

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A GIFT TO THE NATION—PORTRAITS OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND WIFE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to be in the east room of the White House on February 26, 1971, for the impressive ceremony to unveil the Gilbert Stuart portraits of President John Quincy Adams and Louisa Catherine Johnson, his wife.

These portraits were presented as a gift to the Nation and to the White House collection by Mr. John Quincy Adams, the great-great-grandson of President John Quincy Adams, who is a resident of Dover, Mass., and one of my constituents of the 10th Congressional District. The portraits were accepted by President Nixon, while Mrs. Nixon presided as mistress-of-ceremonies. There were 75 members of the Adams family present. No other family in American history has provided both a father—John Adams—and a son as Presidents. These magnificent portraits, because of the generosity of the Adams descendants, will now be enjoyed by the millions of Americans who visit the White House. The Nation's heritage has been greatly enriched.

The brilliant career of John Quincy Adams was summarized during the program by Mr. Andrew Oliver, portraits editor of the Adams Papers, thus:

His career has been eloquently summed up in a few words. He served his country in every department of public occupation. He was Minister to five great powers in succession. He negotiated and signed the Treaty of Ghent, the Commercial Treaty of 1815, the French Treaty of 1822, the Prussian Treaty and the treaty which acquired Florida from Spain. He was Senator, Representative, Foreign Minister, Secretary of State and President. And he breasted the stormy waves of the House of Representatives at the age of 80.

I should like to share the moving moments of the ceremony by inserting the text of the program in the RECORD. I think we can also profitably reflect on Adams' own words, in a speech at Plymouth, where he said:

Think of your forefathers? Think of your posterity!

We shall draw inspiration from these portraits for many generations to come. The text of the ceremony follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, MRS. NIXON, MR. JOHN QUINCY ADAMS OF DOVER, MASS., AND MR. ANDREW OLIVER, PORTRAITS EDITOR OF THE ADAMS PAPERS, AT THE UNVEILING CEREMONY OF PORTRAITS OF PRESIDENT JOHN QUINCY ADAMS AND MRS. ADAMS

Mrs. NIXON. Good afternoon. It is a great pleasure for me to welcome all of you here to the East Room. This is one of the most important days in the history of the White House, because we have two life portraits of John Quincy Adams and Louisa Catherine Johnson, his wife, and they are to be presented today.

To show our appreciation and interest in continuing to add to the White House collection of important American paintings, we have not only invited the Adams descendants, but also members of the Historical Society of the White House, the members of the present and previous Committee on the Preservation of the White House, and Mrs. Kennedy's Paintings Committee.

The President and I are most grateful to all of you who take an interest in this House and help us try to make it the best one in America.

We have over a million and a half visitors here every year. They come to see all of the beautiful objects which have historical meaning. So we are so pleased that they are going to get to see the Adams' portraits beginning tomorrow morning.

We are grateful to Mr. John Quincy Adams, of Dover, Massachusetts, for his very generous gift of the valuable portraits to the White House collection. We are especially pleased to have the one of Mrs. Adams because there was not one of her in the White House until this time.

I should like today to greet Mrs. Arthur Adams, who is the mother of the donor and also the mother of the Governor of Massachusetts.

Would she take a bow, please? (Applause.) It gives me great pleasure at this time to introduce Mr. John Quincy Adams, who is a great-great-grandson of President John Quincy Adams and a great-great-great grandson of John Adams. No other family in American history has provided both a father and a son as Presidents.

Mr. Adams.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon, distinguished friends of the White House:

When John Quincy Adams arrived at the President's House in 1825, after a bitter campaign which he finally won not in the electoral college but in the House of Representatives, this Mansion soon to be called the White House stood largely by itself. It was surrounded by farm buildings, stables, sheds, tool houses and dairies. Cows grazed nearby; sheep kept the grass from getting out of hand. Pennsylvania Avenue was a dust bowl in the summer and no doubt a quagmire of mud in the winter and spring. There was neither plumbing nor running water in the building, and things were, by today's standards, Spartan, to say the least.

But to a puritanical New Englander, the son of a Yankee farmer turned lawyer, this wasn't so bad. After all, during the last few months of his father's term in office, Abigail, the first First Lady to live here, hung her laundry in this, the famous East Room.

Complaining bitterly in a letter to her sister that she much preferred Philadelphia, Abigail wrote, "Not one room or chamber is finished of the whole. It is habitable by fires in every part, 13 of which we are obliged to keep daily or sleep in wet and damp places."

We hope that things are a little better now. (Laughter.)

Ours was a rural society in the 1820's. The President travelled back and forth to Boston by coach and by ship unannounced and uncomfortable. When his father, John Adams, died in Quincy, on July 4, 1826, by extraordinary coincidence, the same day his friend Thomas Jefferson died and, again, to the day, the 50th anniversary of the Declaration they labored over in Philadelphia, it took five days for the news to get to Washington.

John Quincy Adams was unquestionably a man of brilliant intellect, stubborn, aloof, courageous, bound by principle and not by expediency. In short, a statesman but not a politician. Underneath it all he had a warm heart but he certainly did his best to hide it, and in this case his best was very good indeed.

Incredible as it may seem in an era of television and press conferences, he made only two public speeches during his entire four-year term in office. I have often wondered why it was that in succeeding generations of the family nobody has been able to win a substantial victory—political victory. Certainly, there has been ability and courage and vision to wrestle with the great issues of the day. Some were determined and seemingly had the ambition. My grandfather ran for Governor of Massachusetts five times, for instance, but he never made it.

I am afraid the answer is that they were simply unable or refused to allow themselves to develop an ability to communicate effectively with the man in the street. We may have been strong on principle with all its virtues, but I am afraid we haven't been able to accept the fact that Madison Avenue, like it or not, is almost as necessary a part of the political process as a sound background in the classics and a keen sense of history.

This failure to face the world as it is and not as we would like to have it has been, I feel, a tragedy. Somewhere among the bright younger generation—and there are some of them in this room today—I hope we will again produce a young man or maybe, who knows, a young lady, who will make it to this House on his own, to paraphrase Winston Churchill.

Ladies and gentlemen, these two portraits have been in the family for 150 years. We have kept them with quiet pride on the walls of our houses in Boston, in Quincy, and lately in Dover. While we treasure them and we always will, they belong here together, in the house and in the public phase that neither of them enjoyed, for all Americans to view.

We hope you will agree that they are quite outstanding, especially the charming one of Louisa Catherine.

And now, on behalf of all Adams and with great pride in the memory of our distinguished ancestors, we present these Gilbert Stuart masterpieces to the American people, to our First Families, and to all who visit this, the President's House.

Mrs. NIXON. I am glad to have a pretty First Lady for the White House.

I remember when I went to the National Gallery, to see the John Quincy Adams portraits, I had a wonderful companion who told me so many interesting stories. I have asked him to come here today. He is a great authority on the Adams family, and he is Portraits Editor of the Adams Papers, author of the book "Portraits of John and Abigail Adams" and author of the volume "Portraits of John Quincy Adams and His Wife."

It gives me much pleasure to present Mr. Andrew Oliver.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, Mrs. Nixon: Although John Quincy Adams sat for more than 60 portraits, there are only three pairs of oil portraits of himself and his wife, and this pair was the last of the three to be painted.

In 1794, when John Quincy Adams, age 27, was sent abroad by Washington as Minister to the Hague, his mother, Abigail, extracted his promise to send her a miniature of himself, which he did in 1795, and she wore it on her bracelet.

A year later he became engaged to the second of the seven daughters of the well-to-do merchant Joshua Johnson. Nothing would satisfy Abigail but to have a likeness of her future daughter-in-law, so she, too, was painted in miniature, which, with that of her son, have always been kept together and are even now on display together in the diplomatic reception rooms of the Department of State.

In 1797, they were married. Almost immediately afterwards, her father failed in busi-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ness and fled to America to avoid his European creditors. To her, appearances suggested that in Adams, her father had simply found a promising young man and married off his penniless daughter in the nick of time. This fear long haunted her.

Shortly after their marriage, Adams was sent as Minister to Berlin where they lived for four years. In 1801, on the election of Jefferson as President, Adams was recalled to America and Louisa had to run the gauntlet of all her husband's Adams' and Quincy kin who thronged about to view the half English, London-bred wife of their young relative. She was astounded.

"Had I stepped into Noah's ark," she wrote, "I do not think I could have been more utterly astounded."

In 1809, President Madison appointed Adams as Minister to Russia where he lived for upwards of five years. And when he was called to Ghent to negotiate the treaty to end the war of 1812, Mrs. Adams followed later with her 17-month old son on a 40-day journey across the wintry wastes of northern Europe to join him.

Life was sometimes a trial. She had, however, a brief and happy respite in London, when in May 1815, her husband, treading in his father's footsteps, took up his post as Ambassador to the Court of St. James's. It was then that the second pair of portraits was painted by Charles Robert Leslie.

Then after Adams' recall again to America in 1817 to serve as President Monroe's Secretary of State, this pair of portraits were commenced. Adams and Louisa dropped into Stuart's studio in Boston one morning and she persuaded him to sit for his portrait for their children. And presumably he agreed to do so if she would.

In his diary he wrote, "I sat for Stuart before and after breakfast and found his conversation very entertaining as at every sitting, his own figure highly picturesque, taking snuff from a large round tin wafer box holding half a pound, which he must use up in a day. He considers himself beyond all question the first portrait painter of the age and tells numbers of anecdotes concerning himself to prove it. And his conclusion is not very wide from the truth."

Adams' only comment on his portrait was that, "Stuart was much satisfied with what he has done but I cannot exactly say the same."

His cousin, Ward Nicholas Wilson, however, saw the pair just before they were finished and with a keen critic's eye commented that Stuart had never given greater proof of his talents or done more justice to the precise likeness of those they were intended to represent.

But Louisa, with a weakness we all share about pictures of ourselves, had a different opinion. "It speaks too much," she said, "of inward suffering and of a half-broken heart to be an agreeable remembrance."

Yet her son Charles later wrote of the picture: "Her face wears a sorrowful appearance too common to her but I shall value that picture as presenting something of her appearance in those days, for hereafter there will be nothing, and I love to think of her as she was in the midst of her gaiety and her prosperity."

And we at this distance can see at a glance that in her portrait, Stuart did live up to his own ingenuous claim to be the first portrait painter of the age.

This period was one of Louisa's happiest. She won the etiquette war of Washington which reached the level of a Cabinet discussion in 1819 over whether Cabinet wives or Congressmen's wives should pay first calls on each other.

And she became famous for her parties, the most spectacular of which, long remembered as Mrs. Adams' ball, was held for General Jackson in 1824, on the ninth anniversary of

the Battle of New Orleans, at which some 1,000 persons danced their way into the wee hours of the morning.

In 1829, after four years in the White House, for a moment she believed they would go back to Quincy and live out their lives in the peace and quiet of country life. But as it turned out, Adams was on the threshold of another and great career. We are all familiar with his 15 courageous years in the House of Representatives and his fatal stroke at his desk in the House in 1848. Where could death have found him but at his post of duty?

His career has been eloquently summed up in a few words. He served his country in every department of public occupation. He was Minister to five great powers in succession. He negotiated and signed the Treaty of Ghent, the Commercial Treaty of 1815, the French Treaty of 1822, the Prussian Treaty and the treaty which acquired Florida from Spain. He was Senator, Representative, Foreign Minister, Secretary of State and President. And he breasted the stormy waves of the House of Representatives at the age of 80.

When he died in the capitol, he left no purer or loftier fame behind him, but he left a devoted wife who survived him four long years. And we have an affectionate picture of her by her grandson Henry Adams.

"Little Henry," he wrote, "first remembered her from 1843 to 1848 sitting in her paneled room at breakfast with her heavy silver teapot, sugar bowl and cream jug. By that time she was 70 years old or more, Louisa, thoroughly weary, being beaten about a stormy world, more remote than the President, but more delicate.

"To the boy she seemed a fragile creature, presiding over her old President and her Queen Anne mahogany, an exotic like her service of china, and with great deference to everyone and affection to her son Charles, but hardly more Bostonian than she had been 50 years before on her wedding day in the shadow of the Tower of London."

Now in a later and different century, through the generosity of another John Quincy Adams, strictly in keeping with Adams' tradition of the supremacy of country before personal considerations, and after a lapse of more than 140 years, we here today can welcome back the first John Quincy Adams and his wife to their House, the President's House, to the White House, to what the President and Mrs. Nixon have so graciously have said, "All Americans might call our House."

Mrs. NIXON. Thank you very much. That was just great, reliving a little bit of history.

I am going to get your books and read them because I think they must be very fine.

Now, since we are accepting the pictures of the Sixth President of the United States and his wife, I thought it appropriate that the Thirty-Seventh President make the acceptance remarks.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Adams, Dr. Oliver, all of our distinguished guests:

I, of course, make many appearances in my role as President of the United States, and each differs somewhat. Let the record show this is the first time my wife has ever introduced me, and I am very happy.

I, as most Presidents happen to be, am a student of history in the spare hours that I have, one or two a week. And as a student of history I was as fascinated as I am sure all of you were, by the remarks of John Quincy Adams and also of Dr. Oliver.

The difficulty is that after hearing their remarks there is so very little that I can add because, as I was running mentally through my own mind what I planned to say, they ticked off virtually everything that John Quincy Adams had done during his life.

But not quite everything, because it would

March 17, 1971

be impossible in the brief space of time that each of them had for the life of this very remarkable man to be described.

Let me begin at the end and then go to the beginning, and then perhaps put it in the perspective of the times in which we live.

When John Quincy Adams died, as Dr. Oliver pointed out, he had a stroke on the floor of the House of Representatives, and among those who were there and saw him on that day was Abraham Lincoln, serving in his first and only term as a Member of the House.

After he had the stroke, he was moved to the Speaker's room and two days later there he died. I do not recall exactly what his last words were, but I think I can paraphrase them. It was something like this: My life on earth is finished, but I am content.

And well he could be content, not simply because his life had been a long one, but because of perhaps all of the men who have served as President of the United States, it was the most complete life in terms of the areas of service: a United States Senator, Congressman, diplomat for 37 years, President of the United States, and the whole history of America from the time of its beginning until the time of his death.

He was born seven years before the Revolution, but at 14 years of age—and let all young Americans note this—before he finished Harvard he was Secretary to the American Delegation which negotiated the treaty ending the Revolutionary War, which began a long diplomatic career of very great success.

Here was a man who was in Moscow at the time that Napoleon's armies came through Russia and finally were turned back not so much by the Russian armies, but by the weather.

Here was a man who later was in Paris and saw Napoleon when he came back from Elba.

A man who negotiated many treaties—and, as Dr. Oliver pointed out, the one ending the war in 1812.

And this little historical note should be added, and one who served as Secretary of State in President Monroe's Administration, and in that capacity, at least according to an authority as respected as Carl Sandberg, probably had more to do with the concept and the execution of the Monroe Doctrine than President Monroe himself.

And then who, after serving as President of the United States, did not quit, but went back and served in the House, and even there rendered a service that probably would not have been rendered had he not been there.

There was a gag rule then in the House of Representatives. For eight years he fought it. The first time the vote overwhelmingly was against him. But he was a persistent man and after eight years the gag rule was abolished.

So he could well say at the end of that life, looking back over the history of his country and the history of his service: President, Congressman, Senator, Secretary of State, diplomat all over the world representing his country. "My life on earth is finished, but I am content."

There is a little vignette which tells us something about this man, which perhaps, as the John Quincy Adams of today has already alluded to: The fact that he was shy, the fact that he perhaps may not have had the ability to communicate with people generally that many in political life are supposed to have, but a man who had a very warm heart.

Among his antagonists in the House of Representatives was Alexander Stevens, a very brilliant man; sometimes bitter, but extraordinarily eloquent. Lincoln, in his two years, said that Alexander Stevens made the best one-hour speech he had ever heard made in his whole life up to that time.

Alexander Stevens, as we know, later went on to be Vice President of the Confederacy. But Adams, despite the fact that he and

Stevens were on different sides of the great issue of slavery, had the ability to communicate across that chasm of different and to retain a friendly relation.

He also had a capacity to express himself perhaps not so well in speeches—and maybe two speeches in four years is enough for any President, may I say—but an extraordinary capacity to express himself sometimes in bits of poetry.

One day after a bitter debate he wrote a poem and sent it across the aisle to Alexander Stevens. What Adams said to Stevens on that occasion I think is worth reading in this ceremony today.

"We meet as strangers in this hall, but when our task of duty is done, we blend the common good to all and melt the multitude into one.

"As strangers in this hall we met, but now with one united heart, what e'er of life awaits us yet, in cordial friendship let us part."

