. The *one* technology which has the ability to pollute this planet permanently is hard to consider as *progress.*

We've spent billions on nuclear research, we're buying nightmares for generations to come, and for what?

We end up with *another* way to boil water. That's all that a nuclear reactor accomplishes. It boils water, which produces electricity very *inefficiently*, and it also produces radioactive garbage to the tune of about 1,000 Hiroshima bombs-worth a year.

Is that human progress?

One of the main ingredients of the nuclear power program is plutonium-239, which lingers radioactively for 240,000 years. Other kinds of radioactive waste last hundreds of years.

Who needs it?

9. We already have power shortages; won't the lights go out for sure is we have a nuclear moratorium?

The lights won't go out because of a *nuclear moratorium*, although they may go out due to *other* foul-ups.

For instance, in 1969, the utilities spent about $320 million on advertising and sales promotion to increase consumption of electricity—and only $41 million on research and development of ways to generate it. *No wonder* we have a power shortage.

Brown-outs and black-outs won't be because of a moratorium. In fact, we will hardly miss nuclear power at all, which is only 1% to 2% of our power supply now.

10. Will a nuclear moratorium cause chaos and unemployment in the power industry?

We have chaos *now*, even without a nuclear moratorium. Every analysis of the power shortage refers to bad planning and miscalculation on the part of the industry.

Of course we can expect to hear wailing and cries of "We can't deliver the power", even from the coal operators who are sitting on a 400-year supply of coal. We also hear the can-not-do cries from the automobile industry about clean cars. Do you believe them?

This country could declare a moratorium tomorrow—and we might even hear a sigh of relief from some worried people *inside* the nuclear establishment—provided we insured jobs and offered indemnification. After all, we pay landowners billions of dollars every year *not* to grow crops; we can certainly afford to pay people *not* to build radioactive machines which could contaminate an area reaching from New York City to Richmond, Virginia.

If we take care of the financial hardships of a moratorium, arguments in favor of nuclear electricity may lose some of their frenzy.

My proposal for repeal of the Price-Anderson Act is part of legislation which includes establishment of an Energy-Environment Commission. There will be *more* energy business and *more* energy employment, not less, because the total energy effort in this country needs to be far *greater* than it.

11. What alternatives are there to nuclear electricity?

In California alone, there seems to be geothermal steam in the ground equal to the power of 20 big radioactive power plants. Geothermal steam is not only perfectly clean—it's also safe. There is lots of it in the west. Enough for several hundred years.

In addition, this country has enough coal to provide electricity for the next 400 years—the present shortage is both temporary and artificial.

In August 1970, the Vice President of the National Coal Assn. testified under oath that the mine operators can go just as fast mining coal, as the power demands can grow. But it won't be sensible to open coal mines unless the utilities offer long-term contracts.

The lead story in the magazine Science News, January 30, 1971, is "Coal's Road Toward Acceptability". It makes some important points about our ability to make coal a clean fuel, and our ability to restore land ruined by strip-mining.

However, fossil-fuels should not be considered a long-term solution for generating electricity. It is short-sighted to waste the planet's exhaustible natural resources by burning them, when all we have to do is tap into the inexhaustible sources of energy like water, wind, geothermal heat, and the sun. Perhaps the sun is exhaustible, but while it's burning up, we might as well use it.

12. Will a nuclear moratorium increase air pollution by forcing us back into coal and other dirty fossil-fuels?

No. And it's dishonest to tell the public that the only choice is between clean "nukes" and dirty coal.

I favor forcing the coal-plants to clean up, and fast, because even without a nuclear moratorium, we must depend on fossil-fuels to make most of our electricity for the next 20 or 30 years. Dirty plants are an intolerable abuse of public health, so it's a necessity that we clean up the old plants, and build the new ones clean.

It can be done. In fact, equipment to do most of it is already available. We need to see that the utilities buy and use it.

Of course the equipment may not work perfectly at first. But it's far safer to take some chances with unproven fossil-fuel equipment than with unproven nuclear equipment. That's obvious.

13. Will a nuclear moratorium just delay the nuclear plants we'll need sooner or later anyway?

No, because nuclear plants are not inevitable. Perhaps some day we will find a way to make them truly accident-proof; additional safety research is urgently needed now according to the AEC's own Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

We need time to do that research before we build more plants, and also to give the country a chance to look at other new ways to make electricity—ways which are not tied to potential catastrophe.

14. Is it possible to generate electricity without pollution?

The answer is probably yes. No one knows, because we haven't begun really trying yet.

Consider some of the possibilities we are presently neglecting, even though we know they are real possibilities:

Magnetohydrodynamic generators (MHD), which would contain the fossil-fuel pollutants;

Fusion power, which could provide energy for the entire world from seawater—and lower ocean levels by far less than one-thousandth of an inch over the next million years;

Geothermal energy, which is pollution-free and accessible anywhere by drilling 5 to 10 miles down; and

Solar energy, whose energy supply both in the United States and in the world, is far greater than any possible needs; it may already be technically possible to recover about 4 trillion kilowatt-hours in electrical energy per year from Death Valley alone; the use of solar collectors in orbit is another clear possibility.

We should consider wind and tidal power too. There is such a fabulous amount of energy renewing itself naturally on earth that, if man tapped only a tiny percent of it, he could probably make all the electricity he needs without poisoning the planet or disturbing its natural rhythms.

The real question to decide during a nuclear halt is:

Do we take our chances with some of the gentle possibilities, or do we rush into a commitment to the one technology which may end up contaminating this planet permanently?

What this needs urgently is an Energy Commission, instead an Atomic Energy Commission.

15. How many years away are these alternatives to nuclear power?

Obviously, that depends on how much effort we start putting into them. Therefore, the following figures are just estimates; some of the possibilities may *never* be practical, but we need only one or two to work out.

Fossil-fuels: Removal of sulfur pollutants: now.

Removal of nitrogen, mercury, and radioactive particles: 5 years.

MHD generators: Apparently Russia already has a small pilot plant working. AVCO Everett Lab in Massachusetts, which demonstrated MHD feasibility more than 10 years ago, is now designing a 50-megawatt commercial generator with Con Ed of New York, Boston Edison, and some northeast utilities.

Fusion: Feasibility might be proven within the next five years, followed by demonstration plants in the 1980's, and commercial operation before the end of the century.

Geothermal energy: Natural geothermal steam is practical now; it's already producing electricity commercially in California, Italy, Mexico, Japan, New Zealand, and Russia. In order to make geothermal energy available just about everywhere on earth, we need to develop deep drilling techniques, which might take 10 years.

Solar energy: Land-based techniques for recovery, storage, and transmission of solar energy are theoretically possible already; engineering large-scale projects might take 10 years; techniques to collect the energy from orbiting stations are probably 25 years away.

16. Is the government investing equally in all the alternatives?

Unfortunately, for years we've been putting about 83% of the federal energy-research dollar into radioactive power plants, and almost nothing for the other possibilities.

Last year, the government spent approximately: $255,000,000 on developing radioactive nuclear power plants; $30,000,000 on developing fusion power; $300,000 on developing MHD generators; zero on developing geothermal technology; and zero on developing solar energy.

In other words, we spent less on developing non-radioactive sources of power than we spent on two 747 airlines.

In fact, when we take inflation into account, the effort in fusion will *decrease* again this year under the AEC's plans. The AEC is in charge of both fusion *and* fission (radioactive power plants).

17. Would the cost of household electricity have to go up to pay for this energy development?

No. For one thing, the $320,000,000 which is spent per year now on advertising and sales promotion of electricity could be spent on energy research instead.

Then the rate-structure could be reversed, so that the more electricity you use, the more it costs you. Right now, the more you use, the *less* it costs you per kilowatt-hour. Obviously, if we have a power problem, we should not reward people for using *more* electricity, and punish the little person because he uses *less* of it.

In addition, a federal tax on the electrical bills of the big industrial users would pay for the plan without raising household bills. This would be consistent with the long-time policy of this country to avoid regressive taxes and regressive charges, which hit people who can least afford them.

We've got to face a fact, however. Probably *no one* has been paying the true cost of electricity on his bill. We have been paying its true cost instead in pollution and in medical bills.

Nuclear power, which was supposed to be "too cheap to meter," has turned out to be the most expensive power we have, even with all the hidden government subsidies. Let's not make any more foolish predictions about the cost of electricity. Safe, clean alternatives may ultimately cost less or more. There is a good chance that they will cost less.

18. How long might it be before an Energy-Environment Commission is usefully in operation?

There will be lots of hassles over jurisdiction, over powers, over sources of revenue, over allocation of revenue, over new kinds of administrative organization designed to avoid bureaucratic inertia, and so forth. I expect controversy, and also I expect improvements to be made on my bill.

Invariably, these things take more time than necessary . . . which makes it important to start *now*.

19. Is there anything which can be done in the meantime?

Since the energy problem is so urgent, we ought to push for bills *this* session to get initial funding for solar energy and geothermal energy, plus more for fusion than is now in the AEC's budget. If we wait for a perfect new agency to come into existence, we'll lose more time. We can get started *this* year by pushing for programs under existing agencies.

Obviously, it will make a lot more sense to have an Energy-Environment Commission supervising our energy efforts, but we should not use its non-existence to postpone our efforts. Nor should we just study the problem, which is obvious. We need action toward solutions.

Do you realize what it will mean to this earth if we *don't* start action? We'll find ourselves toe-to-toe due to the population explosion, with only primitive energy systems to provide a tolerably human standard of living for billions of people. We would pollute or contaminate this planet beyond tolerance if we had to depend on today's energy technology.

Therefore, it's really a very modest proposal to start funding let's say 2,000 people—out of a labor force of about 70 million Americans—whose *job* will be to make solar energy practical. The same is true for deep geothermal wells. And the fusion budget should be tripled at least.

Some will say, "But the program can't absorb the money," but the can-not-do attitude is nothing new. Can anyone really argue that putting 2,000 new brains, with new ideas, on the problems of fusion would be a waste of money?

That's the kind of immediate effort I'm supporting. Unless we put *effort* into solving energy needs, it's insincere to say that it's electricity *vs.* the environment, or any of the other false choices offered us.

FREEDOM—OUR HERITAGE

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Freedom—Our Heritage," written by Miss Patricia Colberg, Fargo, N. Dak., for the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States Voice of Democracy Contest. Miss Colberg's speech was judged fourth in the National Voice of Democracy Contest.

Her essay is both timely and thought provoking. We in North Dakota are very proud of her achievement. Miss Colberg is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Wayne J. Colberg of Fargo, and attends North High School. After graduation, Miss Colberg plans to enroll at North Dakota State University to study either bacteriology or medicine.

I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this excellent speech written by one of North Dakota's promising young citizens.

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

VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

"Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." These familiar words of the late President John Kennedy typify what I would consider the responsibility necessary for the preservation of that one resource our country can boast is so plentiful—freedom. But before we can determine the role Young America should play in the maintenance of freedom, we must ask ourselves two questions. The first pertaining to freedom of the past: What has made Freedom our Heritage? And the second referring to freedom at present: How is freedom living in today's world? The answers to these questions concerning freedom's past and present hold the key to unlocking the door to freedom's future.

What has made Freedom our Heritage? Our nation was established on the concept of freedom for every man. Three documents virtually assure that end: the Declaration of Independence—proclaiming a free, independent nation; the United States Constitution—actually establishing our country; and the Bill of Rights—insuring Man's undeniable liberties. But there is an even richer background of freedom's actual becoming our heritage if we look only to the men who fought for freedom. For without these brave people who dedicated their very lives to gaining liberty for all men, freedom may never have become the cornerstone of America's foundation and those three documents insuring our freedoms may never have been written. Remember Thomas Paine? Paine struggled defiantly to free the colonies from Britain's tyrannical rule by publishing a newspaper critical of Mother England. Nathan Hale—a young school teacher hanged by the British as a traitor—spurred-on the freedom-fighters with his famous last words: "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country." And it was the oratorical stamina of Patrick Henry who laid his life on the line with his emphatic conviction: "Give me liberty or give me death!" These men—three of a list of hundreds—who substantially consecrated their lives to the establishment of a Free nation. These men made freedom our Heritage because these men struggled to establish the liberties we enjoy today which are guaranteed by the documents they wrote.

Freedom—our Heritage—established and insured by our founding fathers. But how is freedom living in today's world? Even today there are examples of young people not so unlike Patrick Henry and Nathan Hale, who are indeed fighting to live in freedom. A high school student from Kansas spends his summer in Appalachia—instead of Woodstock, New York. A young girl in Mississippi decides to stay in her integrated school, rather than following her friends who enroll in an all-white school in the suburb. A boy in California decides to attend college in his home state. He resolves to become a student leader—in the University Senate . . . not the SDS. A young man in Iowa interrupts his education to serve his country in Vietnam. Living examples, common all over America—examples of how freedom is indeed living in today's world.

Freedom—our Heritage. The future preservation of Freedom as President Kennedy indicated a decade ago is to "do for your country." This primary responsibility of "doing" for America will soon be shifting to my generation, just as my parents assumed these citizenship duties. They have paid taxes, voted at the polls, served in the armed forces. These same requirements must be fulfilled by the Youth of United States. But besides these basics of being a citizen in a free nation, my generation must do two other things. First, respect the opinions of others, and secondly, work through the System. It is important that if we want to be heard and respected that we do the same for others . . . particularly those of the "other" generation. As the writer Voltaire once said: "I disagree entirely with everything you say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it."

The second step Young Americans must take is to work through the System, for like Kenneth Clark, author of the book *Civilization*, I believe that "order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction, and human sympathy more valuable than ideology." History is ourselves and for Americans, freedom was established as our Heritage—and freedom lives today. Freedom's future is certain if my generation continues to assume the responsibilities of being free American citizens and "do" for America.

EL PASO'S SHERIFF BEGINS PROGRAM TRAINING PRISONERS TO FILL JOBS

HON. RICHARD C. WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, ever since I came to Congress, this body has been endeavoring, with one piece of legislation after another, to stem the rising tide of crime. One grim factor continues to counter our best efforts: All too often, our correctional institutions do not correct. Too many of the men committed to them return again to lives of crime. Often it is because they can find nothing else to do. The opportunities for an ex-convict looking for work are limited at best.

In my home city of El Paso, Tex., our county sheriff, Mike Sullivan, with the aid of a dedicated deputy, Frank Trask, decided to do something about this problem. They did it by establishing in the jail a cooks' and bakers' school. The story is well told by Associated Press in the February 28 issue of the Dallas Morning News.

In calling the attention of my colleagues to this matter, I should like to comment that we have heard much about the failures of categorical grants and the necessity of revenue sharing in order to bring Government closer to the people. We have here an excellent project, locally conceived and administered, but federally supported under a categorical grant, properly reviewed and approved, and with local contributions.

In this case, and I am sure in many others, categorical grants for specific projects have been highly successful.

The article follows:

COOKS AND BAKERS: EL PASO'S SHERIFF BEGINS PROGRAM TRAINING PRISONERS TO FILL JOBS

EL PASO.—Sheriff Mike Sullivan of El Paso County looked at his county jail and the men in it and realized the hopelessness of the inmates. A jailbird's wife opened his eyes.

Many were there simply because they just couldn't make it in the outside world.

About 85 per cent were school dropouts. Many were so fearful of more failures they could barely function outside.

So they went and then came back, over and over. Eighty per cent of them returned. And while in jail they simply sat and brooded.

Sheriff Sullivan decided something had to be done. And from this decision has come a project—still only a pilot but guiding the way to the future.

What was started was a cooks' and bakers' school.

The situation was not like that in Dallas, for instance, where a poverty war program began turning out cleaning and pressing school graduates right into the pool of cleaning and pressing unemployed.

The sheriff's survey showed 500 openings in El Paso for cooks and bakers.

When the sheriff and associates talked of remodeling an unused portion of the jail for the school, the idea met with skepticism.

County officials consented with reluctance. Judges and prosecutors thought the plan a poor one in the first place, and jailers insisted the old way of treating prisoners was good enough.

The school's first class began last Oct. 5 with eight men screened from about 100 of the 400 to 500 average inmate population.

Deputy Sheriff Frank Trask, a former master sergeant who spent 25 years in Army food service work, became instructor.

The inmates themselves were less than enthusiastic at first, many inhibited by fear of new failure after all their other failures.

But as the first class progressed, the eight students began to shed their reservations. By the time the 12-week session ended, other inmates were clamoring for a crack at the next one. The class was increased to 15.

The program, Sullivan says, is but a drop in the bucket as far as needed rehabilitative efforts are concerned. But he hopes that it can show the way for offering convicted offenders an alternative to crime.

To get things started, El Paso County turned to Gov. Preston Smith's Criminal Justice Council, which found the project right in line with its goals for the state.

Under authority of the Omnibus Crime Act, the council and its staff are responsible for comprehensive statewide planning to improve the criminal justice system in all areas, including corrections.

It also administers funds from the Justice Department to support projects compatable with its statewide plan. The council approved a grant of $101,250 for the El Paso project for the first year. Of the total, $37,000 was for remodeling and $21,500 for equipment. The county's matching contribution for the year is $68,145.

The idea took form in Sullivan's mind when the wife of a "regular" came to the jail to see if her husband could tell her how to get money to feed the children. All the man could do was share his last dollar with her—he kept half for cigarettes.

The sheriff knew that the husband's release would scarcely improve the family's plight. Without the capability of earning a living, he would be in trouble again.

Deputy Trask planned the physical layout for the cook's and baker's school along the lines of a "Fannie Farmer's kitchen," used frequently in home economics classes and food service instruction in the military. The method was small-quantity cooking.

"If you learn to read the recipe," says Trask, "then you can progress to any amount. I teach the fundamentals; speed comes with experience." When the inmates finish the course they are qualified for employment as fry cooks or dinner cooks.

Trask's pupils range in age from 19 to 53, with the average 27.

Their offenses range from forgery and theft to felonious assault or robbery.

"That man over there got into a fight and cut another guy up with a can opener. This one over here is charged in the same case. His story is he just happened to be there, but they say he held the guy while his buddy worked him over. He has eight kids," said the sheriff.

"The old man over there is a habitual—been in and out of jails all his life." Professional burglar, actually, from New York; feeling his age and looking for respectable work. With a little luck, he'll find it as a cook, and society will have one less burglar.

The men like the program, Trask says: it gives them a way to spend their time; the food is better, and there are special visiting privileges. Friday is visitors' day for the cook's and baker's school. Each man is allowed three visitors who must not have criminal records and may not bring packages into the jail. Pies or cakes prepared by the inmates are served, and each man sits with his guests at a private table.

The students themselves eat most of their own cooking.

Prospects for the program are carefully screened. While the course is intended for those who plan to pursue food service work, Sullivan admits that some make it for other reasons.

"No matter how much of a con man a guy is," the sheriff says, "he's at least entitled to a chance."

But, he says, it's unwise to let your guard down. Two of the members of the first class demonstrated this by escaping down a plumbing duct when sent to an unused part of the jail for supplies. Both were misdemeanants, scheduled for early release, but that did not impede their flight to California.

On the brighter side, a man who finished his sentences before the course was over returned to the jail each day and, by special permission from the sheriff, put on cook's attire and continued the training until he received his certificate. He now holds a job as a cook in El Paso.

Another who completed the first class is under death sentence for a multiple murder. He presently awaits commutation on death row at Huntsville, hoping to get a chance to work in food service in the prison.

During the 12-week course, the students receive 462 hours of instruction, beginning with "orientation to the world of work as good service employes." Teaching methods include lectures, demonstrations, group discussions, individual classroom instruction and practical work.

Trask follows carefully prepared lesson plans which include such topics as sanitation and safety, maintenance and housekeeping, receiving and storing food, meat cutting, food cost and accounting and purchasing.

The day's instruction ends at 4:30 p.m. The men often are reluctant to return to their cells, preferring to stay around asking questions or doing more kitchen work. Before he leaves the school, each man submits to frisking.

The school is only one of the innovative programs being undertaken at the county jail. Soon up to 40 federal prisoners will be housed there, some in the cook's and baker's school, others in a work release program. The latter group will work at an outside job during the day, spending each night in the jail.

Few local jails in Texas have facilities for such projects, according to William H. Gaston, program director for corrections and post sentence processes on the staff of the Texas Criminal Justice Council. He believes the mode of the future will be regional detention facilities. Gaston is in a statewide study expected to result in a plan for a system of regional facilities.

He says there has been little change in the basic operation of most jails in the state during last century, and many of the older jails are unfit for human occupancy. Instead of rehabilitating offenders, they breed crime.

Gaston's proposal calls for maintaining local jails for short-term prisoners only. All those to be confined for extended periods would be sent to a regional facility, where they could be placed in rehabilitation programs designed to provide them with an alternative to crime, eventually to be placed in work release programs and phased back into society.

TWO GEORGIANS WIN "PUBLIC SERVICE IN REPORTING" AWARD FOR 1970

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we in Georgia, as well as the entire Nation, were recently saddened by the death of our senior Senator, the Honorable Richard B. Russell.

Two outstanding Georgians, shortly before the Senator's death, produced a filmed biography and in so doing have been honored by the Dixie Business magazine as winners of the "Public Service in Reporting" Award for 1970.

Hal Suit resigned from WSB Television several months after the series was completed and won Republican nomination for Governor of Georgia in a hotly contested primary. Though unsuccessful in the general election, Hal made all Republicans proud of his leadership.

Jim Giltmier has remained in the news business and is now performing an outstanding job covering national figures in our Nation's Capital for Cox Broadcasting's chain of stations.

Hubert F. Lee, editor of Dixie Business since 1929, in announcing the presentations, said that dual awards were given for great work by these two individuals in producing, "Richard Brevard Russell—Georgia Giant."

Hal Suit, in a letter to Hubert Lee thanking the editors, wrote:

DEAR HUBERT: There are probably a hundred different ways to express appreciation, but none beats an honest and sincere, "thank you."

I am honored to be the recipient of your "Public Service in Reporting" award for the series on the late Senator Richard Russell.

Few people are aware that I first talked to the Senator about the program in late 1965.

It simply took me almost four years to persuade a humble and dedicated public servant that the people of Georgia, and especially the young ones, needed to get to know him.

He was Georgia's greatest and it's going to be many a day before we benefit from another man of his distinction and dedication.

The tribute should be to him.

Thanks for including Jim Giltmier. Without Jim the program series would not have been possible.

With warmest personal regards.

HAL SUIT.

Hubert Lee announced Hal Suit and Jim Giltmier award:

PAST WINNERS INCLUDE

Keeler McCartney, Atlanta Constitution	1952
Ralph O'Leary, Houston Post	1953
Max B. Shelton, Houston AP	1954
No Award	1955
Stephen Trumbull, Miami Herald	1956
John Pennington, now writer Atlanta Journal Magazine	1957
Ted Pearson-Ed Lee, Mobile Press-Register	1958
Jack Nelson, now Los Angeles Times	1959
Norman Shavin, now editor Atlanta magazine	1960
Martha Frances Brown, DeKalb New Era	1961
Hal Hendrix, Miami News	1962
Charles Pou, Atlanta Journal	1963
Paul Jasper, Pensacola News	1964
The American War Correspondent	1965
Ray Moore, WSB–TV, now with WAGA–TV	1966
Adolph Rosenberg, Southern Israelite	1967
Bob Harrell, Atlanta Constitution	1968
Harold E. Martin, Montgomery Advertiser, Alabama Journal	1969
Hal Suit-Jim Giltmier, WSB–TV	1970

Hubert Lee in 1923 delivered a talk over WSB radio, in the days of the old crystal sets. Here is a clipping from the Atlanta Journal dated March 8, 1923, which is of historic interest:

HUBERT LEE TALKS FOR CLEAN-UP WEEK AT WSB THURSDAY

Hubert Lee, well-known young Atlantian serving as chairman of the city's big "Clean Up and Paint Up week" this year, will tell something of the importance of the annual crusade against dirt and dilapidation in a message scheduled for WSB's twilight period Thursday evening.

The 1923 campaign is set for March 15–22 with leading civic organizations co-operating actively in pushing it through to success. Mr. Lee, prominent in numerous roles as a progressive Atlanta citizen, will briefly summarize the fundamental points that Atlanta households ought to know concerning "Clean Up and Paint Up week."

His message will be spoken through the microphone between 5:30 and 6 o'clock Thursday evening.

HAL SUIT

Hal joined the WSB–TV News Staff as associate news director in June of 1959. He was appointed news director in January, 1969.

His work in news has ranged from weekly newspapers to NBC News assignments in the Southeast. Work for WSB–TV has taken him over most of the United States, Europe and the Middle East. During the past decade, Hal has anchored most of the station's political specials. He also reported at both national political conventions for NBC News in 1964 and 1968.

He began his broadcasting career in radio in 1947 and has spent the last 15 years in television. Prior to joining WSB–TV, he was with WALB–TV in Albany, Georgia, where he served as the station's news and production manager.

On three occasions the Associated Press in Georgia has honored Hal's work. And his "Insight" series, a commentary on current events, has been honored with a Quill Award from Sigma Delta Chi and with a National Headliner Award.

JAMES W. GILTMIER

Born in 1934, Jim Giltmier grew up on Chicago's South side and graduated from South Shore High School.

He majored in both English and history at Loyola University of Chicago and Loras College in Iowa.

Giltmier began his career in news delivering the Chicago Tribune when he was 10 years old. Then he was side-tracked to jobs as a drug store soda jerk, meat packing company mail clerk, public relations writer for the American Cancer Society, pharmacist for the U.S. Air Force, insurance salesman, public relations director of the Arkansas Tuberculosis Association and executive director of the Pine Bluff, Arkansas, Community Chest.

He got back into the news business when he went to work for the Pine Bluff Commercial as police reporter. Later he became state editor and won the American Political Science Association's award for Distinguished Reporting of Public Affairs for a series of stories on voter registration gambling and state politics.

For the next 18 months he covered the Boca Raton, Florida, area for the Miami Herald.

In 1965 he became WSB–TV's investigative reporter and has covered everything from Georgia politics to poverty.

Jim and his wife, Kay, have two daughters—Kathryn and Carolyn.

THE POLITICS BEFORE US

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, we are told that the strength of the United States is in the diversity of the ideologies of her citizens; and this diversity is no more sharply demonstrated than in this country's biennial elections.

The results of the 1970 elections will be the object of discussion for many years. The analysis started before the polls closed and continues today.

One of the most perceptive discussions of these elections which I have read was presented by Tom Wicker of the New York Times. Mr. Wicker first made the comments in a speech January 12, 1971, in New York to the New Democratic Coalition. It was printed in the February 11, 1971, issue of the New York Review of Books, and I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

THE POLITICS BEFORE US

(By Tom Wicker)

I was asked to talk today about the results of the 1970 elections and where they may have left us. I'm going to pass over the numbers game that we've played in Washington since those elections. I'm going to pass over the question of whether or not there is an ideological majority of one kind or another in the Senate. I'm going to get right down to the literal fact and say that it seems to me that the only thing you can say about the 1970 elections is that the Democrats picked up nine seats in the House and the Republicans one and a half senators. If you wonder how there can be a half-senator, you haven't met some of those fellows.

Getting beyond the numbers game to some results of the 1970 elections that may mean something, I would say first that there was no further swing to the Republicans in the South. After at least a decade and a half of a steady Republican trend in the South, the Republicans did not make any further gains.

In fact, they lost two governorships they had held, and two more they had hoped very much to win. They won only one seat in Congress and that was from the valley of Virginia. So I would suggest that Nixon may be in a good deal more trouble in 1972 in achieving even as many electoral votes in the South as he did in '68, particularly since Governor Wallace now appears to be ready to run entirely as a Southern candidate, trying to consolidate the Southern vote as best he can. And after his four years in office, it will not be as easy for Southern voters to delude themselves that somehow the election of Richard Nixon will turn back the tide of the civil rights movement.

There are some other consequences. There is no real evidence, it seems to me, of the kind of conservative trend that had been predicted. I'm not talking necessarily about conservatism as against the old New Deal or conservatism in economics or anything of that sort. I have in mind a sort of law-and-

order conservatism, a crackdown on the dissidents. I saw no evidence of any such trend in the 1970 elections, despite the assiduous efforts of the Administration and most of the press to convince us that there was such a trend.

Another thing I didn't see in the 1970 elections was a vast, overwhelming demand for the Democratic party. People like to cite all the governorships the party won. They should look at the governorship in Nebraska, for instance, in which the man who was elected there was about as far to the right, particularly in economic matters, as you could get, even though he ran in the Democratic party. In fact, he displaced a relatively moderate, progressive Republican governor who committed the sin of raising taxes in order to try to provide services for the people. So I saw no overwhelming trend to the Democrats, particularly since so many of their victories were won out of a rather sterile dependence on the economic dislocations that the Democratic party itself had managed to produce in the 1960s.

Another result of those elections is that there seemed to me to be no vast demand for the Republican party either. As I've said, they lost nine seats in the House, despite the fact that they hadn't carried the House in '68, which meant that there was no reservoir of weak Republican seats there, ready to be taken back by the Democrats. They failed to gain much in the Senate despite the fact that in the two previous elections for this class of senators—1958 and 1964—there had been a Democratic landslide.

And finally, it seemed to me that there was no evidence that the leadership of the Republican party, the President and the Vice President—in their strategy, their personal performances, or their actual appearances in the various states—had any overwhelming effect on the electorate, except negative.

I saw no vast demand for either party in those elections and therefore the only real conclusion that I'd venture about 1970 is that President Nixon did not improve himself. He did not, as the quarterbacks say, get good field position for 1972 or for his party, except in one sense. Politics being what they are, I would suggest that his willingness to expose himself to every lost cause from Ralph Smith to George Murphy and to work as hard as he could for the party probably cemented his intraparty leadership. At the same time, the failure of Reagan to reach the majority predicted for him by such experts as Evans and Novak seems to me to have lessened the possibility of a right-wing challenge to Nixon. Now a recent column by Kevin Phillips has raised the possibility of a left-wing challenge to Nixon, if indeed there are those who can regard a challenge from Governor Rockefeller as a left-wing challenge. But I would think that President Nixon's party leadership and hold on the party probably are now a little bit stronger than one might have expected.

Another more obvious conclusion is that Senator Muskie is now the front runner for the Democratic party, and the polls seem to confirm this. But I think that that's a mixed benefit. I can recall when Governor Romney was the front runner at just about this same time in 1967. I wouldn't want to compare the two but, generally speaking, I would say that a front runner at this stage does have a number of problems to contend with.

He's everyone's target in both parties. Every time that some issue arises he's expected to comment on it. And in this case, there's another doubly difficult problem for Senator Muskie: he is in danger of becoming identified suddenly and right away as the candidate of the LBJ-Mayor Daley-John Connally wing of the Democratic party. And I don't think there's any doubt at the moment that this wing of the party, with certain reservations, is indeed in favor of Muskie because he appears to be a man who might reconcile it with other wings of the party. Finally, I think Muskie's position as front runner is endangered by the fact that he still must face what I expect to be vigorous opposition in the Democratic primaries in 1972.

A final conclusion that I would draw from the election, after these two, is that American politics are still unsettled and not moving in any clear direction. I see no evidence, for example, that there's some huge right-wing swing in the Atlantic community, heralded by the election of Edward Heath, and that Nixon and the Republicans are simply following suit along that line.

Nor is there evidence of a great left-wing swing. I think it is useful here to compare the Presidential elections of 1960 and 1968. The election of 1964 was exceptional because it followed so closely after the death of President Kennedy. In retrospect there was never any doubt that the Democratic nominee was going to be elected to complete that period as best people thought it could be. People didn't want three Presidents in the space of a little over a year. But if you look at the elections of 1960 and 1968, they were both, as we say in the South, as tight as Dick's hatband: very close elections in which very few votes either way could have changed the outcome. In fact, if you look at all the Presidential elections, excluding 1964, since 1948, and if you add up all the votes cast for Republicans and all the votes cast for Democrats they come to just about the same numerical total.

During this entire period, there hasn't been a clear trend in American politics, except toward the ultimate bankruptcy of the New Deal. Certainly there has not been a clear ideological trend and I don't think there is one now, nor that the 1970 elections suggested anything of the kind.

I would think then that this means, as we look ahead to 1972 and beyond, that we are in for a continuation of the rather turbulent and embittered politics that we have become accustomed to in recent years, a politics with a very strident base of moral enthusiasm, of ideological sentiment, of zeal on the part of partisans of both sides—a politics in sharp contrast to that of only ten or fifteen years ago, which was much more nearly compromise, coalition politics.

A more turbulent and embittered politics will mean that people like the New Democratic Coalition in New York and the ethnic groups and the blacks and the young are going to demand, or try to find, forms to make ends mean something. They will demand participation in politics, that their views be taken into account. So I think turbulence and a demand for participation can be expected to continue for many years and are not something peculiar to a particular generation in America.

I also suggest that we've probably entered an era of one-term Presidencies. This has nothing particularly to do with Mr. Nixon. President Johnson, I suggest, is the first victim of that circumstance.

Until now in the twentieth century we have, by and large, expected that our Presidents woul win two terms. The only Presidents who have sought re-election in the twentieth century and failed to win it were Taft, who went down in the Bull Moose split, and Hoover, who went down in the Depression. Just this week in a column advocating a six-year Presidency, Willian S. White stated the assumption that, generally speaking, American Presidents win two terms. I think that that assumption now ought to be changed. The assumption now ought to be, in my judgment, that a President seeking re-election probably is going to be in deep trouble. That doesn't mean that he can't get elected—the opposition party might help elect him, as could happen in '72. But he's going to be in deep trouble, rather than having an easy time.

The most obvious reason for this is that communications are beginning to work for the outs too, as we saw on election eve last year, when the President's speech was seen by Democratic politicians as helpful. While the White House is a "bully pulpit," as Theodore Roosevelt said, when the man in the White House goes on television, he's not necessarily a bully preacher.

Communications can work for the outs and after our twenty-odd years of experience with television, I am beginning to believe that television burns out politicians about the same way it does comedians. (This seems a possible explanation for the decline and fall of Spiro T. Agnew.)

The man in office appears very often on television in turbulent surroundings. He seems to be the man who is struggling with difficulties, with controversies. Whereas the fellow who is seeking his office, like Senator Muskie coming out of his den on the banks of the Allagash River in Maine, speaks very pleasantly about how things could be.

Perhaps this danger of politicians being burned out has something to do with the nature of the Presidency itself. Many profound things happened in the American soul in 1960. But in particular, I think that the monarchical sense that we once had of the Presidency—the willingness to rally 'round the Presidency, no matter who the occupant was—has been diminished by the revelations that this institution too has feet of clay, that we cannot necessarily trust what it tells us, that its wisdom is not necessarily far-reaching.

Incidentally, I think the very office itself has lost something of the magical aura that it once had. In Dean Acheson's *Present at the Creation*, for instance, that particular aura infuses every page. In Acheson's book, which is pre-eminently a book of a man of the Forties and Fifties, there is a sense that the President, no matter who he is or what he's been, somehow is all of a sudden set apart from the rest of us.

I think there are not many of us who believe that any more. And I think this has diminished the power of the politician President to use the institutional office to protect himself.

But the major reason why we may be coming into an era of one-term Presidencies is that the problems are becoming too difficult. We expect the President today to be everything from the mayor of Hoboken to the leader of the free world. We expect him to wear a Green Beret and a hard hat and to throw out the first ball for the Washington Senators.

At the same time we have had a shift in American politics from the old, relatively simplistic issue of improving the standard of living to a great many more complicated, difficult issues that don't necessarily yield to legislation. Many of us have been disillusioned since the late Fifties, when we expected the civil rights legislation to have a tremendous impact on racial amity in this country. It hasn't. If anything, this legislation had the opposite effect.

So we begin to see that passing bills and proclaiming policies don't really have the impact that we once thought they did. Presidents, therefore, it seems to me, are victims of the pace of change. I think it's a fair assessment of Mr. Nixon's first two years that he came to office having spent the preceding four years not noticing what was happening in the country while he ran for office: you can't notice what's happening in the country if you're running. So in his first two years in office he attempted to be an Eisenhower President, and also, in a way, a Kennedy President, someone who could deal with the chessboard problems of the world—

a checkmate here, a gambit to be pulled on Nasser there—without realizing that the house was coming around his ears.

And if anything is encouraging in Washington today it is that the pundits say that Mr. Nixon, in preparing to get himself re-elected in 1972, is turning to domestic affairs. It's encouraging because I think the word may have gotten through to him that his view, expressed to Theodore White before the election, that you don't really need a President for domestic affairs, you just need a Cabinet, isn't good enough any more. It isn't the era of Eisenhower.

The problems in the country are intractable. They don't necessarily respond to politics or to policy but they all have the effect of reacting against the man who's in the White House. That's why I think Presidents are going to come up every four years from now on and find themselves in deep trouble because they will not have been able to deal with the matters that people see as their real problems.

The real problem in America today, and the gut issue of our politics, does not, as I've said, have very much to do with the standard of living. We're glutted in this country with the standard of living. Nor do I think we are undergoing some kind of psychological breakdown because all of a sudden, as some have argued, we've been projected into history. We were projected into history a half-century ago. And a half-century, the way time moves nowadays, is five centuries. Nor do I think we're entering Professor Reich's Consciousness III either. I might myself welcome it if we were, but I don't think it's happening.

What has really got us in its grip today in my judgment is the general concern, a lament from the farthest right to the farest left, and from the poorest to the richest, with the breakdown of American life, because American life doesn't work any more. You can't get your garbage picked up and you can't get a quick and easy ride to work on the subway. Or if you get on the freeway with your car, the traffic doesn't move. Or if you walk you get hit over the head and somebody takes your wallet. As George Wallace says, the crook will be out of court before you're out of the hospital and that is a fact, even if George Wallace did say it.

Because every time that the publisher of *The New York Times* gives you a handsome raise, well deserved for the work that you've done so beautifully the past year, prices go up faster, and taxes go up, and in the long run your check shows you have less net money at the end of the month.

Because you can't stand to breathe the air, and if you live in Washington the Potomac River will make you sick when you drink it. And because of the lack of quality from top to bottom in American life. Because when you turn on the television you don't see anything but junk. And when you go down to the store and buy something you don't get anything but junk.

Last year at Christmas we bought my daughter a radio record player. And by God we had to take it back because it didn't work. And then the second one they gave us, we had to take that back because it didn't work. And finally we had to take the third one we got to a shop and get them to adjust the speed of the turntable.

At the same time we bought for our son one of those little mini-bikes and we had to to take that back because it didn't work, and that tells you something about materialism in Amercan life as well as the lack of quality. It sometimes seems there's not any damn thing you can buy that's worth a damn. And we all know that.

What's bothering the people today is that life has broken down in this country. In the midst of wealth, in the midst of plenty, above all, in the midst of pretensions, life has broken down. We can't hear ourselves think for the noise in the streets and most of the noise in the streets comes from where we are tearing down our heritage and everything that's worthwhile in this country, and putting up plastic and pressed concrete that twenty years from now we'll have to tear down and put up all over again.

It's not just the war in Vietnam and it's not just that we're shipping all those arms abroad. It's that we're concealing from ourselves the fact that we're doing those things, as the recent Senate hearings have just revealed.

It's the persistence of racial strife in this country, despite all the legislation that we've passed, and all that we've tried to do. What does that mean?

The persistence of racial strife in this country means that there's something wrong with us, not something wrong with the laws, and we know that. Welfare—it doesn't matter how liberal you are or how conservative you are, you know that the way we give out welfare is wrong. It's a bad system. There's something wrong with it and yet we can't change it.

So I think the general concern from the poorest black to the richest white and everybody in between is that American life has broken down. It doesn't work; in the midst of pretensions and wealth it doesn't work.

Why doesn't it work?

I don't know all the reasons why, but perhaps I can try to suggest some of them. One reason is that the pace of change has moved like a bullet. In the twenty-five years since World War II, technology has made this country move, as none of Detroit's automobiles will move. And while this has happened, all of our institutions have grown old, their arteries have hardened and they've dug in their heels and they've entrenched.

And I would say that there are really four of these institutions that matter, in the broadest sense.

There is the bureaucracy, federal, state, and local.

There are the labor unions.

There are the corporations.

And there are the political parties.

All of them are overaged and entrenched and dug in and refuse to change, and all of them are holding us back. That's what we've got to go for.

Here I get to the weakest part of my thesis, because now you say, all right, how are we going to do it? I don't know. But I know this: If we're going to do it in any way, we're not going to do it by moderation.

I want to say that, in the interests of saving America, moderation is no virtue and extremism is no vice. And I stand behind that.

We've got to have a political movement in America, a political movement that will be at least of the courage and foresightedness of the consumer movement under Ralph Nader. We've got to have something that goes beyond the embryonic lobby movement headed by John Gardner. We've got to incorporate the various environmental movements that have shown what can be done here. The SST has been beaten in the Senate. Or if it hasn't been beaten it may at least be whipped into some kind of shape that the human race can live with.

Something else we've got to do, if we're going to have a political movement that comes anywhere close to matching these other movements, and I say this with some regional pride, we've got to go back and study the George Wallace example. George Wallace is a man who stands on a side of the spectrum which I don't share, but I come from people who do share it, and those people who do share it are good people. The mere fact that they vote for George Wallace doesn't mean that they're bad people; it means that they're upset like the rest of us about things that affect their lives. George Wallace showed that you don't have to take it.