That Adams legacy is something we all could well remember today, and for that and many other reasons we are proud to have in this House, which belongs to all of the American people, our House as we often describe it—which means your and ours together—these two portraits.

There is one, incidentally, as you know, of John Quincy Adams hanging in the White House, painted at a time when he was 78 years of age. This portrait now is when he was 51 as Secretary of State. And, of course, it is the first one of the fifth First Lady.

So joining Mrs. Nixon, we express our appreciation to the Adams family, one of the really great American families, for their generosity, and the gratitude of the Nation goes to them for making it possible for millions now to walk through these rooms, to think of the past and, as they look at these portraits and see this man, they will think of a man who has seen more of American history and has participated more in it, in more capacities, than any President in history.

Mrs. NIXON. And now I invite you for refreshments in the State Dining Room and for a chance to visit with you, too.

Thank you for coming. Thanks to all the Adams family for parting with their treasures. Thank you.

ERIE COUNTY LEGISLATURE SUPPORTS REVENUE SHARING

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, JOHN TERRY and I held briefings on revenue sharing for all interested Erie County officials as well as other leaders in Mr. TERRY's district. The Erie County meeting was held in Buffalo in February and I am pleased that the response has been very favorable.

We had a terrific turnout at our Buffalo meeting and I am looking forward to serving in this capacity in other areas because from the above experience, I know we have an exciting product.

At this point, I include two resolutions sent to me by county executive, John Tutuska, in support of revenue sharing:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY ERIE COUNTY LEGISLATURE ON JANUARY 19, 1971

Item 37—Messrs. Carlsen and Abbott presented the following preamble and resolution.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRO. NO. 3-1. RESOLUTION NO. 48

Whereas, The demands on County Governments for services have increased alarmingly over the past few years, and

Whereas, These demands have overburdened the prime source of funding local government, "the real estate tax", and

Whereas, the National Association of Counties (NACO) wages support of an effort to push through Congress a Federal revenue sharing program,

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Erie County Legislature does hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact into law a principle of Federal revenue sharing, whereby County Governments would receive substantial share payments unrestricted as to use, and be it further

Resolved, That the clerk of this Legislature be and he hereby is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to President Nixon, Senators Javits and Buckley, to Congressman Smith, Dulski, Kemp, Conable and Hastings, to the County Officers Association and to the Inter-County Association of County Legislative Bodies of Western New York urging each of them to exert their influence in having such a bill enacted into law.

ARTHUR J. CARLSEN,
Legislator, 18th District.

SETH A. ABBOTT,
Legislator, 19th District.

Mr. Vackel asked for a suspension of the necessary rule for the immediate adoption of the resolution.

Request granted.

Mr. Abbott moved that the resolution be adopted.

Messrs. Vackel, Wolf, Tuppen and Pletot seconded the motion.

Carried.

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF ERIE COUNTY

Whereas, there is presently a bill in the Ways and Means Committee of the United States Congress titled, "General Revenue Sharing Act of 1971", and

Whereas, the County of Erie and a great number of other counties and municipalities throughout the State of New York and the United States are suffering an ever more painful financial squeeze in receiving revenue necessary to supply essential services to their citizens, and the means of taxation available to it and them are now being pressed to their practicable limits, and

Whereas, it is the sense of this Legislature that the practical and logical solution to the problem is revenue sharing by the United States Government, and

Whereas, the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of New York and many federal, state and local officials who have studied the problem are urging the principle of federal revenue sharing as a proper and statesmanlike solution for the aid of counties and municipalities in performing their obligations.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Erie County Legislature does hereby strongly urge and memorialize the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States, the United States Senators from the State of New York and all Congressmen representing districts in the Western New York area to expeditiously take all steps necessary to study, consider and enact into law, "The General Revenue Sharing Act of 1971", and be it further

Resolved, That the allocation to be made to the State of New York be one billion dollars as urged by Gov. Rockefeller, and be it further

Resolved, that certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to Senators Jacob K. Javits and James L. Buckley, Congressman

Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives, and all congressmen representing districts in the Western New York area.

RICHARD C. TIPPLE,
Legislator, 15th District.
ARTHUR J. CARLSEN,
Legislator, 18th District.

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS—RECENT TRENDS

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Associate Justice Walter B. Hamlin delivered an address to the Attorney General's Conference for District Attorneys on March 5.

His subject is one of interest to all of us—trends of the U.S. Supreme Court. I have often been critical of the Supreme Court in past years for the trend it had adopted. Hopefully, we will see a new trend in the years ahead.

I have known Justice Hamlin for many years. He is a distinguished judge and is respected for his knowledge of the law and his fairness on the bench.

I want everyone to have the benefit of his words, and I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISIONS—RECENT TRENDS

I am again honored at having been invited to address you today. In March, 1965, six years ago, I delivered an address before this conference entitled, "A Discussion of Recent United States Supreme Court Decisions With Regard to Local Law Enforcement."

I discussed, among others, *Mapp v. Ohio* (1961), which overruled *Wolf v. Colorado* (1949), *Beck v. State of Ohio* (1964), *Aguilar v. Texas* (1964), on search and seizure, *Maschall v. United States* (March, 1964), and *Escobedo v. Illinois* (June, 1964), and observed that, in spite of divergent views on the part of members of the court, no really fixed formula was set forth in the majority opinions.

The *Miranda* and *Johnson* cases were decided later and will be mentioned later.

In March, 1965, I stated:

"It is a matter of common knowledge that the number of serious crimes committed annually in the United States has increased by a shocking 50 percent over the last decade. The public generally is alarmed, because we are increasingly frustrating or throttling our law enforcement officers with judge-made rulings that stagger the common-sense of the average citizen. He simply cannot understand them. However, he does feel that there is today the danger of our having a nation of criminals within our great nation, simply because the criminal has increased in numbers. An article in the January, 1965, issue of the American Legion Magazine states that according to FBI head J. Edgar Hoover, the growing crime rate is outstripping the population growth by a ratio of more than 5 to 1.

"The average citizen is afraid of a taking over by this criminal element. And because of his feeling it could be that many years hence, after most of us have passed on and there is an entirely different membership with its different philosophy on our highest court, the pendulum will swing again and a real 'police state' might come into being under the guise of striking at the criminal

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

with an iron heel. The stream of history has recorded that should this occur, no one will be safe.

"If the pendulum swings and a future Supreme Court should create a 'police state', it will be nationwide; whereas, the possibility of fifty 'police states' being in existence at one time is remote indeed. With the radio, television, news media and modern methods of communication, I believe that the people of our fifty states are too enlightened today to stand for the existence of a 'police state' in any one of them. The people possess an intrinsic human dignity, an inner majesty, which gives them an appetite, a passion, for freedom. They will not willingly relinquish that which they have earned by the sweat of their brain or brow to either the criminal or the tyrant.

"Under our system of government, men here, on this land, built from wilderness a nation with the most freedom for the greatest number of people enjoying the highest standard of living the world has ever known. The fact of this magnificent achievement is inescapable; it surrounds us; it is part of our blood and bone. Yet the ever-increasing criminal element, with a blindness or perversion stunning to the national mind, would destroy the system which produced this magnificent achievement.

"Therefore, in these times of mounting danger from the criminal element, *local law enforcement* should not be handcuffed at the expense of the public safety and welfare. So, as Justices Clark and Black said in the Beck Case, I simply suggest that the United States Supreme Court try to allow the state courts to determine and resolve the issues involved in local law enforcement.

"Let me observe that our state judges are sincere men, honorable men, and they know what is best to be done for the safety and welfare of their communities. They want their people to live with freedom from fear—either of the criminal or the tyrant. They know that the course of Right will not die; it suffers eclipses, but is born again; it may be ignored or trampled under foot, but it does not, therefore, cease to exist, and all good souls recognize it as the only rule of life. It is a useless endeavor to place Might upon the pedestal which others have raised to Right."

On May 5, 1969, the United States Supreme Court, by *per curiam* opinion, decided the case of *Hallday v. United States*, 39 S. Ct. 1498, 394 U.S. 831, 23 L. Ed. 2d 16 (1969). This matter involved the acceptance of a guilty plea in a case where a United States District Judge who accepted it failed to comply with Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The *per curiam* of the United States Supreme Court stated in part:

"In McCarthy we noted that the practice we were requiring had been previously followed by only one Circuit; that over 80% of all verdicts in the federal courts are obtained after guilty pleas; and that prior to Rule 11's recent amendment, not all district judges personally questioned defendants before accepting their guilty pleas. Thus, in view of the general application of Rule 11 in a manner inconsistent with our holding in McCarthy, and in view of the large number of constitutionally valid convictions that may have been obtained without full compliance with Rule 11, we decline to apply McCarthy retroactively. We hold that only those defendants whose guilty pleas were accepted after April 2, 1969, are entitled to plead anew if their plea was accepted without full compliance to Rule 11.

"Accordingly, the judgment of the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit is affirmed."

It is my view that the foregoing *per curiam* was rendered to put an end to a massive and indiscriminate jail and penitentiary release and delivery from custody of convicted criminals, which had been

caused by the rendition of *Gideon v. Wainwright* and similar decisions.

I am firmly of the opinion that the United States Supreme Court, in rendering this *per curiam*, realized the effect of the violence of these decisions to the enforcement of criminal justice in this Nation and established a deadline date.

I believe that my opinion is corroborated by the action of the United States Supreme Court in *Johnson v. State of New Jersey*, 384 U.S. 719, 16 L. Ed. 2d 882, 86 S. Ct. 1772, June 22, 1966, as follows:

"We hold that *Escobedo* affects only those cases in which the trial began after June 22, 1964, the date of that decision. We hold further that *Miranda* applies only to cases in which the trial began after the date of our decision one week ago. * * *

The Court established a deadline in *Johnson*; it evidently realized the devastating effect of its failure to set a deadline in *Miranda*.

Dutton v. Evans, 91 S. Ct. 210, was decided on December 15, 1970. In that case, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the judgment of the Court of Appeal and remanded the case to that court for consideration of other issues presented. But what is most significant is the following quote from that decision:

"Almost 40 years ago, in *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 54 S. Ct. 330, 78 L. Ed. 674, Mr. Justice Cardozo wrote an opinion for this Court refusing to set aside a state criminal conviction because of the claimed denial of the right of confrontation. The closing words of that opinion are worth repeating here:

"There is danger that the criminal law will be brought into contempt—that discredit will even touch the great immunities assured by the Fourteenth Amendment—if *gossamer possibilities of prejudice to a defendant are to nullify a sentence pronounced by a court of competent jurisdiction in obedience to local law, and set the guilty free.*" 291 U.S. 122, 54 S. Ct. 338."

In order to be sure about what Justice Cardozo meant by the use of the word "gossamer" I looked it up in the dictionary and found that it has two meanings, as follows:

1. A film of cobwebs floating in the air in calm clear weather.

2. Any gauzelike fabric.

At this point I am going to pause to render a great cheer, because at last the Supreme Court of the United States, as now constituted, has realized that what I said before this conference six years ago is correct.

The *Dutton* Decision is going to have a salutary effect upon the people of this Nation, the enforcement officers and prosecutors, as it filters down.

I say this because for several years past, common sense has been put behind exaggerated judicial concern over the rights of an accused. This situation has been staggering to the national mind. People have never been able to understand why a convicted murderer or rapist—or anyone else—unchallengably guilty, should be freed because of some inconsequential error which did not diminish by any common standard the fairness of his trial.

The true test, in my opinion, is and should be: Not the legal technicalities involved, but whether the rules have denied the defendant a fair trial.

I do not desire to contribute to the devastating effect of technical decisions on the enforcement of criminal justice in this Nation. As a Justice of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, I am reluctant to adopt a technical ruling in favor of a guilty defendant, unless there is a ruling that fits like a glove the case under consideration. In that event, I am compelled to do so.

Another decision of importance is the recent case of *McGarry v. Fogliana*, 370 F. 2d 42, decided by the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, on December 14,

March 17, 1971

1966, rehearing denied January 18, 1967, in which it was held in *habeas corpus* proceeding:

"Appellant also asserts that his retained counsel failed to perfect an appeal from his conviction. Standing alone, this is not a ground for federal *habeas corpus*. He makes no showing whatever that any prejudicial errors occurred that would have called for a reversal of his conviction. * * *

I am quoting that decision because many applications for *habeas corpus* received by us today contain an allegation that defendant had ineffective counsel; that he wanted to appeal, but that his counsel did not or would not allow him to do so. Today, any lawyer who is compelled to accept appointment to defend these criminals is placing his reputation at their mercy. They do not hesitate to attack his ability, leaving it open for some demagogue to use what one of these people has had to say about him if he ever runs for public office.

It is my hope that the lower federal courts will take notice of the trend that the United States Supreme Court is establishing, as the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, apparently did in *McGarry v. Fogliana*.

I am sure that the Supreme Court of the United States is going to continue this trend.

I hope that the lower federal courts will take heed. They have been unduly exercising the so-called "post-conviction remedies," which, as an old practitioner since 1919, stuns me. It is amazing that this expression crept into the jurisprudence. When I was admitted to the Bar in 1919, the only post-conviction remedy which was exercised was by application to the Board of Pardons for clemency. When a man was convicted he stood convicted unless the conscience of the State—the Board of Pardons—did something for him.

I have a simple remedy. All the Supreme Court of the United States has to do is to overrule *Mapp v. Ohio* and go back to *Wolf v. Colorado* and the previous jurisprudence. This will do away with Motions to Suppress and the daily complaint "They arrested me too fast."

We all know that trials for murder are rare in the federal courts. Murder, manslaughter, robbery, burglary, rape, theft, and many other types of cases are tried in the state courts that are not tried in the federal courts.

The effect of *Mapp v. Ohio* has been to prevent the police from pursuing a murderer for the purpose of seizing the lethal weapon; from pursuing a burglar or robber for obtaining the money, jewels or articles stolen, when they have entered a building after the commission of a crime. I could go on and enumerate other instances, but I know it would not be feasible at this time.

It is my view that it was very unwise and ill-advised for the United States Supreme Court to have overruled *Wolf v. Colorado*, which it did *ex proprio motu*. The overruling of *Wolf* was not necessary to the decision.

Mapp put the police in handcuffs.

This address may well close with a reading of a portion of an article appearing in the *Times-Picayune* of Wednesday, February 24, 1971, quoting Justice Hugo L. Black:

Justice Hugo L. Black, in explaining the Supreme Court's reversal of their actions, said federal district courts should not stand in the way of developing state prosecutions except when the prospective defendant proves he would suffer "irreparable injury" or that the state officials were guilty of "bad faith and harassment." What constitutes irreparable injury was not defined.

Black said there must be "a proper respect for state functions, a recognition of the fact that the entire country is made up of a union of separate state governments, and a continuance of the belief that the national government will fare best if the states and their institutions are left free to perform their separate functions in their separate ways."

VIETNAM—A CRISIS AHEAD

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, early this month I devoted the weekly news column that I send to constituents to a summary of my thinking on the Vietnam problem. I place this in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM—A CRISIS AHEAD

Despite all our discussions about revenue sharing, welfare costs, and other problems, the chief problem facing this nation today is still our involvement in Southeast Asia.

As one of the first few Congressmen to oppose our actions in Vietnam six years ago, I can fairly state that our performance there has been a terrible detriment.

The reports of our forces in Vietnam are constantly reflecting the shabbiest of qualities, rather than the nobility which should have been learned from our American history.

Consider the free fire zones where artillery men fire at will into the countryside. No other civilized country has openly sanctioned such tactics in modern warfare.

Consider the reports of citations for valor trumped up out of whole cloth which say that 50 per cent of the generals receive awards while only 10 per cent of the boys out in the front lines have been so honored.

Consider the corruption in the PX stores charged to the sergeants and other military officials who are responsible. Consider the use of marijuana and other drugs which is widespread among American forces in Vietnam. Consider the black market occasioned by our financial presence.

The Vietnam involvement has shattered the American ideals that I and others were brought up to admire.

Instead of bravery, we find military leaders who are covering up for atrocities that have been committed. Instead of courage, we find hardly any present leadership that is great enough to admit that we have made a mistake.

Instead of gallantry, we find our bombers all over Vietnam killing tens of thousands of civilian men, women, and children and leaving some six million homeless. Our poisons have for years been destroying the crops of the Vietnamese peasants. What has happened to the humanity of the American people?

On top of all this, our country has been torn internally by disagreement over this war. The inflation resulting from this senseless involvement in Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia has placed a painful financial burden on every American family because of increasing prices and higher taxes.

The net effect has been great damage to our own nation but none to the great Communist powers like China and the Soviet Union which we are supposedly blocking. They are escaping unscathed while we suffer at home and abroad.

There is no clear end in sight. While "withdrawal" is the present Administration policy, we have at the same time recently invaded Cambodia and Laos.