The importance of George Wallace in 1968 was not so much what we thought it was and what I thought it was, that he might throw the election into the House of Representatives or hold the balance of power in the Electoral College or something of that sort. The importance of George Wallace was the influence he had on Richard Nixon, on Richard Nixon's campaign and on his administration. It behooves not so much the Democratic party as all those who would seek faith in the Democratic party to learn that lesson. The Democratic party is not going to be moved by anything less than the same amount of power that George Wallace wields on the Republican party.

I'm not opposed to Senator Muskie. But whether it's Senator Muskie or anyone else, I dont think that a moderate, centrist candidate, nominated by the Democratic party in 1972, even though he may defeat the present incumbent in the White House, is going to make one damn bit of difference.

The question is how *do* we make a difference? And I confess I don't know how. But the best that I can say is that George Wallace made a difference in the Republican party, and a difference that we all deplore.

When the Democratic party goes into convention—no doubt in Chicago again in 1972, because of course that blot must be wiped from the escutcheon of our leading Democrat—unless it is confronted with a monumental threat that has behind it more than words, a threat that has behind it people who have said and have made their intention plain, that if necessary they're going to be on the ballot, and they're going to be on the ballot in fifty states, and they're going to advocate certain things, I make the prediction here today that the Democratic party will nominate someone who will, as they say, "pull us together." And who will then be elected—and who will not make any difference.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

BLAIR CLARK. I'd like to ask Tom Wicker what he thinks the importance of the primary is going to be. As I understand it there are going to be twenty-three state primaries in 1972, as against about fourteen in 1968. And I've just learned that in the three weeks after Oregon there will be, if Illinois passes the law, primaries in Illinois, California, and New York, which is about a third of the convention. And all these primaries will take place during a three-week period.

So, do you think the ball game is going to be decided in the primary?

WICKER. Well, I don't know, but that fact alone is of interest because after the early upsurge of primaries in the first part of this century, primaries declined to the point where President Truman referred to them as eyewash, right after he'd lost one. And now obviously they're coming back in many ways. There'll be a primary in New Mexico, for instance, which I would suppose is an opening for the Spanish-speaking vote, and the same vote will come into play in New York, too.

I wouldn't want to say yet that in 1972 the primaries will decide the Democratic nominee. In the first place I would think the chances are reasonably good that the primaries will split up—they won't show one man sweeping them all.

I would just make a rough guess at this point, and it's very rough indeed. I would doubt very seriously for instance whether Senator Humphrey or Senator Kennedy would officially enter any primaries. It wouldn't seem to me the right thing for either of them to do. Hence you might have two rather symbolic figures in the party, waiting for all the other men to burn them-

selves out in the primaries, in which case you might have a convention decision between those two rather symbolic figures.

That's one possibility. Certainly it's very difficult for me to see how someone might establish a sweeping dominance of those primaries. Apart from that, I would doubt very seriously that primaries would be the final word. What I also doubt is that the Democratic party could again just nominate someone in total contempt of what the primary results had shown. But that's not quite the same thing as saying a primary winner would be the nominee.

WILFRID SHEED. The question of bad workmanship that you raise reminded me of the way Tories talked about the Labour government, in England, just after the war: you couldn't get a job of work done. And I'm wondering if this idea of a sort of disciplined working class can really fit with any kind of Reich-ian future.

WICKER. Well, as a dedicated "Con II," I'm not sure whether I can conjure up a Reich-ian future. But I am inclined to think that in the age of technology and mass production and so forth, we're not going to have very much Sheraton furniture produced again. But, at the same time isn't it true that those things that we have wished to do and to which we have really devoted ourselves in some pointed fashion—the moon shot being the classic example—have been done with meticulous efficiency and, I think, craftsmanship?

Soulless, perhaps, but meticulous. And so, I don't know that the two things are mutually exclusive. In the long view of history, which isn't terribly long any more, I can't conceive of the United States being a great society over any long period of time if it's a society that has no respect for itself.

And if you don't do your work right, if you don't try to do the best job you can, if you're not interested in the craftsmanship of what it is that you're up to, then I think you have no respect for yourself. And I think that one of the things that's really bothering the American people today is that too many of us in effect, in whatever field of work we're in, are setting bogus type.

I mean, we're making our living not doing anything that matters. You drive down the streets of Los Angeles or Phoenix or any of the new automobile cities and look at the business establishments on either side, look at them with the single criterion of how many are absolutely essential to the sustenance of life in Phoenix or Los Angeles. And they're damn few. And there are people in there who are manufacturing soft ice cream and running bowling alleys, whose livelihood is not necessary to the maintenance of the community. Now some of these things are marginal. Sometimes you can say, well, I'm advantageous to the community even if I'm not necessary to the community. But there are a hell of a lot of people who exist there, and they make relatively good livings in a material sense only because they are able to con people into thinking they need whatever it is that they're selling.

I hesitate to say what the problems of young people and black people are because I obviously don't know, in either case. But it seems to me that one of the major problems for younger people in the country today is that they don't have anything useful to do. When I grew up, not too many years ago, in the South, I had lots of useful things to do. If I didn't bring in the wood and coal at night, my family didn't keep warm. That was a useful thing to do. My children don't have anything useful to do.

And as they go into life and beyond the schools and are trying to spend their lives as citizens, people want to have something useful to do; they don't want to sell soft ice cream. The man who is convicted like a criminal to setting bogus type for the rest of his life—they may be paying him three dollars an hour but his life is as empty as a basket with all the eggs taken out of it.

RAYMOND RUBINOW. Mr. Wicker, would it be a correct inference from what you've been saying to us that you've seen no overwhelming demand for either party, that the mechanism of American life seems to have broken down; that four major institutions are fairly well dug in, and that no centrist candidate who will unite the party will make much of a difference? Is it a correct inference from what you've said that maybe none of the present known candidates will make the kind of difference you're talking about?

WICKER. You always have to put up the caveat against that: nobody thought that Roosevelt was going to make much difference, either, in 1932. But of course he was running with the country lying there in tatters, you know, which it may be today but not quite so visibly and not so demonstrably.

So I don't know, but my instinct (which as a hack journalist over the years I've found is better than my sources) tells me that what you said is right. But on the other hand that leaves such a bleak panorama out in front of us, I hesitate to say that, and you see, I want to believe in all of those people.

I *want* to believe that American political life, more or less as we know it, without really sweeping change, that it will suffice. So I'm willing to go against the evidence for a while. But no, I really think I have to say, if I'm going to be honest with you, that I don't see the man I'm talking about. It bothers me because I think that we could almost as easily have someone of a malignant nature who might capture our imagination.

I said that to Adam Walinsky and he made the significant point that he thought one bit of evidence against that was the fact that Agnew has signally failed to arouse a tremendous movement. I think that's right. Nonetheless I think it's a danger. And what does a President do, when you come down to it? Particularly if you accept what I've said, that conventional politics and policy are not necessarily the answer, what does a President do?

In the first place I think that in a very mystical way a President makes a real connection with the American people. Of course, once you say something is mystical you are avoiding defining it further; but you feel somehow that the President, he's of you and a part of you.

I honestly believe President Kennedy made that connection—strange as it may seem for a rich man, and so on. I don't think either President since has made it.

That's the first thing. The President can make a connection somehow and you feel, you trust, you believe, you know that that man's a part of you. And after he's made that connection, what else does he do? He sets a tone. Or perhaps he gives you a vision. Or he makes you believe somehow that you really are better than you have been. Or he makes you believe that if you aren't better you could have been. And he gives you something to aim for. And I believe that what we need more than anything else today is a leader of that kind.

I take issue with those who say that we've got to be "issues-oriented." What the hell, we've been issues-oriented in this country, and now we've got to go beyond issues. We've got to go somewhere into the American soul. And we need a President today that we can believe in, who will set a tone in this country, and there's only one tone that's going to work: We've got to have a President who will set a tone of generosity to the weak and justice for the disadvantaged, and of magnanimity. All this meanness and this toughness we've been hearing about—all these hard-nosed types, these people who are really going to audit the books and all that—that's not going to do it.

SEYMOUR MELMAN. From 1946 until now, the Pentagon has used up eleven hundred billion dollars of the nation's capital, and that's the value of all the structures in place in the United States. And if you allow for the implied loss of productive services for the parasitic use therein, the cost to the country has been two thousand, two hundred billions, or the total national wealth. Disallowing only the value of the land.

How in the world can you talk about saving America, improving the quality of life, materially and otherwise, in better style, without posting right up in front the proposition that to save America you must put down the Pentagon. And I didn't hear a line of reference about the Pentagon in your remarks or in any of the comments . . . and its absence is the checkmate on dealing with every one of those issues as it will be on dealing with every attempt to redo the quality of life in this society.

Or do you think that's wrong?

WICKER. I think you may be right.

POSTSCRIPT

After seeing these effusions in cold print, I am conscious of what might appear to be a contradiction. First, I called for a form of organized political action to bring certain pressure on the Democratic party. But in answering a question, I said that what we most needed was a leader to give the nation a new vision of itself. I place far more reliance on personality than on political organization and therefore I believe that if the kind of leader I talked about were available, or should make himself known, there would be little need for the organized pressure movement I described; because I think the country is literally crying out for such a man. But we do not have that leader, in my judgment, or if we do, we don't yet know it. It is that sad circumstance that leads me to believe that the most hopeful alternative lies in political organization and pressure from the outside on the Democratic party. I am well aware that this is a second choice and a poor second at that.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD INTRODUCES SOCIAL SECURITY BILL WITH 10-PERCENT INCREASE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is well known that the current inflationary, and at the same time recession prone, economy strikes a terrible blow at those people living on fixed incomes. This group generally is the elderly and those receiving social security or some other form of old-age retirement benefits.

Lately the elderly have been mirroring their children and lobbying for a better shake from Uncle Sam. I am one of those who believe that they deserve all that this great Nation can provide.

Therefore today, I am introducing a bill which calls for a 10-percent across-the-board social security increase with a minimum primary benefit of $100 and sets $2,400 as the amount a person receiving social security can earn without losing any of his benefits. I think this is far more realistic and fairer than the 6 percent and $2,000 which the administration is suggesting.

Since Congress last agreed to an in-

crease in social security benefits, the cost-of-living index has risen 5.5 percent. However, this same index has leaped over 15 percent for an elderly couple receiving social security.

I think we owe it to the elderly of our country to guarantee that their senior years are as comfortable as can be and I believe that this legislation will go far in realizing that end.

MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT IN THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE MEXICAN WAR

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, during our consideration of the all-volunteer force, it must be remembered that military conscription has been the exception, rather than the rule in our Nation's history. When conscription has been applied, it has been selective and discriminatory rather than universal.

During the War of 1812, Secretary of War Monroe submitted a set of draft proposals to the Congress. According to Jack Rafuse of the Center for Naval Analysis:

Had one of the conscription bills been enacted during the War of 1812, it would have been closer to an all-volunteer force than to either today's draft or the French Revolutionary *levee on masse*. Classes would have born either equal shares of expense or equal responsibility for providing volunteers. Every volunteer would have been paid a fair wage.

The structure equated the monetary tax paid by those who did not serve with the tax in kind of military service. Never before nor since in American history has such total recognition of the tax aspect of the draft been coupled with so complete an attempt to tax everyone according to pay, personal inclinations, and minimal exemptions.

Even these limited measures bitterly divided the Nation, and the war ended without enactment of compulsory military service. The tradition of voluntarism would be preserved through this year, and later during the Mexican War. I commend part 2 of the paper prepared by Mr. Rafuse for the Gates Commission to your attention:

UNITED STATES' EXPERIENCE WITH VOLUNTEER AND CONSCRIPT FORCES

PART TWO: THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE MEXICAN WAR

(By John L. Rafuse)

Proposals for conscription—the War of 1812

On June 18, 1812, though totally unprepared, the United States declared war on Great Britain. The struggle which raged in Europe between France and England had years before begun to impinge upon American interests. Years of commercial legislation against the belligerents had backfired and hurt American shipping without forcing either British or French to respect neutral rights—one violation of which was British impressment (conscription) of American seamen. The newly-elected "War Hawk" Congress, envisioning glorious war with England and the easy annexation of Canada, began to pass preparedness legislation in 1811. By April, 1812, the ban on regular enlistments had been lifted, Ranger companies authorized, the Regular Army authorization increased, money appropriated for 30,000 volunteers, and equipment and logistic provided—all on paper.

This rush of legislation did nothing to make service as a regular appealing: no increase in pay was forthcoming, no change in enlistment term was made, and no alteration of popular or individual attitudes about military service was attempted. People were expected to rush the Army when years of experience militated against such action. People were expected to enlist when nothing had changed; military compensation remained inadequate, so Congressional intent was not matched by popular enthusiasm for long-term service. This was America's first demonstration that legislation does not equate with flexibility or responsiveness in war. In April President Madison was empowered to call 100,000 militiamen for 6 months' service because regular recruitment had not worked. On June 1, 1812, President Madison gave a bellicose message to Congress, and less than three weeks later war was declared.

As in the Revolution, the enemy again was England, and many Americans did not want war. This time the division was by states. The government of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut refused to furnish quotas of militiamen on the grounds that the Constitutionally-required conditions for providing militia had not been met. Their refusal reduced the 100,000 men paper militia provided the President by 13,500. In addition, the authorized regular army of 35,603 actually stood at 20% of that strength, while the 30,000 Federal volunteers did not exist. Regulars, volunters, and militia totalled 166,000 on paper, but fewer than 7,000 men were in uniform. The United States could not take advantage of the fact that the British had only 4,500 troops in Canada.

The initially bad situation worsened steadily. The Navy, though spectacularly successful early, was captured ship by ship or bottled up by the British blockade during most of the war, the newly-elected governor of Vermont tried to withdraw the state militia from active duty at the Canadian border, and militiamen refused to cross the Canadian border to fight, even though comrades were engaged in battle within their sight across the border.[1]

In spite of New England's lack of cooperation, militias provided the majority of the American soldiers during the war. Militia troop failures resulted in several dangerous defeats for the United States. In other cases, militias simply refused to cross the national border on the constitutional grounds that they were not obliged to serve outside the United States. Recruiting for the Regular Army continued to be slow. Army Department historians have summed it up thusly:

"The greater attractiveness of the short-term militia tours with their high bonuses and the absence of any kind of compulsion to bring men into the service were handicaps which the Regular Army recruiting teams with small immediate $16 bonuses and nebulous future land grants could not overcome. By the emptiness of the Regular regiments, the Congress, again in session, tried to remedy this situation by such expedients as increasing the pay for all enlisted grades; exempting enlisted men from arrest for debt; making the term of enlistment the duration of the war instead of five years; advancing the enlistees $24 of their pay; and increasing the premium for enlistees from $2 to $4."[2]

Despite these and later measures which raised bounties to $124 and 320 acres of land, the monetary inducements offered by Federal recruiters could not match those of militia recruiters. Despite this, the Regular Army grew from fewer than 7,000 at the outset of the war to 38,000 by September 1814. The population of the U.S. at the time was roughly 7 million, so an equivalent number of volunteers today would be only 1,530,000 men. But there were an additional 471,000 volunteers of militia enlistments (which, as in the Revolution, include man re-enlistments), raising the 1970 equivalence total by several millions. Table 2 gives the type, numbers and terms of service of the troops in the war of 1812.

TABLE 2.—TROOPS OF THE WAR OF 1812[1]

	Number	Percent
Type of troops:		
Regulars (including 5,000 Navy and Marine)	65,032	10.6
Special Federal volunteers:		
Federal volunteers	10,110	1.9
Rangers	3,049	.6
Militia	438,463	86.9
Total	527,654	100.0
Term of service:		
12 months or more	63,179	12.0
6 to 12 months	66,325	12.6
3 to 6 months	125,643	23.8
1 to 3 months	125,307	23.8
Less than 1 month	147,200	27.9
Total	527,654	100.0

[1] Upton, op. cit., p. 137.

The war was an almost uninterrupted string of defeats for the United States. By the fall of 1814, Washington had been burned by the British, American forces had dwindled to 38,000 and would shrink by another 5,000 in February. Some 16,000 of Wellington's Invincibles, finished with Napoleon, had landed at Quebec, with more expected. In response to a request by President Madison, Secretary of War Monroe submitted a set of proposals to the Congress on October 17, 1814 to raise 40,000 men to bring the Federal forces up to their authorized strength.[3] The additional units would not be constrained by state boundaries or national boundaries, since Canada was the target. Monroe's proposals were considered in an extremely partisan atmosphere.

The debate in Congress centered about two plans involving classification and the federal government's right to raise armies independently of the states. The crux of the argument was the difference between the militia and the Army and the tradition of militia service for home defense as contrasted to military service at a distance. The New England states opposed the war for political and economic reasons, but argued against legal grounds. The tyranny of the majority and the spectre of Napoleon's absolutism were raised repeatedly. Daniel Webster led the way, arguing the conscription would force free men into an army (for war) under the guise of militia service (for home defense). He felt that this was an unconstitutional "means to extract slavery from the substance of free government."

The fiery debate ended on November 22, 1814. The Senate passed a draft bill based on a combination of Monroe's proposals. The bill provided for a population-based quota for each state, and the states' militias were to be divided into classes, the number of which would equal the total manpower requirement for a federal force. Each class would then provide a man for two years (by volunteering or internal draft), and would encourage voluntarism by offering a bounty raised by a progressive tax on class members.

At the same time, the House had been

Footnotes at end of article.

debating a bill closely aligned to another of Monroe's alternatives, by which the entire male population (18–45) of the United States would have been placed into classes of 25 men. Each class would have been a cross-section of wealth. Each would provide a soldier or help pay a soldier. The House passed its version on December 14, 1814, but before the final ironing out could take place, the war ended. One effect of the debates was to stir talk of secession by New England. Conscription was one of the issues, along with anti-war sentiment, that led to the Hartford Convention, at which some New England representatives proposed secession from the Union. The Treaty of Ghent ended the war and prevented further discussion or debate of either the Hartford resolutions or the draft. The news did not reach America, however, until after Andrew Jackson and 5,000 Americans had defeated the flower of the British army at the Battle of New Orleans (January 8, 1815). As Upton[4] puts it:

"While the nation had reason to exult over so single a victory, the battle in no sense vindicated a dependence on raw troops. It only proved, as at Bunker Hill, that with trained officers to command them, with an effective artillery and regular troops to support and encourage them—and above all, when protected by works so formidable that nothing but a regular seige should have dislodged them, advantages of position may compensate for an utter lack of instruction and discipline."

Nonetheless, the militiamen received the credit.

Had one of the conscription bills been enacted during the War of 1812, it would have been closer to an all-volunteer force than to either today's draft or the French Revolutionary *levee on masse*. Classes would have borne either equal shares of expense or equal responsibility for providing volunteers. Every volunteer would have been paid a fair wage. The government would not have collected taxes or paid wages and the lack of government involvement was vital during the controversy over states' rights. This was the point that Webster was making when he differentiated militia service from army service. The bill which passed in the House did not. In each case, however, the structure equated the monetary tax paid by those who did not serve with the tax in kind of military service. Never before nor since in American history has such total recognition of the tax aspect of the draft been coupled with so complete an attempt to tax everyone according to ability to pay, personal inclinations, and minimal exemptions. Monroe[5] discussed possible objections, stating:

"Nor does there appear to be any well-founded objection to the right in Congress to adopt this plan, or to its equality in its application to our fellow-citizens individually. Congress has a right, by the Constitution, to raise regular armies, and no restraint is imposed on the exercise of it except in the provisions which are intended to guard generally against the abuse of power, with none of which does this plan interfere. It is proposed that it shall operate on all alike; that none shall be exempted from it except the Chief Magistrate of the United States and the Governors of the several states."

Further, after stating that the Congress had the power to raise armies by other than strictly voluntary means, Monroe went on:

"The idea that the United States cannot raise a regular army in any other mode than by accepting the voluntary service of individuals, is believed to be repugnant to the uniform construction of all grants of power, and equally so to the first principles and leading objects of the federal compact. An unqualified grant of power gives the means necessary to carry it into effect. This is an universal maxim, which admits no exception. Equally true is it, that all its citizens; or rather, the citizens composing the commonwealth have a right collectively and individually to the service of each other, to repel any danger which may be menaced. The manner in which the service is to be apportioned among the citizens and rendered by them, are objects of legislation. All that is to be dreaded in such case, is the abuse of power; and happily our constitution has provided ample security against that evil."

In speaking of the duty and right of all citizens "collectively and individually, to the service of each other" and of the power of legislation, Monroe was primarily concerned with equity and the abuse of power. His clarification—"or rather, the citizens . . .", demonstrates his concern that the people come before the state, and the entire tone of his plan demonstrates his further concern for equity before law and his recognition of the draft as a tax to be equally paid.

From every point of view, then, the Monroe proposals of 1814 sought the equitable distribution of both the duty and of the right to serve. The proposals would have provided true voluntarism and would have provided compensation so that the forces would be all-volunteer.

After the War of 1812, the militia units were never used to the same extent. The U.S. kept a standing army after the War of 1812, whose numbers varied with Congressional mood. The militia, on the other hand, declined after 1815 with the relative security and economic growth of the nation. Training and discipline fell off in the compulsory militia units, and volunteer units, made up of men who enjoy military exercise, grew.

The shrinking regular army authorizations after 1815 forced Jackson to fight the Seminoles (1817), and Scott the Indian Wars of the 1830's, with the traditional dual army of militia units and regulars. By the end of the Indian Wars of the 1830's, Congress was enlisting regulars for five years and maintaining only a small total force.

THE MEXICAN WAR

In 1844, James K. Polk was elected on a platform of territorial annexation and expansionism. The annexation of Texas and the avowed interest of Polk and the American people in California increased the tension between the United States and Mexico. Pressure increased steadily until May 11, 1846 when Polk laid his war message before Congress.

Despite the long sequence of events before war was declared, the United States was not adequately prepared. Zachary Taylor's (1845) "Army of Observation" in Louisiana numbered approximately 1500 men at a time when the Regular Army totalled only about 6000. The Commanding General of the Army, Winfield Scott, recommended in November 1845 a prompt increase in the size of the army, but no action was taken. By the end of the year, the President and his Cabinet had agreed that defense preparations should be made, and messages were sent to the Military Committees of both Houses of Congress. A central point of the messages was that the President should be empowered to call for volunteers rather than militia. The messages evoked no response, nor did Polk's special message to Congress on March 24, 1846; but the concentration of troops in Texas continued until approximately 3500 regulars were massed there despite Government statements that there was no danger of war.[6]

On April 24, 1846, open hostilities broke out along the Rio Grande, which both nations had begun to claim, though it had never been the border of Texas. In reaction General Taylor wrote to Washington requesting 12 month volunteers. This period of service, which seems short today, was definitely long-term in the view of those concerned in 1846. Compared to the periods of militia or even Regular enlistment in the Revolution and the War of 1812, one year was indeed long-term for volunteers. On May 13th the United States declared war on Mexico, and an act was passed authorizing the President to call 50,000 volunteers for twelve months or until the end of the war. The United States armed forces grew from 7000 at the outset of the war to a total of 103,000 in the army alone during the war—all of the growth was attributable to volunteers. There were also approximately 7,500 men in the Navy during the war. The Mexican War began in May, 1846, at which time the Regular Army consisted of 637 officers and 5,925 men. By July 5, 1848, when the war ended, the Army had grown to 42,374. In addition, 60,931 officers and men had enlisted in the 12-month volunteers. At the outbreak of the war, the male population of the United States between the ages of 18–45 was approximately 4,260,000. Today that group numbers 31,736,000, so the equivalent armed force today would be about 7.45 times as great, or 769,522 men. If the 18–38 age group (24,904,000 men) were asked to supply a proportionate number of men today, the resultant army would be about 5.84 times as large or 603,301. These numbers seem small, but they were deemed adequate at the time, and proved to be so.

At first volunteer units were easier to fill—they were paid the same as regulars, their enlistment term was shorter by four years, and their discipline was more relaxed. In addition they received an extra $3.50 per month to furnish their own clothing, since the Army was unable to do so. The situation was changed, however, by a law passed January 12, 1847, which provided regulars an enlistment bounty of $12 and changed the enlistment term to five years or the duration of the war, at the soldier's option. The following month bounties of land were added, varying with length of service. The 1847 enactments made the term of service the duration of the war. The casualties during the war are shown in table 3 below:

TABLE 3.—MEXICAN WAR CASUALTIES

	Regulars			Volunteers			Total in full
	Officers	Enlisted	Total	Officers	Enlisted	Total	
Killed in battle	59	526	585	50	557	607	1,192
Died:							
Wounds	23	402	425	12	92	104	529
Disease	88	4,811	4,899	112	6,144	6,256	11,155
Accident	5	164	169		192	192	361
Total	175	5,903	6,078	174	6,985	7,159	13,237
Deserted	0	5,331	5,331	0	3,876	3,876	9,207

The table provides one more indication of the lack of preparation for the war: for every man killed in battle, another eleven died and another eight deserted. Much of the fault was with bad sanitation, supply, transport, and training, so most of the losses were needless. Much of the desertion[7] has been blamed on the attraction of gold discoveries in nearby California. Despite the waste of life, voluntarism provided all the manpower

for a foreign war of more than two years duration. Militia troops were not used, and the country had not been prepared for war, yet the response and flexibility proved adequate. The war was the most uniformly successful in American history to that time, and conscription was never considered.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Kreidberg and Henry, *op. cit.*, 42f, and Emory Upton, *Military Policy of the United States*. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1911, 95f, give the figures and discuss the war in considerably greater detail.

[2] Kreidberg, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

[3] Monroe's proposals are contained in their entirety in *American State Papers, 1814 Military Affairs*, pp. 514–517.

[4] Upton, *op. cit.*, p. 135. One thing which must be considered in using Upton is his extremely anti-militia bent. In this case, as his statistics, his appraisal seems accurate.

[5] *American State Papers, 1814 Military Affairs*, 514f.

[6] Upton, *op cit.*, 195f, traces the military aspects of the Mexican War from the early stages, and does not go into the political aspects at all. For a sketch and interpretation of the reasoning and machinations behind the war see S. C. Morrison, *The Oxford History of the American People*, New York Oxford University Press, 1965, 550f. He is quite hard on Polk.

[7] *A Study of Desertion*, unpublished paper covering the years 1831–1920. No author or date is given in this paper, which is in the Army Library in the Pentagon. The catalog number is: UB .789.S33.

REVENUE-SHARING MEASURES

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, two editorials in the March 6, 1971, New York Times deserve special thought and attention as we discuss the many aspects of President Nixon's bold and innovative revenue-sharing measures. As the first article, entitled, "Needed Federal Tax Lifeline" indicates, America's States and cities are facing an increasing financial crisis which can no longer be ignored; and which the traditional pattern of providing Federal categorical grants is not solving. The second article, entitled, "Sound Start by the President," rightfully congratulates the President on recognizing some of the difficulties inherent in any such shift in Federal programing. By providing the funds for planning and management assistance to cities and States as they adopt to the new revenue-sharing approach of Federal funding, the President's total package becomes as practical as it is exciting. The full text of both editorials follow:

NEEDED FEDERAL TAX LIFELINE

The enormous new city and state taxes confronting New Yorkers drive home the necessity for a massive program of Federal revenue sharing. Whatever the argument over the size and thrust of President Nixon's tax-sharing plan, one point is undebatable: the Federal Government alone can raise funds in a manner that will enable New York and other metropolitan centers to meet their huge needs without drying up industry and driving away their most productive citizens.

The big cities have become the repository of the social anguish generated by the technological revolution in agriculture and other long-term upheavals that have concentrated 80 per cent of the country's population in urban areas. Yet, as New York's plight demonstrates, the more energetically each community draws on its own resources to grapple with the consequences of this national dislocation, the harder it becomes to hold on to the business enterprises and the creative people needed for viability.

America's cities and states are in frenzied competition to attract and retain industries that will provide stable jobs and function as responsible corporate citizens. The level of local taxes is a major element in that competition.

It becomes particularly decisive when a city depends as heavily as does New York on its appeal as a headquarters for industry, finance, communications and other white-collar activities. Attractiveness to middle management tends to be controlling in company thinking on whether to come or to stay.

When New York City projects a 6 per cent local payroll tax at the same time that state income taxes are due to rise and the combined level of city and state sales taxes goes to 7 per cent, it is nonsense to suggest that these imposts will not operate as a powerful deterrent to many employers—to say nothing of their effect on middle-class and well-to-do families.

The whole national tax pattern is becoming a crazy quilt in which the cities and states that are most responsible in meeting social needs are at a crushing competitive disadvantage. The Federal Government could best rationalize the structure by functioning as central collector of individual and corporate income taxes, then making disbursements to the localities under equitable standards established by Congress. That is the direction in which revenue sharing points.

As it is, the Federal Government last year collected $90 billion in individual income taxes and $33 billion more in corporate taxes. For state and local governments, according to the Tax Foundation, collections came to $11 billion in individual income taxes and another $4 billion in corporate payments. Pennsylvania and Rhode Island have just joined the club, but eleven states still collect no income taxes.

It is perfectly plain that neither New York City nor New York State can avoid the painful necessity of doing much more on their own, no matter how generously Washington responds this year. But the economy-chilling potentialities of the specific programs now under consideration at City Hall and in Albany are so drastic that the patient may well die if the White House and Congress bog down in endless debate over the right cure.

SOUND START BY THE PRESIDENT

The messages President Nixon has sent to Congress on the manpower and urban development parts of his revenue-sharing plan reflect an admirable willingness to adapt his program to make it more responsive to valid criticisms.

He has recognized the incapacity of many local governments to measure up to the heavy responsibilities the Administration plan would thrust on them by recommending a $100-million program of planning and management assistance to states, cities, and area-wide agencies. Such a program could do more than raise the deplorably low level of professional competence now so widespread in local government. It could contribute to regionalization and other movements toward more rational organization of local services.

Similarly, in the manpower field, Mr. Nixon has recognized that the ultra-purist view of job training he took in vetoing the bill passed by Congress last year would work to deprive hard-pressed cities of the opportunity to create public service jobs that would benefit the unemployed as much as the community.

On urban development he has provided maximum latitude to the cities in applying funds that up to now have been smothered in red tape to the vast detriment of progress. He rules out none of the programs now under way, from Model Cities to sewer construction; but the absence of any apparent standards or review power on the part of the Federal Government may prove a death knell for many undertakings vital to the poor.

Over-all, the central criticism remains the small size of the special sharing programs. When allowance is made for normal growth of programs launched in recent years, it is not enough to provide assurance that no city will lose funds. The needs are staggering. Standstill grants are not remotely adequate.

SUPPORT FOR EMERGENCY URBAN LOAN PROPOSAL

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I took the floor of the House to outline a proposal I feel is urgently needed if the fiscal crisis of our cities and States is to be resolved. The initial reaction has been very encouraging.

My proposal—that the Federal Government issue 50-year bonds to finance $20 billion in loans to the States and the cities in the next 2 fiscal years according to the formula in the administration's general revenue-sharing plan—has already been endorsed by the Citizens Budget Commission of New York. Favorable editorial comment has been forthcoming from the New York Post, the New York News, and El Tiempo.

I present herewith for inclusion in the RECORD a news article on the proposal, the aforementioned editorials, and the statement of the Citizens Budget Commission.

[From the New York Daily News, March 5, 1971]

LOAN FOR CITY URGED IN FOREIGN AID STYLE

(By Frank Van Riper)

WASHINGTON, MARCH 4.—Rep. Herman Badillo, declaring that cities like New York are as much in need as underdeveloped countries, called today for a foreign-aid style self-help, emergency loan program in the form of a bond issue that would provide $20 billion in interest-free loans to urban areas over the next two years.

Before unveiling the proposal in his maiden speech in the House, the New York City Democrat said in an interview, "If we lend money to foreign countries, why not do it for our own cities and states?"

LOAN WOULD BE REPAID

Badillo said his proposal could be used as a test run of President Nixon's proposed revenue-sharing plan to see how states and cities would use no-strings federal money. The only difference—and Badillo termed this a safeguard against fiscal misuse—would be that localities would be required to repay the loan over a period of 50 years.

The New Yorker also said the loan plan could be put into operation quickly, to help strapped cities now, while Congress debates more permanent financial aid programs.

MILLS IN FAVOR

Badillo said he discussed his plan yesterday with Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D-Ark.) of the influential House Ways and Means Committee. Mills, a strong foe of revenue sharing, was described by Badillo as preferring the loan approach to the Nixon plan for no-string grants. Mills reportedly thought the loans should be a 3% interest charge, however.

Badillo said the distribution formula for the loans would be identical to that of the administration's revenue sharing, with n state receiving more than 10% of the total money available. Thus, New York State would receive about $1 billion a year for two years with $700 million of the $2 billion total going to New York City, Badillo said.

He said that because his proposal would provide money "in the form of a loan rather than a grant, I believe we can avoid a long, drawn-out debate over restrictions, the earmarking of funds, etc."

"Perhaps the strongest safeguard against abuse of these funds is the cities' and the states' awareness that Congress will be watching how the money is spent, and weighing this experience in development of a long-range approach," Badillo said.

BUDGET UNIT BACKS BADILLO LOAN BID

The Citizens Budget Commission endorsed yesterday the proposal of Rep. Herman Badillo (D-Bronx) that the federal government lend $20 billion to cities and states over the next two years.

This program would keep localities solvent until "disputes between those who advocate revenue sharing and those who prefer a federal takeover of welfare" are ironed out, said John W. Larsen, president of the commission.

REPRESENTATIVE BADILLO SUGGESTS

It seems highly unlikely that Congress will do anything definite this year about President Richard M. Nixon's plans for sharing federal revenues with states and cities.

So Rep. Herman Badillo (D-N.Y.), in his first speech in the House since his election to Congress, proposed yesterday that the government come up with $20 billion worth of interest-free stop-gap loans to states and cities over the next two years. The money would be raised by a federal 50-year bond issue; the state and city borrowers would have 50 years to repay. New York City's share in the loans would be about $760 million.

Without going overboard editorially for the Badillo plan, we'll observe that it least it doesn't call for flat giveaways to governors and mayors with palms outstretched, and that we believe Congress ought to give it respectful consideration.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 5, 1971]

A SENSE OF URGENCY

A new kind of U.S. savings bond has just been recommended to Congress; the purpose of the bond would be to help save the cities.

The proposed securities were recommended by Rep. Badillo (D-N.Y.). A federal government issue, at the going market interest rate, would be floated to raise $20 billion; the revenue would then be used to provide interest-free loans of $10 billion this year and next to states and cities, and repayments would be made over 50 years.

In the Congressman's view, based on inquiries among informed brokers and investment specialists, the bonds would find a ready market.

If that forecast is sustained by Congressional committee study, the issue would produce ready money at a time of critical need.

This is not a program that can be substituted for orthodox revenue raising and sharing. But it could be an interim source of funds in view of long legislative and budgetary "lead time" on authorizations and appropriations. It reflects a true sense of urgency. And it could help reduce some of the most pressing national debts—to the cities.

[From the El Tiempo Nueva York, Domingo 7 De Marzo Dj, 1971]

CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME

In his first speech in the House since his election to Congress, Herman Badillo proposed that the government make available $20 billion in no-interest loans, over a two-year period, to the financially strapped urban areas of the country.

As it seems likely that President Nixon's plan for sharing revenue with states and cities is a couple of years away, Congressman Badillo's suggestion makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Badillo was quick to point out that "if we lend money to foreign countries, then why not to our own cities and states." Certainly, cities like New York are as much in need as underdeveloped countries. It just does not make sense that this government should play a perpetual Santa Claus to foreign nations, while letting its own people go begging for food, education, medical care, housing and the like.

Wilbur D. Mills, Chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee was described by Mr. Badillo as preferring his approach to that of Nixon's "Give away" program.

John W. Larsen, Chairman of the Citizen's Budget Commission, said in support of Mr. Badillo's proposal, "This program would help keep localities solvent until disputes between those who advocate revenue-sharing and those who prefer a federal take over of Welfare are ironed out."

El Tiempo heartily endorses Congressman Badillo's timely proposal and urges the Congress to give it immediate consideration.

ON PROPOSED FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

STATEMENT OF JOHN W. LARSEN, PRESIDENT OF THE CITIZENS BUDGET COMMISSION

There is general agreement that additional federal funds should be made available to the States and local units of government. In terms of actual cash flow, Congress would have to deal with three separate issues:

How much shall be granted?

When shall the funds be made available?

How shall the aid be distributed?

On the issue of *How much*, the President's proposal called for an annual rate of about $5–$6 billion. New York State and New York City officials have asked for an initial national annual rate of $10 billion. Others have gone even further. While few would doubt that the States and localities could use $10 billion or more, there appears to be no room in the proposed 1971–72 federal budget for more than the amount proposed by the President unless (a) the federal budget total were increased or (b) federal budgetary priorities were drastically changed. To do either would be both controversial and time-consuming, thus gravely increasing the risk to the States and localities that additional aid would not be made available in time.

On the issue of *When*, there is little disagreement about the need for the earliest possible initiation of any new aid program. Specifically, both the State and the City of New York need large amounts of additional revenue almost immediately and similar reports have come from other States and localities.

On the issue of *How* additional federal funds should be distributed that there is no consensus at all. If anything, the divisions of opinion are steadily becoming more pronounced. Inasmuch as there can be no aid program without an agreed-upon allocation formula, there now exists a clear and present danger that there will not be any new aid program until the disputes over allocation are settled in the Congress. On the basis of past experience, this agreement on allocation may take years during which the fiscal situation of some States and many localities may become catastrophic.

The dispute over allocation formulas pits the proponents of revenue sharing against the proponents of a federal take-over of programs, particularly welfare, now partially financed from Washington. Proponents of revenue sharing claim that only unrestricted federal grants would enable States and localities to render the services which the people need. In reply, it is said that many State and local governments lack the administrative skill or other qualities needed to handle large amounts of no-strings-attached federal funds and that, in any event, there should not be a separation between the level of government that raises the taxes and the one that spends them, lest fiscal irresponsibility becomes the order of the day. Proponents of a federal take-over of welfare programs claim that this is the only way by which Congress can be sure that the money is spent in line with Congressional intent. In reply, it is said that governmental wisdom—and propriety—is not exclusively the province of the federal bureaucracy.

These arguments are of a fundamental constitutional and philosophical nature. There are, however, other arguments of a more mundane nature. Whatever nationwide total amount in aid to be granted by the Congress may be determined, different allocation formulas would result in different distribution patterns among the States and localities. It is obvious that a federal take-over of welfare would be especially attractive to the handful of large States that are responsible for better than half of all welfare expenditures—the one category of expenditure that is now rising at a rapid and quite unexpected rate.

There are other possible sources of controversy. For example, assuming Congress dedicated that the federal government should take over all welfare expenditures, the question would then arise as to what is to be taken over. Would it be the present overly-costly, socially-destructive and generally discredited welfare system or some version of a Family Assistance Plan? It is unlikely that welfare reform can be staved off any longer regardless of how the costs are to be shared. This too is a matter of controversy the solution of which will take time—and probably more time than is warranted by the urgent needs of the States and localities.

If the States and the localities are to receive substantial amounts of new federal funds (in whatever form) within the next few months, a way will have to be found to by-pass the allocation disputes between those who advocate revenue sharing and those who prefer a federal take-over of welfare. What is needed is an interim solution to bridge, say, the next two federal fiscal years—to allow time for working out a permanent consensus without impeding the needed flow of federal aid to the States and the localities.

One interim solution—proposed by Congressman Herman Badillo—appears to be based on a realistic evaluation of what can and should be done. This proposal would—for the next two years—substitute federal interest-free loans for federal grants. The use of such loan funds would be basically unrestricted and their allocation would be primarily on a population basis. By clearly labelling such funds as "interim," this solution would allow Congress time to deal in depth with the numerous constitutional and philosophical facets of a permanent allocation formula. In the meantime, it would make federal money available almost immediately. Of course, no State or local government would have to apply for such interest-free loans unless it wanted to. But if it

did, it would receive federal funds—something which might not otherwise happen within the reasonable future were the flow of such funds dependent on Congressional approval of a final allocation formula.

Based on fiscal and political considerations, the proposal by Congressman Badillo deserves support as a stopgap measure.

REPRESENTATIVE ARENDS MERITS HONORS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared recently in the Danville, Ill., Commercial News, enumerates the political accomplishments of our colleague and Republican Whip, LES ARENDS. To the deserving praise in this editorial should be added that LES has served his constituents, his district and his country with selflessness, integrity, and courage. I know my colleagues in the Congress have the same great affection for LES ARENDS as the people in Illinois and will be interested in reading the editorial which follows:

REPRESENTATIVE ARENDS MERITS HONORS

Rep. Leslie C. Arends of Melvin, congressman from this 17th Illinois District, has served his country so long and faithfully that new honors seem almost routine.

He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1934, took his seat in that body in 1935. His ability quickly came to the attention of his party's leaders and in 1943, he was elected whip—an almost unprecedented honor for a comparative newcomer.

Since 1934—and since 1943—he has been re-elected by his constituents and his colleagues. He has not set a record for longevity of service in the House but he has as his party's whip. In fact, no man in U.S. history, of any party, has held this position so long.

Congressman Arends is an active whip, otherwise he would not be named to the job year after year. He knows how to get things done, both on his side of the aisle and on the more populous side where the Democrats sit. It would be impossible to enumerate here the beneficial measures which Rep. Arends helped guide through the House on their way to becoming the laws of the land. And on the reverse side of the coin, he has used his superb talents as persuader par excellence to block unwise legislation that might have done this country great harm.

Small wonder, then, that his party wants him to continue in the job.

But he is more than a salesman of GOP wares. He is the ranking minority member of the powerful House Armed Services Committee and is a perennial congressional delegate to NATO conferences in Europe.