The recent foray that we have engineered of sending Saigon soldiers to cut the Ho Chi Minh Trail in Laos is building up to a crisis that may soon be a major turning point.

The unwisdom of sending a small contingent of 16,000 Saigon troops into the position most vital to the North Vietnamese, is another example of the mistakes that our civil and military leaders have been making regularly for years. Anyone can see that if our marines could not hold the base at Khe-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

sanh, it is reckless to send a small number of Saigon troops into an enemy nest miles beyond Khesanh.

All of this promises to be a setback to the Laos expedition and the United States backup efforts. It may shortly present the Administration and the nation with the hard decision whether to expand the war even further or to accept the setback. I predict much trouble in this situation shortly.

It is utterly clear that the solution in Vietnam will finally be one that is provided by the Vietnamese people themselves. The United States is incapable of providing a solution.

The one ray of brightness about the war that has any similarity to historic American ideals is the sacrifice of those 45,000 boys who gave their lives in the faith that they were defending their country.

To those boys who are following them the leadership of this nation owes more than a continuation of the same dreadful folly. As a small part of that leadership, I once again call for an end to the Vietnam War so that we can sweep away the recent tarnish on our heritage and restore unity and nobility to the American nation.

HORTON PRAISES UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AT THE FOREMAN CENTER

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Lester B. Foreman Area Educational Center is located in my congressional district in the town of Perinton. The center is a public school, serving 10 school districts. It is unique, however, in that it serves handicapped and retarded children.

The center has initiated a training program which I think deserves special mention. Since September, children ranging in age from 11 to 17, who are mentally retarded but considered educable and trainable, are being trained for jobs in the outside world.

Perceptual and motor skills are emphasized. The youths learn to stay with a job until it is finished.

The aim of the program, according to Mrs. Winifred Wagner, supervisor of the learning center, is to keep the youths out of institutions as much as possible so that they may contribute to their own living.

Special mention should be made of Mrs. Wagner. Her dedication, patience, and understanding are important ingredients in the success of this program.

Also, several businesses in the Rochester area have contributed supplies and equipment to the school to help make the program more exciting for the children: The Xerox Corp. donated trays, dish racks, and glasses; Rochester Button Co., buttons, and the Penfield Tavern offered pots and pans.

A feature story in the Rochester Times-Union gives a vivid explanation of the Foreman Center program. I share the article, written by Mr. George Anderson, with my colleagues in the House:

TRAINING THE "EDUCABLE" IS AIM AT FOREMAN CENTER

(By George Anderson)

At the Lester B. Foreman Area Educational Center in Perinton, a group of children come to school to learn how to wash dishes, set a table, mop a floor or sort buttons.

The children are involved in a new training program for the mentally retarded which began at the center, 41 O'Connor Road, last September. Ranging in age from 11 to 17, they were chosen because they're "educable and trainable."

Students are being trained for jobs in the outside world. "They're learning how to work," said Mrs. Winifred Wagner, supervisor of the learning center. "They're being trained for jobs in sheltered situations or sheltered workshops—a protected type of environment so they have some supervision," she said.

The center is a public school serving 10 school districts on the east side of the Genesee River. Another center, in Spencerport, serves districts on the west side of the river. Both have programs for handicapped and retarded children and occupational education courses such as data processing, beauty culture, carpentry and auto repair and body shops. Both centers are operated by a BOCES (Board of Cooperative Educational Service).

The children in the program are excited about learning new skills and are anxious to be successful, teachers said.

Mrs. Wagner explained that when the children leave the center—at age 21 or earlier if they're ready—"we hope they can earn some money toward their keep. Our idea now is to keep children out of institutions as much as possible so that they may contribute to their own living." All the children except two live with their parents.

With skills learned at the center, children can help out at home—"This is much better than the old idea of them (retarded children) sitting in a rocking chair all day," Mrs. Wagner said.

There are about 70 children in the program. They attend academic classes where the "3Rs" are taught and special classes including music, gym, cooking and art.

For an hour or so each day, groups of 10 are taken to the learning center where they "practice" what they did the day before.

There are five teachers involved in the program: Mrs. Jane Kohl, Mrs. Barbara Mitacek, Mrs. Marion Copeland and Mrs. Jill Kelly. All of them are required to have a certificate for special education plus an elementary (school) teaching certificate.

In the time spent in the learning center, the children's small muscle skills, motor skills and eye and hand skills are sharpened. Mr. Mitacek explained that at the buttons table, "children build endurance and learn discrimination in the colors and sizes and shapes of the buttons."

"They learn that they have to stick to the job to get it done. It teaches them accuracy and counting where they have to put a certain number of buttons into a bag," Mrs. Mitacek said.

"These jobs can relate to other jobs. They go on to them with the skills they've built here . . . in industry on an assembly line. It's important they get the feeling they're tending to a task," Mrs. Mitacek said.

At another table, girls were collating papers. The girls have been doing this for four weeks and their teacher said this is the first week they didn't need supervision.

Perceptual skills are also developed. "A student must use his eyes to see what needs to be done and make his hands move to do it," Mrs. Wagner said.

After lighter skills are developed, "we'll go on to more complicated things such as machine parts."

In other parts of the room, children are washing dishes, mopping and sweeping the floor, learning how to correctly place glasses into a glass rack, setting a table for four. A young boy is learning the sequence of how to add a washer and a nut to a bolt sticking through a slab of masonite.

Teachers hope that all the students will be ready for a job on the outside by the time they're 21. They all agree that the children are very slow learners, "but once they learn it, they know and won't forget it," Mrs. Wagner added.

So far, the only "graduate" has been a 21-year-old youth who attended the center in Spencerport. He's been employed at a Xerox cafeteria since last summer.

"Some of the children are on real jobs within the school," Mrs. Wagner said. "That's the first step. They deliver films, they work in the Xerox room, they pass out supplies, do janitorial tasks and deliver messages."

Much of the training equipment in the room has been donated to the center. Xerox donated the trays, dish racks, glasses and cups; Rochester Button Co. donated the buttons and a plastic company gave plastic bags. The Penfield Tavern offered pots and pans.

A note on the door of the room makes an appeal to parents and teachers for empty coffee cans, margarine dishes and other assorted things found around the house. A shop teacher picked up a work bench at an auction and had his auto repair class paint it bright yellow. Students now use it to store their supplies.

Mrs. Mary Hess, a working coordinator at the center, will be responsible for looking after the "graduates." She also is program placement director.

ABUSES IN NURSING HOMES

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, I rose on the floor of the House of Representatives to describe conditions I personally observed while working as a volunteer in nursing homes in the Washington, D.C., area. While much of what I said that day was concerned with almost unbelievable conditions, I did think that making public their existence would spark a national outrage giving rise to legislative action.

It is now 14 months since I visited and worked in those homes and there has been little or nothing done to remedy this tragic situation.

I rise today to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first in a series of articles written by staff members of the Chicago Tribune. These are remarkable articles, not only because of the way in which they are written, but more importantly because of what they have to say about our Nation.

These articles are the result of Tribune writers entering nursing homes in Chicago as janitors, nurses aides, and even patients, and they describe conditions which literally boggle the imagination.

What is most remarkable about the articles, however, is the fact that they speak of human misery which has been detailed time after time after time in this Nation and is still no closer to alleviation than at the time of the first report. Now

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the scene is Chicago, but that is transient, for tomorrow it will be Los Angeles and the next day it will be New York, and the day after it will be Philadelphia. And on and on it will go until someone is made to realize we are giving in some instances better treatment to animals than to our own parents and making a profit on it.

Mr. Speaker, I have lived with the reports of incredible misery for over a year now. I have received over 10,000 letters from older Americans and have read avidly the reports of others who have come face to face with the national scandal in nursing homes. Today, as I stand in the well of Congress and insert the first of a series of articles written by a newspaper which is trying to do something in a major American city, I am forced to ask—what about the towns and cities whose newspapers are not leading the fight? To whom can they turn?

[From the Chicago Tribune, Feb. 28, 1971]
ABUSE IN NURSING HOMES—SOME ELDERLY PREFER DEATH, REPORTERS FIND

(Note.—The first assignment of the newly formed Tribune Task Force was a comprehensive investigation of patient care in Chicago area nursing homes. This is the first report on the six-week probe by Reporters William Jones, Philip Caputo, William Currie and Pamela Zekman.)

They are hidden in warehouses for the dying.

Millions of tax dollars are misspent every year to keep them in squalor so depressing that they enjoy talking about their own deaths.

They are Chicago's elderly poor and they are being dumped by the thousands into Chicago nursing homes so poorly administered that a bum off the street can become a nurse's aide in less than 24 hours and administer narcotics and other medications to the ill.

ONLY ONE WAY TO TELL STORY

They have been abandoned. And with every day that passes thousands of our senior citizens are spending their last days wondering why it all must end in the indignity of filthy, rat-infested rooms, physical abuse, wretched food and a series of caretakers who can't see beyond the next welfare or Social Security check.

There is only one way to tell their story and that is to live with them, bathe them, feed them, watch and listen to their "keepers" and then report their story of rage, confusion and frustration as they live out their days in a warehouse for the dying. We worked and lived in these warehouses and this is what is happening:

1. Two old women, their bodies crippled with age and trembling in the cold of a winter night without heat, screech and claw at each other as they struggle for a single, ragged blanket. A nurse's aide appears in the doorway, watches the struggle for a moment and then shouts: "Shut your goddam mouths, both of you, or I'll take your blankets away and you can both freeze."

KICKS AND ABUSE

2. An elderly man, his right foot and leg wasted from a skin disease, accidentally brushes the foot against the white uniform of a woman aide. In an instant the woman kicks him in the leg and punches him in the chest, repeatedly cursing the man and describing him as an "old bastard."

3. The 37 patients living on the filthy second floor of a large North Side nursing home wait silently to be served their evening meal. On this night, however, there is not enough food and the nurse's aide in charge scrapes uneaten portions of steamed cabbage and

March 17, 1971

noodles onto other trays and serves it a second and third time until all are fed.

4. A nurse complains that many elderly patients are kept in the home even tho they are seriously ill and belong in a hospital. They are kept there because their presence guarantees a continued flow of welfare payments. "They're on their death beds before they send them to the hospital," she notes.

"They leave them lying here when they have fevers up to 103 or 105, aren't eating and have diarrhea."

NO ROOM FOR DIGNITY

5. Two aides herd a man and woman into the same bathroom in an effort to complete the bathing of patients as quickly as possible. Both patients are confused and obviously embarrassed, but they obey the order to undress in front of each other. Then, in a final desperate effort to salvage a shred of dignity, the woman insists: "He's not my boyfriend." Once bathed, they again stand staring at each other while the aides dry them with dirty pillow cases. There are no towels.

6. A 91-year-old man stands tottering in a bathtub of a South Side nursing home as two aides attempt to give him a bath. He pleads with them to "slow down, I can't bend my legs this fast." One of the aides responds with a sharp slap across the face and the man cries out.

SEARCH CAN BE DECEPTIVE

This is not an effort to condemn the entire nursing home industry. Indeed, in some of the homes where we worked the atmosphere and patient care matched that of a hospital.

But to the outside observers—especially the families of the elderly, mentally ill and other helpless persons—the search for a good home can be tragically deceptive.

Just as they have learned to outwit and avoid any major crackdown from city and county health officials, so have these warehouse operators learned to dupe the public.

Many homes have freshly waxed and sparkling front hallways while the living quarters of the patients are little better than dimly lit, filthy dungeons. As one operator told his maintenance man:

"Take special care of these front two rooms—my office and this hall. You know what I mean, anything that people will see when they first come in. We must keep it very clean."

Another operator insisted that his janitor ignore the filth in rooms occupied by patients and concentrate on the lobby area because "the lobby and [front] hall are the first thing the Health Department will see if they show up."

These are the places where many of our elderly have been sentenced to die and they know it.

"We are the living dead," one old man observed. "Look around at these people. We're all worn out and we just keep on living. We'd be better off dead."

THEY ARE OBSTACLES

They sit in rooms where the paint is peeling from the walls and the windows covered with grime and they stare. If they are helpless, senile or bedridden they also may have to endure the taunts and abuse of aides who consider them as obstacles to their coffee breaks and to the end of another eight-hour shift.

Our very presence on the staffs of nearly 20 nursing homes in the past six weeks underscored the lack of controls and the gross neglect in an industry responsible for the health and safety of thousands of helpless citizens.

Posing as drifters, college students and nurse's aides with out-of-state experience, we were able to find employment virtually at will in many of the hundreds of nursing homes in Chicago and its suburbs. The investigation was conducted in cooperation with the Better Government Association,

which also sent its investigators into the homes.

BECOMES ADMINISTRATOR

Our phony references were never checked and in one case a reporter was hired as a nursing home administrator less than 72 hours after he applied for work as a handyman.

The owner admitted he was under pressure from the Chicago Board of Health to hire an administrator and apparently was willing to fill the post with the first candidate who walked in the door and was willing to work for \$80 a week.

In another home, an applicant seeking work as a janitor became a nurse over the objections of the director of nursing. The administrator ignored the protest, claiming the applicant was a "personable young man" who could easily master the techniques of administering drugs to the elderly.

HIRE FROM SKID ROW

In a more bizarre case of employee recruiting, a northwest suburban nursing home pays a finder's fee for skid row alcoholics to work as orderlies, nurse's aides and cooks between binges. The clearing house for this cheap labor is a West Madison Street flop-house from where derelicts are sent to the suburb by train. Once they arrive at the nursing home, they must stay for 30 days and are not paid until they depart.

Perhaps the most frightening practice uncovered during the investigation was the handling of narcotics and medication and the possible tragic consequences for patients.

One reporter wandered into a north suburban nursing home and claimed she had experience as a nurse's aide. No effort was made to check her credentials before she was hired.

In less than 24 hours she was left in charge of the home and its 32 patients. She also was told to administer a variety of medications to the patients. She narrowly avoided giving what could have been a fatal dosage to an elderly man. Tragedy was averted only by chance when another aide returned to pick up a forgotten purse.

"OH, BY THE WAY"

"Oh, by the way," the aide told the reporter as she hurried out the door. "If his pulse is over 60 don't give him his pill. He might have a heart attack. Sometimes you screw up giving these pills, but it happens."

In another home the aides have discovered a simple way to deal with patients who balk at taking their medication. They throw it in the sink.

The patients in a large North Side home are frequently subjected to a bizarre form of Russian roulette with medication because of the rapid turnover in employees. At one time, they were at the mercy of a janitor, hired as a nurse, and an aide who had just replaced a fired employee.

"JUST BORROW SOME . . ."

"I'm really not too sure who gets what medication, but I'll do my best," the aide told the janitor as they prepared to distribute the medication. "Oh, this lady is out of her medicine, but I'll just borrow some from this lady."

The investigation also disclosed that several volumes of new state codes regulating the operation of all nursing and shelter care homes largely have been ignored since they went into effect last June. Public and private employees familiar with the new codes ridicule the publications because they have never been enforced.

Nurses employed by the County Health Department have refused since 1967 to inspect the nearly 100 nursing homes in suburban Cook County.

LICENSES STILL ISSUED

Sources close to the agency said the refusal came after years of watching substandard homes repeatedly obtain new licenses

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

from the state Department of Health despite critical reports submitted by county nurses.

This bitterness extends to employees of many of the worst nursing homes where they are repeatedly frustrated in efforts to provide proper care. They describe the food as slop and one floor supervisor declared, "I wouldn't put my dog in this place."

For most residents of the warehouses for the dying, the misery will continue until they die. A group of them listened attentively one bleak February day to a minister who visited a filthy North Side nursing home. His message was one they were waiting to hear:

"Are you ready to change your cross for a crown? For when you die and go to heaven you will have a crown. In heaven there are no nursing homes . . . no suffering, no pain . . ."

TRIBUNE TASK FORCE REPORTS FROM INSIDE

The Chicago Tribune begins today an extraordinary report on the misery and plight of hundreds of persons living in a shadow world of our society. They are the unfortunate confined to poorly staffed and equipped nursing homes in the metropolitan area.

Today's account and eyewitness stories which will appear in the next several days have been compiled by a task force of reporters. It is the first assignment for this special unit of Tribune reporters and introduces a new concept in comprehensive news gathering.

DIRECTOR WINS PRIZES

The task force, directed by William Jones, a reporter who has won numerous awards for investigative reporting, has worked for six weeks in a thorough investigation of the shocking conditions in nursing homes.

Other members of the task force are William Currie, 29, Philip Caputo, 29, and Pamela Zekman, 26. All are outstanding reporters on the Tribune city staff.

The concept of using a team of reporters enables The Tribune to present to its readers, quickly and comprehensively, stories which will analyze the major concerns of society today.

The task force will have varied assignments which will take it into the complexities of government, the maze of social programs and the dilemmas of urban affairs.

WORK WITH B. G. A.

To compile the material for the nursing home series, the reporters worked as janitors, medical aides, kitchen help and even supervisors. Investigators of the Better Government Association worked with The Tribune to make possible a compilation of reports from 21 nursing homes. Without such a team it would have been impossible to make such an in-depth report on the barren lives of the elderly and mentally handicapped, virtually left to die in bleak rooms.

This assignment involved personal risk and long hours of hard and tedious work. Task force reporters found themselves emptying bed pans, changing sheets, scrubbing floors and painting rooms. They faced ominous warnings from fellow workers who suspected them of being state investigators.

PROTECTING EMPLOYEES' PENSION BENEFITS

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives today which will go a long way toward safeguarding the pension benefits

earned and paid for by employees during their working years.

At the present time, there is an abundance of legislation on the books to regulate banks and protect the savings of depositors. Yet, there is no such legislation protecting the savings of 27 million employees and their families under private pension plans.

The working people of this Nation have over \$125 billion in private pension plans, but the Federal Government has done very little to insure that these people will receive the money to which they are entitled.

If an employee's company goes out of business or merges with another company, or if an employee is laid off or quits his job 1 day before he reaches a certain age or accumulates some magic number of years' service, he may lose his entire pension benefits. There is no valid reason why workers who have earned pensions by a lifetime of labor should lose their benefits.

Since private efforts to secure employees' pension rights have failed, the Federal Government has a responsibility to secure these rights. The bill I am sponsoring contains the following provisions:

First, it requires that all private pension plans be registered with the Secretary of Labor.

Second, it requires that all private pension plans be properly funded.

Third, it holds the administrators of private pension plans strictly accountable for the management of pension plan funds.

Fourth, it requires the complete financial disclosure and reporting of private pension plans and their assets.

Fifth, it authorizes fines and prison sentences for violating the disclosure or trust provisions of this act.

Sixth, it provides a Federal reinsurance program guaranteeing the payment of all nonforfeitable pension rights of employees.

Seventh, it establishes a portability system to facilitate the transfer of credits between registered pension plans.

Federal legislation protecting the pension rights of employees is long overdue. It is my fervent hope that Congress will enact a bill encompassing these seven provisions this year.

GENERAL LEMAY, GENERAL POWER, GENERAL EAKER

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, as the appropriate congressional committees begin hearings on the new defense budget it might be well to heed the words of some outstanding former military leaders.

The first article which I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues is an interview with Gen. Curtis LeMay, former head of the Strategic Air Com-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

mand, which appeared in the Santa Ana Register of February 24, 1971. General LeMay feels that within approximately 18 months the Soviets will have increased their lead in essential fields of strategic weaponry to the point that they will have the superiority necessary to destroy the last vestiges of United States extended deterrence. In the near future our nuclear umbrella will no longer stretch far from the shores of the continental United States.

The second article appeared in the Phyllis Schlafly report of February 1971 and contains some statements from another former head of the Strategic Air Command, the recently deceased Gen. Thomas S. Power. It is extremely important to take note of General Power's comment:

Nuclear parity with the Soviet Union is a trap because, by giving them the prerogative of striking first, we automatically more than double their relative nuclear strategic strength.

Mrs. Schlafly goes into some detail on General Power's great disappointment with President Nixon for retreating from campaign pledges to regain nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union to what is known as "sufficiency"—parity fading into inferiority.

The third article is by Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, USAF, retired, and appeared in the January–February issue of Ordnance magazine. General Eaker makes a very astute point:

Does anyone who has observed the truculence of the Kremlin during the years since World War II, when their strategic forces were inferior, doubt that they will be more difficult to deal with now that they are the world's foremost military power?

Unfortunately there is an entire school of thought, identified with the past Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, which believed just that. These parity theorists came to the conclusion that as Soviet Union which was relatively equal to the United States in strategic military power would pursue its expansionist aims with less vigor. They felt that a lasting peace could be best secured from a position of relative military strength which made it impossible to defeat the potential aggressor.

The three articles follow:

LEMAY PREDICTS RUSSIAN "YIELD-OR-ELSE"
ULTIMATUM

(By Len Davis)

Retired Air Force Gen. Curtis E. LeMay Tuesday predicted that within 18 months Russia will serve a "capitulation-or-else" ultimatum on the United States, and that President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

He would not speculate on what the "demands" would be, other than complete withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam.

Asked to define the words "or else," LeMay replied:

"Nuclear weapons."

Interviewed at the South Coast Gun Club, Santa Ana, the 64-year-old former Air Force chief of staff said "while the United States is wasting money on TNT for use in the jungles and rice paddies of Southeast Asia, Russia is spending money on what today is the finest strategic weapons system in the world."

"We have become a second-rate power," he said, "and our whole military establish-

ment is rapidly going downhill because our weaponry—both offensive and defensive—is outmoded and the general public lacks the proper spirit and respect for our nation's leaders."

The former head of the Strategic Air Command (SAC), who built from the remnants of World War II an all-jet bomber force manned and supported by professional airmen dedicated to the preservation of peace, had this to say about the nation's defense capabilities:

"We lack superiority which, to win," he said, "should be overwhelming—more than is actually needed."

"It isn't just the money that is being mis-spent or not budgeted," he added, "it's the whole basic philosophy of our people, which needs a greater demonstration of patriotism and a stronger manifestation of confidence in the leadership of our country—at all levels."

He attributed the "sorry state of our nation" to "the growing Communist menace" and said racial troubles and draft protests, for example, "are all Communist-inspired."

"Like it or not," he said, "we are at war with the Communists—and we'd better do something about it, fast, before it's too late."

"All they (the Communists) have to do is infiltrate our police and military organizations to the point where they are in control," said LeMay.

"The rest will be easy, and they'll take over our country," he added.

LeMay urged the American people to "stand up and shout down the radicals, learn their tactics so you can combat them, and support our men in uniform."

"Quit tearing things down. Quit believing everything that's told us. Investigate. Read the history and development of Communist methods and see how they apply to what's happening across our land today. Then act accordingly," said LeMay.

He said the American people "would be derelict in their duty to believe we have a strong national defense system."

"That's what we're told," he said, "but it's not so—really."

"And I know," added the four-star general under whose leadership at SAC for 10 years plans were laid for the development and integration of the nation's intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capability.

Commenting on the need for a volunteer military service, LeMay said:

"It's a good idea, but the odds are against the plan."

"The American people just won't pay for it, as badly as it's needed."

LeMay recommended the armed forces "pay their members salaries commensurate with those paid civil service people."

"And give our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines added incentives for being away from home without their families," he said.

"A fellow should get something extra for being shot at," LeMay added.

"We need more men in our armed forces with better education, which means they should first finish their schooling before entering the service," he said.

"It's simply a case of constantly upgrading the caliber of both our officers and enlisted men and giving them the best possible equipment and climate in which to do the job required," LeMay explained.

Speaking on the controversial subject of military discipline, LeMay said:

"The ones who criticize rigid disciplinary measures the loudest are usually the ones who have never been in combat and are unaware of its tremendous importance when it comes to saving lives and winning battles. "Discipline is a team operation," LeMay continued, "and at some point in the military everyone's life is on the line."

LeMay posed this question:

"How can you expect to have effective dis-

cipline in the service today when civilians are constantly criticizing the military and belittling those in uniform?"

He said "the boys in Vietnam, for example, are at a great disadvantage, knowing that the people back home are not behind them as they risk their lives almost daily."

"Their will to win is diminished," he added. LeMay would only speak about Vietnam, and what should be done there, off-the-record.

"I've said my piece time and time again," he explained, "but no one listened."

His only comment about Vietnam, on-the-record:

"The war should have been won five years ago."

LeMay, who moved to Newport Beach last September from Bel Air, a Los Angeles suburb, spent Tuesday at the gun club trying his hand with both shotgun and revolver.

Typically, no one beat him.

STORY OF THE UNANSWERED WARNING

(By Phyllis Schlafly)

Three Air Force F-104 jets streaked out of the sky above Arlington National Cemetery on December 10, dipping their wings in a final salute to one of America's most distinguished leaders, and in seconds were gone. Thus was General Thomas S. Power, USAF, given full military honors following his sudden death at his home in Palm Springs, California.

When the poet wrote, "God give us men! A time like this demands strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands," he must have been thinking about leaders such as General Power. A poor boy who could not afford to attend college but loved flying, he earned his way into the Air Force after months of solitary study in the New York Public Library. By the end of his career, he had piloted every type of military plane from the trainers of the 1920s to the B-58s.

When the mission was war, General Power personally led the most devastating air raids in history, the fire bombing of Tokyo. When the mission was peace, he personally built our great Strategic Air Command into the world's most effective weapon to deter attack. During the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, General Power was the one who had his finger on the trigger of 90% of the free world's striking power—and this is why we had peace instead of war.

In 1963 at the peak of his career, General Power retired early in order to testify before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee against the Moscow Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. He felt the urgent duty to warn Americans against this act of folly—even at the risk of ending his career by opposing the Kennedy Administration. General Power was that kind of patriot.

OVERWHELMING SUPERIORITY

General Power endorsed the book *Strike From Space* by Phyllis Schlafly and Rear Admiral Chester Ward, published in 1965. This book was the first to expose the disastrous policies of Secretary Robert McNamara of boasting of our four-to-one nuclear superiority while secretly and systematically dismantling it.

When General Power took Phyllis Schlafly and her husband Fred on a tour of our Strategic Air Command in January 1966, he accurately predicted that our then nuclear superiority would be gone by 1970 if the policies were not reversed.

General Power subsequently spent many weeks working with the Schlaflys on a proposed television program to alert the American people to the need for the United States to be "overwhelmingly superior to the Soviet Union in nuclear strength." General Power always insisted that the key factor in the survival of America as a nation is the word "overwhelming."

"If we want peace," he said, "it is not enough to be a little superior to the Soviets, or to have just enough nuclear weapons to destroy every Russian. Our posture must be one of *overwhelming* superiority. Why? Because the United States will never strike first, but the Soviets have a long history of always striking first—and without warning. The Soviets committed surprise, sneak attacks on Finland and Poland in 1939, on Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia in 1940, on Hungary in 1956, and on Czechoslovakia in 1968."

"Therefore," General Power concluded, "the test of U.S. survival is not how much nuclear power we now possess, but how much nuclear power will we have left after a surprise Soviet attack? Only *overwhelming* nuclear superiority will insure our safety from a nuclear ambush."

Unfortunately, General Power was not able to persuade a television network or sponsor to air a program with this message which is vital to the lives of every American.

NIXON SUPPORTER

General Power was an enthusiastic supporter of Richard Nixon for nomination and election in 1968. Based on personal conversations with Nixon, General Power believed that Nixon clearly understood and agreed with the principle of the absolute necessity of the United States having *overwhelming* nuclear superiority.

Many speeches and statements by Nixon during the 1968 campaign corroborated this belief, and there is no question but that Nixon's position on nuclear superiority kept hundreds of thousands of votes for Nixon which might otherwise have gone over to the Wallace-General LeMay ticket.

For example, on October 19, 1968, candidate Richard Nixon warned in a radio network broadcast that the Johnson Administration by "short-sighted defense policies" had dissipated the strategic advantage left by the Eisenhower Administration. "As a result, even where the thinly stretched forces of the United States can be deployed, they no longer are backed by the decisive nuclear superiority which in past crises made our power fully credible."

Continuing, Nixon warned that the Soviet Union had "very nearly achieved its goal of superiority in strategic nuclear power."

On October 24, 1968 Nixon charged in a nationwide radio speech that under the Democratic Administrations since 1961, when McNamara took over the Defense Department, "a *gravely serious security gap*" had developed that could grow to a "survival gap" by 1970 or 1971. Citing decreases in percentages of American superiority over the Russians in modern weaponry, Nixon charged that "in recent years our country has followed policies which now threaten to make America second best both in numbers and quality of major weapons." Nixon said that if elected President he would undo the sweeping Pentagon reorganization of former Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara.

Nixon blasted what he called the Democratic Administration's "peculiar, unprecedented doctrine called 'parity.'" He said he intends to "restore our objective of *clear-cut military superiority*," and "do away with *wishful thinking* either as to the capability or the intent of potential enemies."

Soon after the November 1968 election, Presidential adviser Henry Kissinger drafted a Presidential Foreign Policy statement in which America retreated from "nuclear superiority" to "nuclear sufficiency."

"SURVIVAL GAP"

As the months wore on, it became clear that the Soviets are building long-range ICBMs at the rate of almost one per day, and the United States is building none at all, that the Soviets are building many multi-megaton SS-9 weapons (each 25 times more powerful than our best missile, the Minuteman III) while the United States

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

neither possesses nor plans such weapons, that the Soviets are building nuclear submarines at a crash wartime rate while the United States builds none at all.

Nothing has been done to repair the damage done to our security by Robert McNamara or to restore "the decisive nuclear superiority which in past crises made our power fully credible."

Apparently, the State Department was influential enough to override the urgent warnings of Dr. John Foster, the U.S. Director of Research and Development, that 420 Soviet SS-9 missiles could destroy 95% of our land-based ICBMs, and the Soviets already have more than 300.

By early 1970 it became obvious to anyone who could count missiles and submarines that the "gravely serious security gap" of 1968 had indeed developed into a "survival gap," just as candidate Nixon had predicted. General Power became so alarmed about what the Nixon Administration is *not* doing to assure the survival of America that he sent a personal, urgent message to the President. Aware that the protective screen around the President might divert this message away from the President's eyes, General Power sent copies of this message to the President via four different personal friends of the President who were scheduled to see him at the White House.

General Power stated bluntly in his message what is required if we are to survive as a nation:

"We must make strategic nuclear superiority our stated policy. The alternative is to risk our security on the gamble that the SALT (nuclear disarmament) negotiations will prevent nuclear war or nuclear blackmail. The history of disarmament coupled with the Communist credo makes this at best a dangerous game of Russian roulette.

"Unquestioned nuclear strategic superiority by the United States is the best insurance against a large-scale nuclear war. Nuclear parity with the Soviet Union is a trap because, by giving them the prerogative of striking first, we automatically more than double their relative nuclear strategic strength."

NO REPLY TO POWER

General Power received no reply to his message. By the fall of 1970, he reluctantly came to the conclusion that the Administration was either hamstrung by the liberal majority in the Senate, or has given up on its campaign to "restore our objective of *clear-cut military superiority*" and to rebuild the strategic might of America which had been dismantled by McNamara. The Administration was not even maintaining the position of the Johnson Administration which Nixon had labeled the "peculiar, unprecedented doctrine called 'parity'."

Because of the Soviet crash missile program, parity had come and gone, but the State Department was still able to persuade the Administration to do nothing and rely on "wishful thinking" about a nuclear arms treaty with the Russians. For one year, we have talked arms limitation with the Russians at Helsinki. The result: nothing—except the United States has kept frozen the number of our missiles while the Russians have increased theirs in number and power at an alarming rate.

For five years, General Power had been saying that 1970 would be the decisive year. He was right. Apparently, in 1970, the State Department secretly made the decision to veto President Nixon's campaign promises and to allow the Soviets to go into first place without any contest.

The Nixon Administration's ABM and MIRV programs cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered a fulfillment of candidate Nixon's promises to restore "clear-cut military superiority." Not a single new land-based or submarine-based missile launcher has been added to our forces since

1967, during which time the Soviets have built hundreds, many of which are vastly more powerful than any we possess.

One of General Power's many constructive proposals was to make some of our long-range missile launchers mobile by putting them on railroad cars and on ships. Obviously, this would make it fantastically more difficult for the Soviets to target their SS-9s to knock out our weapons. Secretary Robert McNamara killed General Power's proposal when he first made it. Dr. Foster, has recommended similar plans in the present Administration, but nothing at all has been done to implement them.

General Power knew that the American people would never knowingly make the decision to abandon our first-place position to the Soviets. But the State Department apparently made this decision secretly, and there have been no headlines to proclaim this dread fact. Many friends believe that General Power died of a broken heart when the events of 1970 revealed the impending danger of a world in which the Soviet Union, not the United States, holds the decisive power.

RED STRATEGIC SUPERIORITY—THE SOVIETS HAVE BECOME THE NO. 1 MILITARY WORLD POWER BY THEIR INCREASE IN NUCLEAR MISSILES AND NAVAL STRENGTH WHILE THE UNITED STATES HAS BEEN PURSUING A STRANGE POLICY OF UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

(Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, U.S.A.F. (Ret.))

As late as last November 10th, Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, warned: "The Soviet forces of today constitute a concentration of military power far beyond anything the world has ever previously seen. It is a force far exceeding their reasonable defense requirements."