Small wonder, too, that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has selected him to receive the VFW's eighth annual Congressional Award for Outstanding Service. Herbert R. Rainwater of San Bernardino, Calif., who is commander-in-chief of the veterans organization, commented that "I can think of no one who is more deserving." High praise—in view of the previous winners: Sens. Henry Jackson, Carl Hayden, Everett M. Dirksen and Richard Russell, and Reps. John McCormack, Olin Teague and Wilbur Mills.

Since Les Arends never forgets that he has a local, as well as a national, constituency, we can say conscientiously that the recognition couldn't have been accorded a better man.

CATERPILLAR TRACTOR CO.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the 1970 annual report of the Caterpillar Tractor Co., included a letter to the shareholders from Mr. William Blackie, chairman of the board and Mr. W. H. Franklin, president of the company.

For the first time in the company's history the volume of sales outside the United States exceeded that within and this letter to the stockholders outlines the problems and challenges confronting the company as it continues to make progress in the highly competitive international market.

I include the reprint from the company's 1970 annual report in the RECORD at this point:

TO THE SHAREHOLDERS

Just as its three-year agreement with the United Automobile Workers was about to expire on October 1, 1970, the Company was confronted by the union's central negotiating body (representing eleven U.S. plants and 30,500 employees) with a choice between two alternatives: (a) be struck—for an indeterminate period of time, or (b) accede to one of the union's most pressing "demands"—a provision for unlimited open-end revision of wage rates based on changes in the cost-of-living index.

The Company chose the latter course, and a strike was thereby averted at least until such time as the terms of a more general "pattern" should be established as a result of bargaining between the UAW and the major constituency of its membership, the automobile industry.

In due course an agreement was, accordingly, reached. Its principal terms call for substantial increases in wage rates and retirement pensions, for greater employment-related benefits, and for the aforementioned unlimited cost-of-living wage increases based on the Consumers Price Index.

The general economic effect of the agreement will be to increase all employment costs substantially in excess of any present or prospective gains in output per man-hour of paid time. The general result, as in the past, can only be further deterioration of the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar as prices are increased in an effort to preserve worthwhile profits and thereby justify the continuation of manufacture of the more marginal products.

This erosion of the value of the currency is naturally a cause of concern among those having national responsibilities in fiscal or monetary affairs, and efforts were made by them to contain the inflationary consequences. The main thrust of such efforts was, however, based on a classical assumption that (1) wage settlements would decline soon after unemployment rose and (2) prices would increase more slowly after capacity utilization declined. As shown by the actual settlements in 1970, this did not occur. Neither wage settlements nor prices have moderated, and it should be understood that most of the contracts involving the large industrial unions call for further wage increases in the second and third years of the commitment—entirely without regard to the state of the general economy or of the particular business, to the degree of capacity utilization or to the volume of unemployment.

In such circumstances, prudent business managers must consider whatever courses of action may be available to ameliorate the adverse effects of the rising costs. One is simply to abandon the production of goods which can no longer be made at prices which customers will pay for them. Where the market conditions will permit, another is to raise prices—to recover the higher costs and thereby reflect in new cost-price relationships the decline in the value of the currency.

Manufacturers competing wholly within the United States have fairly equal freedom to adapt between these two unattractive alternatives. The U.S. manufacturer who exports but does not produce abroad is less fortunate. In competition with manufacturers in overseas markets, he may not be able to raise his prices sufficiently to recover the increase in domestic costs.

But those concerns operating on an international scale and having production sources outside the United States do have one other alternative: to do abroad what they cannot do successfully at home.

Wages rates and man-hour production costs vary country by country and, in an important number of instances, those prevailing outside the United States are substantially lower than those within it. For companies attempting to compete effectively worldwide, this may leave little alternative but to undertake production in some country where lower costs would allow competitive international prices and, therefore, sales at a worthwhile margin of profit.

If, however, manufacturing survival based on least-cost source were to be carried to an extreme, there would be a generally unacceptable relocation of production, investment, employment, profit, and taxes based on income. It is not, therefore, likely that any nation able to protect itself against such an occurrence would refrain from taking whatever restraining measures might be available. These could include, for example import restrictions, export incentives, and investment controls.

But such devices, while they may sometimes provide an expedient short-term palliative, do not provide a sound long-term solution. That is surely to be found only in a scheme of things whereby competition is stimulated, not thwarted, and the worldwide exchange of goods and services is expanded, not contracted.

For the successful achievement of such an objective, it is our opinion—supported by our experience and observation—that the solution lies in the combination of multilateral reciprocal trade agreement with an international monetary system whereby, in an orderly process of readjustment, exchange rates are related more closely to the changing real market values among countries.

As was stated in our annual report for 1968, the end purpose of the monetary system is not and should not be made money itself or the preservation of historical parities which become outmoded in the changing times. Rather, it should be the preservation of real *values;* and these involve people and their needs or desires for employment, for goods and services, and for a sense of security, which at times seems to be more threatened than strengthened by efforts to overcome international monetary instability.

In trade—with other things being equal—the desideratum should be the greatest practical freedom for the exchange of goods between sellers and buyers. But "other things" are seldom equal, and among the most disturbingly unequal in *international* trade are the differing wage-cost levels among different countries and the differing prices derived from these levels when translated into other currencies.

Therein lies the source of and the remedy for the major obstacle to the further development of international trade. Foreign exchange parities established in earlier times and under the different conditions then prevailing could not possibly be appropriate for the present times and conditions. If they are

to serve the purposes for which they were established, parities must surely be modified from time to time as the conditions affecting these purposes change.

On an informal country-by-country basis, there have been over the years a substantial number of unilateral modifications in foreign exchange parities. In number, these have been greatest among the less-developed countries which had their currencies seriously eroded by internal inflation. Of greater importance for purposes of international business were, however, the actions taken by major trading nations. Thus in November, 1967, Great Britain devalued the pound sterling; in August, 1969, France established a new parity for the franc; while in October, 1969, West Germany revalued the deutschemark. More recently Canada allowed the exchange value of its dollar to "float"—presumably until and as long as it stabilizes at a rate which will best serve Canada's purposes.

Some of these and certain other countries may be obliged to consider still further adjustments in exchange rates. But among those countries which have made no adjustment in modern times, none could now do so to greater international advantage than Japan. Since parity for the yen was established at 360 to the U.S. dollar in May, 1953, Japan has become one of the world's most highly developed industrial and commercial nations—trading aggressively and freely wherever its goods can penetrate foreign markets. This it has usually been able to do on the basis of prices lower than those of competitive indigenous alternatives. And insofar as such lower prices may be the result of higher work productivity, superior management, or more effective industrial discipline, the Japanese should be entitled to earn the benefits. It can hardly be claimed, however, that they are also entitled to obtain extraordinary competitive advantage on the basis of outmoded foreign exchange rates.

The disparity that exists today is significant, and present indications are that it will increase still further. In that event the need for exchange rate readjustment will become all the more pressing, and the stresses among the trading nations will be accentuated. Within the United States, evidence of this was given by the proposed Trade Act of 1970. It would have placed quotas on the imports of certain goods and provided means whereby the imposition of quotas on other goods could be facilitated. To some extent, it reflected a form of retaliation against the aggressive success of Japan's industry; and yet, if passed, the law would have operated to incite foreign retaliation against U.S. exports. Such retaliation would be taken against goods and commodities not involved in the import restrictions, and the harm would fall unfairly on those who had no part in bringing about the "trade war."

The last thing this weary world needs—especially at this time—is a trade war. Were one to break out, it would be inexcusable because it is avoidable. Surely the time has come when the conditions of multilateral reciprocal trade established under the terms of the GATT should and can be complemented by a multilateral reciprocal system for establishing and adjusting monetary exchange *values*.

Such a system should permit exchange rates to move in relation to each other timeously and, therefore, *gradually*—in a rational, interpretable manner. It should recognize that there is no such thing as "stability" unless it is to be found in an orderly system of continuous revision. Too often in the past, needed adjustments have been too late and, therefore, too drastic—undertaken only under the compulsive threat of monetary or political crisis. Within the tolerances of international economics, the business community is reasonably capable of making its own prognostications and adapting accordingly. It has much less capacity to foretell the actions of either political bodies or monetary authorities—which, preferably, should be kept independent of each other.

If some such system were established, the coordinate to which other currencies should relate would—under present conditions—have to be the U.S. dollar. In spite of criticism sometimes directed against those who have responsibilities for its health, it is, in free international exchanges, the most generally acceptable reserve currency medium. This does not refute the fact that the value of the dollar has eroded—both internally and externally. It would mean that, in making adjustments, appropriate recognition should be given to the other fact that the basis for the determination of relationships is itself a variable.

If the effective utilization of such a system could be brought about, it would serve to alleviate some of the conditions which are creating present and recurring stresses among the trading nations—stresses which, unfortunately and unnecessarily, could go beyond matters of trade or investment and place undesirable strains upon diplomatic relations.

This, at the moment, is a threat in the case of U.S.-Japanese relations. Vis-a-vis each other, the yen is undervalued and the dollar is overvalued. Correction could be obtained by appropriate revaluation of the yen or by devaluation of the dollar. With so many other international currency relationships based on the dollar, any such devaluation would, however, be extremely and unnecessarily disturbing; and unless other countries, such as Japan, allowed the devaluation to modify the preceding relationships, the effect would be diluted or defeated.

Despite these rather general comments about some of the problems of international trade, it should not be assumed that Caterpillar has been merely waiting for actions by governments or others—at home or abroad—to foster its international business. On the contrary, it has over the years established and now has in being a strategic deployment of resources outside the United States.

Apart from its strong independent dealer organization, the Company has substantial manufacturing subsidiaries operating in Scotland, England, France, and Belgium, while somewhat smaller units are producing parts, components, or assemblies in Australia, Brazil, Canada, Mexico, and South Africa. Parts warehouses are based in England, Belgium, and Singapore as well as at certain manufacturing plants, while commercial subsidiaries are headquartered in Geneva, Switzerland, and Hong Kong.

In Japan, Caterpillar Mitsubishi operates under the joint ownership of Caterpillar and one of that country's most illustrious business organizations. The results of the operations of that affiliate are not incorporated in the reported consolidated figures, but the venture is now maturing into a successful enterprise from which there can be expected worthwhile contributions to Caterpillar's future earning power.

Another, and much smaller, affiliate operates in India in equity partnership with Larsen & Toubro, Bombay.

From the aforementioned description of resources and their locations, it will be apparent that Caterpillar is well situated to participate effectively in worldwide developments and to capitalize on expanding overseas markets. In particular, it is prepared to be a contributing part of the industry of the European Community, especially if that were to be expanded to include Great Britain and several other countries. It also has in the Far East a deployment of resources which is unequaled in the industry—already in position to take appropriate advantage of the growth and progress getting under way there even now.

When undertaking the establishment of its overseas facilities and investments, it was Caterpillar's primary purpose to protect and expand markets which it, for the most part, had opened up. These were exposed to serious threats of competition or displacement which could be met only from bases of operation closer to the important markets in which competition or restrictive government actions might have had adverse effects upon Caterpillar business. This purpose is, on the whole, being achieved—with the understanding, of course, that there will always be need for aggressive venture or defensive response as time and change go on.

While it had been expected that, in addition to serving its primary purpose, overseas production would prove to be stimulating to *exports from* the United States factories, the results have exceeded expectations. In each case where Caterpillar has established overseas production in a selected country, the volume of sales has increased within that country for *both* the particular Caterpillar products made in it and those exported to it from the United States. To some extent, these exports include parts and components to be incorporated in the machines produced overseas; but, to date, the major portion of such exports is comprised of those whole machines *not* produced by the related subsidiary.

Of perhaps more potential long-term significance is, however, the increasing extent to which the controlled overseas subsidiaries of U.S. corporations are becoming capable of producing abroad the equivalent of American-made goods on a cost-price basis which permits imports into the United States in full and successful competition with the indigenous products. This suggests that the time and the conditions are approaching when greater consideration will have to be given to the selection and use of sources of supply on a least-cost basis—worldwide. Multi-national concerns which seek to be competitive in world markets are increasingly obliged to recognize that if their products are to be sold at competitive prices they will have to be made or procured at competitive costs—and from whichever sources, at home or abroad, are most competitive. The essential point is that, in free competitive markets, prices and costs must be related on approximately the same bases—otherwise there is either no effective competition or no business at all.

These opinions suggest another, viz., that international business cannot be considered only in terms of trade. Parallel consideration must be given to foreign investment. The two go hand in hand—with each complementing and supplementing the other.

Appropriate recognition of this would suggest greater caution in the continuance of the so-called "temporary" controls now in effect for U.S. direct foreign investment. Whether they have been helpful or harmful is now beside the point. The time has come when they should be removed—if for no other reason—because the United States can no longer count with assurance on its ability to generate a surplus on its balance of *trade*. If there is to be a favorable balance of *payments*, there should, accordingly, be more adequate recognition of the need for and the long-term advantages of a substantial incoming flow from the return on foreign investments.

The general purport of these remarks has been to inform investors of some of the problems of the times and to indicate that while broad general solutions are beyond the control of the Company it is not deprived of opportunity to work out its own particular pursuit of progress.

Some evidence of this is contained in the following report, and it seems worthy of note here that, for the first time in the Company's history, the volume of its sales outside the United States exceeded that within. Al-

though the manufacturing output of consolidated overseas subsidiaries continued to increase during the year, so also did exports *from* the United States. As a result, Caterpillar was able to increase its net contribution to the U.S. balance of payments to a record-breaking $791 million.

While not entirely satisfactory, the results of operations for 1970 were somewhat better than had been earlier expected. This is a tribute to the men and women who contributed their part during the year and who also earned for their company the accolade of those independent U.S. business managers who voted Caterpillar first among major industrial concerns for its image of quality. Comment on this is made later in the report, and we would only point out here that a reputation for quality is not earned from product alone. The quality of product is a result; the creative cause of it lies in those thousands of people who, throughout the worldwide Caterpillar organization, its independent dealers and its suppliers, have been putting their own *personal* qualities into their work.

A COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S STRATEGY FOR PEACE

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our distinguished former colleague, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird, presented to the House Armed Services Committee a most candid and comprehensive report on the implementation of President Nixon's strategy for peace. I commend this document to a careful study by all Members of Congress, and indeed by all Americans. Certainly this is clear and credible language even in such a complex area as defense for anybody who really wants to understand what the Nixon administration has done and is attempting to do to bring about a generation of peace.

I was particularly impressed, Mr. Speaker, with the point made by Secretary Laird that the Vietnamization program for reducing the American involvement in Southeast Asia is important not only for the obvious purpose of winding down the long and tragic present war, but also as the foundation for the prevention of future Vietnams. As a former ranking minority member of the Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I am impressed by the breadth and scope of current planning and insert at this point in the RECORD the section of yesterday's Defense report entitled "Concepts for Defense Planning."

I include the material as follows:

II. CONCEPTS FOR DEFENSE PLANNING

Planning in the revised and revitalized National Security Council context now takes into account all assets available for achieving foreign policy objectives. The goals we seek for the enhancement of American and world interests—peace, freedom, social, economic and political development, broadening opportunities—obviously cannot be achieved by means of direct military power alone.

The basic objective of our Strategy of Realistic Deterrence is to prevent armed conflict and ultimately to eliminate its use as a means by which one nation tries to impose its will upon another. But so long as the threat persists that other nations may use force, adequate military power must remain an essential element of Free World strategy.

In defense planning, the Strategy of Realistic Deterrence emphasizes our need to plan for optimum use of all military and related resources available to meet the requirements of Free World security. These Free World military and related resources—which we call "Total Force"—include both active and reserve components of the U.S., those of our allies, and the additional military capabilities of our allies and friends that will be made available through local efforts, or through provision of appropriate security assistance programs.

A. THE TOTAL FORCE APPROACH

"It needs to be understood with total clarity . . . that defense programs are not infinitely adjustable . . . there is an absolute point below which our security forces must never be allowed to go. That is the level of sufficiency. Above or at that level, our defense forces protect national security adequately. Below that level is one vast undifferentiated area of no security at all. For it serves no purpose in conflicts between nations to have been almost strong enough."

Elsewhere in this Defense Report, I present a summary of the several existing threats to Free World security. In planning to meet these threats, we intend to use the Total Force approach. We will plan to use all appropriate resources for deterrence—U.S. and Free World—to capitalize on the potential of available assets.

In considering the spectrum of potential conflict, we will be guided by the following principles in our defense planning:

In deterring strategic nuclear war, primary reliance will continue to be placed on U.S. strategic deterrent forces.

In deterring theater nuclear war, the U.S. also has primary responsibility, but certain of our allies are able to share this responsibility by virtue of their own nuclear capabilities.

In deterring theater conventional warfare—for example, a major war in Europe—U.S. and allied forces share the responsibility.

In deterring subtheater or localized warfare, the country or ally which is threatened bears the primary burden, particularly for providing manpower; but when U.S. interests or obligations are at stake, we must be prepared to provide help as appropriate through military and economic assistance to those nations willing to assume their share of responsibility for their own defense. When required and appropriate, this help would consist essentially of backup logistical support and sea and air combat support. In some special cases, it could include ground combat support as well.

Moreover, U.S. involvement in world affairs is not based exclusively on our alliances, but rather, our formal and informal obligations derive from and are shaped by own own national interests. To protect our interests, we must insure free use of international air space and free access to the world's oceans. Thus, our future defense planning must also insure a U.S. capability to prevent an effective challenge to free use of international air space and the oceans of the world.

The significance of Total Force planning perhaps is best illustrated by examining its military application to NATO.

As has been stated, the U.S. bears primary responsibility in the field of strategic and theater nuclear weapons, although in the latter case certain of our allies also contribute significant forces. Our strategic forces must be sufficient now and in the future, since they are a cornerstone of the Free World's deterrent. By providing strong, effective and survivable strategic forces, reliable and effective inteligence and command and control, and other necessary capabilities in our strategic posture, we seek to convince potential opponents that recourse to the holocaust of general nuclear war will continue to be an irrational and unsucessful option.

U.S. strategic forces relate primarily to the deterrence of a strategic nuclear attack. They also serve an important role, together with theater and tactical nuclear capabilities, in deterring conflict below the level of general nuclear war.

However, as the last two decades have demonstrated, reliance on a nuclear capability alone is by no means sufficient to inhibit or deter aggression. A sufficient nuclear capability must be coupled with a sufficient conventional capability in both our own forces and in those of our allies. This conventional capability must be adequate to meet aggression in the sophisticated environment which would be expected in a conflict with the Warsaw Pact. If these NATO forces are to deter this type of aggression, they must be capable of confronting it with such capabilities as strong armor and antitank forces, appropriate air power for air superiority and ground combat support, strong naval forces to support NATO's flanks, and other combat and support forces.

In addition, such a conflict would require reinforcement and augmentation from the U.S. and would undoubtedly involve conflict at sea. Therefore, we and our allies must be able to control wherever necessary the air and sea lanes needed to support U.S. and allied forces abroad.

Finally, because some of our NATO allies—for example, Greece and Turkey—do not have and cannot afford needed modern equipment, it is in our interest to help them modernize their forces, and to rely on them to man and operate those forces. Conversely, we must and do expect that those NATO allies who are able to do so will improve their contributions to the common defense through appropriate programs, financial participation, and force modernization.

In summary, through application of all resources across 1, the full spectrum of possible conflict and 2, the full spectrum of capabilities, we intend to maintain sufficient U.S. strength and to mesh this strength with that of other nations in a new order of partnership. If we are to achieve a lasting peace, we must work together to deter aggression, to prevent war.

We will apply the Total Force Concept in non-NATO areas as well. The President stated in his Foreign Policy Report to Congress last year, in a passage with particular application to Asia, that our friends and allies must bear an increasing responsibility for their own defense.

In his second annual Foreign Policy Report to Congress last month, he said:

"We will continue to provide elements of military strength and economic resources appropriate to our size and our interests. But it is no longer natural or possible in this age to argue that security or development around the globe is primarily America's concern. The defense and progress of other countries must be first their responsibility and second, a regional responsibility. Without the foundations of self-help and regional help, American help will not succeed. The United States can and will participate, where our interests dictate, but as a weight—not the weight—in the scale."

When the Nixon Administration assumed office in January, 1969, just the opposite was the case in Southeast Asia. U.S. forces were carrying the major part of the burden. Our first challenge under President Nixon's Strategy for Peace was to reverse the trend toward greater and greater involvement of Americans in ground combat. We set out to end

American military involvement in the Indochina fighting.

A key element for the success of our new strategy is the need for Total Force planning in an even wider context than defense planning alone. This wider context embraces all Free World assets—military and non-military—which can help prevent the outbreak or continuation of conflict, while fostering freedom, peace, self-determination and cooperation among nations.

B. VIETNAMIZATION AND TOTAL FORCE PLANNING: THE NIXON DOCTRINE IN ACTION

Vietnamization represents the clearest example, in its broader terms, of the Total Force Concept in action. It takes both military and non-military resources into account. It reflects integrated, coordinated and systematic planning by the United States and our allies. It utilizes all available means to bring down pressure to bear on the level and intensity of conflict while seeking to end that conflict—hopefully through successful negotiations. Vietnamization helps mobilize diplomatic and political action for a peaceful settlement, and economic and security assistance for long-term economic stability. Its objective is self-reliant South Vietnamese defense forces, and it encourages increasing cooperation among free Asian nations to aid in restoring and maintaining peace in Indochina.

In my Defense Report last year, Vietnamization was characterized as the first crucial step in implementing the Nixon Doctrine. I said then:

"Vietnamization is both a means to an end and a beginning: a means to end the American involvement in Vietnam and to make a credible beginning on our new policy for peace and increased self-reliance in Asia. This first step in implementing the Nixon Doctrine is of critical importance in ending the war. Moreover, success of the Nixon Doctrine can help remove the need for similar American ground combat involvement in future Asian wars, an important objective of our new strategy."

Our single objective in South Vietnam has been and remains to help that country ensure self-determination and become capable of maintaining security and insuring its own future. At the same time, we seek methodically to terminate American combat involvement in Indochina in such a way that the prospects for effective self-defense—and, more hopefully, the prospects for lasting peace in the area—will be enhanced by the orderly way in which we leave.

Our activities in Indochina during the past year and in the forthcoming year should be measured and evaluated in relation to goals which have guided this Administration since the beginning of Vietnamization:

Maintaining our obligations and interests in Asia as we move toward a generation of peace;

Reducing American casualties;

Continuing the reduction of Americans from all of Southeast Asia;

Turning over military responsibility to the South Vietnamese in a way that provides South Vietnam with its own defense against aggression;

Implementing the Nixon Doctrine effectively.

The start of Vietnamization was based on several critical assumptions:

If the Paris negotiations were not successful, conflict in South Vietnam would continue.

The process of winding down and ending American combat involvement had to begin in 1969 and go forward steadily.

As long as the conflict continued, Free World assistance to South Vietnam would be required.

But with appropriate Free World assistance, the Republic of Vietnam and its people could in a relatively short period of time cope effectively with threats to their security from both the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese.

The Concept of Vietnamization. In October of 1969, I outlined to the National Convention of the AFL–CIO in Atlantic City the basic concept of Vietnamization. That concept has not changed. As I told the AFL–CIO:

"In January (1969), the U.S. Government had no alternative plan to influence the course of events should the continuing efforts at Paris fail. Today, there is an alternative course of action that at the same time complements our efforts at Paris. That program is Vietnamization.

"Vietnamization is something new. Those who view it as a mere continuation of the program for modernizing South Vietnam's armed forces are quite mistaken. It is much more than that. The Vietnamization program represents a major change not only in emphasis but also in objectives. Troop modernization until early this year had the negative goal of partially de-Americanizing the war. Vietnamization has the positive goal of "Vietnamizing" the war, of increasing Vietnamese responsibility for all aspects of the war and handling of their own affairs. There is an enormous difference between these two policies.

"The previous modernization program was designed to prepare the South Vietnamese to handle only the threat of Viet Cong insurgency that would remain after all North Vietnamese regular forces had returned home. It made sense, therefore, only in the context of success at Paris. It was a companion piece to the Paris talks, not a complement and alternative. Vietnamization, on the other hand, is directed toward preparing the South Vietnamese to handle both Viet Cong insurgency and regular North Vietnamese armed forces regardless of the outcome in Paris."

Since assuming office as Secretary of Defense, I have made three trips to Vietnam. In that time, all aspects of Total Force planning in its broader context have been addressed and, in my view, have contributed to the President's program for peace.

Integrated Force Planning. In early 1969, my initial trip to South Vietnam as Secretary of Defense concentrated on the military situation, the status of U.S. forces, and the effectiveness of the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces (RVNAF). I found that our fighting men in Southeast Asia, under the superb leadership of General Abrams, had the resources to accomplish their assigned tasks, but those tasks, as of that time, were not consistent with the expressed goal of South Vietnamese self-determination. The U.S. forces were carrying the main part of the military burden. There were no indications of a program adequate to bring about self-reliance of the RVNAF, to develop South Vietnamese forces which could handle the prospective long-term internal and external military threat, or to bring about significant and orderly reductions or changes in the U.S. military presence in South Vietnam.

After that trip, we proposed policies to improve the RVNAF's capabilities consistent with new U. S. objectives. President Nixon announced the concept of Vietnamization. We then immediately initiated planning for the redeployment of U. S. forces. Despite a continuing substantial enemy military threat, Vietnamization looked promising enough in the early stages to permit the historic Midway decision and announcement by the President in June 1969. U. S. troop redeployments started shortly thereafter, and have continued through six major increments, as of today. There will be further and continuing withdrawals of U. S. forces.

Within the Total Force concept, there are three distinct phases to Vietnamization:

The first phase consists of turning over to South Vietnam the ground combat responsibility against VC/NVA forces. As I have said many times before, we expect to complete Phase I by this summer, although American ground combat forces will remain in a security role to protect U. S. forces as Phase II progresses.

The second phase consists of developing within South Vietnam the air, naval, artillery, logistics and other support capabilities necessary to maintain effective independent security. Phase II has been in process concurrently with Phase I, but it will take longer to complete because of the complex training involved.

The third phase will consist of reducing the American presence to a military advisory mission, together with whatever small security forces are needed to protect this mission. Further reductions of our assistance and advisory presence will then continue, under the Nixon Doctrine, as South Vietnam continues to grow in national strength and self-reliance, until no more U. S. military presence is required.

DOWNWARD PRESSURE ON CONFLICT

The Strategy of Realistic Deterrence seeks systematically to diminish the likelihood of outbreak or continuation of conflict. Faced with an intense ongoing and seemingly endless conflict when we assumed office, we had first to establish conditions conducive to lowering the intensity of the conflict while ending direct American involvement.

By any measurement of our overall activities in Southeast Asia since the start of Vietnamization, the thrust of American activity has been downward. For example:

American combat deaths are down from peaks as high as five hundred a week to an average below fifty a week. I want to stress that we will not be satisfied, of course, until there are no U.S. combat deaths.

By May 1971, American troop strength in Vietnam will have been reduced to almost half the authorized ceiling of 549,500 when I became Secretary of Defense.

American air attack sorties in Indochina during 1970 were down more than 50% from peak 1968 levels.

American war costs for Southeast Asia have been cut approximately in half from the peak level of 1968, and are continuing to decline.

In short, American involvement by any measure—casualties, operations, manpower levels, incremental war costs—is significantly down. At the same time, security inside South Vietnam is markedly improved, and Vietnam's neighbors, notably Cambodia, are making new and determined efforts to defend themselves.

To insure the further downward trend in the level of conflict, particularly in the absence of successful negotiations, requires a continued and carefully programmed increase in the ability of the South Vietnamese to assume more and more of the burden of conflict themselves, and then to preserve the peace once hostilities have ended.

The buildup of South Vietnamese forces to permit them to defend themselves, against not only the Viet Cong but also the North Vietnamese, has been essential to the success of Vietnamization. Improvements in fire power and mobility have been the primary need, requiring extensive materiel transfers and training programs to develop naval, helicopter, tactical air, artillery, and logistic support capabilities. These improvements are progressing on or ahead of schedule. More heartening even than the statistical milestones of Vietnamization has been the actual field performance of Vietnamese forces, particularly since the conduct of the highly successful Cambodian sanctuary operation last spring. Vietnamese forces have demonstrated professional skill, valor, and combined arms effectiveness in their operations to date. Particularly noteworthy has been the Vietnamese ability to operate removed from their permanent bases against enemy-

occupied areas. The current operations in both Cambodia and Laos are providing a further test of their increasing abilities.

As I have advised the Congress and the American people many times, we cannot expect the South Vietnamese to win every battle. We must anticipate some temporary tactical setbacks as they gain increased confidence and strength.

I am confident that the Vietnamization program is succeeding and that more Americans will be coming home.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS

During my second trip to Vietnam in early 1970, it was possible to broaden the scope and perspective of that visit in comparison to the first, because of the impressive gains which had been achieved in the military aspects of Vietnamization. The result was an emphasis during the 1970 trip on the South Vietnamese economic situation.

The economic implications of Vietnamization are complex. In terms of availability of goods and services, the economy will continue to be under inflationary pressures resulting from wartime inflation. Actions undertaken and contemplated in connection with military Vietnamization will require increased spending by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam (GVN). At the same time, recent and proposed measures to increase domestic taxes can yield additional revenues only slowly over time, and the GVN is facing a decline in revenues from U.S. military purchases as U.S. forces redeploy. However, the overall level of U.S. economic aid is expected to remain constant, as U.S. programs are reoriented to aim at developing the economy. In addition, the foreign exchange rate, together with import duties, if adjusted frequently to reflect inflation, can yield increased revenues in the near future.

The Vietnamese are expected to be able to maintain economic and financial stability, even during the height of their military efforts, provided they continue to expand the capacity of their domestic revenue system, undertake further reforms to contain inflation, and receive adequate external assistance, such as the aid we provided Korea at the end of that conflict.

President Thieu began in October 1970 to carry out economic reform measures, among them a partial devalaution of the piaster. Detailed studies undertaken concurrently in Saigon focused on present and future needs with respect to exchange rate structures, interest rates, wage policies, tax reform, and GVN expenditure levels.

While all of the desirable changes obviously cannot be hastily implemented in the immediate future, a start has been made on programs with long-lead times. The U.S. and the GVN have jointly undertaken some preliminary measures to help strengthen the institutional foundations necessary for increased economic development even while hostilities continue.

During the past year, it has been gratifying to witness the salutary effects of the initial steps taken to improve RVN economic prospects, as well as the continued RVNAF military progress. The economic development process that lies ahead, though, will require further fundamental reforms and may prove to be one of the most demanding challenges of Vietnamization.

DIPLOMATIC AND POLITICAL ASPECTS

Vietnamization was conceived as both a complement to and an alternative for a negotiated settlement. President Nixon had earlier made explicit the U.S. interest in pursuing the route of negotiations.

Therefore, Paris was the first stop on my third trip to Vietnam in early January 1971. Representatives of our government and of the Republic of Vietnam have now held more than 100 weekly meetings with representatives of the other side in an effort to end the war by negotiation. However unpromising the Paris talks have been so far, we shall continue to pursue a diplomatic settlement of the conflict.

We have been, are, and shall continue to be ready at any time to make peace at Paris—on reasonable and generous terms. The President in October, 1970, presented an unprecedented five-point peace proposal for ending the war through negotiation. The enemy has refused to discuss these proposals. Nevertheless, our side will not abandon the search for a negotiated peace. This is the way we prefer to settle the war, because this is the way we could end it immediately.

The plight of prisoners of war throughout Indochina has been and continues to be one of the subjects most frequently raised by our negotiating team in Paris. Despite our persistent efforts, the other side has obstinately refused to provide complete and official lists of all prisoners or known dead; to permit impartial inspections of its camps; to release all seriously sick and wounded prisoners; and to accord the minimum mail privileges specified by the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention.

Through diplomatic channels, we have tried to bring the other side to improve the treatment of our men held prisoners and to undertake negotiation of their release. We have asked other governments to bring their influence to bear, and we have raised the issue in the U.N. At the same time, we have called repeatedly in the Paris Talks for humanitarian treatment of captured Americans, pointing out that this is a humanitarian matter.

I believe that because of the growing American and world public opinion pressure on the other side, some limited progress was realized during 1970. Two hundred and twenty prisoners of war, all but one of them in North Vietnam, were allowed to write to their families for the first time. Partial lists of prisoners were released by Hanoi sources.

The President's unprecedented peace proposal of October 7, 1970, called for both sides to release all prisoners of war immediately and unconditionally. This is an offer to exchange some ten prisoners held by the South Vietnamese for every one prisoner held by the other side. Despite the problems such a massive release would raise for the GVN, President Thieu gave his full support to this proposal. The inhumane reaction from the other side has been totally negative thus far.

Our goal, of course, remains the return as soon as possible of all of our men held captive and the fullest possible accounting for those missing. Some men now have been held for almost seven years, many for almost six. The families of over 1,100 men bear daily the anguish of not knowing whether their loved one is dead or alive.

Neither President Nixon nor I will consider Vietnamization to be completed until the Prisoner of War issue has been resolved.

As to general prospects for negotiations, I must reiterate that the information I received in Paris during my recent trip gave me no substantive reason to expect an early negotiated peace settlement. Nevertheless, our efforts to achieve peace through negotiations are continuing, since this is the quickest way to end the killing and to restore peace to that troubled area of the world.

As conceived from the beginning, Vietnamization is not just an alternative to negotiated settlement but also is a complement to and incentive for ongoing negotiations. We should not lose sight of the potential impact of Vietnamization on the negotiations. It may well be that the North Vietnamese have persisted in military action rather than negotiation because they believed that a war-weary U.S. would pull out in a disorderly manner. Therefore, they were determined to stay in the fight, preserve their infrastructure, avoid political compromise, and wait us out, hoping they could then prevail. The best chance to lead them to abandon hope of a military victory and to prefer negotiation is, therefore, to make it clear to the enemy that, even after the U.S. has left, they cannot prevail militarily because the South Vietnamese have the military ability and will to resist aggression.

PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

We have come a long way in the less than two years since President Nixon's watershed decision to begin Vietnamization. My recent trip confirmed for me that we are pursuing the proper objective in supporting the goal of self-determination in South Vietnam. In less than two years the Nixon Doctrine has taken form. Major progress has been made in strengthening the RVNAF. The non-military dimensions of RVN self-determination are being addressed in a progressive and productive way.

While the bonds of partnership among the Free World Southeast Asia nations are growing stronger, the direct U.S. involvement, especially in the form of manpower, is diminishing—exactly as planned.

But we should not delude ourselves. There is still much to be done. The job ahead for full success of the military aspects of Vietnamization remains a difficult one. The same is true for the economic facets of Vietnamization. The ties of partnership in the security field among Southeast Asian nations need to be strengthened to make optimum use of available resources. We must continue to focus on the intimate relationships among the military, economic, political and diplomatic facets of the Indochina situation as we press ceaselessly toward an end of American involvement in the war.

In summary, as I told the Senate Armed Services Committee on 27 January 1971, in reporting on my recent trip:

"Our objective for the future is that the United States will not need to rely on its own manpower to achieve the objective of self-determination for our friends and allies in Asia, and to thwart Communist aggression in that part of the world. Under the Nixon Doctrine, we have, we will maintain, and we will use as necessary sea and air resources to supplement the efforts and the armed forces of our friends and allies who are determined to resist aggression, as the Cambodians are valiantly trying to do.

". . . most of the leaders of Asian nations with whom I and members of my group talked, share this determination. They told us that with U.S. material assistance, such as that recently voted overwhelmingly by Congress for Cambodia, they want to do the defense job themselves to the maximum extent possible. I was heartened by their enthusiastic acceptance of the Nixon Doctrine in action, and I would simply say at this time that it is this spirit and determination on the part of our friends and allies that will form a crucial foundation of our Strategy of Realistic Deterrence for the 1970's."

C. TOTAL FORCE PLANNING AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ASSISTANCE

The challenging objectives of the Nixon Doctrine can be achieved as I reported to the Congress last year, only if we and our allies both contribute to their achievement.

Each nation must do its share to contribute what it can appropriately provide: manpower from many of our allies; technology, material, specialized skills from the United States. By furnishing the materiel and related training support essential to develop and maintain such forces, the International Security Assistance Program serves as a key instrument of the Nixon Doctrine. It is for these reasons that security assistance assumes new importance for initiatives in the

area of national security and foreign policy, through which the Administration seeks to reduce both the total cost of an adequate defense posture and our overseas involvement.

Many willing and potentially helpful friends and allies simply do not have the resources or technical capabilities to assume greater responsibility for their own defense. Unless we help them, the basic policy of diminishing the need for direct U.S. military involvement, without impairing Free World security, cannot be successful.

The better equipped our friends and allies are to provide for their own security, the more firm will be our own security. This is so because the probability of war and of U.S. involvement in war will be lowered.

An effective security assistance program can allow an increasing replacement of U.S. forces—particularly ground combat forces—with local forces. A vigorous and successful security assistance program can also help achieve a period of more meaningful negotiations and a less dangerous world environment as part of the program to attain our objectives: lasting peace and expanding freedom—that is our hope and that is our goal.

D. NEW INITIATIVES TO SUPPORT A STRATEGY OF REALISTIC DETERRENCE

The Strategy of Realistic Deterrence calls for new initiatives and new concepts to complement Total Force planning. Some of these initiatives will fall in areas where the U.S. bears the primary responsibility, while others will stem from closer integration of our planning with that of our friends and allies. Some may more properly be called new directions or redirections of effort, rather than initiatives. Regardless of what they may be called, we believe they are necessary—to modernize our forces, reshape them to future environments, and to provide for our security.

U.S. Force Planning Initiatives

The Free World relies on U.S. strategic forces as the cornerstone of its deterrent. As President Nixon has stated, our strategic force policy is one of sufficiency. In addition to our diplomatic initiative in SALT, we believe that it is appropriate to explore a range of new concepts for future strategic force planning. Depending on progress in SALT or the growth in the military threat, particularly from the Soviet Union, we may or may not need to implement some of these concepts. But I believe it is only prudent that they be examined now. I will discuss key examples of force planning in Chapter IV of this section of the Defense Report.

Another difficult area in planning our forces for the future is the range of potential crisis situations which may require positioning of general purpose forces. In the past, these forces have been designed primarily for sophisticated conventional theater warfare, although provisions were included for minor contingency and limited war conflict situations. We are investigating possible modifications to selected portions of our existing forces, both to enhance overall capabilities and to improve the responsiveness of our forces.

One major step we have taken is our new policy with respect to Reserve Forces. Members of the National Guard and Reserve, instead of draftees, will be the initial and primary source for augmentation of the active forces in any future emergency requiring a rapid and substantial expansion of the active forces.

Lower sustaining costs of non-active duty forces, as compared to the cost of maintaining large active duty forces, make possible a greater flexibility in planning the Total Force structure. This lower cost of non-active forces allows more force units to be provided for the same cost as an all-active force structure, or the same number of force units to be maintained for lesser cost. However, it also requires that the capability and mobilization readiness of Guard and Reserve units be promptly and effectively enhanced. We are taking steps to do so as I will elaborate later in this report.

Other instances of more efficient use of existing forces are being pursued by the Services. For example, the Army is planning to form and test a tri-capability (TRICAP) division at Fort Hood, Texas, with an armor, an airmobile, and an air cavalry combat brigade—to facilitate incorporation of these separate capabilities into one division. The Navy intends this year to test a "CV concept" for a dual ASW and attack aircraft capability aboard our carriers, while retaining the ability to operate either in a full ASW or a full strike mode as appropriate to the circumstances. This concept could increase significantly carrier-operating flexibility. The Air Force is proceeding with procurement of air-transportable "bare base" support sets to enhance their capability for rapid deployment of tactical air forces to austere bases.

These are a few examples of modifications to existing U.S. forces we are considering or implementing. Others are discussed in later sections, and will be amplified by the Services in their reports to Congress. We intend to continue examining and evaluating such programs, and the associated organizational structure for our military forces, with an objective of improving force capabilities, readiness, and responsiveness for the future. At the same time, we intend to pursue other new initiatives, both in the area of technology, and in planning with our allies.

U.S. Technology Base and Technological Initiatives

An adequate research and development, or technological effort remains a most crucial element of our overall defense program. In addressing technological requirements, it is important to distinguish between force levels, which basically establish the overall size of the annual defense budget, and the character and quality of the force, which is decided for future years by current RDT&E expenditures.

If it becomes necessary, we can mobilize the manpower and production potential of this country in a relatively short period of time. Everyone must understand that we cannot similarly improve overnight our technological base. This technological capability will only be available when needed if it is maintained, encouraged, and appreciated now as an essential national asset. Recent reductions in technological areas already have seriously affected our ability to sustain essential technological leadership.

It is not possible for the Department of Defense to provide for our security with a constant or falling level of U.S. R&D effort in the face of the expanding military research and development effort being pursued by the Soviet Union, an effort I will discuss in the next section. I do not know at this time what levels of research we will require by 1975 or by 1980; they will depend on what course the Soviets choose to follow. But I do know that for FY 1972 we must increase our technological effort, particularly as we reduce the size of our active military force.

More specifically, there are a number of areas in which we feel we must now move more rapidly than in the past. In each of these areas we are requesting increases in funding for FY 1972, and in several cases we are already requesting the use of emergency funds and reprogramming authority to accelerate effort in the remaining months of FY 1971.

Before highlighting these requests for an extra technological effort in FY 1972, it would be useful to examine why it is that with our current lower force and equipment levels we have chosen to increase our R&D effort in FY 1972 by some 12% over FY 1971. There are six major reasons for this increase:

1. To avoid the loss of technical superiority to the Soviet Union.

2. To reduce the number of instances—such as SPUTNIK in 1957—that we could expect to be surprised technologically by the Soviet Union in the next few years.

3. To create and maintain additional flexibility in our strategic deterrent forces.

4. To evolve the concepts and weapons necessary to preserve and enhance our ability to control the seas.

5. To improve the ability of our land and air forces to cope with rapidly improving Soviet forces.

6. To develop simpler and less expensive weapons to assist our allies and increase the efficiency of our own capabilities.

Maintaining technological leadership is also important because it will enable us to anticipate an opponent's developments from fragmentary intelligence and may help to design a prompt counter to these developments. And, of course, technological leadership is essential for a rapid response to unexpected operational requirements.

We recognize that these factors, even when considered together cannot enable us to determine the precise size of the R&D program required or this country's defense needs. But without a strong technology base, we would not be able to recognize or take advantage of new developments. Clearly, the objective of maintaining our technological leadership requires more than a minimum sustaining effort. Such an effort would, in fact, guarantee a loss of technological leadership.

Last fall, we conducted an intensive review of existing programs, management, and potential developments which might be pursued in the area of technology. From this review, we concluded that besides shifting emphasis on certain ongoing programs, we needed to embark on a path that would provide an array of new initiatives in our development efforts which could lead to new capabilities in our military programs.

I will mention some of the programs which we have developed or are developing. They will be discussed in greater detail by the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., and other witnesses when they appear before the Committee. Programs contained in the FY 1972 Defense Budget include initiatives in all major mission categories. We have identified and are requesting approximately $300 million in the FY 1972 Budget for research and development to pursue these other "initiative" programs which could provide us with improved capabilities in the future. I wish to emphasize that we have made no commitment to production of specific systems, but we feel it is essential to expand our on-going research and development effort in this way to preserve and expand our flexibility for future production should such systems be needed.

In the strategic area, we are exploring several concepts which will be discussed in a later chapter.

In our ability to control the seas and project our forces abroad, we are:

Pursuing a broad program in the area of ocean surveillance using manned aircraft, and surface and underwater sensor systems.

Improving the communication capability of our fleet by means of satellites and underwater sound communication systems.

Accelerating the development of surface to surface missile capability for our ships.

Investigating possible V/STOL aircraft configurations and missions applicable to the air capable ship (ACS) now in the conceptual stage of planning.

Accelerating development of very high speed ship capabilities by proceeding with

hydrofoil craft of increased size and speed for use as missile attack ships, and by commencing model testing and design competition for a multi-ton experimental R&D Surface Effect Ship.

In the area of land warfare, we are: Increasing our attention to the problems of the individual soldier in an effort to make him more effective, more mobile, and less vulnerable to both ground and air attack when operating in varied environments.

Developing more accurate missiles and artillery to support our tactical forces.

Proceeding to develop less vulnerable helicopters with better surveillance capability.

Increasing our efforts in the area of suppression of anti-aircraft fire and surface to air missile defenses.

Improving the accuracy and stand-off capability of aerial delivered munitions.

Increasing our efforts to provide our forces with the capability to locate and identify a wide range of hostile radar targets with sufficient confidence to attack and destroy them without subjecting our aircraft to the dangers inherent in visual target identification.

Force Planning With Our Allies

The concept of force planning with our allies is not new; it is our objective to revitalize and improve this important military contribution to Free World security.

In NATO planning the United States must fully and effectively pursue detailed and integrated long-range planning and actions—including research and development, procurement, training and operations—that are appropriate for a total-NATO force. Our recent efforts represent major steps in the direction of making sure that NATO forces indeed do constitute a realistic deterrent to Warsaw Pact aggression.

The NATO Ministerial meetings in Brussels last December were the most meaningful NATO conferences that I have attended, either as a Congressman or as Secretary of Defense. They evidenced a new spirit in NATO—one in which our Allies fully recognized the existing realities and resolved on their own to take more of the defense burden upon their own shoulders.

I believe that three items of particular significance emerged from these meetings. First, the Ministers approved the NATO AD–70 Study accomplished over the preceding six months. It highlighted the need for more conventional deterrence and pointed out specific inadequacies in existing NATO capabilities. There was a unanimous feeling that more must be done in the conventional field and that modern and sufficient NATO tactical and strategic capabilities must be maintained.

A second important area was that of detente. While my fellow Ministers reaffirmed the importance they attached to Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions, they noted that Warsaw Pact countries have not directly responded to past evidence of NATO interest for such reductions. Consequently, my colleagues understandably did not go beyond the previous Rome communique in their treatment of Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions.

A third important area, that of burden sharing, set precedents which constitute a significant first step toward more equitable sharing of the NATO defense burden. Ten European nations agreed among themselves to provide almost a billion dollars of additional expenditures over the next five years, divided about equally between improvements to their own forces and contributions to an additional infrastructure program for better communications and aircraft shelters. This is the most tangible evidence yet of European recognition that Europe must do more in its own behalf, and is also the first purely European endeavor of such importance in which the U.S. has played no direct role. It is the first important common move toward force improvement in the last 10–12 years. This demonstration of European awareness of the strategic, fiscal, manpower, and political realities and their determination to face them is good for both Europe and ourselves.

We are continuing our studies and planning to integrate more closely all the resources available within NATO, to improve our procedures for management and mobilization, and thereby enhance NATO's capabilities.

Other examples of closer cooperation include the modernization program for Korean armed forces, and of course, the entire Vietnamization program.

But there are additional steps we are taking or planning to improve both our own and allied capabilities. One area involves a more cooperative R&D effort. The Services have a number of bilateral and NATO cooperative R&D programs underway with our allies, although the amount of funds is small. We are planning to test and evaluate some foreign weapon systems for possible adoption during this fiscal year, and plan to do even more in this area in FY 1972. In taking these steps, we desire to eliminate any unnecessary duplication in weapons systems research and development activity. To the degree that such duplication can be reduced, our overall force capabilities can be improved at lower cost.

Although this plan is not without disadvantages, it has been carefully weighed. We believe that it is in our mutual interest to proceed along these lines with our allies.

Similarly, we believe that our R&D program has a definite role to play in implementing the Nixon Doctrine. Suitable military assistance to our allies is frequently limited both by the items in the U.S. inventory, which may not necessarily be appropriate to the situation at hand and, in some cases, by a lack of knowledge of the technical and economic problems facing these countries. There are several areas where appropriate effort can help insure that suitable equipment or assistance commensurate with allied capabilities is provided.

At the present time, the International Fighter, for which we have included $128 million in the FY 1972 budget, is the only major development project specifically oriented toward support of the Nixon Doctrine. However, there are several smaller R&D efforts underway. One is the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) program of "tailored equipment" for less developed allies. This program will develop and/or test and evaluate a broad variety of more simple, less expensive and more maintainable equipments to meet the needs of these allies. Examples being considered are light attack aircraft, fast patrol boats, ambush protection for vehicles and low maintenance small arms.

Since these types of problems often fall outside normal Service responsibilities, we plan to have ARPA task the Services to perform specific, pertinent tasks using ARPA funds. In certain instances, the Services would be free to undertake projects on their own initiative. It is expected that this arrangement will remove such efforts from funding competition with regular Service programs, yet retain Service flexibility to support important programs which might have multiple applications. We intend to start this effort on a modest basis in FY 1972.

This new program will consolidate and expand on current projects to include those supporting our most important allies. Our goal is to provide equipment to reduce dependence upon U.S. forces, select equipment which offers an optimized military capability for the funds available, and provide options for more sophisticated U.S. general purpose equipment as appropriate and commensurate with the capabilities of a friend or ally.

HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT HAS NOT DETERRED JOBS FOR BRECKINRIDGE JOB CORPS CENTER TRAINEES

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today's tight economic conditions and high unemployment rates affect us all, but they seem to place additional hardships upon the Nation's disadvantaged. Often unskilled and untrained for employment, they are pushed further and further down the economic ladder.

Their economic burdens are great, but often the psychological pressures are greater, especially for the young among the poor.

Without a job—or a chance to be trained for one—these young people look to a bleak tomorrow.

Fortunately, business and industry have begun to recognize the needs of the poor for training and jobs. One company which has been a leader in this area is Graflex, a division of Singer Co., located in Rochester, N.Y.

Graflex is the contractor of the Breckinridge Job Corps Center in Breckinridge, Ky. The center was established in 1965. Since Graflex assumed the contractorship in 1966, more than 4,000 disadvantaged youths have completed the training program.

In graduation ceremonies at the center recently, Hobard Butler, Job Corps official cited the Breckinridge center as an example of what such training programs can do. He said that Job Corps graduates are better qualified to hold jobs than ordinary high school graduates because of specialized training given to them in how to obtain and hold jobs.

During the ceremonies, 90 trainees were graduated. About 40 percent also obtained a general education diploma, equivalent to a high school diploma.

The cost of training one of these graduates during the average 9.4-month period was approximately $3,700 and the cost and effort appear to be paying off. Many past graduates hold well-paying jobs. Almost 100 percent of the 90 trainees in last month's graduating class have been placed in jobs—this despite the economic conditions which prevail today.

The inspiration for Graflex, Singer, to assume the contractorship of Breckinridge came from Gaylord C. Whitaker, chairman of the board, of Graflex. His enthusiasm, interest and dedication and that of his staff have helped to make the Job Corps center the success it is.

A recognition of the Breckinridge Job Corps center appeared in the article, "Panel Discusses Industry's Hiring of

Disadvantaged Youth," in the Evansville, Ind., Courier, November 13, 1970.

I would like to share this article with my colleagues in the House, not only because it cites the outstanding work being done at the center but also because it discusses the roles of management and union in hiring as well as training the disadvantaged.

We turn to such forward-looking companies as Grafiex, which, working with Federal agencies, help alleviate the job plight—so closely tied to the economic plight—of the disadvantaged.

The Courier article follows:

PANEL DISCUSSES INDUSTRY'S HIRING OF DISADVANTAGED YOUTH

MORGANFIELD, KY.—A firm's commitment to hire disadvantaged youths for industrial jobs has to be an all or nothing decision, Wayne Collins, an equal opportunity specialist for Bucyrus-Erie, said here Thursday.

Collins, speaking as a member of the three-man panel during Business and Industry Days at the Breckinridge Job Corps Center, emphasized that concept, "Management must take steps to hire disadvantaged workers only after everyone in the firm from president to co-workers are sold on the idea. Halfway measures in approaching the problem can only lead to failure."

Collins, co-ordinator for the affirmative action program for equal employment opportunity for the Evansville firm, presented in detail some of the special requirements that must be extended to the disadvantaged by employers, ranging from a "willingness to make salary advances so he can afford to eat and get to work before the first pay check is due" to "monthly orientation sessions to acquaint him with company rules and his place in the mainstream of the company's operations.

EMPHASIZE POTENTIAL

"Emphasize whenever possible his potential for progressing within the company as he merits it," said Collins.

Joseph Powell, fieldman for the Appalachian Council Job Corps project of the AFL-CIO, Huntington, W. Va., stressed the increasing role of unions in the recruitment and placement of disadvantaged persons in industry.

He described the union interest in Appalachia as "formed originally to push programs to move the area in a new direction"—a direction he described as from an impoverished existence toward a more viable community.

"Out of this activity, there has grown the AFL-CIO involvement in recruiting and placement of disadvantaged workers," he said.

Powell said in a three-year period the union has provided 11,000 job slots for the disadvantaged of Appalachia and has filled more than 3,000 of those jobs themselves.

He mentioned that the labor movement is becoming increasingly involved in plans for employing the disadvantaged, stressing union involvement in the social and political aspects of employment programs.

TRAINING PROGRAMS

Hobard Butler, Washington, D.C., an official of the Job Corps placement division, emphasized the training programs the trainees are exposed to at centers such as Breckinridge.

He asserted that Job Corps graduates are better qualified to hold jobs than the ordinary high school graduate because of specialized training given to them in how to obtain and to hold jobs. He challenged industrial leaders to rely less on diplomas and to lean toward giving the disadvantaged the opportunity to prove themselves capable of holding jobs.

90 TRAINEES GRADUATE

In graduation ceremonies following the panel discussion, 90 trainees were graduated in ceremonies at the center. About 40 per cent of them had also obtained a General Education Diploma, equivalent to a high school diploma.

Center Director James Fornear estimated the cost of training the graduates during an average 9.4 month period at $3,750 each.

A SOBERING REMINDER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the migration of farm families away from the countryside continues to be a very serious matter, as Ray Stougaard recently reminded his editorial readers in the Fairmont Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn. His sobering reminder is one that needs constantly to be borne in mind here in the Congress as we struggle to find the proper ways to bring new industry to rural America and as we attempt to reverse the population tide flowing to overcrowded cities. I included the entire editorial at this point in my remarks:

ANOTHER REMINDER

(By Ray Stougaard)

Abandoned farmhouses, groves without any buildings, or perhaps just a hand water pump sticking up in the middle of a plowed field . . . they are the visible signs of what is happening in The Sentinel area.

Exactly what is happening was spelled out in a state report on the loss of farms in five Minnesota counties in this area over the past 10 years.

Some 2,100 farms are no more. The land has been absorbed by other farms and the families who once made their livelihood in farming are gone.

It's interesting to note that the loss of farms and their families (at 3 plus per family) account for more than two-thirds of the total population lost (9,600) in the area since 1960.

The rate of farms lost is three times greater than the state average which is understandable because farming is our business. In other parts of the state, such as in the north woods country, it is not.

The sobering aspect of all this is that the loss of farms continues at the same rate as it has in the past 10 years.

This again re-enforces the necessity of creating more jobs in town for our farming people as they leave the land.

Nothing new about that but we must never let ourselves forget that our future lies in industrial development if we are to survive.

A GOOD PLACE TO BE "EXPECTING"

Of all the many reasons why rural living is tops, John Weber, editor-publisher of the Murray County Herald, Slayton, Minn., has added yet another: It is a good place to be "expecting." I include his entire editorial at this point in my remarks:

A GOOD PLACE TO BE "EXPECTING"—

Rural Minnesota in general and Murray county in particular seems to be a good place to live if you are expecting an addition to the family and don't particularly desire going broke financially in the process. This is the conclusion one would reach after reading a feature story on the cost of a baby in Sunday's Minneapolis Tribune.

Total costs to the parents of a newborn child, of course, are very difficult to compute. The Tribune, however, did an excellent job and also took a lot of intangibles, such as gifts, into consideration. But no matter how you cut it, the expense of parenthood in the metropolitan area is astronomical in comparison to what it is today at, for example, Murray County Memorial Hospital while using local physicians.

As close as we could figure it, hospitalization charges in our area are about half of what it would cost in the metropolitan area. Physicians charges, judging from the figures we were able to compile, are even lower on a percentage basis. According to the breakdown in the Tribune, the basic fee for delivery of a baby in the city hits $225.00. Here, the delivery charge is about $60.00. Prenatal care here hits an estimated $30.00, bringing the total charge for the physician to about $90.00.

A circumcision, in the Tribune's example case, ran $25.00 with an added set-up charge of $22.50. Here the whole procedure would go about $15.00-$10.00 medical and $5.00 set-up. Clothing, bedding and other miscellaneous expenses we assume would be only slightly higher in the metro area.

The study seemed to indicate that medical expenses in the metropolitan areas are increasing at a faster rate than any other segment of our cost of living. Undoubtedly they are also up in the country—but not at a rate that even compares with the city. Doctors in the metropolitan area, in our judgment, are in the process of asking for further inroads by proponents of socialized medicine. In the countryside, rates are substantially lower and the medics still manage to live quite comfortably.

We aren't as well acquainted in the rural communities of the state, but it appears that expectant parents can get the job done much more economically here—and still get the same fine, professional attention that they would expect in the highly populated areas.

MINNESOTA EDITOR PLUGS REVENUE-SHARING

Mr. Speaker, Thomas Kuechenmeister, publisher of the Wells Mirror, Wells, Minn., has written a strong editorial endorsing President Nixon's revenue-sharing proposal. It reflects the views of a number of citizens in our State, and I insert Mr. Kuechenmeister's editorial at this point in my remarks for the benefit of our congressional colleagues:

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING

One of the major issues confronting the 92nd Congress is federal revenue sharing—and, hopefully, this might be the year when such a program becomes a reality.

President Nixon, in his State of the Union address, proposed a federal revenue sharing plan calling for $5 billion in new and unrestricted funds to be used by state and local governments with no strings attached, and $11 billion more (almost all of it coming from existing categorical aid programs) to be used for six broad purposes—urban development, rural development, education, transportation, job training and law enforcement. Within these six categories, the states and local governments would have free rein to spend the money as they see fit.

Many other federal revenue sharing plans have been proposed. Most call for a sharing of the revenue from federal income taxes with state and local governments, permitting those governments to decide how the money will be spent, without interference from the federal government. But until the last year

or so, the idea has never received really serious consideration.

Now revenue sharing is an idea whose time has come. State and local governments must find new sources of fiscal assistance to alleviate their financial distress. Property taxes have increased out of all proportion; along with state sales and income taxes, they can no longer produce the revenues needed to meet the expanded costs of state and local government. The federal income tax—with its efficiency of collection, its broad base covering all those receiving income, and its automatic increase with the growth of the economy—is the greatest source of revenue in the nation. Some of that revenue must directly be returned to the state and local governments which shoulder almost all the responsibility for the domestic affairs of this country.

Because of its revenue superiority and its doling of money to states, cities, counties and school districts through categorical grants, the federal government has become steadily more powerful. A program of federal revenue sharing will return some of that power to the states and local government. By bringing these funds closer to home the taxpayers will have a greater voice in determining how their money will be spent.

In the last Congress, some 59 federal revenue sharing bills were introduced, but no committee hearings were held by the House Ways and Means Committee or the Senate Finance Committee on any of them. This congressional reluctance to consider a federal revenue sharing bill may very well carry over to our present group of lawmakers, even though a recent Gallup Poll indicates 77 percent of the people favor such a program. Relinquishing of some federal power to the states and local governments is implicit in federal revenue sharing, and this does not easily meet with congressional approval. The absence of a budgetary surplus is another reason why economy-minded congressmen may oppose the program, as well as a strong politically motivated hesitance to increase income taxes, if necessary.

But common sense tells us that "no tax increase" is not one of the alternatives presented to lawmakers this year either at the federal level or in the state as Governor Anderson made clear in his budget message last week. Whether at the state or federal level, more fiscal resources must be found. And it would seem that federal revenue sharing, is the most just and favorable choice to be made.

RUSSELL FOUGHT FOR HIS IDEA OF VILIFICATION OF SOUTHERN LIFE

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the outstanding character and natural leadership of the late Senator Richard Brevard Russell, of Georgia.

However, I believe that the First District newspaper, the Darien News, recently expressed so well a commentary on Senator Russell's personal and great defense of the South and I commend it to your attention:

RUSSELL FOUGHT FOR HIS IDEA OF VILIFICATION OF SOUTHERN LIFE

(By Edward H. Sims)

The recent death of Richard Russell of Georgia, dean of the Senate, should not pass without a commentary on his effort in the Senate for so many years—to defend the South and its way of life, a South which he believed too often vilified by a prejudiced nation. He once said: "The feeling against the South has become a national disgrace."

What the Senator meant was not that racial conditions in the South were perfect, but that they were as good as in other sections of the country and that the South was being used by politicians of all sections as a whipping boy, for votes, while much of the same way of life was hypocritically carried on outside the South.

That vilification might have been justified in a way by various events, but not more so than for other sections, which received no such political abuse. The Senator also resented that no Senator or statesman from the South had a chance to be President. As he saw it, prejudice against the South was the main reason—prejudice on the racial issue, much of which he found hypocritical.

He believed the two major races got on well in the South, generally speaking, and that there was more genuine friendship and love between them in the South than anywhere else in the nation, that the two races had learned to live together.

He acknowledged that change was due, that every American is due the same opportunity, education and rights of every other. But he fought all his life against measures aimed only at the South, and those which he considered unconstitutional, some of which he considered political pitches for votes. But when a law was passed he asked all to obey it.

If indeed Senator Russell was not completely right in his assessment, it must nevertheless be said that all of the Senate's recent members, including Harry Truman, Lyndon Johnson, John Kennedy, and Mike Mansfield, etc. acknowledged that he was better informed on the major issues of the day, and on the rules of the Senate, than any other man. They conceded he would have been President had he come from a state outside the South. All described him as a giant among giants in the Senate.

This being true, it's impossible to dismiss his defense of the South and its way of life as having no merit and no truth.

Far from being a reactionary, Russell was liberal in many fields. He said once he was a liberal in bad times and a conservative in good years and his voting record substantiated that statement.

This writer years ago visited Russell's office almost daily, as a young Washington correspondent. While he was far more important in the Senate than some of the other Senators on the daily call list, he would almost invariably make himself available for questioning if in. Others were often hard to corner, and if cornered would avoid answers to delicate questions. But Russell was a simple and open man, as his modest biography showed, which only mentioned that he was a Democrat from Winder, Georgia.

STOPPING TERRORIST BOMBINGS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, twice already in the month of March, powerful explosions have been set off by certain unknown individuals or organizations. On March 1, the west wing of the Capitol was rocked by an explosion causing an estimated $300,000 worth of damage. Luckily, however, no one was injured.

That was not the case yesterday though in St. Louis, when two bombs exploded within 15 minutes of each other in an ROTC building. The second explosion injured 14 policemen and firemen who had come to the scene to investigate the first explosion. St. Louis police officials suspect that the 15 minute interval was timed to catch firemen and law enforcement officials investigating the first explosion with a lethal blast.

Mr. Speaker, these kinds of incidents are deplorable; they strike at the very heart of our free society. Criminal bombings must be stopped and must be stopped soon before more Americans become unwitting victims.

In the last Congress, I introduced legislation greatly strengthening existing Federal laws for the illegal use of explosives. In addition to strengthening existing penalties I also proposed invoking the death penalty for illegal bombings resulting in innocent deaths. I was most gratified that this proposal, in substantial measure, is now public law. And I urge officials in the Justice Department to use their new tools unhesitantly.

Mr. Speaker, perpetrators of criminal bombings must not be coddled. Those who commit senseless acts of wanton destruction under the guise of political idealism must be dealt with and punished for the common criminals they are.

VIETNAM WAR

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has shaken our institutions, clouded our national goals, and divided our people.

However, concerning one tragic consequence of this war there seems to be little disagreement. The grief and sadness that draws a family together which has one of its members held as a prisoner of war in Vietnam has also drawn this Nation together in outrage and determination to seek their release.

I am proud and honored to bring to the attention of my colleagues the commendable efforts of over 1,000 students at Farmington High School who, at the urging of their student council, have been drafting letters to be forwarded later this month with letters written by other Connecticut teenagers to Xuan Thy Thuy, the North Vietnam Delegate at the Paris Peace Talks.

The following is an article which appeared in the Hartford Courant about the good works these young people are performing in behalf of those unfortunate Americans held prisoner in Vietnam:

TEENAGERS ASK RELEASE OF POW'S

(By Anne Demeusy)

FARMINGTON.—1,500 men do count.

This is the opening line of a letter to Xuan Thuy, the North Vietnam delegate of the Paris Peace Talks, referring to the estimated number of American Prisoners of War in Vietnam.

It is written by a Farmington High School student, Elaine Buchardt, and is typical of letters being drafted this week by the school's more than 1,000 students.

The letters will be bundled up later this month and sent to a central mailing point in Connecticut to be forwarded with letters written by other Connecticut teenagers.

Elaine's letter tells Thuy that "even one man counts." "This is my plea, and I'm sure our whole country's plea, to your country, to release all the sick and wounded prisoners. You seem not to care that each prisoner is a person. You only care about numbers. It's just another little game of war. If you refuse to release the sick and wounded, you can at least send us all the names of all the prisoners so their families will know they are alive.

* * * * *

The letter-writing drive was launched by the school's Student Council after a visit from a former student attending a naval academy, who urged the students to write.

Students are gathering in groups in the cafeteria to hand write the letters, and many have written up to a half-dozen.

The letter drive will close Friday.

THE MOVE TOWARD METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT IN MINNESOTA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Minneapolis-St. Paul area is making major progress in the coordination of social, physical, and economic growth on an areawide basis.

A unique agency, known as the Metropolitan Council, has been created to help guide the development of this seven-county metropolitan region.

The following article from the New York Times reports on the development of the Metro Council since its establishment by the Minnesota Legislature in 1967:

MINNEAPOLIS AREA COUNCIL IS EMERGING AS A PIONEER IN STRONG REGIONAL GOVERNMENT

(By John Herbers)

ST. PAUL, February 6.—Jet planes and wild ducks have been competing for landing space at a lake near here, and the ducks have been winning.

The Metropolitan Council of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area has twice blocked plans of the area's Airport Commission to build a major new jetport at Ham Lake, 20 miles north of the Minneapolis business district. One of the reasons was testimony that the construction would do ecological damage to the area, including the disruption of a flyway for ducks.

This victory for conservationists is the work of a new level of government that has important authority over the vast proliferation of local governments in the seven-country area of almost 2 million people.

The Metro Council, as it is called, was created by the Minnesota Legislature to plan and oversee the orderly growth of the area, which contains 320 separate but overlapping governmental units, each with taxing jurisdiction.

COORDINATING POWER

This Balkanization of government is typical of metropolitan areas across the country and has contributed greatly to the urban chaos and paralysis that characterizes most of them.

The council, however, is unique in that it has taxing authority and the power to coordinate the over-all social, physical and economic development in the 3,000-square-mile area. When it put bonds up for sale recently, the bond buyers, accustomed to county and municipal governments, were somewhat startled to be dealing with a new government entity.

Nevertheless, the council is at the forefront of a national movement to form councils that sit over metropolitan areas on growth, planning and coordination. Most of these have very little power. They are generally voluntary organizations composed of elected members of the local governments covered by the council.

In some cities, such as Indianapolis, Nashville and Jacksonville, Fla., there has been consolidation of county and municipal governments, but this has occurred rarely and in comparatively uncomplicated geographical situations. Such mergers are expected to become increasingly difficult as metropolitan areas grow.

The Minneapolis-St. Paul initiative was intended to do what was politically feasible: Give the council authority over functions that affect the entire area—sewage disposal and highways, for example—and leave to the local governments those functions that could better be fragmented—such as schools and police.

In 1960, most of the population in this metropolitan area, as defined by the Census Bureau, lived in the cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. But by 1970, Minneapolis has declined by 10 percent, to 432,000; St. Paul had declined by 1.5 percent, to 309,000, but the area outside the central cities had increased 55 percent, to 1,064,423.

FRAGMENTED AUTHORITY

Most of the population, then, fell under the jurisdiction of 26 incorporated cities, 105 incorporated villages, 77 independent school districts, 19 special service districts and the county governments.

During the decade of the sixties, a number of problems became acute. Deterioration of the central cities worsened as tax revenues declined; uncontrolled sewage and solid waste disposal began to pollute the waters; the public transportation system was inadequate, and land use for both parks and industry was chaotic.

The municipalities, which were particularly hard hit by the crisis, joined civic and business interests in pressing for a governmental instrument that could deal effectively with the most pressing of the area-wide problems.

In 1967, the Legislature created the council and two years later, after it had geared up for action, gave it additional powers. It is now engaged in several controversial endeavors designed to bring order and rational growth to the area.

The council is composed of 15 members appointed by the Governor. The chairman is James L. Hetland Jr., a 44-year-old law professor at the University of Minnesota. Mr. Hetland, a liberal Republican, presides over sessions in a low-keyed, scholarly manner and presents himself more as a manager than a political leader.

Other members, who represent districts based on population, are a cross-section of the area's civic and business leadership. Theirs is a part-time office, but some of them spend full time at it, roaming their districts to talk with constituents.

One of the powers of the council is to review the plans of independent, single-service agencies in the area and suspend them if it finds them inconsistent with its plan for orderly, controlled growth. This is what happened with the plan for the airport, which the Metropolitan Airport Commission was determined to establish at Ham Lake.

Efforts are now under way to find a new site for the airport, and the council will have the authority to prescribe the conditions under which it is to be built.

The council has independent taxing authority and is now levying seven-tenths of a mill tax on all real property in the area. This produces more than $1-million a year, which, along with Federal funds, pays staff and other expenses.

SEWAGE CONTROL

It has taken on several new area-wide functions. For example, it builds and controls, through subordinate organizations, sewage treatment plants in the metropolitan area. Its bonds finance construction.

"We don't try to operate the system ourselves," said Mr. Hetland, "because we don't want to get bogged down in operating detail. But we keep budgetary and planning control."

The council also has broad authority in solid waste disposal, highway location and regulations, creation of parks, transit and air pollution. It handles Federal anticrime funds going to the police and other agencies and reviews all other Federal funds for the area to see if the expenditure fits the council's over-all plan.

All zoning changes and comprehensive plans of towns and municipalities are reviewed by the council, which has the power to stop them for 60 days and hold hearings on them. At the end of 60 days, the city involved may put the plan into effect if public pressure has not resulted in a change.

The council is seeking through the Legislature to set up an area-wide housing board to provide more housing for low and moderate income families. It is seeking a method to equalize the crazy-quilt pattern of taxes in the area.

The council was created with the consent of most of the local governments under its jurisdiction. Because of this, its future and ability to acquire the full powers its sponsors feel it needs is uncertain. No one expected it to replace the multiplicity of local governments.

But what seems to be evolving here is a two-level form of government recently recommended by the Committee on Economic Development, with the Metro Council in charge of such things as the environment and growth patterns, and the towns and neighborhoods running such institutions as the schools and social services that profit by decentralization.

MY GOD, THEY BOMBED MY CAPITOL

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Arlington, Va., News on its front page took a personal view of the bombing of the Capitol. The writer was Ed Alley, a former UPI reporter who covered the Hill for a number of years. I think his reaction—"My God, They Bombed My Capitol"—says it very well indeed. I commend the article to my colleagues:

MY GOD, THEY BOMBED MY CAPITOL

(By Ed Alley)

I'm just plain mad. No, maybe hurt is a better word. They—somebody—something—bombed MY Capitol. Not only as an American do I have a special fondness—an unexplainable feeling for—My Capitol. It is, also because of my closeness there over a span of

many years that makes it a real symbol. I must confess that I have never ceased to get a tingle as I ride into Washington and My building looms in view. I don't ever want to lose that tingle. It is something that's between the Capitol and yours truly. It's special. I cried—long and hard—when they told me I had to retire from it. I've never gotten over that void the doctor's decision caused. I really don't want to, though. It's just between us—the Capitol and me—yes—something special. And then somebody—something comes along and tried to hurt my friend—and they hurt me too.

Perhaps President Nixon said it best when he called the bombing "a shocking act of violence." Or Senator Mike Mansfield referring to the disgrace as a "sacrilege." I agree, too, with President Nixon's simple but ever-so-true statement that "the Capitol is a building that belongs to all Americans and symbolizes a form of government that has provided a means of peaceful change."

I'm happy to share MY building with all Americans—as long as they feel like I do about her. I've seen them come, too, from all stages of our life here in these United States over the years—proud to see her—to share with her that special meaning you can only know when you are part of her. I know that feeling and I'm only sorry it didn't rub off on the parties who tried to hurt her. Had they known the Capitol like I know her, nobody would ever bomb her. They couldn't—for they'd be hurting themselves. Just like I was hurt when I heard about it in the wee hours. Truly those stark words on the radio lost me a piece of my heart. I just couldn't help it. I hope, you, too, as Americans will understand.

BAN STRIP MINING

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, last week, the West Virginia State Senate voted to ban all strip mining in 36 of the State's 55 counties for the next year. The bill now goes to the West Virginia House of Delegates where its chances of passage are considered to be good.

As one who supports a Federal ban on strip mining, I find West Virginia's action heartening and most welcome.

West Virginia's efforts to ban strip mining have had the solid support of their Secretary of State, John D. Rockefeller IV. In a speech last December, Mr. Rockefeller explained the classic dilemma facing his State:

West Virginia needs both its job opportunities and its natural beauty. State policy should try to preserve both. In this case, however, I see no way to do that. I am convinced—reluctantly but strongly—that strip mining of coal in West Virginia must be prohibited by law, completely and forever.

In that statement, and a later address before the Charleston Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Rockefeller talks frankly about the pros and cons of strip mining, and the effects a total ban would have on the State.

West Virginia has taken a courageous first step in moving toward a partial ban on the strip mining of coal. But she needs the support of the Federal Government. And Congress can now provide that by enacting a bill, introduced by Congressman KEN HECHLER of West Virginia to ban the strip mining of coal throughout the country.

I commend Mr. Rockefeller's speeches to my colleagues, and that they be printed at this point in the RECORD:

STATEMENT BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, IV

In late summer I set out to assess as thoroughly and reasonably as possible the effects of continued strip mining of coal in West Virginia. My purpose was to develop a position on strip mining for this session of the Legislature.

I spent hundreds of hours making a variety of field trips—by car, on foot, and by helicopter. I went to strip mining operations both north and south of the Kanawha River. I listened to the views of operators, conservation groups, unions, state government officials, Federal and State reclamation people, Corps of Engineer experts, water experts, and soil experts. I read the literature, studied our laws and other states' laws, did research on the economic and job significance of the industry. I saw the new and the old—the bad and the better.

I considered the difference between the northern coal industry and the southern; the possibilities of reclamation research; the consequences of tightening the laws or of leaving the laws alone, of reducing the slope levels to 25 or 20 degrees, and of abolishing strip mining altogether.

I saw the reclamation of operators who care, and the work of those who don't.

The dilemma is a classic one: West Virginia needs both its job opportunities and its natural beauty. State policy should try to preserve both. In this case, however, I see no way to do that. I am convinced—reluctantly but strongly—that strip mining of coal in West Virginia must be prohibited by law, completely and forever. And I will work for that statutory prohibition in the coming session of the Legislature.

Clearly, the industry has tried to do a better job since the 1967 strip-mining law They have worked on seeding spoil banks, sloping benches, planting, water impoundments, and covering toxic materials. I saw a few operators who had been conscientious and somewhat successful. I saw many more operations that were neither conscientious nor successful.

Even the best efforts fell short of preventing slides, acid drainage and other stream pollution. And I saw no solution to the most glaring problem of all—the highwall. This is the fatal flaw of reclamation. The highwall is the signature of the strip miner. Wherever he goes, he leaves it there. Bleak rock circles, often two or three tiered and semi-permanent, shatters the contoured beauty of our hills. The effect is devastating and humiliating.

Frankly, I think of those highways as a cancer—spreading out from hill to hill, and on and on, into more and more areas. Why should Grant, Raleigh and Upshur Counties, for example, all with ample strip coal reserves and quiet scenic landscapes, fall prey to this cancer?

Our state's natural beauty is a great resource now, and will become more so. But it is a fragile beauty, highly personal, easily destroyed, and a beauty that depends on space and isolation and mood. In other words, a frontier beauty.

We still have it, but we are losing it. The highwall is like a knife slash through a painting—you can patch it up, but somehow it is always there, and the beauty and mood, the closeness, are never the same again.

The industry says it needs time to research. I say it is too late for that. The damage to large sections of our state is already beyond repair. Research, and the time for the results of research to become clear, would take four or five years.

There is a special urgency to act now. The energy crisis has made the demand for coal so great that the next few years will see a fury of stripping. Huge new equipment has been developed to speeed the job.

Too much of West Virginia is already a tangle of ugly highwalls and eroded spoilbanks. The damage is grotesque.

Despite the efforts of the Reclamation Division, I am convinced stronger enforcement is not the answer.

Our enforcement history in West Virginia has not been a distinguished one, and there is no reason to rely on an adequate change of pattern and budgeting now. In any event, the Reclamation Division will be needed to work on the tens of thousands of acres of presently unreclaimed strip-mined land.

I am deeply concerned about the number of jobs—both direct and indirect—involved in prohibiting strip mining. But I might note that one reason stripping is so profitable is that it has a low employment factor relative to deep mining. One man stripping can do what two or three men can do deep mining. Therefore, if strip mining is abolished, thus forcing an even greater investment of capital and men into deep mining, the employment picture in West Virginia will soon improve.

Even the immediate labor impact should not be insuperable. Only one-half of one percent of the work force in West Virginia is engaged in stripping. The bulk of these men are highly skilled electricians, mechanics, and heavy equipment operators whose services are definitely marketable. Nearly all of these men will be able to find good work. Services and businesses dependent on strip mining may not be able to adjust as well and as quickly: Nevertheless, the public interest must assert itself at some point. It rarely has in West Virginia.

It is argued that America faces an energy crisis and that strip mining is part of West Virginia's obligation toward meeting the national demand for coal. In the first place, stripped coal is only about 14% of our coal production. Secondly, it is coal mined at too great a cost to West Virginia.

Neither America nor West Virginia will always be able to have it both ways—all the energy they want and all the beauty and tranquility they want. It isn't often, particularly in West Virginia, that anything as intangible and basic as beauty and the quality of life can stand their ground against economic and political interests. But in this case, the political process must function in behalf of this and future generations, in order that they may have beauty and tranquility. And, in the process, we may give encouragement to other states, such as Kentucky, Ohio and Wyoming.

One of the fallacies of our state's environmental efforts became clear to me as I studied the strip mining problem—that oil and was well sites and deep-mining sites, as well as our own state highway building efforts, show a basic disregard for the responsibility of reclamation. Some of the worst highwalls and spoilbanks in the state are direct results of our road-building program.

Strip mining, however, is the problem with first priority. The constitutionality of a statute prohibiting strip mining may be questioned, either in its general scope or as it applies to a particular landowner or operator. The constitutional issues ultimately may may have to be decided by the courts. I'm not a lawyer, but to me this is obvious: Each citizen loses each time any of our hills is permanently scarred and disfigured by strip mining. The loss diminishes the state as a whole; stream pollution and sedimentation are specific losses.

Most important, such damage limits future alternatives for our state. We become

less attractive to industry, to tourists, to retaining our own citizens.

For all these reasons, I will strongly support legislation at this upcoming session to end strip mining.

I would like to see such legislation take effect upon passage, but a certain winding-down period—perhaps six months—is probably necessary. Displaced workers must have time to find new jobs. Operators have major capital investments in equipment and heavy machinery. Power plants utilizing strip coal must find other fuel supplies.

In closing, I feel it is fitting, and a matter of pride, that West Virginia, a state most richly blessed by natural beauty, and a state most cruelly devastated by strip mining operations, take the lead in historic environmental legislation.

I sincerely believe the most responsible, the most significant, and the most generous contribution this 60th Legislature can make to all our people is to abolish strip mining.

STATEMENT BY JAY ROCKEFELLER FOR PUBLIC MEETING ON SURFACE MINING

I want to thank the Committee of 100 and the Chamber for providing this forum today.

Both the Chamber and the Committee have a common purpose: to help our region and our state to grow and to prosper. And that is why you are such an appropriate audience for this discussion.

Three weeks ago, I said at a press conference that I had come to a reluctant decision—that I feel that strip mining in West Virginia must end if we are to maintain and develop both the environment and the economy to grow and prosper in the future.

My position disappointed some people, and it angered some. No one wants to propose legislation that might cut down on some jobs, particularly in West Virginia.

I have often said, and I sincerely mean, that if there is any one contribution I could make to West Virginia, it would be to make our state more attractive to industry. To create jobs.

That remains my goal and my commitment.

My aim this afternoon is to convince you that my position on surface mining is not paradoxical to that commitment—indeed that abolition is necessary to that growth and full-range development.

When I made my statement three weeks ago, I dwelled at some length on my anguish at what strip mining does to the beauty of our state. The aesthetic and ecological theme is not central to what I will concentrate on here today, but it is a basic theme. Our mountains and valleys, our forests and streams, are extraordinary. No state is as richly blessed in scenic splendor as West Virginia.

In years to come, as the *shortage* of open land grows more and more serious, all this tranquil beauty, if we can preserve it, will have even greater value than today.

But I'm not here to make that case today. There's another question many of you have told me you are concerned about. And that is the impact abolition will have on jobs and economy.

That is my concern, too, and has been from the beginning. It may surprise you to know that the deeper one delves into the implications of this, the greater the case is made for abolition.

So even though my private office looks like the M–G–M studios, with hundreds of slides and films showing the destructive effect of strip mining since the '67 law, and while I have letters from citizens around our state whose homes and water supplies have been endangered by strip operations since the '67 law, I'll spare you slide shows, movies and letters—and outline as quietly and logically as I can the economics of this prohibition, and what I am convinced it will mean to West Virginia in the way of jobs, present and future.

Let's talk first about the economy, then get specific about jobs.

The economy of West Virginia rests on three major industries: coal, chemicals, and steel.

The most important human characteristic about the economy is that for the first time in 30 years personal income in West Virginia is going up faster than the national rate.

Now, what does that mean?

To get an answer to that question, we are all fortunate that we can turn to a man who is one of the outstanding economists in this country, a West Virginian, who in 1970 published the most thorough analysis of the state's economy that has ever been done. He's internationally regarded. As a matter of fact, when I tried to reach him about this he was in Geneva—he had been invited there by the United Nations to participate in a confernce on economic development. I'm speaking of Dr. William H. Miernyk of West Virginia University.

Dr. Miernyk's evaluation of our economy and the impact of strip mining, begins with that interesting note I just mentioned:

That for the first time in 30 years personal income is going up in West Virginia faster than the national rate.

And this is due to the boom in the coal industry. *But*: in spite of its present health, the one unstable segment of that coal economy is strip mining. In the long run, it is counter-productive to West Virginia's growth and development.