This and other assessments of the Red threat clearly indicate that the U.S.S.R. is now the No. 1 military world power, that the U. S. is now a second-class power, and that the disparity is still growing in favor of the Reds.

In a dramatic speech in the House on October 10, 1970, the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, after detailing the size of the Red threat, said:

"Mr. Speaker, never before in the 30 years of my membership in this body have I stepped into the well of this House with greater concern for the future of this Nation."

I share completely Mr. Rivers' concern and I do not believe he overstated the case when he continued:

"I have no doubt that the Soviets are now building a nuclear submarine base in Cuba. Mark my words well—one of these fine mornings we are going to be told by the Russians, in most unmistakable terms, to get out of the Mediterranean."

Here are other quotes from this speech which are of significance:

"The 7 per cent portion of the gross national product which is now allocated to our national defense represents the smallest allocation of our gross national product to national-defense purposes in 20 years. Surely no American would argue that we can put a price tag on the lives of our people. But I would rather be alive at 10 per cent than dead at 7 per cent."

"The Soviet Union now has a nuclear strategic weapon capability in excess of ours, and this superiority will continue to increase if we do not take dramatic action to stem the tide."

"In calendar year 1969, the United States spent a total of \$7.5 billion on strategic offensive and defensive weaponry. During that same period the Soviet Union expended approximately \$13 billion dollars in the same effort."

There are two decisive factors which give the Russians a tremendous advantage in any

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

nuclear exchange with us. There are many more lucrative nuclear targets in the U.S. than in the U.S.S.R. due to the fact that population and industry is much more concentrated here into urban areas.

For example, if Russia hits the 50 largest U.S. cities it would kill 86 million Americans and destroy 55 per cent of U.S. industry. On the other hand, a nuclear attack against the 50 largest Russian cities would kill only 40 million Soviet citizens and destroy but 40 per cent of their industrial capacity. Such attacks would result in the death of 42 per cent of the U.S. population but only 20 per cent of Russia's.

The other dangerous inequity lies in the fact that it is U.S. policy not to deliver the first nuclear strike. The only U.S. retaliatory nuclear capability would be that which survived an enemy nuclear attack. Present estimates of our weapons survival is between 15 and 20 per cent. This policy makes it possible for the U.S.S.R. to plan their nuclear first strike against the strategic forces of the U.S.

Obviously, the U.S. strategic capability which survives a Red first strike will not hit the nuclear delivery capacity of the Russians, since it would be senseless to destroy ICBM sites which have already released their missiles.

Since President Nixon expressed grave concern, when he was a candidate, about Russia's growing strategic strength coincident with our own unilateral disarmament, and since both have accelerated since he became Commander in Chief, it seems appropriate to examine this phenomenon.

Following is my present analysis of the administration's defense policy:

The President went to the country recently, in an effort to elect a Republican Congress, and reminded our people that he expressed the hope in his inaugural address that we are leaving a period of confrontation with the Reds and moving into a period of negotiation.

Since he became President, therefore, he has reduced our defense budgets by more than \$10 billion and has not deployed a single new offensive strategic weapon, relying upon SALT (the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) to provide for our security through negotiation.

In the meantime, Mr. Nixon will continue to wind down the Vietnam war, reducing by more than half the extent and cost of that conflict and reducing our defense forces by about one million men, military and civilian.

Whether this plan will be politically effective, I cannot predict, not being a politician or a political commentator. But I am certain, having spent 50 years as a Red watcher, that it will not favorably influence Kremlin policy. The U.S.S.R. will never agree to return to strategic inferiority or parity at Vienna, Helsinki, or anywhere else. There is no evidence that they have abandoned their plans for world domination, and they know that parity is not the route to success in that area.

Instead of the period of negotiation for which the President hopes, we shall, I believe, have a period of Red nuclear blackmail. Taking advantage of their strategic superiority, the Reds will begin to show their muscle and make more and more hostile demands.

Their air and sea bases in North Africa, their missiles and fighters in Egypt, their growing naval thrusts into the Mediterranean Sea and Indian Ocean, and their missile-carrying subs off our coast provide unmistakable evidence of this.

On last May 20th their missile ships returned to Cuban waters, and U.S. intelligence agencies report that Russian bombers are now using Cuban bases.

Faced then with positive evidence of Red truculence and blackmail, President Nixon may go to the American people in his own reelection bid in 1972 reminding our people

and all the world that he bent over backward in an effort to support SALT. He even continued our own strategic disarmament for two years despite certain evidences of the Red strategic arms build-up, particularly in nuclear weapons.

Since this effort failed, he may propose to begin at once to restore the strategic imbalance. He can point out that since we have twice the economic resources of the U.S.S.R. we can and will do this without further delay. Such a campaign promise will be very effective, as our people will by then have ample warning of the hazard in strategic inferiority, the loss of the credibility of our deterrent posture.

But there is a terrible danger in the Nixon defense strategy as I have outlined it. The Reds may not permit our rearmament. Over the Hot Line from Moscow could come this ultimatum:

"As you know, Mr. President, we now have your land-based ICBM's well covered with our SS-9's. Your own Secretary of Defense has told your Congress that we can destroy 95 per cent of your ICBM capability in a surprise first strike. The only thing we now have to fear is your Polaris and Poseidon nuclear submarines. We now order you to send these vessels into the Black Sea where we can be sure they are disarmed. You will be wise to comply, since each of your subs at sea is now followed everywhere it goes by two of our killer subs."

In such a circumstance, when the U.S.S.R. has about the same four-to-one strategic superiority which we enjoyed at the time of the Cuban missile crisis, the President may have no alternative but to comply with the Red ultimatum, as Khushchev responded in 1961.

With loss of our No. 1 power position will go loss of world leadership. Many fateful consequences will inevitably follow.

One early and tragic result may be the destruction of Israel. The U.S. has been the only nation guaranteeing Israel's continued status as a free nation with the strength to enforce its pledge. This guarantee will be ineffective in the future with the U.S. a second-rate world power.

A second inevitable result will be the breakup of NATO. European leaders have realized for some time that the U.S. no longer was a dependable ally and assured protector, her people having lost the will and refused to provide the means for free world leadership.

This is why the leaders in Germany and France recently have been to Moscow seeking some form of *detente* with the Kremlin. That also was the reason Greece and Turkey refused use of their bases to U.S. aircraft in the late Middle East crisis. Likewise it accounts for the recent defection of Canada, confirmed by her recognition of Red China.

The U.S. must now alter its strategy since its defense posture is such that its peace-keeping ability is no longer credible. When the U.S. was the No. 1 world power, so acknowledged by friend and foe, its earlier policies of massive retaliation and graduated response were effective.

A nation faced with an adversary having superior nuclear capability and strategic strength has only these options: It can strike first in a surprise attack in order to reduce the nuclear capacity of the enemy. It can await the enemy's first strike and then retaliate by launching whatever nuclear weapons survive upon the cities of the enemy. Or it can accede to nuclear blackmail—tantamount to surrender.

Our former allies of the free world have but two options now. They can make the best deal they can get from Moscow or they can develop their own nuclear defenses. Britain and France have a nuclear start, and Germany and Japan will no doubt be making that hard decision soon.

In the past, whenever U.S. defense appro-

priations were reaching dangerously low levels, the Reds always took some offensive action to alarm our people and warn our leaders. The blockade of Berlin, the invasion of South Korea, and the Cuban missile crisis were such examples. The U.S. then acted promptly to restore the credibility of its deterrent posture.

The Reds have done the same thing this time. They have never been more aggressive than since gaining strategic superiority. Their fleets in all the world's oceans, their aircraft, missiles, and troops in Egypt, their nuclear submarines patrolling our coasts, and their sub base in Cuba have given unmistakable warning. But our people have not responded as in the past.

Some defense leaders credit this apathy to an unrealistic reliance upon SALT (the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks). The recent action of the House on defense appropriations cuts the ground from under SALT. Why would Russia agree to *mutual* disarmament when she has congressional confirmation that U.S. *unilateral* disarmament is being accelerated?

According to Gen. H. N. Cordes, Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence, Strategic Air Command: "The Soviets have established a technically oriented society. As a measure of this growth, they have nearly doubled the number of research institutes over the past 20 years and quadrupled their graduated engineers. This technical manpower force is now six times the size of ours."

Dr. John S. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, has repeatedly warned the Congress of the tremendous Red research and development effort and its dangerous consequences for us.

In Russia, the scientists, engineers, and technicians enjoy favored status, ranking right after the Party leaders in salary, housing, food, and prestige. There are no unemployed scientists and engineers in the U.S.S.R., while today we have thousands of unemployed scientists and engineers. To me, this has obvious and ominous future consequences.

It means that the U.S.S.R. will have superior strategic weapons in the future. Add this to their numerical superiority, and our defenses lose their deterrent credibility entirely.

There is another grave significance to this Soviet technological superiority. They ultimately will control the markets of the world. Their consumer products will be better, cheaper, and favored worldwide as were those of Britain in earlier times and as are those of Germany, Japan, and the United States today.

I foresee and fear the time when Russian technology joins the great industrial capacity of Western Europe to dominate the world's commercial markets.

The Reds also have caught this vision. That's why they are now building a vast merchant marine, able to deliver these merchandise cargoes to every people on every island and continent on earth.

There is another side to the U.S.S.R.-U.S. inequity which disturbs me greatly. I have a sufficient acquaintance with history to know that more nations have fallen due to internal disorder and decay than from outside conquest. I see in our country today many of the maladies which have been fatal to other peoples and other once-great nations which ultimately disappeared.

The apathy of our people to their defense establishment and military forces passes all understanding. There was strong popular support for President Kennedy when he ordered the Russians to get their offensive missiles out of Cuba. Contrast that reaction with the lack of popular concern when President Nixon told us that the Soviets were building a nuclear sub base in Cuba.

We also have in this country, as we all know, a large and growing group of traitors.

March 17, 1971

By definition of long standing, a traitor is one who gives aid and comfort to the enemy. During the Vietnam war many of our citizens—some in high places—have given aid and encouragement to the Reds, hiding behind the legal fiction that the war was not declared by Congress.

When some historian of the future does the job on us which Gibon did on Rome, I believe he will trace the beginning of our decline to our tolerance of treason. The Reds do not have that problem.

There is now much talk about national priorities. We are told that we must reduce defense expenditures in order to provide more funds for other pressing priorities. I submit that our first priority must be the national security, for if that fails the other priorities do not matter. Our conquerors will take care of those.

There appears to be a considerable feeling in this country, which has been fostered by the intellectual left, that the Reds no longer represent a serious menace, since Russia and China are quarreling. I believe the U.S.S.R.-ChiCom quarrels are like those between a husband and a wife. They can be bitter, but when a third party intervenes the couple promptly doubles up on the intruder.

Despite this heated oral controversy, I note that both big Red powers have been supplying aid to North Vietnam.

No free world leader knows what would deter an enemy from launching a nuclear first strike. Only the rulers in Moscow and Peking know that. We do, however, have some pertinent yardsticks. Our strategic superiority has kept the truce thus far. At the time of the Cuban missile crisis when our strategic superiority was four or five times theirs, they were deterred.

A nation whose policy is to survive a nuclear first strike and retaliate must be sure to emphasize all defense measures, including the ABM and civil defenses, especially shelter programs and ample warning devices.

An adequate force, when on the defensive, must also be much larger, more extensive, and more expensive than a nuclear first strike force due to the frightful destructiveness of nuclear weapons. Incidentally, I never knew of any nation which became victorious while on the defensive.

The frequently heard argument against the great cost of our defense system is scarcely valid, since whatever it costs is but a pittance compared with what we would lose by defeat.

Here I want to suggest one caution to the military.

Sometimes in the past when defense appropriations were inadequate the armed services have engaged among themselves in heated controversy over the sparse funds which were available. That would be fatal now when it is open season on all things military.

Every military leader must put national interest above any partisan or parochial advantage. The Joint Chiefs of Staff and all subordinates in uniform must speak with one voice, resolving all issues in conference and creating no headlines about interservice rivalry.

One decisive aspect of the Red threat has not received the attention it deserves. That is the intention, plan, and will of enemy leadership.

Does anyone who has observed the truculence of the Kremlin during the years since World War II, when their strategic forces were inferior, doubt that they will be more difficult to deal with now that they are the world's foremost military power?

Has anyone seen any evidence that Soviet leadership has abandoned its announced plan for world conquest?

Two things are necessary for world domination—the military power and the will or determination of national leadership to use it. Russia undoubtedly now has both.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When the U.S. was the No. 1 military power in the world this represented no menace to any people or nation on earth. Everyone here and abroad knew that our strength was defensive. Not since 1898 (the Spanish American War) has the U.S. been an expansionist nation or had an aggressive policy. Can any informed person say the same of the Soviets?

In 1914 the Kaiser and his Prussian war lords had the will for conquest but not, as it developed, the military strength. In 1940 Hitler, Mussolini, and the Japanese war lords had the will but not the means. Now for the first time there is a nation with the strength whose leaders obviously possess the will for conquest.

Finally, I have observed that some of our people misunderstand why we recommend superior U.S. military strength. Recently, for example, Senator Brooke criticized Gen. John D. Ryan, Air Force Chief of Staff, for saying that our strategic forces must be able to disarm an enemy.

Frankly, I have little interest in retaliation or how many Russians or Red Chinese are killed after a massive nuclear attack on the U.S. Everything, everyone, every institution I cherish will have been destroyed.

What I want, what this country must have, is a strategic force of such size and composition that no enemy will ever dare to launch that massive nuclear first strike. We have had such a force, and it has kept the uneasy nuclear truce for two decades. We have lost it. We must never cease our effort until we get it back. That is our highest national priority.

THE PLIGHT OF SPANISH-SPEAKING AMERICANS

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the plight of Spanish-speaking Americans continues to be a matter of deep concern to political leaders of our Nation.

It is my understanding that more than 500,000 Spanish-speaking Americans reside in my State of Illinois.

A comprehensive legislative program is to be introduced in the Illinois General Assembly to provide State authorization for our Americans of Spanish origin. State Representative Arthur Telcsler, of Chicago, is a leading supporter of this legislative program.

Mr. Speaker, the work of Representative Telcsler and others in the Illinois General Assembly has been recognized in an editorial which appeared in the March 8, 1971, issue of the Chicago Sun-Times.

This editorial articulates convincingly the advantages which can follow effective authority to serve the needs of our growing number of Spanish-speaking Americans. The editorial follows:

THE 500,000-PLUS

His name is Jose and he is a Spanish-speaking Illinois resident, employed perhaps in a Chicago factory, perhaps on a farm. Whether in dealing with his employer or wrestling with forms and applications, he probably is hampered by bad English. He is poorly paid, has little if any protection when hard times come and he lives in dilapidated quarters. He may be fully an American citizen, but he feels deeply the burden of an alien.

Now, however, a better deal may be com-

ing his way. A comprehensive legislative program dealing with problems of the Spanish-speaking is being readied for introduction in the General Assembly. The program, first of its kind in state legislative history, coincides with the release of a major U.S. Census Bureau survey.

The survey, recently released, identified 9.2 million Spanish-origin residents in the United States, although John Barenco, executive director of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish-Speaking, says he suspects the figure is actually about 12 million. In Illinois the figure is 500,000-plus.

The Illinois legislative program is the result of work by the Spanish-Speaking Peoples Study Commission. The legislative measures touch on housing, employment, education, and health and welfare services. They are being prepared for both the migrant field worker and the factory worker.

For example, the commission, headed by Rep. Arthur A. Telcsler (R-Chicago) will seek legislation providing unemployment compensation for migrant workers between jobs during the picking season. Among other goals are offering certain intelligence tests in Spanish and tests for the driver's license in Spanish.

The Census Bureau tended to confirm the widespread notion that in general the Spanish-speaking have replaced blacks at the bottom of the economic ladder. There are of course wide differences. Cubans tend to be refugees from Castro and therefore middle class, older, better educated and more prosperous than Mexicans, Puerto Ricans and South Americans. Yet over-all, Spanish-origin workers are more concentrated in lower-paying occupations than other Americans. Only 25 per cent of the men are in white-collar jobs and the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in November, 1969, for Spanish-origin workers was 6 per cent compared to 3.5 per cent for the rest of the population.

One may doubt that such Illinois legislation can quickly accomplish much. But the very existence of the commission is a move ahead because it tends to give prestigious attention to the matter. Heretofore there have been mostly sincere sentiments or unorganized good intentions. Telcsler deserves support and he has struck the right note in saying: "These people are American citizens, entitled to all the rights and privileges of other Americans. But in the past they have been denied them and in some instances systematically exploited."

REQUIRING 1 MILE VISIBILITY

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the FAA is proposing an unreasonable and unwarranted restriction of general aviation in the form of new proposed regulations requiring 1 mile visibility for takeoff on an instrument flight plan.