Strip mining, according to Dr. Miernyk, is not a part of the industry that contributes to long-range stability and growth.

It is an industry flourishing now because deep mining has only in the last two years been really gearing up for the growing demand for coal. In these next several years the price of stripped coal is going to be increasingly vulnerable on the market—in fact, the prices have softened in the past several weeks. As deep mined coal gears up production, the market for stripped coal will be less energetic and the industry will grow increasingly vulnerable and unstable. Many of the operators are newly in the field, have no long-term commitment or investment—or even interest—in coal mining, except as a short-term way to make a good profit now. Furthermore, in my judgment, strip mining has a naturally limited future in parts of the state. Operators have told me that in the north, all the reserves will be stripped away in another five to ten years. There will be a natural death there. In Harrison County, the stripped coal is about depleted. But if you have flown over the county, you know how that county has been slashed to ribbons by highwalls. It is not a pretty sight, and I dare say it never will be.

Strip operators are now moving east, into Barbour County, Preston County, Grant County, Upshur County, and Tucker County—all counties where there is much beauty and recreational and development future. Stripping will, in my view, radically and detrimentally alter the growth and recreational potential of those counties. And I think that you men who know that part of the state basically agree with that.

In the south, where the steeper slopes are, it is my judgment that no matter what happens to the abolition bill, the industry will be regulated in such a way that stripping to any great degree on those slopes will be impossible. As a matter of fact, the Department of Natural Resources has proposed that no stripping be permitted on any slopes steeper than 25 degrees. That in itself would eliminate 75% of strip mining in southern West Virginia. The Department—hence, the reclamation people—is clearly saying that it does not believe that reclamation is possible on those slopes, and they, of all, should know that. So, severe regulation is the least you can expect from this legislative session.

Therefore, from the viewpoint of its future on the competitive coal market, from the viewpoint of its natural deposit life, and from the viewpoint of limitation on its activities, I feel strongly that strip mining is indeed an unstable and unreliable component of our future growth. Its contribution to our economy is a *temporary* one—while the devastation it brings is permanent!

In fact, I don't think anyone will argue that *eventually* strip mining must stop. We have only so much land in West Virginia.

You gentlemen well know that at *some* point, before *every* mountain and hillside has been gouged and ripped and ravaged, before all of West Virginia looks like parts of it look now, at *some* point, the public is going to demand it be stopped. We know that. Even now, that outcry is growing, as the strippers' highway spreads like an ugly, malignant cancer across the countryside, infecting lush new areas. In 1969, it was 27 counties, in 1970, it was 29. The pace of the strippers is truly awesome. Permits were granted in 1970 for *double* the acreage of the year before . . . from 15,710 acres in 1969, to 31,802 in 1970. What will it be two years from now—or five years—or ten? What will be left?

So, really—and this is to me a crucial point—our debate is not if strip mining should be stopped, but *when?*

And according to every economic indicator we can measure, there never was a better time than now.

For instance, Dr. Miernyk points out that in our economy jobs are lost in many ways: through technology, changing markets, changing demands, changing tastes, or a public policy decision.

When this happens, remedies are attempted.

But usually, the change and the remedies are forced to take place in response to alarm—in times of decline, when the economy cannot by itself absorb the impact of change.

If you have a choice then, as to when to make a change that will affect jobs, the time is when there is growth in areas that may provide substitute jobs.

Secondly, advises Dr. Miernyk, make your choice at a time when personal income is rising, to minimize or offset the indirect effects.

And third, do it at a time when much of the land remains unspoiled, while it is still possible to retain a high quality of the land as an asset to diversity, and attract other less destructive industries. Continued stripping eventually will close off opportunities for other major and minor economic development.

For example, while new industries can be persuaded to move to major urban centers with good transportation, they are always more reluctant to do so in rural areas. And if the land in a rural county is ripped and scarred, it almost guarantees a severe limit to new industries in the future.

Timing, then, according to Dr. Miernyk, is the *key* factor in the decision we must make. *And the time, it seems to me, is now.*

Let's examine each of those timing factors favorable to this decision.

First, that if an economic adjustment must be made that will eliminate jobs, do it at a time when there is growth potential in substitute jobs.

The substitute activity is picking up in a number of areas.

Governor Moore, in his State of the State speech a week ago, called for a stepped-up highway construction program. In 1970, the state awarded $266 million in new highway contracts, a record high, and the Governor said that pace is not going to slacken.

Some of the skills employed in strip mining are needed in highway construction.

Some training may be needed. The state perhaps can help in this by giving preferential hiring to strip mine employees who qualify, and to help train those who do not.

Deep mining is undergoing a powerful expansion. The West Virginia Coal Association has said the industry here will need 10,000 new employees over the next five years. Certainly the decline in deep mining employment which has worried many people for more than a decade has now been reversed. Employment promises to be strong in deep mining—both underground, and, for that purpose of this discussion, above ground—for many years to come because of long-term contracts and growing demand. This places an obligation on the industry and the state to help train West Virginians for those jobs.

Permit me to digress for a minute and speak of another obligation—a most serious one—that I feel very strongly about when the coal industry makes its plea for 10,000 workers. It is not enough to say wages are good in deep mines. In most instances, the quality of life is inadequate, inside and outside the deep mines.

Miners don't want their sons going into the mines because they want them to enjoy a safer life, a better life than what has traditionally been the life of a coal miner. They would rather their sons move out of the state, if no other job is available. The industry must push for safer mines, even *without* increased demand by inspectors, the public, the lawmakers. It is *their* economic self-interest to make mining a good, decent occupation. This can happen, and it must happen, if the deep mining industry wants to attract some of the high-skill labor from strip mining that might well be available, particularly at the mouth of the mine. Readily transferrable skills include truck drivers, tipple operators and maintenance mechanics, as well as clerical and management personnel.

One of the things the state can help with is decent housing as stimulated through the Housing Development Fund. The Fund is a resource for helping finance low and middle-income housing in our growing mining communities. Just as some strip mine employees might move into deep mining, many others with directly applicable construction skills might have employment opportunities in an accelerated housing program. In fact, the Housing Fund has set as a goal within the next two years to stimulate 5,000 new homes a year. And there is no business the lower interest rates has stimulated more than the housing industry. The coming years will be good ones. Housing starts are up, industrial construction is expanding, as is road building. These trends offer opportunities and needs for bulldozer operators, truck drivers, mechanics, front-end loader operators, oilers and greasers, welders, and other heavy equipment operators.

Second, if you are to phase out an industry that has destructive social costs, according to Dr. Miernyk, do it at a time when personal income is rising.

In West Virginia, as I have said, personal income is rising faster than in the rest of the country. This helps offset the "multiplier effect," and perhaps this is a good time to talk about that.

There has been much discussion of the number of people who are employed in surface and auger mining directly, and the others whose jobs in one way or another depend on surface mining. Most of the talk has been of quantity, and to date there is little agreement on that—and almost none on the quality of jobs. Apologists for strip mining are saying that twenty to twenty-five thousand jobs are involved by an abolition of strip mining. That is a powerful, but totally wrong argument.

Let's clarify the record. The total number of people employed in surface and auger mining in West Virginia in *1969*, according to the records of the Department of Mines, was 3651.

Again, according to the Department of Mines, a field check was made on January 1, 1971—just three weeks ago—and the total number of people employed *directly* by surface and auger mines was 4,102. That number does not indicate full or part time—only that they were working that day.

The Department keeps records of the number of days worked—full time work for most occupations means five days a week, 50 weeks a year, or 250 days per year. In 1969, surface and auger miners worked, on the average, 143 days. There was a full 66 days less than the average employment in deep mining in 1969. And, while there has been an upward change in these figures in the first ten months of 1970, the meaning is still clear—*simply* that employment in surface mining in many places is seasonal, and subject to irregular hours and other vagaries and uncertainties.

When a coal company establishes a new deep mine, the very nature of the heavy capital investment represents a long-term commitment to employees and community alike. Surface mining, that hits, boosts the economy briefly, and moves on, offers no such stability, either to the employees or the community. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that of the 29 counties that now have surface mining, 25 of them also have deep mining, so there is certainly the potential for some job absorption on an area basis.

So we look to the experts to help us understand what impact abolition will have on direct employment, and indirectly on other jobs and other people throughout the economy.

In the study published in 1970 by Dr. Miernyk and his associates, he was able to point us to the evaluation of surface and auger mining and 47 other industries in the state.

Dr. Miernyk explains that for every full time basic job, there is a multiplier. He cautions that the multiplier is widely and popularly used but quite often misunderstood and misapplied.

He has used the multiplier to discover the full employment impact of the end of surface mining, and that the maximum number of jobs which will be lost by this change will be 4,000 to 8,000. But he immediately cautions that these jobs will not be lost all at once. And that if adjustments can be made in West Virginia's economy during the time the change is underway, there may well be considerably fewer jobs lost. And if the economy experiences substantial growth, it may well fully absorb the loss.

On the other hand, the 4,000 to 8,000 job loss would take effect only if the abolition took effect today, or two months from now, or six months from now. I am now strongly in favor of a 21-month to two-year period for a phase down. Only at the end of that period would the abolition apply. Up until then, stripping would continue, under regulation, to allow the employees the chance to earn their living while they deal with adjustment, and it would also allow the operators substantial time to handle their financial adjustment. As you know, 6-month leasing arrangements for equipment are not uncommon, and two or three year terms for financing are rather common. Several operators would go into road building, as much of the equipment and personnel are largely interchangeable. The largest dollar services that strip mining purchases are legal and accounting and clerical. Certainly, the two years would take care of all of them.

To summarize, then: If coal wasn't booming, if highway construction or housing construction weren't potentially viable job substitute, if personal income were not rising, and the general economic picture were not improving, if absolutely *nothing* developed in the economy to take up the slack, abolition of surface mining would result in the loss of 4,000 to 8,000 jobs direct and indirect. That is a far cry from the 20–25,000 figure that is being used. The figures I use are accurate.

On the other hand, if we provided a two-year phase out for surface mining, giving every opportunity for the economy to develop as it is predicted, we are left with this statement by Dr. Miernyk: "It is quite possible there will be no multiplier effect at all."

I'm not here to pretend some people will not be hurt. Abolition will work hardship on some, and uncertainties for many—if they do not have alternatives. All of us will share the responsibility to minimize that hurt.

But after the adjustment has been made, we come out far ahead of where we are today, because growth will take place—real growth, stable, non-harmful to our state's future.

So, it seems to me that we simply cannot afford to sit back and watch strip-mining chew up our hills. West Virginia will have to learn to live without strip mining. And the time to begin that adjustment is upon us.

THE MIDDLESEX PLAN

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, every one of us has been affected and disheartened by the perplexing problems that have been brought about by the abuse of narcotics in this country. Many of our communities have expressed a deep desire to help, but often their ambitions have been thwarted because of a lack of knowledge and understanding. Most have become bewildered and confused.

In the February 7, 1971, edition of the Boston Herald an article was written by the Honorable Foster Furcolo, a close personal friend of mine and a man for whom I have the highest regard. As a former Congressman and Governor, Mr. Furcolo has served his State of Massachusetts and its people with distinction, and most recently he has brought his knowledge and expertise to aid Middlesex County in the establishment of a new drug program. In this well-done article Mr. Furcolo delineates the scope of the drug program and points out the four major areas of concern: prevention, rehabilitation, education, and prosecution:

THE MIDDLESEX PLAN

(By Foster Furcolo)

Massachusetts, like every other state, has a drug abuse problem. What to do about it concerns every community in the state. How do you prevent it from spreading? How do you educate people to deal with it? How do you rehabilitate the addicted? What do law enforcement authorities do to prosecute those responsible?

What has been called "The Middlesex plan to prevent drug abuse" is a many-pronged educational endeavor with the ambitious goal of reaching every person in the most populous county of the Bay State. Middlesex County, sprawling through northeast Massachusetts from the New Hampshire border to the edge of Boston, has one million inhabitants—one-

fifth of the state's entire population. Within its borders is a melting pot of people of Polish, French and Greek origin from cities like Lowell; Yankee farmers in towns with names like Chelmsford, Tyngsboro, Dracut, Concord and Lexington; Italian and Irish descendants in Somerville, Malden and Medford; and the Cantabrigians around Harvard University. It has the problems of every urban and rural county in the nation—and perhaps more cases of drug abuse than any place outside of New York City itself.

That was the situation when State Senator Dennis McKenna prevailed upon the Massachusetts legislature to put $50,000 in the county budget for a drug program to be conducted by the district attorney's office in Middlesex county. County Treasurer, Tom Brennan helped us set up our budget and asked for county-wide cooperation in the effort.

Within hours after the program was authorized, Dist. Atty. John J. Droney went into action. As an assistant district attorney, I was placed in charge with this directive: "Use the money to help the kids who are victims, and put away the professional pushers. I'll back you up all the way."

Droney's first step was to call a meeting with the Middlesex County Commissioners, who supervise expenditures of county money. "We have a program without any personnel or offices," he ponted out. "Will you help us?"

The county fathers authorized us to hire qualified personnel and provided us with offices in the Middlesex County Hospital. The hospital's director agreed to furnish the offices with equipment already available in the hospital's storeroom. Unfortunately, the already over-burdened hospital switchboard could not physically handle even one more telephone line—and how could we operate without a telephone? An emergency call to William Hogan, vice president of the New England Telephone Company, produced immediate cooperation in the form of a special cable run in from the street direct to our offices in the hospital basement.

It was only when the installation man asked its listing name that we realized everything had moved so quickly that we didn't even have a name for our project.

"Well," said Droney, "we're going to try to prevent drug abuse . . . rehabilitate those who've been victimized by it . . . educate the public so we can cope with the problem . . . and," he banged the desk, "prosecute drug traffic profiteers." He looked around at us. "Prevent . . . rehabilitate . . . educate . . . prosecute. That basically is what our project is so why not take the first four letters—PREP—and call it Project PREP."

We decided it would be a crash program. Marijuana smokers were increasing; the habit had drifted down from high school to the junior high and even into some grade schools. Pill popping was on the increase everywhere . . . the use of speed was becoming more prevalent . . . and deadly heroin was being introduced to more sophisticated users.

Our first task was to assemble a staff with expertise. The first members selected were Thomas McCarthy and Philip Nyman, two young, bright, able and dedicated attorneys. As a former assistant district attorney, Phil Nyman had had experience in trial work and was familiar with cases involving drug abuse. Tom McCarthy had been on the other side of the fence as a trial lawyer in the Massachusetts Defenders Committee. In addition, he was the chairman of the drug committee of the Town of Arlington and was particularly knowledgeable of the suburban drug scene.

Next came two recently retired State Troopers, Pompei Valenti and Al Whitney, who had been the top State Police narcotics experts for many years. They were joined by Joan Fuld, a Brandeis graduate who also holds a master's degree in social work from Boston University. She had worked with Head Start and with children's and parents' groups in the greater Boston area.

June Swartz, Linda Feig and Sharon Glendon were the next three additions. June, a Phi Beta Kappa, had taught sociology and psychology in Michigan. Linda had graduated from McGill, then earned a master's degree in counselling and psychology at B.U. before going into teaching and guidance work. Sharon, who had taken various educational courses at Sonoma State and San Mateo colleges, then done secretarial work at Harvard, is a former drug addict who lost four years of her life in California's drug world before fighting her way back.

Three other staff members are Bill Kickham, Jack Farrell and Bud Robaitelle. The first are two former FBI agents, while Bud had been a federal narcotics agent.

From Project Place, a drug rehabilitation center, we obtained Mike Elkin and Larry Birnbach, both of whom have had extensive experience with youngsters caught up in the drug culture. Mike who has a master's degree in psychology is professionally a teacher of emotionally disturbed children. Larry, a Boston College graduate, is now in the Boston University Graduate School working on his master's degree.

Two other drug rehabilitation centers—Marathon House and Project Turnabout—are also cooperating with us through two of their top men, Bill McCue of Turnabout and Richard Rode of Marathon.

Stody Ward, former member of the Youth Service Board, also joined us. Massachusetts' teacher of the year Bob Anastas was another addition. An experienced guidance counsellor, he set up a drug program that is followed in many schools.

Rounding out our team is pharmacologist Ben Hershenson, a professor in the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy and the guiding hand of that institution's excellent program of sending its pharmacology seniors into Massachusetts schoolrooms. The teacher leaves the classroom and the seniors then rap with the students about drugs—what they consist of, what they do to the body and mind, why they are used, and so on. Experience has shown that students talk frankly under such conditions.

We have also obtained the assistance of a panel of doctors and phychiatrists and other experts who have volunteered their services in an advisory capacity.

Lastly—and important cogs in the project—are Joan Booth, Eleanor Ryan and Marie Reid. They actually run the whole program. Various citizens' committees are being set up throughout Middlesex County by Joan. Eleanor Ryan for ten years had been secure in the high-paying lifetime position of secretary of the Massachusetts Government Center Authority. She sacrificed all to become executive secretary for Project PREP, with no pension, insurance, or fringe benefits—and in a temporary job dependent on legislative approval. Marie Reid, housewife and mother of two teenagers, originally came in on a volunteer basis that now stretches to eight hours a day every week. A graduate of Portia Law School, she also attended and was elected student secretary of the attorney general's school on drugs and was instrumental in establishing a drug control program in Acton.

In Project PREP we wanted ultimately to reach the kids—and we have programs for just that purpose too—but we decided to start with someone other than the youngsters themselves. We would begin with adults. We determined to try to "educate" everyone who has anything at all to do with kids we are trying to help.

We would take the first step with teachers, the second with parents, the third with police and religious advisers—then the fourth, fifth and fiftieth steps until we had reached everyone in Middlesex County who wanted to listen, who wanted to learn, and would invite the kids to listen too, if they wanted. We would constantly tell the kids: "We'd like to make Project PREP available to you, too, whenever you want it. We are ready and willing to bring it to you at your convenience, and we hope you'll want to listen."

We began our program by telephoning and writing to every school in the county—grade schools, junior and senior high schools, parochial schools, public, private, everything. We told them of our program, what was being offered and why, that we would bring it right to their teachers in their own school at whatever times were convenient for them, and that there was no cost or obligation of any kind. We pointed out that our program was purposely flexible in the number, length, and content of sessions—again, for their convenience and needs. In short, we made it clear that each school could spell out its own terms and conditions for the convenience of the teachers.

We suggested the ideal program was four sessions of two hours apiece, at the conclusion of which the teachers would have had the benefit of the knowledge and experience of a lawyer, a sociologist, a pharmacologist, a psychiatrist, the director of a drug rehabilitation center, a narcotics expert, and an FBI man. Three seminars would have two speakers each and the concluding one would have a panel of four or five. Each seminar would consist of lecture, discussion and questions, with the exception that the PREP speakers themselves would not only be teaching but also learning from the teachers. After all, the teachers would probably know a good deal about conditions in their own schools and their own communities.

In the usual program, the first session might be addressed by the lawyer and the narcotics specialist. The lawyer would discuss matters of concern personally to the teachers, such as, "Do I have a legal duty to take any kind of action if Mrs. Jones complains to me that Johnny Smith sold pot to her son? If I do report it, do I incur any civil liability? Can student lockers be checked?" The lawyer also discusses the various criminal penalties for violation of drug laws, what an arrest or a record means to the youthful offender, and other questions that students have asked their teachers. One major aim of PREP is to make certain that the teachers can answer students' questions truthfully and not fall into a credibility gap.

The narcotics expert, describing each drug and the symptoms it produces, shows a display panel of drugs. He gives their nicknames and characteristics, e.g., with marijuana, by burning a synthetic substance that has its distinctive odor.

The purpose of the lawyer and narcotics expert is not to make the teachers a legal expert or a narcotics expert; it is merely to increase the teacher's knowledge to the point where drugs and their symptoms are readily recognized. The possible "danger signals" are listed: Any radical change of clothing, companions, habits, personality, conduct, wearing dark glasses; unusual amounts of money; lethargy or inattention; excessive talking or groping for words; unusual yawning or sneezing; and other signs obvious to anyone who knows the youngster.

The sociologist and pharmacologist handle another seminar. There is no special need for teachers to know the chemical components of any drug, but these particular pharmacologists have had extensive experience in matters pertaining to drug abuse.

The sociologist discusses environmental factors that affect the drug problem: what drug facilities the community has and what it needs, what other communities have done to attack drug abuse, what makes youngsters turn to drugs, and the facilities available to be helpful to a youngster who has a drug

problem (the average teacher has some vague knowledge of one or two of the more publicized drug services; the sociologist gives specific names of hospitals, drug rehabilitation centers, "hot lines," clinics, and other kinds of drug abuse treatments and services available at scores of places in or within reach of most communities). Another indirect benefit to society is that the sociologist also gets helpful information from the teachers that he in turn may relay to local and state agencies dealing with the drug abuse problem.

The Drug Rehabilitation Center Director describes actual experiences with youngsters who have become addicts or were threatened with addiction. "This is where and how teacher A failed this boy." "This is where and how teacher B helped that girl." "This is how and why Johnny started taking drugs; this is how and why Mary was saved from starting." He also may indicate the type of drug facility or assistance he believes the particular community should have.

We usually schedule an FBI man to be in the same seminar with the Drug Rehabilitation Center director. We theorize that their attitudes are sufficiently far apart so that if by chance an audience has a preconceived belief that either one is "far out" it probably still would be impressed by the other. The FBI man discusses drug abuse from the federal point of view: penalties, facilities, and programs. He also gives illustrations of customs and immigration security that should dispel any student thoughts of easy riches by sneaking in a suitcase of drugs from Europe or Mexico.

In the final seminar, the panel may include a psychiatrist who answers some of the "why's," a sociologist who outlines programs which should be helpful in eliminating some of the causes of drug abuse, and other participants who not only add to the teacher's store of knowledge, but also suggest constructive steps that may be taken by an informed community.

PREP's aim is to make the teacher better informed and more knowledgeable—not only to be able to be of more help to the student, but also to the community as a whole. It is also believed that the communications gap (if any) between student and teacher is lessened not only by that increased knowledge but also by the mere fact that the student knows the teacher is sufficiently interested to take the time and trouble to participate in seminars intended to aid the student.

As of mid-January the program had been brought to 118 schools and more than 4,000 teachers. Principal Henry Blake of Woburn High School said, "We have had many programs on current drug problems, but none has been as clear cut and helpful as Project PREP" Principal James Lazenby of North Reading High School said PREP had brought his teachers "much new information" that would "help us handle problems." And Rose Picone, director of drug education for the Arlington public schools, told me that "constructive things have happened as a result of the PREP program."

Paralleling the PREP program for teachers is the law enforcement phase that is intended to improve the policeman's knowledge of the drug abuse problem. In Massachusetts, as in most states, the average police department has a few officers who are narcotics experts. The great bulk of the police force in any community is about as ignorant of drugs as the average layman. The PREP program for police officers is offered to every police department on the same terms as the program for teachers—at the policeman's convenience so far as time and place are concerned, and at no cost or obligation. Bentley College allowed us to use an auditorium as our workshop for policemen.

Some of the police seminars are similar to those presented to the schools while others emphasize legal and technical points of concern primarily to law enforcement officials: Search warrants, admissibility of evidence, modus operandi of drug peddlers. However, one session is conducted by a sociologist and a director of a drug rehabilitation center to make certain that the policeman has more understanding and compassion for the victims.

More than 100 police officers have now received law training certificates from PREP.

Another phase of the "prosecution of drug traffic profiteers" has been the organization of a county association of narcotic enforcement officers, and the establishment of a central information bureau in the district attorney's office. All these officers already have attended the Attorney General's Narcotics Training program and all are skilled in investigation and prosecution of drug peddlers. However, all too frequently they have worked on their own and cooperation among communities and coordination of effort have sometimes been sadly lacking.

An innovation in the Middlesex District Attorney's office is the establishment of a filing system, accessible to every local narcotics man, containing a card on every person associated in any way with the drug traffic. The card contains the subject's name, address, photo, description and car registration, together with a description of his habits, associates, method of operation, and other pertinent data. Professional drug peddlers tend to move from one community to another, banking on "hitting and running" before the local authorities get too much of a line on them. The central filing system practically guarantees that the professional drug pusher will be spotted in a town as soon as he arrives.

Another advantage of the association will probably be the interchange of undercover agents, who are essential to drug law enforcement, but become "visible" (and therefore useless to a small town) in short order.

That is a costly waste to the town—but the new association is remedying that loss. Recognizing that a well-trained agent can be equally valuable to another town through coordinated efforts of the association, the various communities in Middlesex are now planning cooperative exchanges of undercover agents. The association also sponsors legislation that probably will find readier acceptance by legislators because it comes from an organized group.

In addition to the teachers and police, Project PREP is also bringing its program to parents, service clubs, fraternal organizations, and any and all groups that want to improve their knowledge of drug abuse.

Project PREP may or may not be the answer to drug abuse, but we have examined programs in England, Israel, Sweden and other countries with similar cultures. Of all the programs, Project PREP seems to offer the most hope. It is easy, relatively inexpensive and constructive.

TRIBUTE TO WHS CLASS OF 1970

HON. J. IRVING WHALLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WHALLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the course of history, I believe that graduating classes tend to become like the proverbial childhood snowfall—always much more devastating than any in recent history.

The high school in my hometown of Windber, Pa.—population approximately 6,000—has, in my opinion, always been outstanding. But talking with not-so-recent graduates—like myself—one would think that all the accomplishments, all the awards, all the accolades took place before the present student body was even born.

Not so. Mr. Austin M. Greenland, public relations coordinator of the Windber Area School District, recently wrote to me and included a list of awards and accomplishments of the class of 1970. Even with the memory of those great classes of yesteryear clearly in mind, I have to admit that the record of the class of 1970 is most outstanding. And the class consisted of just over 200 students.

Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to this great class of 1970 of Windber Area High School, and to the students who made up this class, I include Mr. Greenland's letter in the RECORD for all to see.

WINDBER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Windber, Pa., February 2, 1971.

Hon. J. IRVING WHALLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALLEY: Windber Area School District, in Windber, Pennsylvania, has enjoyed a very rewarding 1970. The following is a list of the awards and accomplishments of the Windber Area High School:

ACTIVITIES

Band

The Senior High School Band won the first prize trophy in Class A Competition at the National Dogwood Festival in Statesville, North Carolina.

Cheerleaders

First place, 15th Annual Somerset County Cheerleading Contest.

First place, 11th Annual Windber Rotary Tournament Cheerleading Contest.

First place, 27th Annual Cambria County War Memorial Cheerleading Contest.

First place, 5th Annual Jaffa Shrine Cheerleading Contest.

ATHLETICS

Football

The 1970 Varsity Team won the Mountain Conference Football Championship.

The 1970 Junior High Team won the Western Division Championship of Inter-County Junior High School Football Leagues.

Basketball

First place, 11th Annual Windber Rotary Tournament.

First place, Greater Johnstown Hi-Y Basketball League.

First place, PIAA District 6 Class B.

Also participated in the State Play-Offs and were eliminated in the semi-finals.

INDIVIDUAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Tim Berkey, senior, is on the first team of the 1970 Greater Johnstown All Scholastic Basketball Team. Tim also received a letter of commendation from the National Merit Scholarship Quality Test. He finished in the top two per cent out of 30,000 applicants.

Curt Miller, senior, is on the second team of the 1970 Greater Johnstown All Scholastic Basketball Team.

Kathleen Felix, senior, received the Good Citizen Award, presented by the Quemahoning Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Carol Batiste, senior, was chosen to participate in the Pennsylvania Music Educators All State Chorus in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. She will also participate in the MENC Chorus in Atlantic City, New Jersey. Carol, and Eileen Rairigh, a 1970 graduate, represented WAHS at the All State Chorus at Warren, Pennsylvania.

Rick Holtzman, senior, was selected to attend the American Legion's Keystone Boys State at Pennsylvania State University.

Tony Slatcoff, senior, was selected to attend Youth Week at the State Police Academy in Hershey, Pennsylvania. This is sponsored by the Windber American Legion Post.

Kathleen Felix, Deborah Swetz, Matthew Petrilla, and Tim Berkey were chosen as the outstanding teenagers of the Windber Area School District for 1970. They are all seniors.

Darlene Melnkovic, 1970 graduate, was the winner of the 1970 Somerset County Bar Association Essay Contest, captured third place in State competition.

Deborah Ross, 1970 graduate, received the State Homemaker Degree from Future Homemakers of America at the Farm Show in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Colleen Hannakan, 1970 graduate, was selected to receive the Most Valuable Staffer Award in recognition of outstanding contributions to her high school newspaper. This award is sponsored by the Johnstown *Tribune-Democrat*.

Jim Lashinsky, 1970 graduate, was presented the Nunzio Marino Award, in recognition of his fine performance and sportsmanship in football.

Linda Dill and Ronald Pekela, 1970 graduates, were selected as the outstanding girl and boy by the Windmer Lions Club. This award is presented to seniors each year.

Mr. Joe Fiori, basketball coach, was named "Coach of the Year" by the Windber Rotary Club.

The above named awards and championships have honored the community, as well as the Windber Area School District. As an elected official, I feel that you should be made aware of such accomplishments.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully yours,

AUSTIN M. GREENLAND,
Public Relations Coordinator.

CANCER—NATION'S NO. 2 KILLER

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the terrible disease of cancer is one of the most terrifying problems facing our country today. On the list of this Nation's greatest killers, cancer ranks second.

An article which appeared recently in Newsweek magazine points out that to many people the word "cancer" has become synonymous with death—with good reason, I am afraid. The American Cancer Society reports that in 1971, alone, approximately 975,000 Americans will require medical care for this disease and 330,000 will die.

Of the 200 million Americans now alive and healthy, it is estimated that 34 million will eventually lose their lives to cancer; and millions more will be disfigured. Perhaps one of the cruelest traits of cancer is that is attacks children as viciously as adults. Of the 330,000 Americans who will die of cancer in 1971, 4,000 of them will be children.

Because cancer ranks as one of the greatest and most frightening problems in all our minds, it is time that we meet the challenge of conquering it. We have now reached the point where a cure is within grasp. Just 30 years ago, only one cancer patient in five had a chance to survive. Today the figure stands at 40 percent. Nevertheless, despite the fact that methods of detection and treatment have improved, the annual number of deaths from cancer continues to rise at a rate faster than our population growth.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the people of the United States to make the commitment to cure cancer once and for all. Our history of the last decade proves that when this Nation really commits itself to a goal, we can achieve it. We need only to recall President Kennedys pledge at the beginning of the 1960's to land a man on the moon before 1970 and remember the culmination of this pledge in 1969.

Last year, 600 of the leading physicians and scientists in the field of medical research expressed their conviction that cancer could be cured if only there were sufficient funds to support cancer research. The current level of funding is far below what is necessary to accelerate the search for a cure. In fact, many research programs have been unable to progress due to lack of money.

A national commitment to wipe out cancer is a challenge that cannot be ignored. While this is one of the most important problems we face, it should give us great hope and encouragement in knowing that it is one of the serious problems that can be overcome if only we provide the commitment and the funds.

By supporting the following bills, we are making the pledge and taking up the commitment.

I include the material as follows:

H.R. 3656

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Conquest of Cancer Act".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that the incidence of cancer is increasing and is the major health concern of the American people;

(2) that the attainment of better methods of prevention, diagnosis, and cure of cancer deserve the highest priority; and

(3) that a great opportunity is offered as a result of recent advances in the knowledge of this dread disease to conduct energetically a national program for the conquest of cancer.

(b) In order to carry out the policy set forth in this Act it is the purpose of this Act to establish, as an independent agency of the United States, the National Cancer Authority.

NATIONAL CANCER AUTHORITY ESTABLISHED

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established an independent agency within the executive branch of the Federal Government to be known as the National Cancer Authority, having as its objective the conquest of cancer at the earliest possible time.

(b) The Authority shall be headed by an Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of five years. There shall be in the Authority a Deputy Administrator who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of five years. The Deputy Administrator shall perform such functions as the Administrator may prescribe and shall be the Acting Administrator during the absence or disability of the Administrator or in the event of a vacancy in the position of Administrator. Upon the expiration of his term, the Administrator shall continue to serve until his successor has been appointed and has been qualified.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas cancer takes the lives of more than three hundred thousand Americans each year; and

Whereas the death rate from cancer is steadily increasing as our population grows; and

Whereas more than one million Americans are currently under treatment for this dread disease; and

Whereas it is clearly in the best interests of mankind that this disease be cured and controlled; and

Whereas prominent medical authorities have indicated that cancer can be cured and controlled if the necessary funds are made available; and

Whereas current appropriations are inadequate to accomplish this task; and

Whereas the Nation's success in space was largely due to centralized direction of expenditures under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and

Whereas it is both necessary and desirable that a national commitment be immediately undertaken to achieve a cure and control for cancer within this decade; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) no less than $650,000,000 be appropriated annually over the next ten fiscal years for the national cancer research program;

(2) no less than $250,000,000 of this appropriation be utilized to construct five new cancer research institutes in the United States during the first two years of the new appropriations; and

(3) the funds thus appropriated be controlled and directed by a National Cancer Authority which would have the same absolute direction of the cure and control of cancer that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has over our conquest of space.

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, one of nature's most precious gifts to an individual is functional eyesight. Yet, like many other things we experience in our day-to-day lives, we tend to take this valuable possession for granted.

The President has proclaimed this week as Save Your Vision Week, and has called upon Americans to learn how visual disabilities can be prevented.

There is no doubt about the important role vision plays in our society. It has been estimated that up to 80 percent of our knowledge is acquired through the medium of vision. Accordingly, we should place special emphasis on the eye care need of our young.

The President has said that more than 10 million children in the United States

need eye care. Further, a report from a member of the U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Advisory Committee on Dyslexia and Related Reading Disorders estimated that one out of seven children is handicapped in his ability to acquire essential reading skills. These figures would seem to create a special need to alert parents and teachers to the existence of this problem.

But the need for regular eye care is certainly not limited to our young. Some type of vision disorder affects over one hundred million Americans, many of whom are not aware of their problem. Some of these individuals with undetected problems will suffer no major difficulties or physical pain, although they certainly will not get full enjoyment out of life. Others who are less fortunate, however, will lose their vision entirely due to lack of prompt and proper treatment. This is tragic because almost all of the consequences of eye disorders—whether major or minor—can be avoided if the problem is detected and corrected. During this week we should determine when our last eye examination took place, and if it was over a year ago, we should make an appointment to have one.

I have a special interest here because Indiana University's Division of Optometry is located in Bloomington, which is part of my district. This school is one of 12 such schools in the country which has been involved in meeting the pressing eye care needs of the Nation.

Ever since the American Optometric Association observed the first Save Your Vision Week 44 years ago, we have learned a great deal about the eye and its proper care. There is little reason for any of us to neglect our eyesight. We should also concern ourselves with the need for safety in all walks of life to avoid eye damage due to carelessness. This week affords us an excellent opportunity to focus on the need for good eye care.

NAVY AS CONSERVATIONIST: CULEBRA'S FUTURE IS NOT TOO BLEAK

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of March 9 carried an interesting column by Irwin Goodwin entitled "Navy as Conservationist: Culebra's Future Is Not Too Bleak." Goodwin indicates that the Navy has, through the years, helped Culebra in this role of a conservationist of the natural environment, as well as in other ways. This is in strong refutation of the hysterical, adverse comments made by some when the Navy sought patiently, through Secretary of the Navy John Chafee, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Joseph Grimes, and Adm. Means Johnston, to reorganize its targets and safety lanes last year. I include the article hereunder:

NAVY AS CONSERVATIONIST: CULEBRA'S FUTURE IS NOT TOO BLEAK

(By Irwin Goodwin)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—By its very presence in the past 35 years, the Navy has performed an unexpected role as conservationist of the natural environment of Culebra. This is the startling theme running through a 104-page report: "Culebra 1970: An Island in Transition," prepared for Puerto Rico's Gov. Luis A. Ferre by 17 scientists from commonwealth and federal agencies.

Ferre gave the study to Russell Train, chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality in Washington recently.

"Without a doubt," states the report, "Culebra and its surrounding keys and rocks" probably constitutes one of the very few areas in Puerto Rico where human activities have not yet altered natural conditions to a significant extent.

"Earnest efforts must be made to maintain the diverse ecosystems in the area in present conditions or, better yet, reduce the present human activities so that the natural state can be preserved."

SINCE 1936, when the Navy began using Culebra's northwest peninsula for ship-to-shore target practice, the island has not developed significantly. As a result, its present population of 726 is little more than the 704 residents of 1899, the first year after the Spanish-American War, when Puerto Rico and Culebra were ceded to the United States.

The report indicates that Culebra, with no minerals worth mining, little land usable for farming, frequent droughts and salty well-water, is clearly one of the Caribbean's lesser jewels.

It has no industries other than ocean fishing and cattle grazing, each conducted on a small scale; limited the costly transportation by airplane and ferryboats to the main island, 19 miles west; inadequate schools and services. Per capita income is $551—about $1,000 less than on Puerto Rico.

The island, however, as the report points out, "is best suited for wildlife and esthetic appreciation." It possesses 33 rare or unique species of plants, including wild orchids and tall palms, battalions of birds such as the endangered Bahama pintailed duck, brown pelican and varieties of heron, and swarms of sealife life—lobsters, grouper, starfish and sharks. These, as well as its abundant coral, clear water and mangrove swamps "in more or less natural state," the report notes, make Culebra "of great interest to marine biologists, geologists and oceanographers."

The Puerto Rican government's new report finds that decades of target practice apparently have not damaged the island. It criticizes the Navy for one incident: The underwater demolition of unexploded shells on a coral reef off the northwest peninsula target on Dec. 2. Upon investigation the next day, a diving scientist found a hole about 50 feet in diameter in a rich coral reef and partial destruction of another 200 feet.

Ironically the Navy exploded its misfired old ordnance only after the islanders insisted that the shells were a peril to swimmers and boaters. The study concludes that the "dangers of these disposal activities might be minimized if all ordnance deemed safe to remove was transferred to bare sandy bottoms devoid of coral." The Navy has agreed to do this.

In a socio-economic section of the study, the team reported wide disagreement among Culebrans about the island's future. "Some feel the solution to all problems lies in the complete withdrawal of the Navy," it states. "For others such a withdrawal would be a catastrophe."

An opinion poll of one-third of the households taken last December showed that 54 per cent felt the absence of fresh water and sewage disposal were the greatest deterrents to Culebra's future. One-third thought the Navy's presence hampered their well-being, while a similar proportion attributed their problems to inaccessibility for trade or tourism.

"The critical condition of Culebra at present is blamed on the government of Puerto Rico by 54 per cent, on the Navy by 7 per cent," says the study.

Because Culebrans now insist on a share of Puerto Rico's economic prosperity, tourism is considered a panacea. Recognizing this, the study group calls for a master plan of development, with a moratorium on building while measures are taken to protect the environment.

Even before the Navy agreed on Jan. 11 to curtail its training maneuvers and limit its activities to the northwest peninsula and several distant keys after Jan. 1, 1972, there were "new forces," says the report, altering and detracting from the island's environment.

Oil from pleasure boats is contaminating beaches, sand stealthily removed from the beaches, houses built illegally along the shoreline, raw wastes dumped into the bays. "As human use of the island increases," notes the study, "these destructive forces will become stronger unless specific measures are adopted to reduce them."

In presenting the report to Train, Governor Ferre proposed that Culebra become a national park. As it happens, President Theodore Roosevelt declared the keys and islets around Culebra a wildlife refuge back in 1909. But some observers question whether Culebrans will want to limit their economic and social development with such a designation.

Train, who has indicated to Ferre that he will consider the request, was designated in December by President Nixon to take a major part in the Pentagon study of the embattled 11-square mile island. The study is due next April 1.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS N. DOWNING TO THE WORLD AFFAIRS FORUM, RIVERDALE THEATER, HAMPTON, VA.

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, we have gone beyond an unusual point in our development as a free Nation—that point in history where a man's honest and lawful dissent with his government's policy was somehow used as a barometer of his patriotism. That point where the flag became a symbol not for the people of the United States, but a symbol for a specific foreign policy. It was a point where a hope for peace was somehow equated with wanting to weaken the defensive posture of our Nation. What brought us to that point was the tragic war in Indochina.

That period could not survive the test of time. We are now striving to reach a new and free atmosphere where debate and learned disagreement with our Government's policy can take place without acrimony, and where a man's patriotism

is not called to question because he disagrees.

I say this by way of introducing and inserting into the RECORD a speech delivered by my esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS N. DOWNING, at Hampton, Va., on March 8. Congressman DOWNING's devotion to this country is beyond question, and his record shows he stands steadfastly for a firm U.S. defense policy. In his speech he asks the President immediately to withdraw our troops from South Vietnam following the completion of the Laos campaign. I believe that speech speaks eloquently for itself:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS N. DOWNING TO THE WORLD AFFAIRS FORUM

This is a remarkable country in which we live, and this is a wonderful place where we can get together, with each other, for a free exchange of ideas.

There are seven of these national security seminars being held throughout the United States today, and I feel that we are most fortunate indeed to host one of them in our area.

It goes without saying, but I will say it anyway, that the selection of the Hampton Roads area of Virginia was the most appropriate that could be made. This is a great bastion in our democracy. Right here on this peninsula within sight and sound of Jamestown, Williamsburg and Yorktown stands the palladium of our liberty.

We stand together here—civilian and military, government and private industry—in a strong posture of national defense and in a great cooperative military-industrial complex which helps to keep the breath of life in our liberty.

Needless to say, my friends, I am proud to have you here and I am honored to be here with you. I salute not only you but all of those who have worked to make this "world affairs" forum a reality. Their success and our success will be measured not by what we learn here but by what we do with it when we leave here.

My remarks to you this morning will be brief; my speech will be short; you may be the judges of how sweet it is.

These are "truly times that try men's souls." Do you know where that thought came from? It came from the great essayist, Thomas Paine, who said: "These are the times that try men's souls." Hardly anyone, however, remembers the lines which immediately follow.

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country.

We do not need the "sunshine patriot" at this time in our Nation's history. We need honest God-fearing Americans who are willing to stick by their country in these times of crisis.

For over 17 years we have been involved, directly or indirectly, in a war nobody wanted and few could understand. This war had no "Lusitania" or "Pearl Harbor" to instantly mold public unity and provoke outrage.

The provocation for this involvement is hard to describe. Primarily it was the simple defense of a philosophy.

The free world—the United States—abhors the ideology of communism—as well it must. To contain communism, this country and others have entered into a number of international treaties designed to protect free nations from the clutches of communism. These were solemn agreements of national honor at the time of their signing. Later on, some signatory nations became "summer soldiers and sunshine patriots" in the words of Thomas Paine.

Each of these nations had a strong parochial interest—including the United States. We understandably wanted to stop communism before it reached our own shores. With over two-thirds of the earth's surface under some form of Communist domination, the line had to be drawn somewhere.

Someone, somewhere, in our hierarchy of government decided the place to draw the line consistent with our treaties was in Southeast Asia. It was considered that South Vietnam was the "domino" which, if pushed over, could topple Southeast Asia in its entirety. This was the prevailing thought at the time.

So, we decided to defend South Vietnam against this aggression. Our mission was not to invade, not to attack—but to defend a weak nation against its more powerful Communist aggressor.

Noble in theory, the concept was difficult to explain, difficult to justify and—as the years passed by—almost impossible to achieve. And there was no "Pearl Harbor."

Truman initiated it; Eisenhower supported it; Kennedy activated it; Johnson continued it and, I hope to God, Nixon ends it.

As a member of Congress, I have supported the last four presidents in their foreign policy because I considered myself a loyal American, duty-bound to support my commander-in-chief, as most Americans have. And should!

I supported the President's move into Cambodia because he assured me—and I believed—that it would minimize the attacks on American troops from those sanctuaries and reduce American casualties. Hindsight and statistics have proven this to be true.

I approved the decision to allow South Vietnamese troops—and South Vietnamese troops only—to cross the Laotian border and cut the Ho Chi Minh supply trail. With the old port of Sihanoukville closed, these complex trails were the enemy's main pipeline of troops and weapons from north to south. If the ARVN can accomplish this mission—and I pray they can—and hold until the rainy season closes the paths to everybody, we should be free to bring our men home, post haste.

I am sending the President of the United States this speech for whatever good it may do, to tell him this.

We have been in South Vietnam for seventeen long, painful years. We have paid the price in lives and money to enable these people to defend themselves, if they have the will to defend themselves. They have the resources. If they lack the determination to defend their borders with their own people, our withdrawal should not blemish our conscience or abrogate our treaties.

Today the Vietnamese have a sturdy regular army of over 1.2 million men. In addition. They have over 500,000 irregulars who can be called upon. They are armed with the finest weapons or war that this country can produce. They have received every technical and military advice that they can absorb. President Thieu, himself, has said they are willing and ready to defend themselves. Much of the civilian population has denounced our presence. Clearly, the time has come to leave that country.

Therefore, Mr. President, as soon as the Laotian campaign has been successfully terminated. I urge you immediately to pull our people out of South Vietnam. If we can believe what you tell us, no enemy supplies, no substantial personnel, could filter through to attack our forces. Vietnamization would be complete. We can leave with honor—and we should!

I am convinced that this is what the world would expect us to do. What our people want us to do, and what we must do.

And—I believe that history will prove us right.

SUPPORT FOR THE COURAGEOUS JEWS OF THE SOVIET UNION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today a group of 100 Jews has begun a sit-in and fast in the very heart of the Kremlin. They have vowed to continue this demonstration every day until they are granted permission to emigrate to Israel.

A demonstration of this kind within the Soviet Union is unprecedented. At least, previous reports of such activities have not appeared in the Western press.

It is obvious that these people are taking a great risk. Indeed, the risks are so great, that their demonstration is clearly an act of desperation.

Many of these people have been deprived of their jobs because of their previously expressed desire to emigrate. Many of them have been harassed, some have been beaten, and others have been arrested.

The Jews in the Soviet Union are denied the rights guaranteed to them by both the Soviet Constitution and the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights, assuring the right to emigrate, to which the Soviet Government is a signatory. Soviet Jews are denied the right to worship in their own way, to study Yiddish or Hebrew, to have their own schools, to maintain healthy Jewish cultural activities, such as the Yiddish theater and press.

Mr. Speaker, I have conferred at length with two Jews who have recently left the Soviet Union, Leonid Rigerman and Luba Bershadskaja. Both of these individuals have firmly expressed the opinion that the Soviet Union is sensitive to world public opinion and that lawful, peaceful expressions of concern can have a cumulative effect.

I am today introducing a joint resolution calling upon the President to firmly express our country's commitment to cultural diversity, freedom of worship, and the right of emigration, and to persuade the Soviet Government to grant these same freedoms to its Jewish minority.

I sincerely hope that my colleagues will give this resolution every consideration and that it will be adopted with the urgency the situation demands.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I insert the text of the resolution to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks:

H. CON. RES. —

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Whereas, persons of Jewish faith residing in the Soviet Union have long suffered persecution, oppression, and discrimination in their daily lives at the hands of the government of that country; and

Whereas, the authorities in the Soviet Union have suppressed, discouraged and prevented the free expression of Jewish education and culture, and have deprived Soviet Jews of the opportunity of worshiping freely and in accordance with the traditions of their age-old faith; and

Whereas, the Soviet Union has consistently denied the right of Jewish people freely to emigrate from that country to Israel or to any country of their choosing;

Resolved, that the Congress of the United States respectfully requests the President of the United States to manifest our country's position as the guardian of the traditions of liberty and justice for all, the dignity of all mankind, and the freedom of worship, by taking appropriate affirmative action to persuade the Soviet Union to revise its official policies in the following manner:

(a) to terminate its practice of depriving Soviet Jewry of the opportunity of worshiping in a free manner and in accordance with age-old Jewish traditions; and

(b) to grant to the Jewish minority the same rights of preserving its cultural identity as the government grants to other Soviet minority groups; and

(c) to permit Jewish persons to emigrate freely from the Soviet Union to Israel or to any country of their choice without restriction or limitation.

WISCONSIN CHEESE AND THE SST

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Janesville Gazette on February 15, 1971. It makes its points so well any introduction on my part would simply be redundant. It follows:

WISCONSIN CHEESE VERSUS THE SST

A group of businessmen, union officials and aerospace subcontratcors in Seattle is threatening to boycott Wisconsin cheese and other Wisconsin-made products because of Sen. William Proxmire's role in leading the Senate opposition to the Supersonic Transport (SST).

This tiny group's childish, petulant tactic has created alarm far out of proportion to its probable impact, since the market for Wisconsin cheese is considerably broader than the City of Seattle.

Most people will recognize this for what it is—an attempt to bring a national environmental issue down to the level of provincial economics. It's like urging people not to buy textiles made in South Carolina because of Sen. Thurmond's views on the war in Vietnam, and it makes about as much sense.

The people of Wisconsin did not elect Sen. William Proxmire to the U.S. Senate because they expected him to yield to this kind of blackmail—not from a few disgruntled souls in Seattle, and not from anybody else.

Since the issue has been joined on this level, however, let's make it a test of public opinion on the national level.

Those Americans who favor the SST can demonstrate this by not eating Wisconsin cheese. Those who are against the SST can do likewise by eating twice as much Wisconsin cheese as they normally do.

We have confidence in the outcome because we think the overwhelming majority of the American people are opposed to spending millions on this environmental monster. Besides that, Wisconsin cheese is excellent. Unlike the SST, it can stand on its own merits.

AUTHORITATIVE AND VALUABLE STATEMENT BY HEW PANEL ON BEHAVIORAL MODIFICATION DRUGS TO GRAMMAR SCHOOL-CHILDREN

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today a blue-ribbon panel issued its statement on the problems connected with giving behavioral modification drugs to grammar school children, an issue with which our Privacy Subcommittee has been concerned for almost a year.

This report addresses itself to virtually every one of the concerns which were raised in my hearing on September 29, 1970. I consider it to be a model of its kind; concise, comprehensive, and remarkably free of the specialized jargon which so often mars Federal prose.

The panel has found, as have I during my investigation, that the causes of minimal brain dysfunction may be as deeply embedded in modern society as they are in the brain of most of the afflicted children. I was struck by the sentence:

It is important to recognize the child whose inattention and restlessness may be caused by hunger, poor teaching, overcrowded classrooms, or lack of understanding by teachers and parents.

The insight in that sentence is exactly what I was trying to convince the experts of during my investigation and I believe this sober and responsible statement will slow down the widely predicted zoom in the seventies. I was also pleased that the panel focused on informed parental consent. If the teachers, school administrators, and doctors follow the recommended procedures, I think much of the current agony of some parents who have communicated with me will be relieved.

The report also contains evidence for raising amphetamines to schedule II of the Drug Abuse Act of 1970. The violations of proper procedure, against which the report warns, could be detected by the prescription reporting process mandated under schedule II.

I agree completely with the statement:

These medicines should be promoted ethically and *only* through medical channels. (Emphasis in original.)

We have received disturbing examples of drug company salesmen attending local PTA meetings, for example, and I read the report's statement as saying that such promotion activities must stop.

I was also impressed by the sentence:

Variations in different socioeconomic and ethnic groups must be considered in order to arrive at better definitions of behavior properly regarded as pathological.

I recall that during the Privacy Subcommittee investigation of psychological testing in 1965, we learned that the tests were devised by men who, however dedicated they were, mirrored their own preconceptions in the tests. This warning in the panel's report is especially relevant.

Further, I praise the panel for effectively demolishing what was described as the "paradoxical effect"; that is, that drugs work entirely differently in children by calming them down, instead of being "speed." The drugs focus attention in children the same as they do in adults.

I believe the report merits the widest possible distribution and acceptance. It is obvious that these drugs do work in carefully diagnosed and controlled situations and it was never my intention to try to intefere with the doctor-patient relationship. I feel that the Privacy Subcommittee has isolated another area of genuine concern and I commend the panel and its chairman, Dr. Donald X. Freedman, for confronting the hard issues we raised.

That being said, however, a significant weakness does exist and it relates to the place where the problem originally surfaced: Omaha, Nebr. The panel did no original research into specific cases; they were solely concerned with the general medical and academic ramifications for the populace at large. The report states that sensationalism and half truths are to be avoided, but by not dealing with the Omaha charges, they have produced what may be described as only half a report. I attempted to anticipate this eventuality when I wrote to HEW Secretary Richardson on October 12, 1970. I recommended as follows:

Control over these grants and followup studies should be centralized in one office so that should a situation like that in Omaha again arise, responsibility for an adequate in-depth investigation would be firmly fixed.

Secretary Richardson replied that the liaison between the National Institute of Mental Health and the Food and Drug Administration was sufficient.

I was impressed with the report prepared under the auspices of the Office of Child Development and I feel that it should take a more central role. I say this for two reasons:

First, as admirable as the recommendations in the report are, they will be nothing but high-sounding platitudes unless supervision of local schools can assure that they are being given the attention I think they deserve; and

Second, an issue of contention still exists over behavioral modification drugs in Omaha, and, perhaps more important for our society, the suspicion still exists that these programs will be used to modify the behavior of black children to have them conform with white society's norms. I repeat my contention that someone in the Government must have the responsibility, and I now feel that the Office of Child Development is the logical place.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the HEW news release, the report, and a list of the panel's members:

HEW NEWS RELEASE

Diagnosis by a doctor, close supervision of treatment and parental understanding and

cooperation are keys to the proper administration of amphetamine drugs to school children with hyperkinetic behavioral disturbance problems, a panel of experts called together by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported today.

The behavioral problem, which affects about three of every 100 elementary school children, is characterized by poor attention in class, disordered behavior and intense physical and mental overactivity.

The panel of experts, chaired by Dr. Daniel X. Freedman, Professor and Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry at the University of Chicago, was called together by HEW's Office of Child Development and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, to discuss the use and misuse of such medications in treating school children with behavior problems.

The panel met in Washington, January 11 and 12.

The panel's report issued today is a 17 page statement on the conditions under which amphetamines should, and should not be, administered to children. Highlights of the panel's findings are:

(1) Under the conditions specified, strong evidence indicates that use of such medication in treating hyperkinetic behavior disturbance improves the child's attention, learning and social abilities. There is no evidence to show that the proper use of amphetamines in treating this age group leads to subsequent addiction in later life.

(2) Diagnosis should take into account the child's environment and family relationships, as well as other physical and psychological factors. Many children suffer from problems with behavior control primarily attributable to hunger, emotional stress, poor teaching and overcrowded classrooms. The use of amphetamines clearly is not called for in these cases.

(3) No stigma should be attached to a child who has been prescribed medication for behavior disorders. His situation is no different from that of the child who benefits from wearing eyeglasses.

(4) While it is entirely proper for school personnel to draw parents' attention to an individual child's behavior problems in school, teachers and school administrators should scrupulously avoid any attempt to force parents to accept any particular treatment. With parental permission, they should collaborate with the physician in the total program for the child.

(5) Manufacturers of stimulant medications should promote their products solely through the appropriate medical channels and should not seek the endorsement of such products from school personnel.

(6) No child should be given the responsibility for taking his own medication. In most cases, it is not even necessary to bring the drug to school. The same household precautions should be taken against the misuse of amphetamines as with any other medication.

(7) While there is no need for sensational alarm about the health or safety of the individual child under carefully supervised treatment with amphetamines, abuses and misuses must promptly be called to the attention of the proper authorities. Physicians, educators, parents and the news media share this responsibility.

The report also emphasizes the need for further research into causes, prevention and treatment of all behavior disorders in children. It points out that, even when medication has improved a condition, a child will often require special educational attention and opportunities to reinforce the treatment.

The panel cautioned the public not to regard the use of amphetamines among school children as replacing the need for improved school systems, nor should negative public attitudes toward the use of appropriate drugs deprive any child of possible benefit from such medication.

Dr. Edward Zigler, Director of the Office of Child Development, complimented the panel on its efforts in addressing a complex subject. "Every member of the panel was carefully selected to represent a wide range of scientific interests. The statement is the product of some of the finest expertise in the country, and I am confident that it will clarify issues which have been of concern to the public."

REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON THE USE OF STIMULANT DRUGS IN THE TREATMENT OF BEHAVIORALLY DISTURBED YOUNG SCHOOL-CHILDREN

(Sponsored by the Office of Child Development and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., January 11–12, 1971)

INTRODUCTION

On January 11–12, 1971, the Office of Child Development and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, called a conference to discuss the use of stimulant medications in the treatment of elementary school-age children with certain behavioral disturbances. In convening the conference, the Office of Child Development was aware of public concern about the increasing use of stimulant medications (such as dextroamphetamine and methylphenidate) in treating so-called hyperkinetic behavior disorders. Were these drugs—so widely misused or abused by adolescents and adults—truly safe for children? Were they properly prescribed, or were they used for youngsters who, in fact, need other types of treatment? Is emphasis on medications for behavior disorders misleading? Might this approach tempt many to oversimplify a complex problem, leading to neglect of remedial social, educational or psychological efforts on the part of professionals, parents, schools and public agencies?

In order to clarify the conditions in which these medications are beneficial or harmful to children, to assess the status of current knowledge, and to determine the best auspices for administering these drugs to children, a panel of fifteen specialists was invited to meet in Washington. The panelists were from the fields of education, psychology, special education, pediatrics, adult and child psychiatry, psychoanalysis, basic and clinical pharmacology, internal medicine, drug abuse and social work. The panel's task was to review the evidence of research and experience and to prepare an advisory report for professionals and the public.

This report briefly outlines the general nature of behavioral disorders in children and then focuses on those disorders that are being treated with stimulant medications. It discusses appropriate treatment and the concerns voiced by the public and media. Finally, the report examines the role of the pharmaceutical industry, professionals, and the news media in publicizing stimulant drugs for children and outlines the glaring gaps in needed research, training and facilities.

BEHAVIOR DISORDERS OF CHILDHOOD

A wide range of conditions and disabilities can interfere with a child's learning at home and in school, his socialization with peers, and his capacity to reach his maximum development. Social deprivations and stress at home or school may retard optimal development. Mental retardation, the more rarely occurring childhood autism and psychosis, and other such disabilities may cause serious problems. Some difficulties arise because of clearly definable medical conditions such as blindness, deafness or obvious brain dysfunction. Some are associated with specific reading or perceptual defects, and others with severe personality or emotional disturbance.

Such dysfunctions are known to require careful evaluation, thoughtfully planned treatment employing a variety of methods on the child's behalf, and conscientious monitoring of remedial treatments. Individualized evaluation and treatment is important for any childhood behavior disorder. There are appropriate occasions for use of medications such as tranquilizers and antidepressants in some children with these disorders. For over three decades, stimulant medications have been selectively used for children under medical supervision. We now focus upon issues related to the current use of these drugs.

HYPERKINETIC DISORDERS

The type of disturbance which has evoked misunderstanding and concern has many names. The two most familiar—neither entirely satisfactory—are "minimal brain dysfunction" or, more commonly, "hyperkinetic behavioral disturbance." There is no known single cause or simple answer for such problems. The major symptoms are an increase of purposeless physical activity and a significantly impaired span of focused attention. The inability to control physical motion and attention may generate other consequences, such as disturbed mood and behavior within the home, at play with peers, and in the schoolroom.

In its clear-cut form, the overt hyperactivity is not simply a matter of degree but of quality. The physical activity appears driven—as if there were an "inner tornado"—so that the activity is beyond the child's control, as compared to other children. The child is distracted, racing from one idea and interest to another, but unable to focus attention.

INCIDENCE OF HYPERKINETIC DISORDERS

This syndrome is found in children of all socioeconomic groups and in countries throughout the world. A conservative estimate would be that moderate and severe disorders are found in about 3 out of 100 elementary school children—an estimate that would vary somewhat in different communities. More males than females are affected, as is true in a number of childhood ailments. Children so afflicted are generally of normal or superior intelligence. A significant number so diagnosed have special learning or reading disabilities, in addition to the major symptoms. A near majority are reported to have had behavioral problems since infancy. There is a small group of more severely afflicted children upon whom most studies have focused; they may show increased clumsiness and a variety of physical symptoms. Thus, some of the children show hyperactivity and reduced attention which ranges in degree from mild to severe, with or without associated physical signs or special learning impairments; some have complex behavioral and personality problems, as well as special learning and reading difficulties, along with the major hyperkinetic symptoms.

CAUSES OF HYPERKINETIC DISORDERS

We know little about definitive causes. The disorder has been ascribed to biological, psychological, social or environmental factors, or a combination of these. There is speculation that the core set of symptoms—those affecting control of attention and motor activity—may have their origin in events taking place before the child is born, or during the birth process, or they may be related to some infection or injury in early life. The neurological and psychological control of at-

tention is an important but incompletely researched topic, as are the nutritional, perinatal and developmental factors. Thus, in many instances, it is not yet possible even to speculate as to original causes.

THE COURSE OF HYPERKINETIC DISORDERS

Usually, the excessive activity and attentional disturbances are less apparent after puberty. Specialists citing experience and some fragmentary research data believe that treatment enables many to lead productive lives as adults, while severely afflicted children who remain untreated may be significantly at risk for adult disorders. Extensive research is still required on these points. Because the ages of 5 to 12 are crucial to the child's development and self-image, treatments which permit the child to be more accessible to environmental resources are warranted and useful.

DIAGNOSIS OF HYPERKINETIC DISORDERS

In diagnosing hyperkinetic behavioral disturbance, it is important to note that similar behavioral symptoms may be due to other illness or to relatively simple causes. Essentially healthy children may have difficulty maintaining attention and motor control because of a period of stress in school or at home. It is important to recognize the child whose inattention and restlessness may be caused by hunger, poor teaching, overcrowded classrooms, or lack of understanding by teachers or parents. Frustrated adults reacting to a child who does not meet their standards can exaggerate the significance of occasional inattention or restlessness. Above all, the normal ebullience of childhood should not be confused with the very special problems of the child with hyperkinetic behavioral disorders.

The diagnosis is clearly best made by a skilled observer. There unfortunately is no single diagnostic test. Accordingly, the specialist must comprehensively evaluate the child and assess the significance of a variety of symptoms. He considers causal and contributory factors—both permanent and temporary—such as environmental stress. He distinguishes special dysfunctions such as certain epilepsies, schizophrenia, depression or anxiety, mental retardation or perceptual deficiencies. The less severe and dramatic forms of hyperkinetic disorders also require careful evaluation. Adequate diagnosis may require the use not only of medical, but of special psychological, educational and social resources.

TREATMENT PROGRAMS

The fact that these dysfunctions range from mild to severe and have ill-understood causes and outcomes should *not* obscure the necessity for skilled and special interventions. The majority of the better known diseases—from cancer and diabetes to hypertension—similarly have unknown or multiple causes and consequences. Their early manifestations are often not readily recognizable. Yet useful treatment programs have been developed to alleviate these conditions. Uncertainty as to cause has not prevented tests of the effectiveness of available treatments, while the search for clearer definitions and more effective kinds of therapy continues. The same principles should clearly apply to the hyperkinetic behavior disorders.

Several approaches now appear to be helpful. Special classes and teachers can be directed to specific learning disabilities and thus restore the confidence of the child who experiences chronic failure. Modification of behavoir by systematic rewarding of desired actions has been reported to be useful in some children. Elimination of disturbing influences in the family or classroom through counseling may often tip the balance, and a happier child may show improved control and function.

There will be children for whom such efforts are not sufficient. Their history and their examination reveal symptoms of such a driven nature that skilled clinicians undertake a trial of medical treatment. *Medicine does not "cure" the condition, but the child may become more accessible to educational and counseling efforts.* Over the short term and at a critical age, this can provide the help needed for the child's development.

Stimulant medications are beneficial in only about one-half to two-thirds of the cases in which trials of the drugs are warranted. The stimulant drugs are considered to be the first and least complicated of the medicines to be tried. Other medications—the so-called tranquilizers and anti-depressants—are generally reserved for a smaller group of patients. Without specialized medical therapy, the consequences for these children of their failure to manage—even in an optimal environment—are clearly very severe. In such cases, the aim is not to "solve problems with drugs," but to put the severely handicapped child in a position to interact with his environment to the extent that his condition permits.

Response to stimulant medication cannot be predicted in advance. Fortunately, the issue can be resolved quickly. When stimulants are given in adequate doses, a favorable response—when it occurs—is fairly rapidly obtained and is unmistakably the consequence of the drug. Thus, if an adequate test of pharmacotherapy (a few days or weeks) produces only doubtful benefits or none at all, treatment can be promptly terminated. The physician will, of course, adjust dosage carefully to assure an adequate therapeutic trial. It would be tragic to deprive a child of a potentially beneficial treatment by inattention to dose. Thus, it is clear that not all affected children require medication and that of those who do, not all respond.

When the medication is effective, the child can modulate and organize his activities in the direction he wishes. The stimulant does not slow down or suppress the hyperkinetic child in the exercise of his initiative. Nor does it "pep him up," make him feel high, overstimulated, or out of touch with his environment. Much has been made of the "paradoxical sedative" effect of stimulants in such children. The term is inappropriate. Although their exact mechanism of action is not known, stimulants do not provide a chemical straitjacket. They do not act as a sedative. Rather, they appear to mobilize and to increase the child's abilities to focus on meaningful stimuli and to organize his bodily movements more purposefully.

The hoped-for secondary consequences are better peer relationships, improved self-image, and pleasure in acquiring competencies. Any coexisting dysfunctions—such as special perceptual and learning handicaps—must not be left unattended, simply because pharmacotherapy is available and sometimes helpful. Similarly, personality and psychological problems, social and family problems, may require continued attention.

During drug treatment, the dosage may require shifting to minimize unwanted effects, of which the major ones are loss of appetite and insomnia. Drug treatment should not and need not be indefinite, and usually is stopped after the age of 11 or 12. Frequently, following a sustained improvement over several months or a year or so, drugs may be discontinued, as during a vacation period. Drug-free intervals can be prolonged as observers assess the child's condition.

The decision to use drug treatment thus depends on the commitment to diagnose and to monitor the response to treatment in the best traditions of medical practice. When there is informed parental consent, parents, teachers and professionals can collaborate in organizing and monitoring treatment programs.

CONCERNS RAISED BY THE PUBLIC AND THE NEWS MEDIA

We will now turn to various concerns about hazards and abuses when stimulant medications are used for children. For example, concern has been expressed that the medical use of stimulants could create drug dependence in later years or induce toxicity. This subject touches on the rights of the child to needed treatment, as well as risks to both the child and the public, and requires continued intensive scrutiny.

1. Does the medication produce toxicity?

One should not confuse the effects of intravenous stimulants and the high dosages used by drug abusers with the effects or the risks of the low dosages used in medical therapy. In the dosage used for children, the questions of acute or chronic toxicity noted in the stimulant abuser are simply not a critical issue. Unwanted mental or physical effects do rarely appear in children; cessation of therapy or adjustment of dosage quite readily solves the problem.

2. Is there a risk of drug dependency in later years?

Thirty years of clinical experience and several scientific studies have failed to reveal an association between the medical use of stimulants in the pre-adolescent child and later drug abuse. Physicians who care for children treated with stimulants have noted that the children do not experience the pleasurable, subjective effects that would encourage misuse. They observe that most often the child is willing to stop the therapy, which he views as "medicine." Thus, the young child's experience of drug effects under medical management does not seem to induce misuse. The medical supervision may "train" him in the appropriate use of medicines. When adults are given stimulants—or even opiates—for time-limited periods under appropriate supervision and for justifiable reasons, there is relatively little misuse. Similarly, in treating epilepsy, barbiturates have been given from infancy to adulthood without creating problems of dependency or abuse.

It is not ordinarily the drug which constitutes abuse but the way in which a drug and its effects are used and exploited by an individual. There are indeed adolescents who, in varying degrees and for varying periods of time, either misuse or dangerously abuse stimulants. They experiment with the effects of excessive dosages to create excitement, to avoid sleep, to defy constraints, and to combat fatigue and gloom. It should be noted that these drugs are not commonly prescribed to children after the age of 11 or 12, when the actual risks of such experimentation or misuse might possibly become more significant.

Alert monitoring of drug use at any age is a part of sensible medical practice. With such precaution and with the available evidence, we find minimal cause for concern that treatment will induce dangerous drug misuse. To the contrary, there are very good reasons to expect that help, rather than harm, will be the result of appropriate treatment.

3. Are there safeguards against misuse?

There are some sensible steps, in addition to medical control, that guard against possible misuse. The child should not be given sole responsibility for taking the medication. He usually need not bring the drug to school. The precautions that surround the medicine cabinet—whether antibiotics, aspirins, sedatives or other medications are present—should be applied. Many such medicines, when misused, can be more dangerous to health and life than even the stimulant drugs. No child in the family should have access to medications not prescribed for him. These are general precautions comprising a

part of the child's education in the "etiquette of the medicine cabinet."

4. Do stimulants for children create a risk for others?

The panel agrees that stimulant drug abuse is seriously undesirable and frequently dangerous, although views vary on the scope of the problem and the number of actual casualties. Experts also agree that far more stimulants are prescribed for adults than are medically needed and far more are manufactured than prescribed.

Overprescription of any medication is deplored, whether or not it is liable to abuse. The question is whether the availability of stimulants for a very few of the childhood behavior disorders threatens the public health.

The prescribed dosage for an individual child constitutes an insufficient quantity to supply the confirmed abuser of stimulants with the amounts he requires. It is also true that illicitly manufactured stimulants are quite readily available and abused in this country. We must weigh the advantages of having appropriate medication available against the dangers of withholding treatment from a child who can clearly benefit from it. We doubt that prescriptions for the children who benefit from stimulants will require the manufacture of excessive and dangerously divertible supplies. With sensible precautions, there is at present no evidence justifying sensational alarm, either about the safety of the individual child who can benefit from therapy or about the safety of the general public.

5. Does medication handicap the child emotionally?

It is sometimes suggested that treated children may not be able to learn normal responses and master adjustments to the stresses of everyday life. These fears are understandable but are not confirmed by specialists who have experience with the conditions and the situations in which medications are properly used. For the correctly diagnosed child, these medications—if they work at all—facilitate the development of the ability to focus attention and to make judgments in directing behavior. Such children can acquire the capacity to tolerate and master stress by creating stress. The medications, in these circumstances, help "set the stage" for satisfactory psychological development.

The hyperkinetic behavioral disturbance is a form of disorganization that creates great stress in the afflicted child. The use of therapeutic stimulants for this disturbance should not be equated with the misuse of medication aimed at allowing a normal child or adult to avoid or escape the ordinary stresses of life.

6. What are the rights of the parents?

Under no circumstances should any attempt be made to coerce parents to accept any particular treatment. As with any illness, the child's confidence must be respected. The consent of the patient and his parents or guardian must be obtained for treatment. It is proper for school personnel to inform parents of a child's behavior problems, but members of the school staff should not directly diagnose the hyperkinetic disturbance or prescribe treatment. The school should initiate contact with a physician only with the parents' consent. When the parents do give their approval, cooperation by teachers, social workers, special education and medical personnel can provide valuable help in treating the child's problem.

STIGMATIZING THE MEDICINES AND CHILDREN, AND THE ROLE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

A child who benefits from stimulants or other psychotropic medications should not be stigmatized; his situation is no different from that of the child who benefits from eyeglasses. It is unjust to stigmatize a child in later life, when competing in various situations (applying for college, employment or organization memberships), by labeling him early in life as "stupid," and "emotional cripple," a "drug-taker," or by any other kind of unjustified and unfortunate stereotype.

Nor should the medicine be stigmatized. Where bad practices prevail—and a number of complaints have been called to our attention—these practices should be squarely dealt with. This is not only a responsibility of physicians and educators, but also of the news media. Yet indignation must be tempered with perspective and scrupulous respect for the facts. An informed and understanding public can foster the growth and development of children, and these public attitudes may lead to the development of more refined and better-delivered health services. Either bad practices or exaggerated alarm can threaten the availability of medical resources for those who critically need it. This has happened before in the history of valuable medicines, and it can take years to repair the damage.

THE PROMOTION OF DRUGS BY INDUSTRY AND THE MEDIA

Pharmaceutical companies producing stimulants or new medications which may become useful for hyperkinetic disorders have a serious obligation to the public. These medicines should be promoted ethically and *only* through medical channels. Manufacturers should not seek endorsement of their products by school personnel. In the current climate, society can best be served if industry refrains from any implicit urging that nonspecialists deal with disorders and medications with which they are unfamiliar. Professionals and the news media can play useful roles by not pressing for treatments in advance of their practical availability.

THE DELIVERY OF SPECIAL HEALTH CARE: A DILEMMA

Our society has not as yet found complete solutions to the problem of the delivery of special health care. When available treatments cannot be confidently and appropriately delivered by physicians, they are perhaps best withheld until such treatments can be provided—especially with milder dysfunctions. This is not to say that severely afflicted hyperkinetic children should not or cannot receive available medical treatment. But until systems of continuing professional education and ready access to consultants are financed and perfected, some judgment about the pace at which unfamiliar treatments can be widely fostered is required. Finally, we must recognize that it is not only the scarcity of trained personnel, but factors such as poverty and inadequate educational facilities which prevent accessibility to individualized treatment.

THE NEED FOR SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

In preparing this report, the Committee was repeatedly struck by our lack of information in many crucial areas. The facts are that children constitute well over half our population, but receive a disproportionately low share of skilled research attention. We have noted the difficulties in arriving at accurate methods of diagnosis and the importance of launching careful longitudinal and follow-up studies. The investigation of causal factors lags. Such factors as perinatal injury, environmental stress or the development of the neurological and psychological controls of attention require study. Variations in different socioeconomic and ethnic groups must be considered in order to arrive at better definitions of behavior properly regarded as pathological. All such research efforts would have aided us in assessing the numbers of affected children and in recommending designs for more effective treatment programs.

Clinical pharmacologists have repeatedly found that drugs may act differently in children than in adults. To use medicines of all kinds effectively in children, more specialists must be trained in drug investigation—pharmacologists who can develop basic knowledge about the action of drugs in the developing organism. There is the obvious need for better and more precisely targeted drugs for the whole range of severe childhood behavior disorders. This requires intense research and training efforts. Such efforts provide the means for developing, testing and delivering better treatment programs. There is a similar need for research in the techniques of special education and also a need to make these techniques available to children who can benefit. It would appear to be a sound Federal investment to conduct such research and training.

In summary, there is a place for stimulant medications in the treatment of the hyperkinetic behavioral disturbance, but these medications are not the only form of effective treatment. We recommend a code of ethical practices in the promotion of medicines, and candor, meticulous care and restraint on the part of the media, professionals and the public. Expanded programs of continuing education for those concerned with the health care of the young, and also sustained research into their problems, are urgently needed.

Our society is facing a crisis in its competence and willingness to develop and deliver authentic knowledge about complex problems. Without such knowledge, the public cannot be protected against half-truths and sensationalism, nor can the public advance its concern for the health of children.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE PANEL

Dr. Daniel X. Freedman, Chairman, Professor and Chairman, Department of Psychiatry, University of Chicago.

Dr. T. Berry Brazelton, practicing pediatrician and Research Associate and Lecturer in Cognitive Studies, Harvard University.

Dr. James Comer, Associate Professor of Psychiatry, Yale Study Center, and Associate Dean, Yale Medical School.

Dr. William Cruickshank, Director, Institute for the Study of Mental Retardation, University of Michigan.

Dr. Edward Perry Crump, Professor of Pediatrics, Meharry Medical College, Nashville, Tennessee.

Dr. Barbara Fish, Professor of Child Psychiatry, New York School of Medicine.

Dr. George H. Garrison, Clinical Professor of Pediatrics, University of Oklahoma.

Dr. Frank Hewett, Associate Professor in Special Education and Psychiatry, University of California.

Dr. Leo E. Hollister, clinical pharmacologist and Medical Investigator, Veterans Administration Hospital, Palo Alto, California.

Dr. Conan Kornetsky, Research Professor, Division of Psychiatry and Department of Pharmacology, Boston University School of Medicine.

Dr. Edward T. Ladd, Professor of Education, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

Dr. Robert J. Levine, Associate Professor of Medicine and Pharmacology, Yale University School of Medicine.

Dr. Patricia Morisey, Associate Professor, School of Social Service, Fordham University.

Dr. Irving Schulman, Professor and Head of the Department of Pediatrics, University of Illinois College of Medicine.

Dr. Martin H. Smith, practicing pediatrician in Gainesville, Georgia, and past Chairman of the Georgia Chapter, American Academy of Pediatrics.

U.S.-SOVIET POLICY IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, millions of Americans continue to question why our present policy in Southeast Asia precludes ending the war by a military victory over the aggressor nation—North Vietnam—as a means of achieving a truly lasting peace in that part of the world. North Vietnamese forces have not only invaded South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, but have trained local insurgents for guerrilla operations in Thailand as well.

It is well established, I think, that our policy in Southeast Asia has been based on containing Red Chinese expansionism. The doctrine of containment has been advanced time and time again by policymakers in the Johnson administration, by international affairs analysts, by members of the intellectual community, and by Richard Nixon himself in justifying U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia.

Dean Rusk, who was Secretary of State under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, in reviewing U.S. foreign policy in 1966 stated:

. . . We must remain firm in our determination to help those allied nations which seek our help to resist the direct and indirect use of threat of force against their territory by Peiping.[1]

The seriousness of our determination to stand firm and oppose Red China's expansion efforts was brought to light in testimony by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 3, 1966 in which he hinted that war with Red China was possible:

Given this history of militant aggressive actions by Communist China, it would be irresponsible for me to say that we run no risk of war with China arising from our efforts to defend South Vietnam from aggression.[2]

Again in July of 1966, McNamara said:

China is building more military power than she needs to protect herself against her neighbors—there is at least the presumption, if not the certainty, that she may use that military power to try to advance beyond her borders, probing and taking advantage of weakness on her periphery . . . and therefore, . . . I think it is important that the weak nations of the periphery of Red China be assisted to grow economically, to grow politically and to receive military assistance when required to throw back potential aggression *from Red China*.[3]

McNamara held to his view that Red Chinese supported aggression dictated U.S. military presence in South Vietnam. On January 22, 1968, at the height of the war in Vietnam, McNamara in a prepared statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee stated:

We can assume that Red China will continue to support North Vietnam's aggression against South Vietnam and Laos as well as the present low keyed but continuing insurrections against Thailand and Burma . . . In its dealings with the Peking regime, the United States will be concerned to stress the common interest we share in avoiding war, . . . while we continue to try to deter direct or indirect Chinese aggressions against her neighbors.[4]

Walt Whitman Rostow, a National Security Advisor to both Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has defended U.S. involvement in Vietnam inasmuch as it prevented Communist China from dominating Asia.[5]

This same position was taken by Johnson's Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, Eugene Rostow, in an interview with William Whitworth of the New Yorker magazine which appeared in the New Yorker of July 4, 1970 in a lengthy article entitled "A Reporter at Large, Some Questions About the War."[6]

The containment doctrine has also been expounded by Mr. Nixon. In a speech to the Executives Club of New York on January 26, 1965 wherein he called for stepped-up military activities by the United States in Vietnam, Nixon stated:

It is dangerous and foolhardy to try to gloss over the truth as to what the war in Vietnam really involves:

First, the war in Vietnam is not about Vietnam but about Southeast Asia.

Second, the confrontation in Vietnam is, in the final analysis, not between the Vietnamese and the Viet Cong nor between the United States and the Viet Cong, *but between the United States and communist China. If communist China were not instigating and supporting the Viet Cong, there would be no war in Vietnam today.* (Italic for emphasis)

Third, *a U.S. defeat in Vietnam means a Chinese communist victory which could decide the fate of Asia for generations to come.*[7]

William P. Bundy, presently visiting professor, Center of International Studies, MIT; former Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, 1964–69 and Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, 1963–64, wrote in Foreign Affairs for January 1971:

The picture [in Southeast Asia] is wholly different from what it was in the spring and summer of 1965, when the culminating series of major American decisions in Vietnam was taken.

Then, the great power forces within the area were seen in starkly bipolar terms: the "East Wind" of China was blowing strongly and thrustingly versus a "West Wind" which was pretty much American alone. . . . Then, if ever, a Hanoi takeover of South Vietnam seemed likely, in conjunction with other trends, *to make probable not only North Vietnamese domination in the Indochina area but a wave of Chinese expansion into the rest of Southeast Asia.*

The United States, with these wider stakes much in mind, decided, with the support of others, to stand in defense of South Vietnam.[8]

In an article appearing in the October 1967 issue of Foreign Affairs entitled "Asia After Viet Nam" Nixon, justifying U.S. involvement in Vietnam, said:

The U.S. presence has provided . . . a shield behind which the anti-communist forces found the courage and the capacity to stage their counter-coup and, at the final moment, to rescue their country *from the Chinese orbit*.[9]

Another member of the Johnson cabinet, John Gardner, warned in an interview published in the Christian Science Monitor of June 8, 1970 that:

The withdrawal of American commitment from Southeast Asia would change the terms of the debate going forward within mainland China. Powerful forces are at work there to move post-Mao China toward a long delayed concentration of its energies and talents on the modernization of its life. *American withdrawal would, in my view, inevitably lead Peking to exploit its new opportunities to the south.*[10]

One of France's top economists and political scientists, Prof. Raymond Aron, has maintained that the United States involved itself in Vietnam under the containment doctrine. In an interview with U.S. News & World Report in 1969, Aron stated that:

The U.S. intervened in South Vietnam—rightly or wrongly—in the name of a policy of containment, which was perhaps meaningless but it was the official policy. It was not done in order to establish any sovereignty in South Vietnam.[11]

If containment of Communist China is our present policy vis-a-vis Southeast Asia, the question naturally arises: "How is military victory over North Vietnam—a policy which three administrations have refused to pursue—incompatible with our overall policy of containing Chinese communist expansion?"

A review of other statements by persons who make or influence U.S. foreign policy might be helpful in providing some of the answer.

Henry Kissinger, who formulates foreign policy for Nixon, and is the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs, discussed the Soviet's stake in Vietnam:

The same is true of the Soviet Union, whose large-scale aid to Hanoi makes it a semi-participant in the war. Moscow must be torn by contradictory inclinations. A complete victory for Hanoi would tend to benefit Peking in the struggle for influence among the communist parties of the world; it would support the Chinese argument that intransigence toward the United States is, if not without risk, at least relatively manageable. But a defeat of Hanoi would demonstrate Soviet inability to protect "fraternal" communist countries against the United States. *It would also weaken a potential barrier to Chinese influence in Southeast Asia and enable Peking to turn its full fury on Moscow.*[12]

Kissinger apparently believes that the Soviets are caught in a dilemma in Vietnam whereby they stand to lose a great deal if Hanoi should either win or lose the war. They would wish neither.