To many of my friends, this seems to be another indication that too many FAA officials believe their agency was established by, for, and in the interest of the airline industry.

I am including with my remarks for the information of everyone concerned an excellent statement of the proposed regulation by my friend and constituent, Forest Beckett, president of Beckett Aviation Corp., the largest executive fleet operator in the world. I hope that

the letter is very carefully considered and its message heeded by those in FAA to whom it was addressed.

The letter follows:

BECKETT AVIATION CORP.,
Youngstown, Ohio, March 2, 1971.
FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION,
Office of the General Council,
Washington, D.C.

Attention: Rules Docket, GC-24.

GENTLEMEN: I would like to express our very strong objection to the proposed changes in Part 91 of the Federal Aviation Regulations, to apply to takeoff weather minimums.

I feel that imposing these drastic changes in the minimums is a distinct regression in one of the most desirous and vital needs of the industry, 'all weather capabilities'.

In your notice of proposed rule making you mention that in the old, 'Air Share' meetings, some pilots thought if such a measure was adopted, they would be protected from the demands of their employers. I believe it is very obvious that if a pilot is not strong enough or capable of setting up standards for his operation which his employer will respect, he is not capable of running his flight operation; and if he averts an accident on takeoff by citing the FAA regulations, he will have one somewhere when he cannot cite FAA regulations. I believe we all know rules cannot substitute for judgment, and trying to regulate, 'decisions of judgment', would be sheer folly.

While I will agree that many private operations have large transport equipment in their operations, not all do, and in any event, I do not think the type of equipment should have any bearing on establishing takeoff minimums. If it could be shown that certain types of equipment have known characteristics which would indicate that, in the interest of safety, minimums for that particular type of equipment should be established, that action could be taken.

As I understand it, the accidents cited as reason to change this rule are:

A Piper PA-23 at Newton, Iowa on 7-22-69.
A Cessna 310-G at Fletcher, N.C. on 5-4-68.
A Piper PA-27 at Chesapeake, Ohio on 3-18-68.

An Aero Commander 1121 at Salt Lake City, Utah on 12-16-69.

First, I believe the fallacy of citing these accidents is best pointed out by citing a fact we all know. Accidents, with very few exceptions, happen at or near the point of takeoff or landing. I would believe a careful analysis of accidents would show that the number of accidents, which happen under VFR conditions or conditions where airline minimums prevail, outnumber those where minimum conditions do not exist, and that the fact that there were four accidents over a period of years under such conditions, is not indicative of a problem.

In fact, page 290 of the National Transportation Safety Board's briefs of accidents, which cites the accident involving the Cessna 310-G, lists three other accidents. Every one of these accidents resulted in substantial damage. Every one of them happened on takeoff or landing. Also, in every case they reflect an error in either judgment or proficiency. In these cases no amount of regulation could have averted them. The point I am trying to make is this. Is anyone sure the accident involving the 310-G was not an error in judgment or proficiency and was not the takeoff in restricted visibility, in itself, a perfectly safe operation?

I think the Jet Commander accident at Salt Lake City on 12-16-69 further substantiates this theory. The airplane was far over weight, there was sleet and freezing rain, the pilot was suffering from fatigue, and as cited in the report, lifted off prematurely. Undoubtedly, the 7000 foot elevation, plus fatigue, affected his judgment as to time of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rotation, and how do we know the visibility had anything to do with the fact that the airplane got away from him after it lifted off.

Without going into a very careful analysis of each and every accident, either VFR, IFR with minimums, or IFR below stated minimums, I see nothing that would indicate that the accidents that happened under conditions where marginal minimums existed, may not have been attributable to plain pilot error. I think a strong possibility exists that these accidents would have happened whether the visibility was $\frac{1}{4}$ mile, 1 mile, or even 5 miles.

To go a little further on this, a Jet Commander recently went in at Lake Champlain just after takeoff, for no apparent cause. What if whatever caused this accident had happened under takeoff conditions of $\frac{1}{4}$ mile. Immediately someone would have said, "If the weather had been better, it would not have happened". Again, in my opinion, factors other than weather could have caused every accident that was cited as being caused by below minimum conditions.

Along these lines of pilot error, and the whole idea of regression on takeoff minimums at the same time we are lowering landing minimums, I wonder if the FAA has done enough practical experimentation on blind takeoffs.

For many years I gave instrument instruction and instrument flight tests and while, with a manual technique operation, it requires a very high degree of skill to accomplish a completely blind landing; a blind takeoff is relatively a simple operation. In fact, it requires much less training and skill than ordinary instrument flying. In my opinion, and I believe a little research will substantiate it, an average student half way through an instrument course, but far from being able to pass an instrument flight test, can be taught to make full IFR takeoffs with very little trouble.

What I am trying to say is that the degree of skill required to accomplish a full IFR takeoff is much, much less than that required to make a standard instrument approach or a routine instrument flight, which are certainly considered safe.

In closing, it would be my suggestion that were it ever evident, which doesn't seem to be the case, that too many accidents were happening on takeoffs in conditions of bad visibility, an effort be made by FAA to stress the fact that accidents were happening in such a condition. In that event, additional training, simulating such conditions could be recommended, just as such training has been recommended in other problem areas in the past.

Sincerely,

FOREST BECKETT,
President.

TAX SHARING

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including a copy of a speech on tax sharing which I gave before the National Public Affairs Conference of the American Bankers Association today. I am also including some tables on state and local tax effort to which I refer in my speech.

REMARKS OF REP. JOHN W. BYRNES BEFORE THE NATIONAL PUBLIC AFFAIRS CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION

I would like to direct my remarks to one aspect of the subject of raising and dis-

tributing the tax dollar or, in the parlance of the day, to Revenue Sharing.

This is a subject that rightfully should engage our attention. I congratulate the President for making it a matter of prime national concern.

For too long, we at the federal level have ignored the state and local governments which represent the real strength of our federal system of government. For too long, we have delayed facing up to their problems within the framework of our federal System.

In speaking before the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders in December, 1968, I said, "In recent decades, and especially during the 1960's, the trend toward centralization in Washington of decision making on domestic public service has been all too apparent" and "this trend, if left unchecked, can destroy the system of government our Founding Fathers created."

At the heart of this trend is the change in the method of distributing our federal tax dollars (and also, our government-borrowed dollars).

CATEGORICAL GRANTS IN AID

The trend is portrayed most vividly by the unparalleled growth of specialized grants-in-aid programs from a few dozen with expenditures of \$1 billion not too long ago to over 400 programs and a total outlay of almost \$30 billion at the present time. They cover virtually the entire range of domestic public service.

As a result of federal inducements, followed by detailed federal controls and restrictions, states, counties, cities, towns, and school districts have learned that they are no longer masters of their own affairs.

Attempting to get the most in federal funds, states and localities often fail to meet more urgent needs because federal money is available for other, less important, purposes. Nationally-determined priorities again and again determine what will be done even though needs differ widely from area to area.

I suggest that a most urgent problem crying for attention is a drastic reform of the present method of distributing the almost \$30 billion that now is either collected or borrowed by the federal government and distributed back to the states in the form of specific grants-in-aid. This system has sapped the vitality of local government and is wasteful in the emphasis it places on federally-determined priorities to the neglect, in many cases, of local needs.

I told the legislative leaders in 1968 that, pragmatically, our first and most important need was to consolidate the over 400 separate programs into broad functional areas. Such a consolidation and conversion of the multitudinous categorical grants to block grants would not only revitalize local government and permit the establishment by the states and localities of more appropriate priorities for use of public moneys; it would also reduce substantially the administrative costs and burdens which have been imposed at all levels by the current method of specialized grant assistance. In Wisconsin today, about 6% of the expenditures for elementary education comes through federal aid programs. Yet, over 50% of the man hours consumed by our State Department of Education is spent in administering this 6%. How crazy can we get? Block grants would sharply reduce the need for personnel at both the local and federal level and greatly reduce the cost of providing federal assistance.

SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING

The Administration has recommended a long step in this direction in what it terms Special Revenue Sharing. Some \$10 billion of current categorical grants would be consolidated into six broad grant areas—law enforcement, manpower training, urban development, rural development, transportation and education. I agree with the President

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that it represents an historical opportunity to restore some balance to our federal system and to markedly strengthen state and local government. It recognized the national interest in certain broad functional areas of public need but leaves the determination of priority of need within the functional area to the states and localities.

Because my disagreement and the disagreement of Chairman Mills with the President on another part of his program, which is called General Revenue Sharing, has been highlighted by the press, let me emphasize my solid support for his Special Revenue Sharing proposal which in dollar terms represents over $\frac{1}{3}$ of the President's total program for "Revenue Sharing."

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

This brings me then to part two of the President's program which, if implemented, would also be historic. General Revenue Sharing would, in my judgment, represent a fundamental change in the relationship between the national government and the states and their local governments. With your permission, I'd like to explore it in some depth.

Part two would represent the assumption by the federal government of the responsibility for financing part of the general cost of state and local governments. A small share at first—yes, if we can call \$5 billion small—but the principles would be established—federal responsibility for funding the general operations of state and local governments. And anyone who thinks that the degree of responsibility for funding would not grow need only listen to the demands already being made that we should start out with \$10 billion rather than \$5 billion.

Let me say right from the start, while the dollars and cents are important, what concerns me most is the basic change in principle and philosophy that is involved. Rather than improving our structure of government, I think it would weaken it.

I have confidence in our American System. Yes, I have confidence in our governors, our state legislators, our mayors, our city councils, our county boards of supervisors. I also recognize the fiscal problem many of them face in attempting to meet the demands for public services. I also recognize the intolerable burden of state and local levies on many of our people. It is understandable that hard-pressed taxpayers are demanding relief.

No one can contend that there is not a serious problem of crisis proportions or that a better way cannot be found to raise and distribute that portion of our national wealth that is needed for government services.

THE FISCAL PROBLEM

Let me suggest, however, that the problem is broader than just the fiscal plight of the states and cities. It is deeper than just the question of how we raise and distribute the tax dollars.

We are a great and rich country. There is no question about our capacity to meet our real national needs—and we will meet those needs.

We must be aware, however, that in spite of our riches there is a limit to our resources—a limit to what our people can pay in taxes and a limit to how much we can borrow.

Let me make this real clear—it cannot be emphasized too strongly—neither the federal government, the state governments, or local governments—all put together—have the tax resources to finance all of the programs that may be desired at any given time. There is a limit to the amount of our resources that can be dedicated to public service without jeopardizing our economic, social, and political system—yes, our way of life.

The fact of the matter is that we, as a people, are demanding of all government, state, local, national, more services than we are willing to pay for or, in fact, can pay for.

It's time that politicians at all levels—governors, mayors, presidents, congressmen—make clear that we can't give the people all the services they want and still pay for them.

This fact must be recognized by all of us. We must curb our appetites for more and more government service.

THE FISCAL DIVIDEND

I am sometimes amused by the term "Federal Revenue Sharing". What revenue is there to share?

The term cropped up a number of years ago when there was a belief on the part of some economists that the federal government soon would have an excess of receipts over expenditures and a good way to spend it would be to divide it among the states through revenue sharing.

At that time, Dr. Walter Heller expressed it this way: "Looking beyond current rising Vietnam costs, big deficits, and contingency tax increases, one can visualize (he should have said fantasize) an \$8 billion annual automatic growth in federal revenues generating new leeway for fiscal dividends—tax cuts, revenue sharing, program increases—if Vietnam demands level off. If rising revenues are not to hold the economy back under such circumstances, we need to get our bets down promptly on the competing entrants in the fiscal drag race."

But it has not worked out that way—as we all know. The projection of what the federal government will have to borrow in order to pay its bills for just this year and next is optimistically estimated at \$48 billion. The House and Senate as recently as last week passed legislation increasing the borrowing authority of the Treasury by \$35 billion just to get us through the next twelve months.

I find nothing in the fiscal history of the last thirty years to justify the dream of sugar plums—or fiscal dividends—all of a sudden overwhelming us. That history has been one of deficits, mostly high—in good economic years and bad.

The Administration, in supporting general revenue sharing, envisions a budget margin or surplus of \$30 billion in 1976. But that is without any new government programs being initiated and the Administration frankly states, "Certainly it will be insufficient to cover all demands for further government programs, even without consideration of demands for further tax reduction or reduction of the public debt."

Wham! Bang! There goes the fiscal dividend. Only last year the Administration projected a budget margin of \$22 billion for 1975, but it now acknowledges that changes which have taken place during the past year altered the projection and it now has to be cut almost in half.

CREDIT SHARING

If we will just be a little realistic, we must recognize there is no revenue to share. The only thing the federal government has to share today is more debt. Fiscal dividends are nothing more than mirages in the mind of those who desire to rationalize a justification for expenditures which they are unwilling to pay for currently.

If we were to give general revenue sharing a more honest designation, we would call it "credit sharing." Let us frankly admit that there is no excess federal revenue to share and I know of no proponent of revenue sharing who is proposing new taxes to finance the payments.

Yet, I submit, *revenue to be shared must first be collected.*

This so-called "new money" for the states and cities, as the proponents like to refer to it, can come only from increased federal bor-

rowing or increased taxes. None of the proponents, as far as I know, have the power to perform the miracle of the loaves and fishes. Pray tell me then: When is our big borrowing going to end? Or how much higher are we prepared to go in raising federal taxes?

If I am any judge, we are reaching the point of taxpayer revolt. Governors and Mayors tell me they can't possibly raise local taxes. "The taxpayers won't stand for it," they say. Why are federal taxes any different? I don't think they are.

WHAT ABOUT THE TAXPAYER?

Because the argument is always made that there is something unique about the federal government's capacity to tax, first let us recognize that no matter how you dress it up, the federal government has no tax resources that are not available to the states, and the federal taxpayers are but a composite of the state taxpayers. We are all—federal, state and local governments—trying to squeeze blood out of the same turnip.

Let's remember that all government spending eventually focuses at one spot, the American taxpayer. He is the one who must pay the bill. I would hope that he has learned to be leery of any proposal for government spending, at no matter what level, which ignores the question of where the money is to come from. Too often I get the feeling as I hear mayors and governors and federal officials discussing revenue sharing that I am witnessing a gathering of Robin Hoods planning a robbery with the participants trying to figure out how the loot is to be divided.

I suggest to you as taxpayers that it's your money they are talking about taking and dividing among them.

What about the sources of revenue? There is only one source of revenue available to the national government that is not also available to the states—that is the revenue from duties or tariffs.

True it is that the income tax is the primary source of revenue of the national government. And it has merits as a means of raising revenue not shared by other forms of taxes.

But there is one observation I'd like to make. If the national government has preempted the income tax, and particularly the personal income tax, as some contend, then it means this tax is already at its maximum level. Where, then, is the national government going to get the new money?

Even if we accept the argument of pre-emption by the national government of the personal income tax as it applies to some of our states, it cannot be generalized to apply to all states.

STATE REVENUE EFFORT

I would make two points as we look at the fiscal problems of our states. First: Many of the states do not tax themselves with the severity which other states accept. Second: When we view the variation in the use of the personal income tax among the states, it is clear that many are merely crying "wolf".

Look at the total revenue effort of state and local governments of the various states in relation to personal income. We have the four highest states—Wyoming, North Dakota, New Mexico, and Hawaii, taxing to the tune of between \$172 and \$195 per \$1,000 of personal income while the four lowest, the District of Columbia, Connecticut, Illinois, and Ohio, are taxing at a rate of between \$108 and \$113 per \$1,000. I would not call a spread of almost 45% insignificant.

When we realize that general revenue sharing as proposed is primarily related to the personal income tax, it is revealing to look at the use of the personal income tax by the states and at the disparity which exists in this area.

It is important to note that seven states—Florida, Nevada, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

and Wyoming—have no individual income tax whatsoever. An eighth state, Pennsylvania, adopted this tax only a few days ago. Five additional states which are credited with an income tax by the census bureau qualify only on technical grounds.

In addition, many states make extremely limited use of this revenue source. Louisiana and Maine, at the bottom of the list, levy personal income taxes which represent only 4/10th and 6/10th of 1%, respectively, of the personal income of the State. Yet some states impose a very high burden of personal income tax on their citizens. Hawaii imposes a personal income tax amounting to 3.4% of its personal income, and the Wisconsin income tax amounts to 3.2% of its personal income.

If we look at the relative burdens on the states and the use of the personal income tax, I submit that the argument is not well made that all states have exhausted their revenue capacity. Nor can we generalize that the federal government has preempted the use of the individual income tax as a source of revenue. The arguments may apply to some few states, but not to the many.