Nixon said in 1964 that Russia and Red China were:

Bitter enemies.[13]

And that:

Moscow does not want to see Peking grow strong and *expand in Southeast Asia.*[14]

He also stated in 1965 that:

The Soviet Union is not now interested in the *Chinese gaining success in Asia,* or any place else.[15]

This same view of wanting to "contain" Red China as a policy of the Soviet Union has been expressed by others. Nationally syndicated columnist David Lawrence in

Footnotes at end of article.

an editorial wrote about Soviet intentions in Vietnam in this way:

It is acknowledged that the Soviet Union has spent an average of a billion dollars a year on the Vietnam war. *The objective has been to gain friends in Southeast Asia and also to prevent Red China from acquiring a dominant position on the continent* by setting up its own puppet states.[16]

Bundy has had this to say about the Soviet interests in Southeast Asia:

As for the Soviet Union's own behavior, there has been a slowly emerging trend to treat Southeast Asia in the same manner as it deals with India and Pakistan and with the same *basic fear of Chinese expansion as a major factor*. In addition to their need for rubber, the Soviets have a natural interest in the free movement of their commercial shipping through the southern seas, and as time goes on this interest is bound to be reflected in some naval activity.[17]

According to Bundy, the Soviet Union not only fears the political implications of Chinese expansion in Southeast Asia, it is also concerned that it might lose a potential source of raw materials and endanger its commercial trade in that area.

President Nixon has also recognized the Soviets' concern about Red China as related to the problem of Vietnam. When asked at a news conference on March 4, 1969, about whether he had been able to enlist the Soviet Union's help in getting out of Vietnam, a position he had taken during his candidacy for the Presidency, Nixon replied:

As you know, the Soviet Union is in a very delicate and sensitive position as far as Vietnam is concerned. I do not divulge any confidence from the Soviet Ambassador in indicating that is the case . . . here you have Communist China aiding North Vietnam. You also have the Soviet Union aiding North Vietnam. Each is vying for power in the Communist world and, therefore what the Soviet Union does in the Vietnamese conflict is a very difficult decision for them as related to that objective—the objective of leadership in the Communist world.[18]

Apparently our appreciation for the Soviet Union's difficult situation in Vietnam goes further than one would think at first glance. Eugene Rostow has provided us with an interesting insight into the thinking of U.S. policymakers on the subject of Vietnam as related to Soviet objectives there:

When I came into the State Department, in 1966, Rusk asked me to try to think of alternatives in Vietnam, and I thought of the way the Korean war was unwound. And I told the Russians, with full backing from my bosses, that this was the best way to solve the Vietnam problem—the way the Korean problem was solved. Namely, by Russian-American collaboration. They said, "That's very interesting, and it hasn't been rejected, but it's very difficult for us." And I said, "Yes, we understand, *we're not trying to push you out of there and turn it over to the Chinese at all. Quite the contrary.*" And they said, "We never reject this approach." But they didn't act on it, either . . . They are very much concerned about leadership of the world Communist movement, or movements, and their rivalry with China in that regard. They really seem to care quite a lot about that.[19]

While Moscow is not anxious to accept the American presence in Asia, it is more afraid that Asia will be dominated by Red China.

Although a united Vietnam under Communist leadership would seem to be theoretically desirable from the Soviet point of view, an ominous background presence of Red China would almost suggest in practice that a divided Vietnam may not [thwart] the long-range policy planners of the USSR.[20]

The Soviets share with the United States and local nations in Asia—including North Vietnam—an interest in preventing Red China's domination of the Asiatic mainland. This provides the main basis for Soviet-North Vietnamese relations in Southeast Asia vis-a-vis Red China. Although the Soviets are equally concerned with United States policy and actions in the area, their immediate concern is centered more on the short-run threat that the United States poses to the survival of a Communist state—North Vietnam—which the Soviets are committed to defend against her overthrow by the United States. The Soviets are concerned less that in the long run the United States will be able to dominate the Asian mainland than that Red China may . . . in this context . . . Soviet interests would be best served by a stalemate in Vietnam. . . .[21]

Although the Soviet Union dismisses it as propaganda, the Red Chinese talk of United States-Soviet collusion on Vietnam. In an interview with Simon Malley of the Washington Evening Star in 1967, Red Chinese Foreign Minister, Chen Yi said that Khrushchev and Eisenhower had made a deal at their 1959 meetings at Camp David, Md., wherein he said:

They agreed to work together to maintain a political status quo in the world. By the terms of the deal, the Soviet Union was committed to discourage wars of national liberation directed against governments friendly to the United States.[22]

Premier Chou En-lai added further:

What the Russian revisionists aimed at was to develop further the recognition by the U.S.A. and Russia of areas of vital interest, which they divided between themselves.[23]

One would be willing to agree with the Soviets that this is nothing but mainland China propaganda if it were not for the persistence with which the leaders in the United States adhere to our all-out no-win policy in Vietnam.

Three administrations have agreed that we should commit the lives of American men to the Asian continent to fight a war of attrition to contain communism, yet for some mysterious reason the question of military victory cannot even be considered. McNamara had said that:

U.S. policy in Vietnam is bottomed upon a disavowal of any intention to destroy the Hanoi regime, to seize its territory.[24]

And in the first official statement on Vietnam from the Nixon administration, Secretary of State William P. Rogers told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that:

We are not seeking a military victory nor do we want military escalation [25] in Vietnam.

Why not an end to the war by victory in Southeast Asia? It is certainly not because victory is not possible. Gen. William Westmoreland, Army Chief of Staff and former commander of U.S. Armed Forces in Southeast Asia said in 1969 that the United States could win a military victory in Vietnam:

Absolutely, if it were the policy of this country to seek one, and if we were given the resources.[26]

The late Senator Richard B. Russell who was privy to much inside information on Vietnam as chairman of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees and as a close personal friend of President Johnson, said in 1969 that:

We could've brought the war to a conclusion in three months, up to two years ago.[27]

Criticizing Johnson for his handling of the war, Russell said in January of 1970:

My complaint with him [Johnson] was not for sending others in, but because we didn't go on and win the day by closing up the ports of North Vietnam. He let the timid souls in the State Department talk him out of that. He could have ended that war in six months any time.[28]

Even Kissinger admits that victory is now possible but he is apparently concerned, for some undetermined reason, that the South Vietnamese might carry the war to the north in an attempt to achieve that objective. Peregrine Worsthorne, a political columnist for the London Sunday Telegraph, who interviewed both Nixon and Kissinger on the subject of Vietnam, had this to say about Kissinger's views on Vietnam:

Henry Kissinger is engagingly frank on this point. He admits that on first coming into the White House his assumption was that the Nixon policy of combining American withdrawal with rapid Vietnamization was in effect little more than a face-saving formula. The Vietnamization program was seen as a bluff designed to build up a slightly more favorable negotiating position from which to reach a settlement that would in effect be a North Vietnamese victory, only delayed long enough to save America's face. The last two years, however, have drastically altered his judgment. Vietnamization has succeeded beyond his wildest expectations.

. . . Kissinger believes it to be the task of the realist today to prick the defeatist bubble. He is no longer worried by the possibility of the North Vietnamese pulling off some catastrophic surprise. *Much more dangerous and possible in the long run, in his view, is the possibility of the South Vietnamese doing something untoward. One almost got the impression from Kissinger that he is more worried today that the South Vietnamese will invade the North than vice versa.*[29]

Since victory over the enemy in Southeast Asia is possible, why will not this administration, as the two that passed before, allow it? A victory now, over communism, would do more to benefit the United States and the rest of the free world, particularly the free Asian world, than any other present course of action. It would bind up the internal wounds of divisiveness here in the United States caused by our present no-win policy; it would give hope to those millions of people now enslaved under Communist regimes elsewhere; and it would show those millions of people in the free world, some of whom face the threat of communism daily, that Communist totalitarianism is a thing of the past. What could be more in the American interest than ending the war through victory?

Could it be, as has been suggested by Nixon, Kissinger, Rostow and others, that our overriding consideration in

Footnotes at end of article.

Vietnam is the present Soviet policy there? Or is it that the United States does in fact share with the Soviet Union a common economic interest in that area? But, even so, it is only the Soviet Union who benefits by the continued stalemate. In the short run it keeps Asia out of the hands of the Soviet's Communist enemy, Red China, and in the long run weakens internally by divisiveness among its people caused by a no-win policy its only real barrier to world domination, the United States, who is also forced to furnish the arms, money, and support troops with which to fight the war.

If our involvement in Indochina is to help keep this area out of the hands of the Chinese Communists for later exploitation by the Russian Communists, or if U.S. policy is tailored so as not to embarrass the Soviet Union, we should withdraw our forces from Vietnam forthwith.

Kissinger said in a background briefing on U.S. foreign policy at San Clemente, Calif., June 26, 1970, that:

> It is very hard to see what we could do in Southeast Asia that would produce a direct confrontation with the Soviet Union.[30]

If what Kissinger says is true, either the Soviet Union is not as interested in Southeast Asia as has been noted, or the Soviets have been assured in advance that what we do in Vietnam will not be damaging to them. Based on the information available, I would tend to think the latter is the case. For a U.S. victory in Vietnam would be a catastrophe to the Soviet Union.

It is high time the United States began thinking about its own interests and those of the free world, and went about the task of eliminating communist totalitarianism wherever it threatens. A good start would be Vietnam—ending the war by winning it.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Dean Rusk, "U. S. Policy Toward Communist China," *Commander's Digest*, April 30, 1966.

[2] Robert S. McNamara, Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 3, 1966.

[3] McNamara, from an interview by Professor Kei Wakaizumi, July 15, 1966. See *Selected Statement By DoD And Other Administration Officials*, July 1–December 31, 1966, Office of the Secretary of Defense.

[4] McNamara, Statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee on the FY 1969–73 Defense Program and 1969 Defense Budget, Jan. 2, 1968.

[5] See "Historians Rebuke Rostow For Role in Vietnam Policy," *The Washington Post*, Dec. 30, 1969, p. A3.

[6] See "A Reporter at Large, Some Questions About the War," *New Yorker Magazine*, July 4, 1970, pp. 30–56.

[7] Richard M. Nixon, "Facing the Facts in Vietnam." *Vital Speeches*, March 15, 1965, p. 339.

[8] William P. Bundy, "New Tides in Southeast Asia," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1971, p. 187.

[9] Nixon, "Asia After Viet Nam," *Foreign Affairs*, October 1967, p. 111.

[10] Walt W. Rostow, "Why We Should Not Abandon Our Role in Asia," *The Sunday Star*, Washington, D. C., June 28, 1970, p. B–2.

[11] "If American Will Crumbles—," *U. S. News & World Report*, December 1, 1969, p. 43.

[12] Henry A. Kissinger, "The Vietnam Negotiations," *Foreign Affairs*, January 1969, p. 219.

[13] Nixon, "Needed In Vietnam: The Will To Win," *The Reader's Digest*, August 1964, p. 41.

[14] *ibid.*

[15] Nixon, *op. cit.*, March 15, 1965, p. 339.

[16] David Lawrence, "Key To Viet Peace In Moscow," *Congressional Record*, December 20, 1969, P. E. 10962.

[17] Bundy, *op. cit.*, January 1971, p. 195.

[18] "Nixon: 'Tour Was a Condition Precedent to an East-West Summit,'" *The Washington Post*, March 5, 1969, p. A10.

[19] See "A Reporter at Large, Some Questions About the War," *New Yorker Magazine*, July 4, 1970, p. 40.

[20] Kurt L. London, Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, The George Washington University, "Vietnam: A Sino-Soviet Dilemma," *The Russian Review*, Vol. XVI, No. 1 (January, 1967), 26 ff.

[21] John R. Thomas, Research Associate, Research Analysis Corporation, "Soviet Russia and Southeast Asia," *The Reprint Series of the Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies*, George Washington University, No. 24, January, 1969, p. 277.

[22] Simon Malley, "Sino-Soviet Border Conflict 'Possible . . . Even Probable,' *The Evening Star*, Washington, D.C., May 17, 1967, p. A–8.

[23] *ibid.*

[24] McNamara, *op. cit.*, March 3, 1966.

[25] George Sherman, "Rogers . . . Says President Does Not Seek Military Win," *The Evening Star*, March 27, 1969, p. 1.

[26] Gen. William Westmoreland, Testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations, *Department of Defense Appropriations For 1970*, Part 7, p. 165.

[27] "Russell—War Can Be Won In 6 Months," *The Washington Post*, April 8, 1969.

[28] Don Oberdorfer, "Russell Says He Never Believed Oswald Alone Planned Killing," *The Washington Post*, Jan. 19, 1970, p. A3.

[29] Peregrine Worsthorne, "Mr. Nixon Is Playing to Win in Asia," *The Washington Post*, February 28, 1971, p. B1.

[30] *Background Briefing United States Foreign Policy*, June 26, 1970, p. 20.

CLOTHING UNION LEADER WARNS OF JAPANESE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the AFL–CIO unions in Miami Beach, Mr. Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, warned that the U.S. textile and clothing industry is rapidly being threatened with a depression worse than the 1930's due to cheap imports from Japan.

"The Japanese are hell-bent on taking over our jobs," said Mr. Potofsky, in an understatement of the situation. They are hell-bent on taking over American jobs in all major sectors of the economy, and have made tremendous inroads in the electronic, computer and other fields.

The Japanese have made a modest proposal in "voluntarily" cutting back on their textile and clothing imports to the United States, which is ludicrous.

To protect our industry and jobs, I have introduced H.R. 1073, which would curb the flood of cheap imports into the United States. It is my sincere hope that the Ways and Means Committee will consider this legislation as soon as possible.

Following is a dispatch out of Miami Beach concerning Mr. Potofsky's grave concern over the future of the textile and clothing industry.

I include the article as follows:

CLOTHING UNION LEADER WARNS OF JAPANESE

MIAMI BEACH.—The Japanese are trying to take over the U.S. textile and clothing industry, threatening this nation's largest manufacturing employer with economic disaster from a flood of imports, a labor leader said Saturday.

"The Japanese are hell-bent on taking over our jobs," said Jacob S. Potofsky, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, one of several major AFL–CIO unions leading a drive to curb foreign imports.

PICKETING PLANS

The problem of imports was tops on the agenda of the unions' meeting here, including demands for action from Congress and plans for mass picketing against U.S. stores that sell foreign-made clothing.

Potofsky said clothing and textile imports from Asia and Europe, particularly from Japan, wiped out 70,000 American jobs last year alone, half of them in his union's shirt and suit-making jurisdiction.

The job loss, totaling 250,000 over the last 15 years, is rapidly increasing and threatening the industry with a depression worse than the 1930s, he said.

$1 BILLION DEFICIT

Potofsky's chief aide, Howard D. Samuel, said this country is running a $1-billion trade deficit from imported textiles and "the Japanese are dumping heavily on us" while barring U.S.-made clothing from Japan.

The union is planning a new round of mass protest picketing in Boston, New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and Los Angeles.

TRIBUTE TO MISS DORCIA PATCHETT

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, at a recent dinner in Santa Rosa, Calif., the Exchange Club of that city honored a distinguished lady who has served her community and mankind for over 50 years.

Miss Dorcia Patchett, for 39 years a public school teacher in the area, was honored for not only her efforts with the young people of the community through the school system, but has donated willingly of her time and abundant talents to assist young people who came to "Miss Docia" for help.

President Josephine Nattkemper, of the local branch of the American Association of University Women stated:

> She has exemplified and epitomized the ideals of our organization, by her service to young girls who have, by her help and example, gone on into higher education and from there to greater service to mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the world is a better place because of the efforts of this wonderful woman. She continually inspired those with whom

she came in contact, by creating an awareness of nature and its beauties. A long time member of many leading conservation organizations, Miss Patchett is currently program chairman of the Madrone Audubon Society and is active as the curator of the Santa Rosa Junior College Museum, in which post she has served since her retirement from active teaching in 1957.

She was honored at the time of her retirement by her colleagues as the "Teacher of the Century," in commemoration of the centennial year of the National Education Association.

While still teaching, Miss Patchett provided room in her home for several foreign students who were attending Santa Rosa Junior College and financially assisted several other young people, one of whom is now a teacher in his native Kenya.

Although she never married, upon the death of her beloved sister, Miss Patchett legally adopted her two youngest nieces and raised them as her own.

It would be impossible to list here all of the many awards, honors and accomplishments of this devoted teacher and conservationist; suffice it to say that they are many and varied.

I join with the hundreds who have honored "Miss Docia" and congratulate her on her very positive contributions to making our world a better place in which to live.

SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, next month, we will all be given an opportunity to pay tribute to the ladies who play a major role in our lives—our secretaries. During Secretaries Week, April 18 to 24, and on Secretaries Day, April 21, I hope that all my colleagues will take time to recognize the vital role which secretaries play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions.

The last full week in April has been celebrated as Secretaries Week since 1952. All secretaries participate in observance of this week, and thus reemphasize the importance of their continued loyalty to their employers and their responsibility to their profession.

In addition, in keeping with the professional objective of the National Secretaries Association, chapters of NSA sponsor special educational activities such as seminars, workshops, and educational forums which are available to all secretaries. NSA members make public appearances at meetings of civic, educational, and professional groups.

I hope that all my colleagues will join next month in observance of Secretaries Week and its theme, "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business." As those entrusted with the handling of the Nation's business, we all recognize the truth of this theme and the vital role played by secretaries all over this country.

LITHUANIAN BARRED BY UNITED STATES IS NOW REPORTED JAILED WHILE SOVIET STUDIES TREASON CHARGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times and the Chicago Tribune carried dispatches in their editions today which again focus attention on Simas Kudirka.

I am placing both articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and renewing my appeal to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries for early consideration of House Joint Resolution 271 sponsored by a number of our colleagues urging that the Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant* be renamed the *Simas Kudirka*.

At the time that Soviet propaganda was trying to create the impression that Simas Kudirka was alive and well in Lithuania, I denounced the reports as false and still say they are false.

I hope that Congress will be given the opportunity to vote on House Joint Resolution 271 without too much delay.

I include the articles as follows:

LITHUANIA BARRED BY U.S. IS NOW REPORTED JAILED WHILE SOVIET STUDIES TREASON CHARGE

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Moscow, March 9—Simas Kudirka, the Lithuanian sailor who was refused political sanctuary in the United States after jumping from his fishing ship to a Coast Guard cutter last November, is reported to be in a Vilna prison undergoing investigation of treason charges.

Usually reliable sources said today that Mr. Kudirka had been confined since December, when his ship returned to Lithuania after the incident off of Martha's Vineyard.

His wife reportedly told friends that she was able to visit him once around New Year's Day and had no word about him since then.

According to these sources, Mr. Kudirka, who is 32 years old, went on a hunger strike when first imprisoned, but it was not known what his present condition was. They also said that the apartments of about 50 of his friends and relatives in the Lithuanian port city of Klaipeda had been searched in connection with the case.

The sources said information, made available last month and distributed by some press agencies, that Mr. Kudirka was well and at liberty was inaccurate. There was no way of explaining the discrepancy between the two versions.

Lithuanian emigre organizations in the West contend that Mr. Kudirka is dead, but the sources here said that as of about two weeks ago, at least, he apparently was alive.

Mr. Kudirka's effort to seek refuge in the United States took place Nov. 23 when his ship, the Sovetskaya Litva, was tied to the Coast Guard cutter Vigilant while Soviet and American officials were discussing a fisheries accord.

Coast Guard officials decided to return Mr. Kudirka to his ship. The incident angered President Nixon. Two Coast Guard officers were retired as a result of the act.

The sources said that Mr. Kudirka was being held under the Lithuanian equivalent of the Russian Republic's Article 64–A, which makes it treason and a capital crime to seek to leave the Soviet Union without permission.

In January, another Lithuanian, Vitautas Simokaitis, who had tried to hijack a Soviet plane from Lithuania to Sweden with his wife, was sentenced to death for the attempt. But his sentence was commuted to 15 years in a prison camp.

In addition, two other Lithuanians, Pranas Brazinskas-Koreivo and his son, Algirdas, succeeded in October in hijacking a Soviet plane to Turkey. In that hijacking a Soviet stewardess was killed. A Turkish appeals court said yesterday the two men could be extradited, but the authorities have not made a final ruling.

These acts have focused attention on discontent said to exist in Lithuania under Soviet rule. Apparently alluding to the acts, Antanas Y. Snechkus, the head of the Lithuanian party, said at a recent Lithuanian party congress:

"Recently we have had taken place acts of treason against the motherland, or attempts to commit such crimes by politically and morally depraved people, in the main, coming from criminal elements.

"Leaders of the Lithuanian reactionary emigres played a shameful role in this business, defending the criminals, portraying them as heroes in the fight against Communism."

REPORT SOVIETS JAIL SAILOR U.S. REJECTED

MOSCOW, MARCH 9 [REUTHERS]—A Lithuanian sailor who unsuccessfully sought asylum on a United States coast guard cutter in November was arrested by Soviet secret police late last year, unofficial sources said today.

The sources quoted a friend of the sailor, Simas Kudirka, as saying Kudirka's wife visited him in prison in Vilnius, the Lithuanian capital. He was said to look pale and thin and to have told her he had been forcibly fed while staging a hunger strike.

NOT REPORTED IN PRESS

The Soviet press has not reported the incident.

Other unofficial information last month had said Kudirka was still at liberty in his home town of Klapeda and had recently moved into a new apartment.

The latest account took two weeks to reach Moscow. Klajpeda, a naval port, is closed to foreigners.

Kudirka boarded the U.S. coast guard cutter Vigilant off Martha's Vineyard No. 23 while it was within a few feet of the Soviet ship Sovietskaya Litva during a talk on fishing rights. The cutter's captain, comdr. Ralph E. Eustis, was ordered by coast guard officials in Boston to return him. The decision brought a public outcry in the U.S. and a Congressional reprimand for Coast Guard authorities.

TELL OF AFRICAN SAILOR

The soviet press in a report reaching here today reported a case of a portuguese african sailor who jumped overboard from his ship in the English Channel after alleged persecution by fellow crewmen.

The Estonian daily Sovetskaya Estoniya said the African sailor, Antos Dias, refused to return to his ship, the Greek vessel Peramatarisa, when his captain sent a boat to bring him back.

The Soviet ship, the Ludze, handed over Dias to West German marine agents two days later on Feb. 28. The agents said they would help him return home to the Cape Verde Islands, it said.

AN OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT, AN HONORABLE GOAL

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent announcement that will be of interest to every Member of this distinguished body.

In the February 17, 1971, edition of the Davie County, N.C., Enterprise Record, there appeared a story announcing that Mr. John Avery Foster had been named Davie County's Most Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer.

This commendation would represent an outstanding achievement and an honorable goal for any man, but it especially meaningful in this case.

Mr. Foster is 76 years old, and he is a black man. For much of his life, he has dedicated himself to the maintenance of law and order, and the pursuit of justice, in his community.

That dedication led him to become the first Negro deputy sheriff in the history of North Carolina and also the first Negro constable in the State.

Still an active member of the Mocksville Police Department, Mr. Foster has won the respect and the admiration of every citizen in that community.

In honoring Mr. Foster at a recent banquet, one of the speakers said:

It is hard to evaluate Avery Foster's service to this community, but in large measure the credit is his for the harmonious race relations that we have enjoyed through the years.

This is indeed a fitting tribute to an outstanding public servant, and I am sure all my colleagues in the House join me in extending congratulations to Mr. Foster for his long career of selfless service.

I insert in the RECORD two articles appearing in the aforementioned Davie County Enterprise Record of February 17, regarding Mr. Foster:

AVERY FOSTER CITED FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT WORK

John Avery Foster, 76, was honored last Thursday night as Davie County's "Most Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer" by the Mocksville Jaycees. Mr. Foster was presented with a $200 U.S. Savings Bond by the Jaycees.

Davie law enforcement officers were special guests of the Jaycees for a buffet dinner and special program at the Rotary Hut. This is the second annual banquet of the local club that pays honor and tribute to the local law enforcement officers.

The featured speaker was Eugene Hafer, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the consumer protection division.

Mr. Hafer praised the Mocksville Jaycees as an outstanding "Gold Chip" club and for recognizing and paying tribute to the services being rendered by law enforcement officers.

Discussing his work in the attorney general's office, Mr. Hafer said the primary purpose of the consumer protection division was to "make the consumer wishes felt" . . . and to remove false practices, deception and fraud that may exist in some business fields.

Mr. Hafer discussed the misrepresentations that often occur in purchases from door-to-door salesmen.

"Contracts dealing with home improvement often results in exorbitant prices . . . with the work being done poorly or not even finished," said Mr. Hafer.

The speaker also revealed that his division had sent out letters warning automobile dealers about altering speedometer readings on vehicles.

"We have the cooperation of most ethical businesses because they are desirous of the best possible business climate in the state," said Mr. Hafer.

Certificates of appreciation for outstanding law enforcement were presented to the following:

Chief Joe Foster of the Mocksville Police Department, 13 years in law enforcement.

J. Avery Foster of the Mocksville Police Department, 25 years in law enforcement.

Sheriff Joe Smith, beginning his first term in the capacity as sheriff but with previous experience in law enforcement.

Sgt. Bill Wooten of the State Highway Patrol, 22 years in law enforcement.

Leonard K. Howard, Special Deputy, 21 years in law enforcement.

The presentation of the certificates were made by Rocky Johnson.

Vernon Thompson, President of the local Jaycee Club, made the presentation of the Savings Bond to Avery Foster.

Bob Knight was in charge of the program. Tom Drillette introduced Mr. Hafer.

AVERY FOSTER

John Avery Foster has been a part of Davie County since his birth on April 27, 1895 in the Farmington Township. He was the son of Robert Foster and Anna Cuthrell Foster.

Shortly after the birth of Avery, his parents moved to Mocksville. His father worked for O. L. Williams Veneer Plant and his mother became a cook for Mr. and Mrs. Williams.

Around 1910, Avery's mother went to work for C. C. Sanford and around that time Avery went to work for the same family. He remained with the Sanford family, in one capacity or another, serving three generations of Sanfords.

In 1946 Avery Foster was employed as a policeman by the Town of Mocksville.

In 1952 he was named deputy sheriff by Sheriff Ben Boyles and became the first Negro deputy ever to serve in North Carolina. He served in this capacity for eight years.

In 1965 he again broke the color barrier when he ran and was elected constable of the Mocksville Township. He was re-elected to his post in 1967.

Rejoining the Mocksville Police Department in 1960, Mr. Foster served in this post even during the same years he was serving as constable.

Today, at the age of 76, Mr. Foster still is an active member of the Mocksville Police Department and still maintains a keen interest in the affairs of this community.

One of his contemporaries made this apt observation about the services of Avery Foster to his community:

"It is hard to evaluate Avery Foster's service to this community but in large measure the credit is his for the harmonious race relations that we have enjoyed through the years."

Having worn the lawman's badge for 25 years without complaining about long hours and little compensation . . . always displaying understanding combined with just a firm policy . . . Avery Foster is most deserving of the award as "Davie County's Outstanding Law Enforcement Officer." He has proven himself to be a great humanitarian, respected by both races.

HERMAN ROBINSON, A FRIEND OF THE HANDICAPPED

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the handicapped and other citizens throughout Tennessee and the Nation lost a great friend and statesman in the death of Herman Robinson on Thursday, February 26, 1971. He certainly was a close friend of mine and I am going to miss him.

All of his life Herman had been close to the cause of the handicapped. He was chairman of the Tennessee Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, cochairman of the International Committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, a member of the executive committee of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and chairman of the Tennessee State Executive Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

In all of these many activities he was a real champion of the handicapped. Their well-being came first above everything else.

Herman traveled extensively to promote the cause of the handicapped. His determination to help others was matched by few. He had a great heart full of compassion and love; he had a noble vision; and, above all, he had a consuming love of his State and country.

I feel fortunate in the fact that I served in the State legislature for many years in the house of representatives while Herman served in the State senate. He was a good legislator and he always did an excellent job of representing the people who elected him.

Herman Robinson was an exceptional man in every respect—as a legislator, newspaperman, politician, and political analyst.

Three articles which truly tell the story of Herman appeared in three different newspapers. One was a very poignant editorial written by his son, Robert H. Robinson, Jr., in the Elizabethton, Tenn., Star on Sunday, February 28. This paper is published by Herman's brother, Frank Robinson.

A MAN WHO STUMBLED TO GREATNESS

Most everyone strives to live a useful life. Herman Robinson did more than that.

His hometown community, which he cherished, others in the State of Tennessee, the Nation, and those who knew him throughout the World, have lost a man whom they all admired. He would not give up. From birth, he fought to do the things other healthy children do and which are taken for granted by their parents.

His mother, Mrs. E. E. Robinson of Elizabethton, did not keep a protective shield surrounding him, even though he was a victim of cerebral palsy and could not walk until age 10. Words did not come from his open mouth . . . just guttual sounds.

Herman Robinson was a guiding example of how one could overcome such great obstacles. He finished high school, several years

behind others of his age, went on to East Tennessee State University and received his degree. He served diligently, too, in the Tennessee Legislature for many years.

His love for others and his devotion to help the forgotten was carried out through his newspaper profession. He also, with Allen Taylor, organized the first baseball team in Elizabethton in his teenage days.

Herman Robinson would not be stopped. At the age of 58 when he finished his journey for his fellowman, Herman made sure before he left this World that everything, as much as possible, would be readily accessible to those who attempt to follow his footsteps and carry on his work.

His devotion to help the handicapped was felt by everyone who knew him. His service as chairman of the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped is an example. During the administration of two governors, the late Frank G. Clement and Buford G. Ellington, he gave of his time and his body to promote the handicapped.

Gov. Winfield Dunn re-appointed Herman chairman last Thursday in a State Capitol press conference. This was the final time all of his immediate family would be together with him before death took its toll. He wanted others to know that the handicapped could live a "productive and useful" life at work and at home.

He traveled extensively throughout the state and nation, and also abroad while in this capacity, a shining example of what mankind can do to overcome affliction. He did this without being paid for his work as chairman of the Governor's Committee . . . only receiving travel allowances.

In 1965 Herman Robinson celebrated his birthday in the Soviet Union, while on a People to People sponsored tour promoting the United States. Everyone with him watched as he sliced the first piece of a Russian birthday cake. On top, in lieu of candles were the American Flag and the flag of the U.S.S.R.

Herman Robinson was attempting to bridge the gap between men of the World, through his work for the handicapped. He was a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

His day was long. But he did his other job as Elizabethton bureau chief of the Johnson City Press Chronicle too. He shouldered awesome responsibilities without hesitancy. He loved what he was doing and the pace he had set for himself seemed to make him work harder.

He know how to get to the right person in the state government in order to help those who sought his help. He was respected by those he worked with.

He was a Christian who rededicated his life at First Baptist Church along side his son, Robert H. Robinson Jr., who came forward to follow Christ.

Herman Robinson loved his children. He looked forward to seeing his daughter, Jacquelyn Robinson, graduate from Carson-Newman College in June. Everywhere he went he talked about his grandchildren, Robert III and Susan.

Those who visited his office would see a variety of family pictures of these grandchildren, his children and his wife, Marjorie. Marjorie helped Herman mount the insurmountable.

The void of his passing will be felt by many. But he was happy to the very end, a fallen servant the victim of a heart attack. His "big" heart to help everyone, his parental guidance as a father, and his love for the job he was doing was above reproach.

As all of us who pickup pieces of the heart will not forget this great man. He somehow knew that "his" work was coming to an end.

After summoning help from his wife via telephone to take him to the hospital after suffering pains in his right shoulder, among other things, he removed a biographical sketch on himself from his office desk and placed it by his telephone.

He finished his report for travel allowance reimbursement too. And then after lying on his hospital bed, gave instructions to his wife to complete other unfinished details. After Marjorie returned to his bedside and reported these details were complete, Herman Robinson rested his mind. He died three hours later.

His typewriter is silent. His office and home telephone is not ringing for the purposes of others seeking help. Others are now showing their appreciation for what he did.

His pipe rests in his ashtray. His paper work is neatly piled on his desk.

He would want the tears spared from mourners.

His work will continue, but a man of his stature and caliber will be difficult to find. The echo of his footsteps will linger in the halls of the Tennessee Capitol and other state government buildings.

His family will sorely miss him too. Their suffering was already shared by Herman Robinson even before he died. He was so strong that this made him stand above others in a crowd. But you would never hear him say this.

I know that Herman Robinson was all of this and more. I am glad his family shared the generosity of his heart with others. This is the way he wanted it. I know. I am his son, Robert H. Robinson, Jr.

Another article was written by Tom Hodge and appeared in the Johnson City, Tenn., Press-Chronicle on Sunday, February 28. It reads as follows:

ROBINSON COMBINED SERVICE, POLITICS

(By Tom Hodge)

He loved Carter County and he loved politics.

The two tied together very naturally in the life of Herman Robinson.

Robinson, bureau chief in Elizabethton for the Johnson City Press-Chronicle, died Thursday night after suffering a heart attack.

He has been state senator four times—but his political interests went back to the 1930s when he had appointive positions with the houses of the legislature.

But almost all of his political efforts were directed at gaining something for Carter County—or the other Upper East Tennessee counties he served as state senator.

Even after he had left office after his defeat in 1964 at the hands of Marshall T. Nave, he was a frequent visitor to Nashville, usually at the request of some Elizabethton or Carter County group who needed his knowledge of state government and the people in it.

DIPLOMACY

Although he was a lifelong Republican, he had the knack for working with Democratic governors—that's all Tennessee had had for 50 years until Gov. Winfield Dunn's election in November—in order to gain things for Upper East Tennessee.

Both former governors Frank G. Clement and Buford Ellington named Robinson as chairman of the Governor's Committee on Employing the Handicapped. And Gov. Dunn followed suit earlier this month.

Perhaps it was his determination to overcome his own handicap that made Robinson so effective. He was born with cerebral palsy; his parents were told that he would never walk or talk—much less become a state senator.

But he did. And his fellow legislators respected him for the obstacles he had overcome.

WORKING NEWSMAN

As a newspaperman from the old school, he was fond of recalling past stories he had covered, such as the Hampton dynamiting murder trials of the late 1930s.

He was adamant about such things as public access to public records, of the people's right to know. And that sometimes brought him into conflict with officials and others.

All things concerning employment of the handicapped and rehabilitation were of prime interest to Robinson.

But he had other interests, too. In his first years in the legislature, he also had a consuming interest in industrial development.

SOUGHT INDUSTRY

Although he first had in mind attracting industry to Carter, Washington, Unicoi and Johnson counties, he originated legislation in cooperation with the governor's office which really put Tennessee into the industrial development business.

Out of this interest came the cabinet-level post of industrial commissioner.

And in the past dozen years, Tennessee has gained hundreds of thousands of new jobs from the new industries which have come to the state.

In recent weeks, he had expressed concern about the Dunn administration settling down in Nashville. "Why, they don't have anybody helping them," he said, "who really know their way around Capitol Hill."

He watched from afar—and sent along some suggestions.

He was newspaperman, politician, statesman, political analyst. His type comes along very seldom.

The Bristol, Tenn., Herald Courier carried an editorial on Sunday, February 28, concerning Herman:

AN EXCEPTIONAL MAN

It was not without good reason that Gov. Winfield Dunn termed the death of Herman Robinson a loss "not only to his family and thousands of friends, but to all the people of Tennessee."

Mr. Robinson, a former state senator, was a man of remarkable personal accomplishment. But, even more, he was a man of great inspiration to others who, like himself, came into this world with a handicap.

A victim of cerebral palsy, Mr. Robinson chose to fight, and win, rather than surrender, and lose. He served in the State Senate from 1957 through 1964; he had been a member of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped for six years; he was only recently named chairman of the Tennessee Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Through all these years of doing for others, Mr. Robinson also pursued his profession as a newspaperman. He was once editor of the Elizabethton Star and, in more recent years, was chief of the Elizabethton bureau of the Johnson City Press-Chronicle.

It is with considerable pride, of course, that we counted him among our colleagues. But he was more than that. He was a friend, a man of exceptional courage, an example of what all of us can do, with or without a handicap, to lead a good life and help others do the same.

His loss is great, for us and for Tennessee.

Herman Robinson will long be remembered as a champion for the cause of the handicapped and an inspiration to us all.

RESHAPING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, in recent years many of us have found our congressional duties hampered by a bur-

geoning executive branch. Cabinet offices have been added one after another with competing power groups developing within each of the 12 Federal departments.

As carefully as we perform our tasks, too often we are unable to check or direct specific activities, because they are conducted by numerous offices reporting to different congressional committees.

Now President Nixon has recommended that we join with him in reshaping the functions and responsibilities of the Federal Government. Our reorganization of the executive branch will allow us to pinpoint Government expenditures, activities, and program results. In this way, Congress can evaluate the executive branch. It can make the executive branch responsive to congressional direction and specific program guidance.

I am sure my colleagues join me in an eagerness to begin this task of reform. Congress must be restored to its role of directing Government on behalf of the American people. One way is by making the executive branch more accountable.

ALPHA AND OMEGA

HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a copy of a poem "Alpha and Omega" written by one of the citizens of my district in New Mexico, Dick Barber of Bernalillo. I think it is an excellent commentary on our world today, and Dick's ability to demonstrate the relevance of the Bible in today's life is most thought provoking.

The following is the text:

ALPHA AND OMEGA

(By Dick Barber)

God in the beginning
Created heavens, earth: (Genesis)
Without form and void,
As if in awful dearth.

And so there was darkness
Upon the face of deep (1: 1, 2)
And then God's Spirit moved,
No longer did earth sleep.

Upon the face of waters,
God spoke and there was light. (1: 4, 5)
He said 'tis good and called it day,
The darkness He called night.

To let dry land appear,
The waters gathered He. (1: 9, 10)
He then called dry land earth,
The waters He called sea.

Let waters bring forth life,
God said and it was good, (1: 20)
The fowl shall fly above the earth,
They shall not want for food.

God said let earth bring grass,
The herb its seeds to yield,
The fruit tree bearing fruit,
And flowers of the field.

Creeping things and cattle,
The beast each of his kind. (1:11, 24)
This God said and it was so,
'Twas what He had in mind.

The land was green and pleasant
With peace and plenty filled.
There was no man upon the earth,
The ground had not been tilled. (2: 5)

In God's own image then,
Created man and said
Replenish earth, subdue it (1: 27, 28)
And from its fruits be fed.

To man and woman freely
All living things I give; (1: 29, 30)
Each beast, each seed and green herb,
All things on earth that live.

To every beast on earth
The green herb did He give. (Genesis 1: 30)
God looked and said 'tis very good,
Let my creation live.

A garden then He planted,
In Eden put the man
To dress and keep the garden (2: 8, 15)
As part of His great plan.

The earth brought forth her fruit, (James 5: 8)
As heaven gave the rain,
But man was ignorant and sinned,
His punishment was pain.

Ye husbandmen, be ye ashamed
To desolate my land, (Jer. 12: 10)
All good trees ye have felled, (2 Kg. 3: 25)
Created by my hand.

The rivers have been spoiled (Is. 18: 1, 2)
The land they overflow (Jer. 47: 2)
The waters wear away the stones,
And wash the things that grow. (Job. 14: 19)

Drought and heat consume the snow, (Job 14:19)
The rivers all are dry, (Is. 19: 5)
The corn is withered in the field, (Joel 1: 17)
The cattle groan and cry. (Joel 1: 18)

Good pastures have been eaten,
And drunk the waters deep, (Ez. 34: 18)
Even residues were trodden;
The land shall mourn and weep. (Hosea 4: 3)

The land shall then be emptied, (Is. 24: 3)
A wilderness forlorn. (Jer. 12: 10)
The mirth of land is gone, (Is. 24: 11)
Spoiled with briers, thorn. (Is. 7: 24)

What then shall be the fate
Of husbandmen like this?
When the Lord of vineyards cometh, (Matt. 21: 40, 43)
They're sure the mark to miss.

The earth can bring forth fruit again,
And blossom as a rose;
God's love, man's work together,
Can solve the nation's woes.

A sower sows good seed, (Matt. 13: 24)
The Lord his work will bless, (Deut. 33: 11)
Will make bright clouds and showers (Zach. 10: 1)

The earth shall yield increase. (Psa. 67: 6)
Plant vines upon the mountain, (Jer. 31: 5)
In desert plant the fir,
In wilderness, the cedar, (Is. 41: 19)
Their merry branches stir. (Is. 55: 12)

God makes the grasses grow
Upon the mountain too, (Psa. 147: 5, 8)
The valley's covered o'er with corn (Psa. 65: 13)
Earth's fullness to renew.

He that tilleth shall have plenty; (Prov. 28: 19)
Clods of the valley shall be sweet, (Job. 21: 33)
Earth's profit is for all,

The King himself shall eat. (Eccl. 5: 9)

Fear not Oh land, rejoice, (Joel 2: 18, 21)
Delightful you shall be, (Mal. 2: 18, 21)
A land for which God careth, (Deut. 11: 12)
A lovely land to see.

While the earth remaineth,
Seed time and harvest, cold and heat,
Summer, winter, day and night
Shall not cease, the Lord repeat. (Genesis 8: 21, 22)

The conclusion of the matter;
God's commandments we must keep, (Eccl. 12: 13)
This, man's duty here on earth
If its fruits we'd reap.

Teach us, Oh Lord, this land is ours,
To care for as a gift from Thee,
To treat it as a source of life,
To treasure its vitality.

So future generations
May also benefit,
Respect and honor providence,
And keep your good earth fit.

MAYBE THEY COVER A WAR THE SAME WAY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Washington Post staff writer Jim Mann speaks for itself:

AP AGAINST UPI: HEAVYWEIGHT FIGHT IN THE WIRE ROOM

(By Jim Mann)

It started out as Frazier against Ali, but gradually, after the fight began, it became AP against UPI. Or so it seemed to the 20-odd people in the wire room Monday night.