I would suggest that the solution is not in the perpetuation of these disparities and these inequities, as general revenue sharing would tend to do. We would do better to look to methods that would encourage the reduction of the disparity that currently exists.

A substantial number of states could make a greater revenue effort and also greater use of the individual income tax than they now do. Is it not logical to expect them to do so before asking the federal government, in effect, to do it for them?

CONSTITUTIONALITY

Let me move to that aspect of general revenue sharing that gives me even greater concern: What does it do to the basic structure of our federal system of government?

Frankly, I have serious doubts concerning the constitutionality of general revenue sharing as it is proposed. There is no doubt that a blanket grant to the Department of Commerce to spend as it saw fit would be an unconstitutional delegation of power under Supreme Court decisions. Is the same delegation any less unconstitutional because it is made to the states instead of to another branch of the national government? Under special revenue sharing, we would require the money be spent for a specific purpose—education, transportation, law enforcement, etc., and an accounting is required. No accountability, however, is demanded under general revenue sharing. The Secretary of the Treasury merely sends a check.

Congress is empowered to collect taxes to provide for the "general welfare of the United States." The relationship that the expenditure of the shared revenues bears to the general welfare of the United States will depend on policy judgments made not by the U.S. Congress and the President, but by 50 state legislatures and thousands of local units of government. Can it be assumed that these judgments will always be for the "general welfare of the United States?" I wonder.

PRINCIPLES, NOT COMPETENCE, THE ISSUE

In wondering, I am not questioning the competence or dedication of state or local governments. Their judgment may on occasion, however, be influenced by what might be advantageous to their area rather than to the general welfare of the nation as a whole.

I do not share the view of those who oppose revenue sharing because of a lack of confidence in local officials. They are as conscientious, yes, and as able as the officials of the national government. The wisdom of Washington versus the wisdom of state and local governments is not the issue.

Basic principles and precepts of sound government are at issue.

I said earlier that one of the greatest needs today is to restrain our appetite, as a nation, for more and more government services. If the pleasure of spending public funds is to have any restraint, it must be coupled with the odium of imposing the taxes to pay the bill.

One of the basic precepts of government, it seems to me, is that the authority to spend public funds should be connected as closely as possible to the responsibility for collecting them.

We talk about the need to establish priorities. A fundamental decision that every public official should be required to make is the relative priority of spending for some desirable cause as against the levying of taxes to pay for it.

Also, once the national government acknowledges and assumes responsibility for even a small part of the general cost of state and local government, we make a fundamental change in the relationship between the national government and the states.

We talk about decentralizing government and thus giving greater authority to the people.

Centralization has been defined as "that device by which the taxpayer's normal prudence is overcome by his greed." Revenue sharing may represent the most invidious type of centralization yet devised. By centralizing the burdens and decentralizing the benefits, we make the benefit more immediate and the burden more remote.

With this division of responsibility, will the proper legislative judgment be made? Will citizens be sufficiently motivated to assure that their resources are prudently administered? Even with sufficient motivation, will they be able to develop a coordinated picture of benefits and burdens related to activities spread over several governmental levels?

Once the foot is in the door, where will the demand for more and more financing from Washington stop? It won't. Any lack of capacity on the part of our states or localities to meet requests for additional services will be passed on to Washington in a demand for more funding, and you will have the same lobby at work that is today pressing for general revenue sharing.

What about the controversy that will then develop between state-local officials on the one hand and federal officials on the other. We see some of the tensions and controversy rising already. A group of state legislators has been moved to threaten a refusal to act in congressional redistricting if general revenue sharing is not enacted, thus forcing Congressmen to run at-large in the next election.

Because general revenue sharing is tied to the Internal Revenue Code, what effect will it have on our tax laws? Every city and state will have a vested interest in enlarging the taxable personal income base and opposing the reduction of that base, since the amount they will receive is a percentage of the base—1.3%. In considering changes in the Code, a new element will be added—the effect of the change on the amount of funds going to the states. I can testify that we have enough problems already in trying to devise an equitable system without adding another controversial complication.

EXPERIENCE OF OTHERS

Let me emphasize my concern over general revenue sharing by reciting a little history.

Social and economic conditions vary radically from one country to another and, although it can be misleading and dangerous to attempt to transfer fiscal lessons from one socio-economic milieu to another, it might be even more risky to ignore completely the experience of others. With this caveat, look at the experience of Germany in the 1920's and early 1930's.

March 17, 1971

The central German government, or Reich, collected all taxes and distributed to the states and localities a percentage of its annual revenues.

Germany also had to pay a portion of its income to the allied powers, as reparations from World War I. When the Reich failed to meet its World War I commitments, the Allies sent a commission to try and straighten out the country's finances.

S. Parker Gilbert, who was the Agent General for the Commission, filed this report in 1930:

"... the underlying fault in the whole system of transfers to the States and communities (is) the division of responsibility as between the authority which collects the taxes and the authority which spends the money. The Government of the Reich collects the taxes, but does not feel the full responsibility for them since it must pass on a large share of the proceeds to the States and communes... The States and communes, on their side, spend the money without having had any of the responsibility or odium of collecting it, and they have fallen into the habit of expecting the Reich to provide more and more money for them to meet their recurring budgetary deficits. One of the States, in fact, has recently entered additional transfers from the Reich as the balancing item in its draft budget, and with each new provisional settlement, the States and communes generally unite to exert all possible pressure to get larger payments from the Reich as if the Government of the Reich were an external authority depending on some other body of taxpayers. The financial relations between the Reich and the States and communes will not be on a sound basis until the responsibility for raising the money by taxation has been reunited with the responsibility for spending it..."

Another lesson might be learned from the Argentine experience. Professor Harley H. Hinrichs, now at the University of Maryland, had the following to say, based on his World Bank missions to Argentina in 1964 and 1966:

"As decentralized governmental units have found themselves more and more reliant on the central purse for budgetary revenues, their own vitality and independence have tended to decrease. This Argentine result casts doubt on the common assumption that revenue sharing—in and of itself—is a sufficient force for shifting power within a federal system to state and local governments."

DIFFERING POSITIONS

Having voiced my deep-seated objections to general revenue sharing, let me make some distinctions concerning my opposition and then, hopefully, end on a more positive note.

I find myself in the strange position of opposing my own President on this issue and being joined by some of my liberal friends whose political philosophy and mine are miles apart. It is important to distinguish between our positions.

Some liberals are centralists at heart and are quick to protest any shift in power from the federal to the state and local level. It is natural, therefore, that they should oppose both forms of revenue sharing. They want the federal government to establish the priorities and call the tune on where and how the money should be spent. They have a basic distrust of state government and most local government. I support special revenue sharing because of my fundamental belief that we will only solve our pressing domestic problems through the revitalization of state and local governments and that special revenue sharing will assist in that revitalization process. I oppose general revenue sharing because, as I have pointed out and as experience has shown, it will lead not to the revitalization but to the weakening of state and local governments.

As far as the President is concerned, I find

myself in the unpleasant position of disagreeing with him on the means to achieve the objective to which he and I both deeply subscribe. It is because I believe special revenue sharing contributes to the goal of revitalizing local government that I support it and it is because I believe general revenue sharing gravely endangers that goal that I oppose it.

The President and I are not, in fact, very far apart even in our disagreement over the means to reach a commonly-shared objective. We do not disagree on sharing; we only disagree on what should be shared.

TAX SHARING

The fundamental error in general revenue sharing, it seems to me, lies not in the act of sharing; it lies in the sharing of federal revenues. If we need to share, then, as I suggested long before the Administration's program was devised, what we need is tax sharing, not revenue sharing.

We should not make available to states and localities to be spent as they see fit, funds they have not raised, thus encouraging irresponsibility. We should make available tax resources which they can use to collect their own revenue which can then be spent as they see fit, thus encouraging responsibility.

The difference is great. It is the distinction between unresponsive and dynamic local governments; between dependent and independent local governments; between weak and strong local governments.

I would make two specific suggestions for tax sharing, always assuming, of course, that the fiscal plight of the states and localities is so much worse than the federal government that greater federal deficits are justified, an assumption I have questioned here today. I suggest we consider the enactment of a federal individual income tax credit for state and local income taxes paid and the updating of the present federal estate tax credit for death taxes paid to a state. Without going into all of the details, let me outline this two-pronged approach, which would make over three billion dollars available to states and localities in the first full years of operation—and substantially more in the future—in a manner greatly preferable to revenue sharing.

First, I would recommend that a 20% tax credit be provided against an individual's federal income tax liability for state and local income taxes that he pays. It would be extremely simple and easily understood by the taxpayer. A taxpayer would simply claim a credit on his federal return for 20% of the state and local income taxes he has paid. For all taxpayers, whether they itemize or take the standard deduction, the credit will be in addition to and not a substitute for the deduction already provided for state and local taxes. This means that state governments would know in advance that all taxpayers in their state, regardless of what income tax bracket they are in, would have a reduction in their federal personal income taxes equal to 20% of their state and local taxes paid.

The additional state tax resources made available by the new credit—over two billion dollars—would be clearly identified, and the state or local government, if they had justification, could raise an equivalent amount by simply increasing their tax rates across-the-board by 20% or by imposing a 20% surtax.

I propose that we update the federal estate tax credit for state death taxes. Historically, death taxes have been regarded by both the federal and state government as a state revenue source. Although the federal government enacted an estate tax in 1916, it recognized the states' prior claims to this revenue source. Congress, in 1926, provided an 80% credit against the federal estate tax for state death taxes as an alternative to repeal of the federal tax. The credit mechanism, which was

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

based on the 1926 rates, was intended to minimize interstate competition for estates while reserving death taxes essentially for the states.

Under the financial pressure of the depression and the fiscal crunch of World War II, the federal government sharply increased federal estate tax rates while continuing to base the credit for state death taxes paid on the 1926 rate schedule.

The law is now an anachronism providing a credit of only about ten percent of the present rates rather than the 80% originally intended. Cooperative federalism and fiscal balance in our federal system dictate that we update this credit.

The federal estate tax credit should be increased to 80% of the first \$150,000 of a taxable estate and 20% of the remainder. This proposal, based on recommendations made by the Advisory Council on Intergovernmental Relations, would substantially reduce the incentive in present law for "forum shopping" by people of means, provide a fair distribution of over one billion dollars in revenue among the several states, and stabilize this source of state taxation.

Forty-four states, including the District of Columbia, now have "pick-up" provisions in their state laws that would automatically increase their death taxes to the level provided by the new credit, although eleven of these states would need a minor conforming amendment. The other seven states would have to change their laws.

Unlike revenue sharing, the two-pronged approach I am suggesting would not divorce the responsibility for taxing from the privilege of dispensing benefits. It would help those states willing to help themselves and provide an incentive for them to improve their tax structures. States would retain more control over and responsibility for their fiscal affairs and taxpayers would retain a greater interest in the way local governments use their resources. The danger of making the states functional appendages to the federal government, dependent on federal largesse inherent in revenue sharing, would be avoided.

Tax sharing—coupled with the enactment of special revenue sharing—is the sound answer, it seems to me, if our real objective is to strengthen and revitalize the federal system.

You have been very patient. If I have been burdensome, I apologize. This is a subject, however, that I hope will not be taken lightly. We know we face a problem at all levels of government in developing the best possible way to raise and distribute the tax dollar.

The answers are not going to be simple. Certainly the problems are not going to be solved by just passing the buck from one governmental unit to another. In my book, they will not be solved by concentrating greater and greater taxing responsibility in Washington.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX EFFORT

[General revenues from own sources as a percent of personal income by State]

State	Personal income, 1968 ¹	General revenue from own sources, 1968-69 ¹	Revenue effort (col. 2 as a percentage of col. 1)
Alabama	\$8,316	\$1,121.8	13.49
Alaska	1,136	182.7	16.09
Arizona	5,034	826.2	16.41
Arkansas	4,611	584.0	12.66
California	76,581	12,822.1	16.74
Colorado	6,824	1,052.0	15.41
Connecticut	12,611	1,394.4	11.06
Delaware	2,026	280.7	13.85
District of Columbia	3,580	386.6	10.80
Florida	19,626	2,739.6	13.96
Georgia	12,705	1,684.7	13.26
Hawaii	2,705	466.4	17.24
Idaho	1,876	299.0	15.94
Illinois	43,760	4,897.6	11.19

State	Personal income, 1968 ¹	General revenue from own sources, 1968-69 ¹	Revenue effort (col. 2 as a percentage of col. 1)
Indiana	17,270	2,178.9	12.62
Iowa	9,057	1,351.7	14.92
Kansas	7,574	1,033.7	13.65
Kentucky	8,516	1,170.8	13.75
Louisiana	9,814	1,547.1	15.76
Maine	2,757	359.4	13.03
Maryland	14,048	1,878.5	13.37
Massachusetts	20,974	2,841.4	13.55
Michigan	32,119	4,694.0	14.61
Minnesota	12,185	1,953.8	16.03
Mississippi	4,878	763.4	15.65
Missouri	15,065	1,758.0	11.67
Montana	2,039	311.9	15.30
Nebraska	4,661	693.3	14.87
Nevada	1,777	285.4	16.06
New Hampshire	2,288	262.6	11.48
New Jersey	28,047	3,405.6	12.14
New Mexico	2,667	472.7	17.73
New York	75,049	12,472.0	16.62
North Carolina	13,642	1,721.4	12.62
North Dakota	1,712	321.7	18.79
Ohio	37,151	4,195.7	11.29
Oklahoma	7,259	1,022.4	14.09
Oregon	6,660	1,024.9	15.39
Pennsylvania	40,102	4,738.6	11.82
Rhode Island	3,244	402.7	12.41
South Carolina	6,341	785.6	12.39
South Dakota	1,887	301.8	15.99
Tennessee	10,252	1,283.7	12.52
Texas	33,254	4,085.6	12.29
Utah	2,885	442.5	15.34
Vermont	1,306	198.4	15.19
Virginia	14,100	1,796.0	12.74
Washington	12,081	1,844.5	15.27
West Virginia	4,451	602.1	13.53
Wisconsin	14,197	2,262.2	15.93
Wyoming	1,005	195.7	19.47
Total	683,072	95,397.5	13.95

¹ Millions of dollars.

Source: Governmental Finances in 1968-69, Bureau of Census.

RELATIVE TAX EFFORT—RANKING OF STATES BY STATE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REVENUE AS A PERCENT OF STATE PERSONAL INCOME

State	Total individual income tax revenue, fiscal year 1970 (in thousands)	Total personal income, calendar year 1969 (in millions)	Tax as a percent of personal income
No individual income tax:			
Florida	\$22,396		
Nevada	2,037		
Ohio	40,145		
Pennsylvania	43,182		
South Dakota	1,995		
Texas	36,458		
Washington	13,093		
Wyoming	1,073		
Selective individual income tax: ²			
New Jersey	17,643	30,312	0.58
Rhode Island	18,644	3,515	0.53
New Hampshire	3,462	2,489	0.14
Tennessee	12,113	11,189	0.11
Connecticut	4,916	13,784	0.04
Broad base individual income tax:			
Hawaii	105,019	3,060	3.43
Wisconsin	489,944	15,376	3.19
Delaware	68,486	2,218	3.09
New York	2,506,435	81,384	3.08
Vermont	43,668	1,426	3.06
Oregon	213,053	7,261	2.93
Maryland	413,366	15,336	2.70
Alaska	32,455	1,258	2.58
Minnesota	345,733	13,448	2.57
Massachusetts	517,952	22,722	2.28
Utah	61,335	3,132	1.96
Virginia	282,769	15,441	1.83
North Carolina	270,945	15,030	1.80
Montana	38,871	2,172	1.79
Idaho	36,662	2,120	1.73
Colorado	129,097	7,569	1.71
California	1,150,604	83,408	1.38
South Carolina	95,398	7,018	1.36
Kentucky	121,423	9,202	1.32
Georgia	184,943	14,253	1.30
New Mexico	35,730	2,879	1.24
Illinois	575,601	47,340	1.22
Michigan	415,345	35,010	1.19
Arizona	64,974	5,709	1.14
Indiana	216,394	18,868	1.14

Footnotes at end of table.

RELATIVE TAX EFFORT—RANKING OF STATES BY STATE
INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REVENUE AS A PERCENT OF
STATE PERSONAL INCOME—Continued

State	Total individual income tax revenue, fiscal year 1970 (in thousands)	Total personal income, calendar year 1969 (in millions)	Tax as a percent of personal income
Broad base individual income tax—Con.			
Iowa	\$112,746	\$9,870	\$1.14
Kansas	78,423	8,096	0.97
Alabama	85,081	9,116	0.93
Arkansas	42,548	4,963	0.86
Nebraska	44,444	5,230	0.85
Mississippi	44,162	5,234	0.84
West Virginia	40,061	4,735	0.84
North Dakota	15,379	1,852	0.83
Missouri	129,654	16,085	0.81
Oklahoma	50,516	7,825	0.65
Maine	18,885	2,987	0.63
Louisiana	47,993	10,413	0.46

¹ Pennsylvania on Mar. 4, 1971, enacted a State individual income tax.