Never was there a better example that heavyweight fights—like wars and funerals and coronations and the other drums-and-trumpets stuff—are more comforting with one version than with two or more. Two different accounts may more closely approximate the truth, but they are also more unsettling.

We all wandered into the wire room promptly at fight time, many of us muttering at Jack Kent Cooke, the man who had denied us even the right to listen to the fight. Would the wire service transmit the Gillette commercials? How would they simulate Howard Cosell in six-word lines?

No matter. Each of us settled down in clusters in front of the various wires and prepared to make do. Before it all started, we had to read one more insult: "Editors," said UP, "The following round-by-round account of the Ali-Frazier heavyweight championship fight is intended for newspaper publication and may not be used by radio in any attempt to do a 'recreation' or simulated live broadcast of the fight . . ."

Round one. UPI came first with its decision. "Ali took the first round as he outboxed Frazier and landed most of the punches." AP plodded along with a blow-by-blow description. Finally, it tossed off the kicker: "The AP gave Frazier the round by a shade."

That pronouncement brought a roar of laughter from those who had already read the UPI wire. It also produced, for several rounds, a steady stream of traffic from AP machines to UPI machines and then back.

It was uncanny. Of the first seven rounds, the wire services differed on four. "It was a big round for Frazier," trumpeted AP in the sixth. "Ali, using his left jab like a long spear, had the edge in the sixth," countered UPI.

UPI was pro-Ali and AP was pro-Frazier. There was no denying it. UPI had the first, sixth and seventh for Ali, while AP had the

first and sixth for Frazier, the seventh even. After seven, UPI had Ali 5–2, while AP had Frazier 4–2 with one round even.

Noticing this, we began to read the wire services in the fashion that foreign correspondents read Pravda—with the hope of gleaning the reality from what we knew were obviously biased accounts.

What was one to make, for example, of round nine? UPI said Ali landed "eight straight solid shots." AP told us Ali had landed "a series of light jabs, half of which Frazier blocked." Each wire service sounded as certain as Tokyo Rose. Yet AP acknowledged at the beginning of the next round that Frazier came out with his face puffed. Was that a clue?

Meanwhile, the whole process had become rhythmical. UPI would hold off until the end of the round, then would announce who had won the round and give a short description. AP—obviously anxious to satisfy the radio stations that were broadcasting round-by-round versions—provided lengthy detail, then ended (long after UPI) with its verdict for the round.

We were just not used to it. All of us—reporters, copyboys, editors, wire room employees—were working for a newspaper. We liked print. And yet, for an American extravaganza . . . never in recent years had a world series or super bowl or heavyweight championship fight or political convention been kept off both the television and the radio. It was depriving us of our secondary entertainment, the media men. We couldn't talk about Brinkley and Mudd and Schenckel. We were hanging over the wires in the way that crowds had gathered around the copy when H. L. Mencken cabled in his dispatches from the conventions or the Scopes trial.

And who were the anonymous people behind these wires? There were no bylines. (Only later, after the fight, did we find bylines, and they appeared over stories that told us Frazier "left Clay sobbing with remorse . . . It was a vicious test of manhood.")

Lacking the normal media entertainment, we were relegated to laughing at the misprints and contradictions. In round five, AP opened with, "Frazier was off the stole first." As the round wore on, it told us, "Ali had a worried look on his face." But after reconsidering a sentence or two, it decided, "Ali, however, was doing the scoring."

Before we knew it, the fight was over. The wire services had suddenly, miraculously, begun to agree in the last five rounds: in eleven, AP said Ali's "knees buckled," while UPI said Ali "almost went down."

When it ended, UPI had the fight even on rounds, 7–7, with one round even. AP gave it to Frazier, 9–5, with one even. In case you haven't seen a sports page, the referee had the fight 8–6–1 Frazier, while the two judges had it 9–6 and 11–4 Frazier. Score one big one for the AP.

But then again, after the fight ended, UPI reported by bulletin several seconds before AP that Frazier had won the decision.

Maybe they cover a war the same way.

EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is to be congratulated for grappling with the tremendous problems involved in executive reorganization. For years the executive branch has assumed responsibilities in departments and offices which were already heavily overworked.

Dedicated professionals now sort through piles of bureaucratic paperwork to move a problem towards solution. With the growth in population, Government has grown larger, but no more efficient.

As we approach the year 2000, it is entirely appropriate that Congress set about revising the executive branch of Government. This is our opportunity to remove overlapping responsibilities, cut redtape, eliminate the causes of interoffice rivalry and conflicting authorities.

I feel certain that my colleagues share my enthusiasm for taking a close look at executive reorganization. Undoubtedly numerous ways can be found for conducting the Federal business with greater efficiency. The President's proposals will provide a basis for investigating reorganization problems and acting to resolve them.

Good government, responsive government must be clear and orderly. To bring government functions in line with modern thinking, we must clarify its purpose.

RECYCLING SUCCESS STORY: NEW PAPER MADE FROM OLD

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to report a major breakthrough in the field of conservation of natural resources and elimination of wastes has occurred, with a manufacturing plant in my congressional district playing a leading role.

The Simpson Lee Paper Co. has started regular production of 100 percent recycled book paper at its plant in Ripon, Calif.

After repeated tests by the firm's technical staff, processes have been evolved which now make it possible to recycle paper into high quality book printing paper.

The Ripon plant was erected in the 1960's to introduce modern manufacturing techniques and now employs 150 persons. Simpson Lee Paper Co., a subsidiary of the Simpson Timber Co., combines two of the oldest major paper manufacturing firms in the West and Midwest. The Simpson Lee plant at Everett, Wash., was founded in 1891, and its operation at Vicksburg, Mich., dates from 1905.

In addition to perfecting a process for making new paper out of old or used paper products, thus reducing the amount of timber for paper manufacture, all plants today are operating in compliance with State and Federal regulations applying to their respective areas.

The following news release was prepared by the firm and appeared in numerous newspapers on March 3. The article follows:

RECYCLING SUCCESS STORY: NEW PAPER MADE FROM OLD

This year's annual report may be printed on the paper you threw in the wastebasket this morning. At least, that's the aim of Simpson Lee Paper Company, a San Francisco based manufacturer of high-grade printing and specialty papers.

Regular production of 100 percent recycled book paper is scheduled to begin tomorrow morning, March 4, at Simpson Lee's plant in Ripon near Modesto, California.

Simpson Lee is believed to be the first manufacturer in the nation to salvage discarded paper and manufacture it into fine quality printing paper.

The company began experimenting with the process about four months ago at its Ripon plant. The plant itself is considered a model of up-to-date, ecologically-sound facilities. There is no smokestack pouring out pulp fumes.

The machinery that had been installed when the plant was erected in 1961 was capable of being adapted to handle the recycling process.

Just what is involved? First, of course, Simpson Lee had to round up as much waste paper as it could. It contracted with waste paper brokers in California to supply discarded office paper, like letters, envelopes, memorandum slips, adding machine tapes and used data processing forms.

Once the waste paper gets to Ripon, it is carefully sorted, then shredded into thin strips and packed into bales. Next, it is dumped into a large mixing beater, treated to remove whatever was printed on it previously and then fed onto the paper machine to become a quality printing paper.

It is finally ready to be shipped from Ripon as customers of Simpson Lee call for it.

The first major customer for this new product was Bank America Corporation, which printed over 250,000 copies of its 1970 annual report on Simpson Lee's 100 percent recycled paper.

Furman C. Moseley, 36-year-old chairman of the company, says Simpson Lee was "intrigued" with the idea of developing a quality book paper from recycled waste.

"Of course, for years we've used scraps, side rolls and similar waste paper from our own plant," Moseley points out. "But we gradually became interested in recycling waste paper into a high quality printing paper. After all, our entire business is based on the efficient use of wood fibers. We figured a project like that made good ecological sense. We think it not only contributes to the growing movement to better utilize the country's total resources, but makes good business sense too. It also complements the broad range of fine printing and writing papers that we manufacture in the West."

Simpson Lee employs 150 people at its Ripon plant.

TRACKED AIR-CUSHIONED VEHICLE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a careful evaluation of Transportation Secretary John A. Volpe's proposal to build a tracked air cushion vehicle along the access highway to Dulles International Airport has convinced me that this experimental toy will serve no useful purpose and will endanger if not permanently destroy the prospect of promoting greater utilization of the Dulles Airport so eagerly sought by those of us who look forward to completion of our subway, rapid rail system for bringing all parts of the metropolitan area into a smoothly operated, conges-

tion, and pollution free, balanced transportation system.

I have today directed a letter to Secretary Volpe urging him to abandon plans for the so-called TACV, and, if he declines to do so, at least to wait until the feasibility study his Department was directed to conduct on the possible extension of our 97-mile system to Dulles has been completed and reported to Congress as provided in Public Law 91–154.

Mr. Speaker, as I believe many of our colleagues may be interested in the Secretary's proposal and its possible effect on transportation in the Washington area, I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

MARCH 8, 1971.

Hon. JOHN A. VOLPE,
Secretary of Transportation, Department of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I urge that you abandon your recently announced plan to build a tracked air-cushion vehicle (TACV) along the Dulles Access Highway, to be opened during the U.S. International Transportation Exposition at the Dulles airport on May 27, 1972. While such an experimental toy might be of some interest to Exposition visitors, it would be virtually useless in terms of transportation value, and the $20 million price-tag would inevitably lead to charges of wasteful Federal spending and ridicule.

As you know, Congress enacted Public Law 91–143 in 1969 to finance building of a rapid-rail, subway system (METRO) for the Washington Metropolitan Area. A section of this bill directed your Department to study the feasibility of extending the system to Dulles. Your Department assigned this study to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority, and a report is due in six weeks to three months. The intent of Congress was: first, to study feasibility of making Dulles easily available to air passengers along the entire METRO system; second, to provide a system to permit transfer of air passengers between Dulles and National Airports, compatible with but not duplicating lines to be constructed in the 97-mile METRO system; and third, to open availability of transportation to patrons from Reston and other stations along the extended route into Loudoun County. If such an extension is determined to be feasible, Dulles Airport can be made available to passengers from any point along the METRO line without ever leaving the same form of transportation.

Your February 16 announcement that you plan to sponsor construction of a TACV system indicated it would be 13.5 miles long. But since the announcement a representative of the Rohr Corporation has been visiting Capitol Hill to provide details on the vehicle and offer Members of Congress VIP tours of a system they built in Paris, as though they have been secretly informed they will be awarded the contract to build it. He said that the vehicle takes 1½ miles to speed up and a similar distance to slow down, so it obviously cannot serve commuters between Dulles and D.C. He also said that while the original TACV would travel only a short distance you hope the community will open its heart to the project and provide a right of way into the District of Columbia so it can serve some useful purpose. Let me assure you right now that the citizens of Northern Virginia, who have already suffered so much to make way for the Beltway, Route 66 and METRO, will never offer to tear down any more homes to make way for a non-stop vehicle to race at 150 miles-per-hour through their neighborhood. On the contrary, the track for the TACV will forever end at the Beltway to become a sterile appendage to the airport, providing nothing more than a carnival-type amusement ride for fidgety children whose parents are waiting for a plane at Dulles, and referred to disparagingly as something like "Volpe's Ventilated Vehicle."

Those of us who have fought for years to get the METRO system built are concerned that by using the airport access road median strip you will permanently deny METRO the only available right of way for an extension to Dulles if one is recommended by the WMATA study. It seems contradictory that you would recognize the need for access to the roadway of Reston residents' automobiles while ignoring their need for rapid rail transportation along the same route.

If your Department has $20 million-plus to spare to help with Washington area transportation problems, I know I speak for all residents in urging that you let us spend it where it will do the most good for the most people. I therefore urge you to scrap the TACV and apply its price toward helping us with the Metro $40 to $50 million extension to Dulles. Regardless of your decision in this regard, however, I urge you to at least hold up further development of the TACV until the WMATA study is complete, evaluated by your Department, and presented to Congress as set forth in Public Law 91–143.

Thanking you, and with best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

IN SUPPORT OF A VOLUNTEER ARMY

HON. PATSY T. MINK

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the earliest expiration date of the draft and for the substitution of a voluntary army in place of the draft. The issue of the draft is a matter of paramount importance as it becomes increasingly evident that we cannot bring to an end our involvement in undeclared wars.

In their wisdom the Founding Fathers of this Nation gave to the Congress, and only to the Congress, power to declare wars. Somewhere in the gray area of the classic separation of powers, the Office of the President has usurped this power. We are supposed to believe that there is a difference between declaring war against an enemy and waging a war against him.

The Congress has one clear course of action to reestablish its constitutional powers to declare war. It would be by refusing to extend the draft, and failing that, to prohibit the use of all draftees in combat areas except when the Congress shall have declared war.

There are few indeed who today defend our intrusion in the internal affairs of the people of Indochina. Whatever their position might be with regard to our invasion of Cambodia and Laos to save American lives, almost none will disagree that our entry into this conflict was a serious mistake.

Since this admission of grave error is voiced even by those who are continuing our military presence in Indochina, it is extremely difficult for me to accept the notion that either patriotism or Americanism justifies our sending our sons barely 18 years of age to prove their courage or faith in freedom without being given a choice. It is impossible logic that requires only these young men to fight and die for a policy which has not met the Constitutional test of an act of Congress legalizing the warfare. Yet this is precisely what the draft now does and requires.

Even beyond that, the draft, in and of itself, is not fair and equitable. There is no justice to the involuntary call of a single individual, if not all persons similarly situated are not likewise summoned to serve his country.

I have joined many of my colleagues in sponsoring the voluntary military manpower procurement bill, H.R. 4452. I endorse this bill because it is a viable alternative to the draft and because it can be immediately implemented.

I view this bill, however, only as a temporary expedient until the large manpower needs caused by the Indochina war are reduced.

Although a voluntary army could engage as many as 3 million persons, it would be my belief that efforts should be made continuously to reduce these numbers to approximately the level of pre-World War II forces.

In view of the realistic difficulty in reducing manpower through absolute numerical limits, we must, therefore, not raise the postwar service incentives to a point where we will have a large number of surplus personnel. Instead, the higher pay and incentives of H.R. 4452, if adopted, should be utilized only during this wartime period as a means of ending the inequities of the draft. Our needs after the war can be met without either the draft or the unusually high incentives provided by this bill. It would be unwise to approve permanent incentives sufficient to induce a military manpower level of 3 million soldiers. Postwar manpower limits must be carefully and systematically reviewed and effective steps taken to seek reduction of the total authorizations.

In enacting a volunteer approach during the interim wartime period, the first question concerns whether such a step is possible at all.

Our current system of induction, based upon compulsion, further exploits our youth by paying them only token wages. This only adds the inequity of economic servitude to the adversity of conscription. I realize it will be costly to pay military salaries comparable to those in civilian life, but the constant training and turnover resulting from the existing system is also expensive and more inefficient.

The next issue is whether such a professional service is advisable. I feel that the civilizing benefits of conscription on the services are overstressed. Most draftees enter for their 2 years, serve in nondecisionmaking positions, and then depart. Even those who enlist as officers in one of the services only to meet their military obligations usually are unable to achieve a policy-influencing level before discharge.

The real decisions in the military are now made by a professional group of officers, along with their civilian superiors. It seems to me that the only impact inductees have on their thinking is to provide a ready supply of manpower enabling wholesale combat commitments. In fact, if conscription were abolished,

our military leaders would have to face the reality of depending on volunteer participation in their future combat exploits. This might indeed have a salutary civilizing effect.

Further, I have heard it argued that having draftees in the Army will focus public attention on the uses to which this drafted army is being put, and thereby maintain control of the military in the hands of an interested and alert public. Given these circumstances these past 7 years, with a drafted army largely being utilized in Vietnam, and with active public opposition to the war, it still has had little or no effect on the policies which have continued this conflict.

The charge has been made that a volunteer army would consist largely of underprivileged persons, hired with the inducement of good pay to fight rich men's wars. It goes without saying that our existing draft system favors the wealthy. Those who can afford college have a 4-year deferment advantage over those who cannot. I do not think it is more unfair to allow all persons to freely enter military service than it is to allow them to freely enter whatever other occupation or undertaking they may choose to pursue. Volunteer military service would not be a penalty but a right of citizenship bestowing benefits as well as responsibilities. Various economic classes might see opportunities is this field of endeavor, especially in the benefits such as free education and early retirement which should be provided.

It has also been suggested that public service jobs of certain categories might be required as an alternative to military service. I do not feel that the answer to compulsion is more compulsion. Why should some be required to serve in the military while others escape to Government jobs? Who is to choose which young men will be allowed to enter public service, and on what basis? Again, will the college degree or IQ be the determining factor? I feel that a draft, military or civilian, is an unwanted national policy.

Finally, there is the matter of reforming the draft. Admittedly, our hodgepodge of community-by-community selective service boards, presided over by State officials operating largely independently of each other, have created a wide disparity of policy across the Nation. The percentage of some young men rejected for medical or mental reasons is far higher in some States than in others. Because of this and other differences, a person's relative vulnerability to the draft still depends largely on where he lives. This should not be true in an ostensibly national system.

Much can and should be done to improve the draft, and I have sponsored legislation to achieve such objectives. This, however, must be judged in the context of the overall justification for the draft itself. I feel that elimination of the draft is our first objective. If that cannot be accomplished, then sweeping reforms are in order to guarantee total equality in the selection of those who serve when not all serve.

I realize that the military wants to be assured of an abundant supply of our youth, and is not concerned with method or manner. Yet we in the Congress have an obligation to consider the total needs of our country, including those of the young men affected, and their families. I hope and urge that we will meet that responsibility by limiting our military manpower requirements, and to seek its recruitment by voluntary means in keeping with our Nation's tradition of individual freedom and liberty.

TAPS FOR THE DRAFT?

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has made it clear that all U.S. ground combat responsibilities will be virtually completed sometime this summer, and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has reaffirmed this objective before hearings in Congress. It is, therefore, my firm conviction that we should move more aggressively toward the concept of an all-voluntary military and away from a compulsory draft.

An article which appeared in the recent issue of Barron's national business and financial weekly, dated March 8, 1971, presents very strong arguments why this should come about at the earliest possible date. I submit this article for the consideration of my fellow colleagues, and especialy for the attention of the members of our Armed Services Committee in both Houses who are now seriously considering all aspects of this concept:

TAPS FOR THE DRAFT? A FREE SOCIETY SHOULD OPT FOR A VOLUNTEER ARMY

"They have set up separate companies for men who have refused to go out into the field. It is no big thing here anymore to refuse to go. If a man is ordered to go such and such place he no longer goes through the hassle of refusing: he just packs his shirt and goes visit some buddies at another base camp. Operations have become incredibly rag-tag . . . Many guys don't even put on their uniforms any more. . . . The American garrisons on the larger bases are virtually unarmed. The lifers have taken our weapons from us and put them under lock and key. . . . One black locked and loaded on the battalion CO recently because they were trying to send him into the field. About 10 others backed him up. . . . There have also been quite a few frag incidents in the battalion."

The foregoing is part of a letter from an American soldier stationed in Cu Chi, as quoted recently in The New York Times; more powerfully than the front-line dispatches, it underscores the breakdown of disciplines in Vietnam. It also suggests that something must be done, and quickly, if the U.S. Armed Forces are to retain the capability of defending the nation. There is no dearth of proposals. When the Senate Armed Services Committee resumes debate this week on extending the draft, it will have before it several alternatives. One, introduced by Senator Edward Kennedy, would give the draft a new lease on life but limit inductions to 150,000 men per year. It stands virtually no chance of adoption. Neither does a proposal to repeal the Selective Service Act outright. Rated as having an outside chance, however, is the Hatfield-Goldwater Bill; it follows the recommendations of the Gates Commission, set up in 1969 to study the matter, which came out four-square for an all-volunteer armed service. Essentially, the bill calls for expenditure of about $3 billion to boost soldiers' pay to a level thought likely to attract the necessary volunteers. That would mean $300 a month for raw recruits, compared to the $134 offered now. It would keep the structure of Selective Service intact. Men still would register, and draft boards would stay on the job; if enough volunteers failed to respond, conscription could quickly fill the gap.

Until the war in Vietnam finally ends, some such standby authority is doubtless needed. Nevertheless, the Hatfield-Goldwater bill would be a long step in the right direction—toward an all-volunteer military establishment. Contrary to the objections voiced by Senator Kennedy and other critics, it would not place the burden of fighting U.S. wars on "the poor and the black," surely no more than is now the case, nor would it create a new military elite. It would be a great reaffirmation of individual rights. That argument was set forth in these columns in 1965, when Barron's first advocated an all-volunteer army. "The strongest objection to the draft," we said then, "is philosophic: for the sake of the majority, it imposes a heavy sacrifice upon what might almost be called an oppressed minority. In the process, it cannot fail to stamp on the minds of young adults a vivid impression of the power of the state, a totalitarian image which those who argue for a free society may spend a lifetime trying to erase."

Prior to November 1968, Richard Nixon took a similar stand: "Today, all across our country, we face a crisis of confidence," he declared. "Nowhere is it more acute than among our young people. They recognize the draft as an infringement on their liberty, which it is. To them, it represents a government insensitive to their rights, a government callous to their status as free men." Now, however, the President insists the time is not yet ripe. He has asked Congress to extend the draft another two years beyond June 30, when it is due to expire. During that time, the Pentagon will try to make military service more palatable to the nation's youth—eliminating useless work details, putting up curtains in the barracks—and soldiers' pay is to be raised again. A saturation campaign of TV commercials, costing $30 million, will sell young men on the idea that army life is fun. By such means, plus the constant threat that if they don't join up they will be drafted anyway, the President hopes to get enough volunteers to make zero draft calls feasible, at least by next election time.

Clearly, that's not good enough. A zero draft call is not the same thing as no draft. The element of compulsion remains; it's like the sergeant barking, "I want three volunteers—you, you and you." For evidence that an all-volunteer army can meet the requirements of national defense, the U.S. need look no farther than across its northern border. True, Canada's armed forces number a scant 90,000 men, but they are under no compulsion; volunteers from the start, they can quit the service at will. A recent television documentary by ABC found that the Canadian Army turns away three would-be soldiers for every one it accepts. The strategic ingredient, of course, is money: raw recruits earn $250 a month, and a corporal starting his second five-year hitch can make up to $698 a month. Similarly, the British army has been a volunteer force since 1957, with 400,000 men under arms. Whitehall says the system is working well.

Opponents of an all-volunteer military service in Congress make some specious claims. Senator Kennedy, as noted, objects

that under such a system the defense burden would fall disproportionately upon the poor and the black, who would constitute the bulk of the recruits. Since most well-to-do youths now avoid the draft by staying in college, that wouldn't change anything. Under the pay scales contemplated for the volunteer army, the poor who enlisted at least would be on the road to affluence. Another argument is that a volunteer force would be made up of "mercenaries" ready to follow any would-be dictator on the General Staff. Yet, fully half the men in the armed forces now are "true" volunteers, including all the officers. So far, the "lifers" have resisted any temptation to overthrow the government.

Currently, all the services are on a volunteer basis except the army, which also has a high proportion of enlistees. Only 4% of army volunteers, however, sign up for infantry, artillery or tanker outfits; hence, the Pentagon says it still needs the draft to fill their ranks, even though bonuses of up to $3,000 will be paid for such service. Conceivably, what is needed is a change in tactics, particularly to eliminate what GIs call "chicken"—the whole fabric of regulations that demean the common soldier. Military service also could be made infinitely more attractive if educational opportunities were broadened. There is no dearth of applicants for the service academies, even though cadets are well aware that, on graduation, they will quickly be shipped off to front-line duty in Vietnam. Last year, for example, over 6,000 young men took the exams at West Point—to fill 1,375 openings. For less than the government has budgeted for aid to higher education and vocational training next year, it could give every GI the equivalent of a college education or teach him a trade.

Whatever the inducements offered enlistees, there should be no delay in tooling up for volunteers. The annual cost, says the Gates Commission, would run to less than $3 billion; for halfway measures which, critics claim, are really designed to perpetuate the draft, the Administration is budgeting $1.5 billion. Wouldn't it be better to go all out? As the commission report says, "A return to an all-volunteer force will strengthen our freedoms, remove an inequity now imposed on the expression of the patriotism that has never been lacking among our youth, promote the efficiency of the armed forces, and enhance their dignity."

HEALTH SECURITY ACT, H.R. 22

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, along with 76 cosponsors, I introduced a bill, H.R. 22, to establish a national health insurance program under the social security system, and to give to middle-class Americans those health and medical benefits presently being developed for the poor and aged, and which the wealthy already have simply because they can afford to pay for them. I first introduced this bill in February of last year. Several improvements have been made since that time.

This bill would relieve State and local governments of $2.5 billion a year in expenditures for health care. In addition, since this bill would eliminate medicare and medicaid, the $10 billion supporting these programs would become available for the comprehensive national health program.

My bill also would preserve free choice of physicians; preserve traditional professional freedom of practice and methods of payment; and maintain, indeed, utilize the authority of local medical and dental associations and societies.

At the same time, my bill would make it possible for doctors and dentists to bypass time-consuming business administration and bookkeeping functions and permit them to concentrate on the practice of medicine and dentistry. It recognizes that the business of doctors is administering health and medical care. They should not have to be bookkeepers or credit collection agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the soaring inflation of health care prices has literally priced the average wage and salary earner out of the health care market. It is estimated that 9 out of 10 Americans are medically indigent in the sense that they face financial ruin should they contract a serious or extended illness. During the last decade, health care prices have increased twice as fast as the cost of living. Hospital daily charges have shot up 150 percent in the last 10 years, and in a short time the $100 per day hospital room will be commonplace. In some metropolitan areas, of course, hospital room charges already have reached that level and more.

Total health care expenditures are absorbing an increasing amount of our gross national product. In 1950, total health expenditures of $12.1 billion represented 4.6 percent of the gross national product. In fiscal year 1970, we spent approximately $67 billion on health or 7 percent of gross national product. If health costs are permitted to continue increasing at the present rate, in 30 years we will be spending twice as great a portion of our gross national product on health as we do now.

In spite of our lavish expenditures on health care, however, we are getting inadequate results and inferior services. According to an official United Nations report: There are 35 other nations where 10-year-old boys can expect to live longer; in 10 other nations, 10-year-old girls have a longer life expectancy; and in 13 other nations newborn babies have a better chance of survival. Although our medical technology is the most sophisticated in the world by many standards, neither the benefits of this technology nor even necessary health care services are readily obtainable by vast numbers of our citizens.

Unless soaring health care costs are placed under some form of rational budgetary control, there is no relief in sight for the majority of our population from the crushing financial burden of spiraling health prices, and the longer we delay in implementing a comprehensive program to meet the present crisis, the more costly will be the remedy necessary to revive our ailing system of health care delivery. The national health insurance bill I have introduced would place health care expenditures under firm budgetary control, while providing practitioners with genuine financial incentives to improve the quality of care and the efficiency with which it is delivered. This would be accomplished by stimulating the development of time-tested prepaid group practice plans to provide health care services on the basis of approved prospective budgets.

Comprehensive group practice plans are rapidly gaining popularity for their superiority in terms of quality of care provided and efficiency, over the fragmented methods of solo physicians and specialists working independently. Administrators within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare already have designed programs to encourage group practice plans. Last September, the president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Walter C. Bornemeier, acting on his own, recommended that the Federal Government provide money for doctors to build group practice clinics in areas where there are shortages of physicians.

The improvements in quality of care and efficiency accomplished by group practice prepayment plans are matters of statistical fact. The President's Commission on Health Manpower, in studying the group practice prepayment plan of the Kaiser Foundation, concluded that the Kaiser plan provided as good or better care than was available in the general community at from 20 to 30 percent less cost. In addition to Kaiser, other group practice plans have demonstrated the capability of reducing hospitalization and the number of surgical procedures. A recent study of the Federal employees health benefits program showed the group practice plans had only one-half the number of nonmaternity hospital days per 1,000 subscribers, as the alternate coverage. Federal employees have a choice between five different types of coverage, including an indemnity plan and Blue Cross-Blue Shield. Also, the group practice prepayment plans had 42 percent fewer surgical precedures than Blue Cross.

Under the program I have proposed, State or county medical societies, or any qualified group of practitioners could enter into contracts with the Government to provide comprehensive health care services to their respective patient populations. An individual practitioner could enter the program on his own, but the financial incentives provided under the plan make it more profitable for him to become part of a group practice plan. Hospitals, as well, could contract with the Government to serve the beneficiaries of national health insurance.

Hospitals could also build outpatient centers and elect to provide comprehensive outpatient and inpatient services to a defined population thereby becoming prepaid group practice plans. Moreover, the program would provide financial assistance to hospitals which elect this option. The American Hospital Association has called for the development of health care corporations to provide comprehensive health services on a capitation basis. H.R. 22 will stimulate this development. Hospitals, under this program, could also contract with the health security board to provide acute care,

skilled nursing care, and home health care, and be reimbursed under a consolidated budget for all these services. If a medical society, group practice plan or hospital elect to contract to deliver health services on a capitation basis, the medical staffs can pay individual physicians in any way they choose, either on a fee-for-service, capitation or salary basis.

The budget of a group practice plan or hospital will be a liberal one, but it will place a ceiling on yearly expenditures. If by improving the quality of health care and the efficiency with which it is delivered, a group or hospital has budget money left over at the end of the year, they will be permitted to retain this amount as a reward for efficiency. Prepaid group practice plans and medical foundation plans also will be able to retain 75 percent of the savings they accomplish by reducing hospital utilization. The general idea is to make it more profitable for doctors to keep people well than let them get sick enough to require hospitalization. The Government would be required to pay the total cost of hospitalization without limit, but the more money spent on hospital services, the less doctors would have for themselves.

In addition, the national health insurance program I have proposed would move toward restoring the balance between rural and urban areas in the availability of doctor care. In the countryside, over 412,000 people in 115 counties, scattered through 23 States do not have access to a physician at all. One out of 50 Americans cannot get a doctor under any circumstance. Also, there is a doctor imbalance inside our large cities. New York City, for example, has an overall physician-population ratio of 278 doctors per 100,000 residents. Yet the ratio is only 13 doctors per 100,000 residents in poor areas and ghettos.

If my bill should become law, we would witness, I trust, a migration of doctors from the overdoctored areas of the United States to the underdoctored areas of our country, since the money will be there whether or not the area is rural, poor, or affluent. Under this program, doctors would be motivated to serve not on the basis of a community's wealth, but on the basis of the people's need for health care in the area, and the physician's own personal inclination as to living arrangements.

My bill also provides financial incentives for physicians to practice in underdoctored areas, by making them eligible for supplemental stipends and by reimbursing the practitioner for special costs of continuing professional education and maintaining linkages with other providers of services.

Benefits provided under the program consist of virtually every kind of medical service for the diagnosis and treatment of disease, including: physical examinations; physician visits to the home, office, and hospital; specialist services, including surgery and psychotherapy; eye care, including eyeglasses and frames; prescription drugs; physical therapy, and rehabilitation. Institutional benefits include hospitalization without limit and home health services. Ambulance services are covered by the plan. Children under the age of 15 on the effective date of health benefits will be entitled to comprehensive dental services under the program, and will remain so entitled throughout their lives. Within 5 years after the program becomes operative, persons up to age 25 will receive full dental coverage. All citizens of the United States will be eligible beneficiaries of national health insurance. Aliens admitted as permanent residents and living within the United States, or aliens admitted for employment and employed within the United States also are eligible for benefits under the program.

The program would be financed within a predetermined budget defined by the revenue raised under the payroll tax provisions of the bill. Employees would pay 1 percent into the health fund on wages up to $15,000, self-employed persons would pay 2.5 percent of income up to $15,000, employers would contribute 3.5 percent of total payroll, and the Government would match the employee and employer contribution out of general revenues. It is estimated that, if this program had been fully implemented in fiscal year 1970, the total cost would have been $41 billion, or 70 percent of the total personal health care expenses in the United States.

It is obvious, however, that the promise of comprehensive health benefits will be an empty one, unless we create a rational, efficient system of health care delivery, which is readily accessible to each beneficiary.

Two years before benefits begin under national health insurance, a resources development fund will be established to strengthen our resources of health personnel and facilities and restructure our health care delivery system to meet the increased demand for comprehensive medical services; $200 million will be appropriated to the fund in its first year of operation, and the following year $400 million will be devoted to the fund. Once benefits begin, up to 5 percent of the trust fund, nearly $2 billion a year, will be set aside for resources development.

A fundamental aspect of the problem of rationalizing the delivery of health care in America can be dealt with by the option I have mentioned of contracting in advance for the services of health care practitioners. As opposed to our current practice of rewarding practitioners in proportion to the seriousness of a patient's malady, the method of paying for services in advance results, in fact, in paying physicians to keep us healthy. In this way, physicians are financially rewarded for implementing techniques which reduce the cost and improve the efficiency of their services, since they are permitted to retain, as a bonus, 75 percent of their hospital utilization savings. By the same token, they are financially penalized for inefficient or unnecessary practices. The resources development fund will stimulate the development of such contractual arrangements.

There are many provisions of the bill that would improve the quality of care. Practitioners would be required to participate in programs of continuing education. Surgeons and other designated specialists would be required to hold a certificate from the appropriate national specialty board or possess the qualifications requisite to such certification. Except in emergencies, a consultation with an appropriately qualified specialist will be required prior to surgery. Medical foundations sponsored by medical societies would be required to establish peer review procedures acceptable to the health security board, which is responsible for administering the health security program. Prepaid group practice plans would be required to have a committee of physicians promulgate medical standards, oversee the professional aspects of the delivery of care, and monitor the quality of all health services provided by the plan.

Under the program, grant-in-aid amounts would be provided for the planning and development of comprehensive health delivery systems, and subsidized loans would be made available for the initial staffing of these systems. Under Kennedy and Johnson, the Federal Housing Act was amended to provide health facilities for doctors engaged in group practice. I understand, however, that this provision has not been taken advantage of, chiefly because neither the Federal Housing Administration nor the doctors knew how to put it to use.

Unless we move to construct a national plan, 50 individual State plans will be created under medicaid in an attempt to fill the need for national health insurance. The State of New York, as you may be aware, has extended medicaid benefits to persons in a family of four with $5,400 income, exclusive of the cost of getting to work. Since approximately 50 percent of medicaid's financing comes from Federal revenues, you are purchasing health care benefits for New Yorkers that are not available to persons, with comparable incomes, in your own States. We must have a national plan that can be administered fairly to all persons.

CAN MARTIAL LAW AID EDUCATION?

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives I am deeply concerned about the crisis facing our Nation's educational system.

Our public and private schools are experiencing a period of unprecedented turmoil, as well as a breakdown in the all-important relationship between students and administrators. It is no exaggeration to say that at least some of our schools are in a virtual state of anarchy.

In my judgment, the learning process simply cannot take place without the proper degree of discipline and mutual respect. In this connection, the efforts of the Reverend Charles Gallen, principal of Roman Catholic High School in Philadelphia, deserve special commendation.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully include a Philadelphia Inquirer article on Father Gallen, written by columnist Sandy Padwe, in the RECORD at this point:

CAN MARTIAL LAW AID EDUCATION?

(By Sandy Padwe)

The Rev. Charles Gallen opened the green cardboard box on his desk. It was filled with mail.

"There are about 200 letters here," Father Gallen said, "along with some more in another office. Only a few could be considered of a crank variety."

The Rev. Charles Gallen is the principal at Roman Catholic High School, Broad and Vine sts. But by now, many people know that. Father Gallen is becoming a very popular figure in this town.

Last week he declared that educational program at Roman would be the equivalent of "martial law." He added that when students were told to jump, they would do so and ask "how far" on the way up.

Father Gallen is a tall, powerful man who looks more like an aging athlete than a high school principal. He says he is 50, but if you had to guess you might say 40.

Last week his tough disciplinary policies meant, among other things, a frisking of students as they entered the school. The atmosphere was, indeed, one of martial law, and those who did not agree with the stern measures wondered if Father Gallen's crackdown actually helped or hindered learning. Martial law, they reasoned, was no more conducive to learning than an atmosphere where discipline was non-existent.

"What I said doesn't carry the same implications to students as to some outsiders," Father Gallen said. "My kids aren't afraid of me or my staff."

Discipline in the schools is becoming a big issue in the city. The opponents of public school superintendent, Dr. Mark Shedd, label him—and his system—too permissive. Many of these people applaud Father Gallen, a complex man of many philosophies.

TEMPERED WITH CHRISTIAN CONCEPTS

"When I say 'martial law,'" Father Gallen said, "I'm not talking about an atmosphere like the military where you have this business of hatred of the sergeant. Our discipline has to be tempered with Christian concepts. I'm only an adult Christian trying to help others. Knowledge and will power have to be trained."

Racial turmoil is at the root of the trouble which led to last week's crackdown at Roman.

"The students," Father Gallen said, "were bringing the prejudices, hatreds and fears of their communities with them . . . This is not a place to do politicking or whatever. . . ."

Father Gallen grew up in Clifton Heights, Delaware County. His father was a mechanic. There is a strong dedication and feeling for the old, established virtues in Father Gallen's philosophy. He believes, simply, that the most important consideration in a man's makeup is his feeling for others.

He said he feels this is being lost in modern society.

"What worries me," Father Gallen said, "has been this tremendous amount of time and effort that goes into quality education, almost to the neglect of the production of the true man.

"All emphasis seems to be placed on intellectual attainment. Teachers are being hired not because they are men, but because they have so many degrees.

"If we face facts," he continued, "our nation was built by mechanics. They've always worked hard, eaten well and slept long because they were tired from their work. Generally they were better men than and—I don't like to use the word that much 'eggheads,' or those who went totally for education, and excluded other parts of learning.

"I despise the person today who says this is the way I FEEL about things. It is more important to say this is the way I THINK about things. We need will power to go along with intellect.

ECONOMIC, INTELLECTUAL ATTAINMENTS

"We have put so much emphasis on economic and intellectual attainments that the real qualities are sometimes lost . . . My father was one of the smartest men I knew . . . the plumber who put water on top of the Empire State Building was no dummy either."

Father Gallen says he is interested in graduating his concept of "the total man" from Roman.

But he admits that other programs with less structured discipline—such as the city's Parkway Program where students do not attend any particular school—have a function in society.

* * * iron hand," Father Gallen said, "The Parkway Program wouldn't be good. The student wouldn't get much out of it. But for a sensitive student it would be a tremendous thing."

Meanwhile, it will be Father Gallen's version of "martial law" at Roman.

YOUNG CITIZENS ARE ALSO CONCERNED

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, how many times has each of us urged our constituents, both young and old and in between, to learn about the issues to write us their opinions? I know that I for one do this all the time. This is a sure way of learning about the matters of special local interest—even local issues—and of seeing in another focus national problems and concerns.

So I was especially pleased to receive a number of letters from a very active and alert fourth grade at Carlin Park School in Angola, Ind.

In all the arguments for and against concerning funding of the supersonic transport prototype, I think the questions and conclusions of these students are timely and telling.

It is indeed interesting to me to note how very concerned the future generation's leaders are about the environment in a total sense. They are concerned that we preserve what nature offers us and this includes human lives and hopes and values.

It is refreshing to me to receive letters such as these and I include these particular letters from the Carlin Park Fourth Grade in the RECORD. My congratulations to their teacher, Linda Jennings, and to each of these young concerned citizens:

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: What is your opinion on the SST? My opinion is that if it does damage why start it? Did you know how much damage the SST would do before you started? How much money has already been spent on the project? How much more is needed to finish? Write and answer my letter.

Your friend,

JAN BLEDSAE.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I hope you vote against the SST project because it makes too much noise and too much pollution. It will make too much damage.

Sincerely,

STUART REESE.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I am against the SST because I think it will pollute the air and the air has enough pollution already. Please send me a reply and your opinion.

Your friend,

MARK LINSBERG.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 21, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: My opinion is that you should stop the SST project. We should use the money to stop pollution.

Sincerely,

CINDY HESS.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: What is the plans for the SST? When will the SST be done? How much money has already been spent in the SST? How much more money will be spent on the SST?

Mr. Roush, could the U.S. go back to horse and buggy and bicycle so the U.S. would quit polluting the air? Please send me a reply.

Your friend,

PHILLIP MEANS.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I'm against the SST because it makes too much noise and is polluting the air. It disturbs the animals and it could kill them. I wish you would do something about it.

Your friend,

BETSY GAFFIN.

CARLIN PARK SCHOOL,
Angola, Ind., January 15, 1971.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: I'm against the SST because I don't think it will stop pollution. It will make too much noise. What is your opinion? Can you give me some additional information?

Your friend,

DONNA O. QUINN.

SUPREME COURT'S RECENT DECISION ON PRAYER PRAISED

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, with all the turmoil and dissent we read about in the world today, it is always refreshing for me to hear about something which has been accomplished in the name of God and country.

The action I am referring to occurred yesterday when the U.S. Supreme Court announced it was letting stand a lower court ruling dismissing a suit by Madalyn Murray O'Hair, the atheist, who sought to bar Apollo astronauts from praying and reading from the Bible while being televised on the way to the moon.

If ever there was a time for this Nation and the world to turn its attention to an Almighty Being for guidance and help, that time is now. What better time for man to express his solidarity and belief in God than during the astronaut's trip to the moon.

It is a comfort and inspiration for all of us on earth to know that there are those among us, including the members of the U.S. Supreme Court, who agree that the pursuit of expressing faith in God and his guidance is both a personal as well as constitutional privilege.