² Income subject to tax in these States as follows: New Hampshire—interest and dividends; Connecticut—capital gains; Tennessee—interest and dividends; New Jersey—commuter tax; New Jersey residents deriving income from New York sources and New York residents deriving income from New Jersey sources; Rhode Island—interest, dividends and capital gains.

Source: State Tax Collections in 1970, GF 70 No. 1, Bureau of the Census, tables 3 and 6.

TELEPHONE IS INDISPENSABLE

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the years we have come to take the telephone for granted. For fishwives and politicians the telephone is literally an extension of the body—an indispensable appendage to the auditory system. For the other 200 million Americans across the Nation it is only slightly less necessary. Indeed, who would do without one?

In the process, however, we have lost sight of one of the telephone's prime virtues: its ability to provide a speedy response in an emergency situation. Very few Americans can recite offhand the numbers of their police and fire departments or their local ambulance service. And their alternative—dialing an operator who never knows which one of her thousands of calls is an emergency—is just too slow.

As long as Americans continue to rely on the telephone we might as well see that it is used to maximum advantage. The present system of calling in emergencies is plainly inefficient and time-consuming. Thousands of crimes, fires, and deaths occur annually only because they are not reported quickly enough. To solve this problem I have introduced a bill that would establish a single nationwide phone number to be dialed in the event of an emergency.

The number—911—is easy to dial and easy to remember. It has proven effective in hundreds of cities across the Nation.

One of these cities is Oak Park in my own district. Prior to the installation of 911, the city made a survey of 622 people. They were asked a single question, "What is Oak Park's emergency tele-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

phone number?" Only two knew the number.

Six weeks after 911 was in service 1,200 students were interviewed, and 96.7 percent knew that 911 was Oak Park's emergency telephone number. In fact, for the first 7 weeks of the new service the city answered 1,247 calls for help.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am simply asking that the remainder of our communities be provided funds for the installation of 911. We spend millions of dollars every year on crime prevention and health care. Yet, we have ignored one of the easiest means we have to prevent crimes and to provide immediate and adequate health care: a universal emergency phone number. For the benefits it will have, 911 is well worth the cost.

THE POLITICS OF DEATH

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, an honest judgment is often obtained when, removed from the immediacy of a situation, speculation and passions fade into the background and the simple reality of events emerges.

Anthony Lewis' column "The Politics of Death," written in London, achieves such a perspective. His comments on the future of the Vietnam war are stripped of the rhetoric and emotion which too often clothe less removed observations.

I quote from Mr. Lewis' column:

In the six years since those marines landed, American weapons have killed upward of 200,000 civilians in Indochina and made several million people refugees. Whatever the original reason, that scale of destruction is an indecency.

That drives home the horror of this war.

I commend Mr. Lewis' column to my colleagues:

THE POLITICS OF DEATH

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, March 7.—Six years ago tomorrow the first American ground combat unit, 3,500 marines, landed in Vietnam. Their announced mission was to protect U.S. bases. As late as June, 1965, a State Department spokesman said that was still the role of the rapidly growing American force—though if fired upon, he said, "our troops naturally return the fire."

The furtive way Lyndon Johnson got us into a land war in Asia has been followed by so many other deceptions that we are almost numb to them. What matters now, to most Americans, is not so much truth as just getting out. We want to liquidate the disastrous process that began six years ago.

Since President Nixon began withdrawing troops, there has really been only one central issue for the United States in Indochina: Would it be a complete withdrawal, with that fixed aim and by a time certain or would it be a conditional withdrawal, indefinite in extent and timing? Events make increasingly clear how significant that issue is.

There are elements within the Nixon Administration that favor a fixed commitment to total withdrawal, possibly including Secretary of Defense Laird. The reason is that

March 17, 1971

the "Korean solution" of leaving a large residual American force is unattractive in budgetary and strategic terms. It would be a hostage to Vietnamese politics, always in danger of either having to leave or having to call more Americans back to help.

Indeed, the U.S. negotiating position at the Paris peace talks does not envisage a Korean settlement. The delegation under Ambassador Bruce is operating on the theory that, if the other side ever takes up our proposal for a cease-fire in place, the talks would move on to discuss the terms of a total withdrawal.

Yet the President has declined to make total withdrawal his policy. His recent statements, in fact, have tended to make the end of American involvement in Indochina recede into the even more indefinite distance.

At his news conference last week he said that "as long as there are American prisoners of war in North Vietnam, we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam. At another point he indicated that our withdrawal depended on North Vietnamese forces leaving the South and Laos and Cambodia: "If that happens, we will be glad to withdraw."

Why does Mr. Nixon take this position?

The prisoner argument is really the other way. We may all wish that North Vietnam would make the gesture of releasing the 460 Americans we believe it holds (not 1,600, as Mr. Nixon said). But we know that the one sure way of getting them out is to end the war and withdraw.

A more serious contention is that delaying and conditioning our exit will give time for "Vietnamization" to work—for the South Vietnamese to be strong enough to protect themselves without our help. But the Laos operation, however it turns out, has shown that in terms of any imaginable time and effort, the goal is a will-o'-the-wisp.

In the limited area of the Laos invasion, American forces have flown more than 20,000 helicopter sorties and 2,500 bombing missions in the last month. Yet Vice President Ky of South Vietnam said last week that the United States had not done enough. On the basis of the Laos experience, with all the difficulties encountered by Saigon's troops, when can we ever imagine them ready to operate without American air cover?

The only thing that a delayed and indefinite withdrawal can gain is time. And there we come to the real reason for the Nixon policy. Its aim must be to hold the Saigon Government together at least until the American Presidential election next year. Mr. Nixon wants to be the candidate who withdrew most of our forces without "losing South Vietnam."

The question is whether Mr. Nixon's re-election is worth the cost of his way of withdrawing—the cost in human lives and damage to the social fabric. For his policy is necessarily one of aggressive withdrawals, depending on immense air activity to carry on the fighting as our ground troops leave. The Washington correspondent of the *Financial Times* of London, John Graham, described the effects of the policy succinctly when he wrote recently of the Nixon Administration: "It is bombing four countries, and has invaded two, in order to withdraw from one."

In the six years since those marines landed, American weapons have killed upward of 200,000 civilians in Indochina and made several million people refugees. Whatever the original reason, that scale of destruction is an indecency. And under the Nixon policy it will go on indefinitely.

Mr. Nixon is gambling, politically, on the belief that low U.S. casualties and continuing gradual withdrawals of ground troops will satisfy American opinion—in other words, that Americans will show no moral concern for death and disintegration among other people. I think he is wrong.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTRY IS NEEDED MORE THAN EVER BEFORE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in recent years more and more of the debate in this Chamber has centered on the need to protect and preserve our environment.

Some of the words have concerned our forest resources, and the men who manage them. William Towell, executive vice president of the American Forestry Association, recently commented on the role of the professional forester in both the utilization of this valuable natural resource and in the management of associated values—water, wildlife habitat, wilderness. The editorial, titled "Let's Not Scuttle Professional Forestry," was published in the March 1971 issue of American Forests magazine and I insert it in the RECORD at this point.

LET'S NOT SCUTTLE PROFESSIONAL FORESTRY

The forestry profession is taking a beating. Forestry itself has become a dirty word among certain environmental revolutionists. Foresters have been labeled exploiters, money-grabbers or even traitors. The Forest Service is being severely criticized as having total disregard for esthetics, for wilderness or for the environment. Industrial foresters have become the villains in an ecologically oriented society which frowns upon anyone making a profit from cutting trees. Strong sentiments are being expressed for taking public land management decisions away from foresters and giving them to landscape architects, to ecologists or to the public itself.

Clearcutting and even-aged forest management are under attack in the East and in the West. Prime monoculture in the South is opposed by wildlife enthusiasts who label it a biological desert for game. Forest cutting practices and forest road construction are being blamed for floods, erosion and stream siltation. In fact, little if anything good is being credited to the forestry profession these days or to those who are responsible for the care and management of our nation's forest lands.

And, there is some truth to all these charges. Foresters are not blameless for many of the land and resource decisions that today offend a public suddenly aroused by what they see in their natural environment. Mistakes have been made by foresters, just as they are made by all men of action who must make judgments and decisions. At the time they were made, however, most were not mistakes and the foresters' batting average probably is as good or better than most. It is easy to focus on the negative and to be critical, but let's take a look at the positive side for a moment.

Conservation in America began with forestry. The setting aside of federal forest reserves was the first significant conservation act in our growing, exploitative nation. It was foresters who first recognized the evils of fire and who brought this demon under control. It was foresters who saw the need for wilderness and set aside vast areas of our National Forests as wilderness and primitive areas long before there was a Wilderness Act. It was foresters who recognized the necessity for multiple-use management of public forests and made it the law of the land.

The U. S. Forest Service has been a model of efficiency in land administration, an example to other land management agencies that followed. Federal foresters are well trained,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

dedicated and highly respected in the eyes of the people who know them best. Congress long has recognized the Forest Service as a well disciplined, scandal-free, reliable public agency. The Service has shown strong leadership in helping the states develop sound, productive programs on state and private forest lands. Industry looks to the federal service for leadership in land management techniques, for research and for environmental protection.

From the ranks of professional foresters have come many leaders in American conservation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and former Directors of the Bureaus of Outdoor Recreation and Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Several state conservation departments are headed by foresters who have demonstrated as much concern for water quality, for recreation, for wildlife and esthetics as they have for trees. Professional foresters direct the work of two national conservation groups—The Wilderness Society and The American Forestry Association. Schools of forestry have become schools of natural resources under the leadership of foresters concerned about ecology and the total environment.

Let's not scuttle professional forestry in America. Foresters have made mistakes, yes, but they still represent the best trained management professionals for more than a third of our nation's lands. They, too, are awakened to the new ecological relationships which must govern our use of land and resources. Many foresters, particularly the younger men who will be directing forestry programs in the future, are just as concerned with esthetics and the amenities as they are with providing lumber, pulpwood and plywood which commercial forest lands must produce.

Clearcutting most certainly has been abused in some areas. But it is a necessary tool in the professional forester's kit. It is the only way of regenerating forests of desirable species in certain regions. It is the only way to control some diseases and insects which can destroy the forest in a much more unsightly way. Clearcutting can be just as important to the forester as amputation is to the surgeon who must use it to save a life, but unlike human amputation, the forest will grow again. Foresters are learning to use the clearcut more sparingly, in smaller units and away from public view, just as they are giving greater priority to esthetics, to recreation, to wildlife, to water quality and other amenities of forest lands. Let's not rob him of the essential tools of his profession, but rather demand that they be used with greater discretion in the public interest. The forester is a professional who will rise to the challenges of today as he has in the past. Let's give him that chance.

AID TO RURAL AMERICA

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the needs of rural America for a long time. During that time I have tried to give fullest recognition of the problems peculiar to our greatest resource comprising more than nine-tenths of our land area. I have worked and voted for legislation that has at least met the basic requirements of the people still holding the economic fort at the crossroads and the comparatively small communities.

We are at a period in history, however, when it is no longer sufficient to fight delaying battles against the onrushing problems of this modern era. These tactics have not been successful in past decades, and they most assuredly would be destined for calamity if continued into the decade of the 1970's.

President Nixon has advocated offering the chance for the keen minds and initiatives present, but stifled, in rural America to emerge into the greatness available and merely awaiting the opportunity. This could only come about by removing the shackles of unnecessary bureaucratic government and returning initiative and adequate tax money back to the people who created the economic climate that makes it possible for the Nation to prosper.

The rural development special revenue sharing program just introduced in the Congress is the first real plan of action that will permit rural America to overcome Government-induced handicaps and contribute mightily to our country's true potential. The benefits will not only lift rural communities to new vigor and growth, but will relieve the pressure upon the large cities. Leaders of the metropolis need a breathing space in which to replan and also gain new direction and momentum.

The measure we will now be considering cannot be termed a cure-all, of course. But, it does give more hope for rural people rather than continuing the deep frustration they have known for too long. It does offer an immediate means for setting up priorities that will fit the needs of each State and local community. It does turn initiative back to the people themselves through their legislatures. It does begin a reversal of the resource flow from Washington back to the creators of the resources.

I can see no reason why this portion of the administration's revenue sharing program should not receive fast attention from the Congress. I commend it with no reservations to my colleagues.

CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD WANTS FUNDING FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY BILL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I must rise to express some concern I have that the occupational health and safety legislation which this House voted so favorably for last year, was not given any funding by the Appropriations Committee.

The administration came before the committee with two supplemental appropriations bills; one for unemployment compensation and the second for the occupational health and safety legislation.

The first received funding. The health and safety bill did not.

This legislation becomes effective next month on April 28.

I feel that the Appropriations Committee should act quickly and grant the administration the funds needed to put this desired program to work.

I feel the longer this program remains unfunded the more we are playing games with health and safety of this Nation's workforce.

I urge the committee to act now on a money bill for this program.

SENATOR GRUENING—HIS PROPHETIC WORDS STILL RING TRUE

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, 1964—almost exactly 7 years ago—the Honorable Ernest Gruening, then Senator from the State of Alaska, took the floor of the Senate to deliver a major address. The subject of his discussion was entitled "The United States Should Get Out of Vietnam."

Since that time, and before it, as well, Senator Gruening has been one of our most astute and perceptive analysts of the war, and of this Nation's role in it. His vigor, his dedication, and his concern have been constant and unswerving.

What Senator Gruening had to say on March 10, 1964, bears repeating. It has borne repeating for these long and tragic years, as this war has continued, claiming more than 53,000 American lives by now. At the time he spoke, some 200 Americans had been killed in Vietnam, 115 of them in combat. Yet, his words were startlingly prophetic, and the events since then have borne out their acuity.

Senator Gruening said then:

I consider the life of one American worth more than this putrid mess. I consider that every additional life that is sacrificed in this forlorn venture a tragedy. Some day—not distant—if this sacrificing continues, it will be denounced as a crime.

And Senator Gruening continued:

Let us do a little hard rethinking. Must the United States be expected to jump into every fracas all over the world, to go it all alone, at the cost of our youngsters' lives, and stay in blindly and stubbornly when a decade of bitter experience has shown us that the expenditure of blood and treasure has resulted in failure?

Shall we not, if taught anything by this tragic experience, consider that of the three alternatives: First, to continue this bloody and wanton stalemate; second, to go in "all-out" for a full-scale invasion and the certain sacrifice of far more lives and a scarcely less doubtful outcome; or, third, to pull out with the knowledge that the game was not worth the candle.

This last is the best of these choices.

Senator Gruening stated:

All our military should immediately be relieved of combat assignments. All military dependents should be returned home at once. A return of the troops to our own shores should begin.

And he concluded:

This is a fight which is not our fight into which we should not have gotten in the first place. The time to get out is now before the further loss of American lives.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senator Gruening's words were not heeded in 1964. But, they still ring true. We cannot undo the tragedy of the ensuing years, but we can prevent the tragedy of future days and months and years. We must end our involvement in this war.

**DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT DECISION
MADE IN A VACUUM**

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on or before April 1 of each year, the Secretary of Agriculture must make a decision whether or not to raise the price support level for milk.

The support price at the present time is \$4.66 per hundredweight, equal to just about 81 percent of parity. There is ample justification, I think, for raising that support level to \$5.15 per hundredweight. For example, our dairymen have seen a significant increase in their costs of production, and they have competition from large volumes of dairy imports. There has been a decrease in milk production in that area of our Nation which produces the major share of our total milk supply, a development which should cause concern for those who know we need to have adequate future supplies of milk.

Judging from their remarks on the floor of the House and the Senate, it is obvious that many others in Congress agree with me that an increase in the support level is needed.

Unfortunately, the Secretary of Agriculture did not agree, for we learned late last Friday that there will be no increase in the price support level for milk on April 1.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary's decision must have been made in a vacuum—with no consideration for the increasing costs of operation facing our dairy farmers, with no concern for the possibility of future milk shortages, and with no feelings whatsoever for the economic problems of those in our rural communities.

The decision of the Secretary of Agriculture not to increase the price support level for milk was linked with two other announcements: That the U.S. Government will begin to purchase domestic cheeses and that the Tariff Commission has been instructed to begin an investigation of imported cheeses selling for over 47 cents per pound.

The Secretary of Agriculture is wrong if he believes a Tariff Commission investigation of imported cheese can act as a sop for those of us who attempted to get an increase in the price-support level. The Secretary knows full well it will be months before any investigation is completed, and if the President pays as much attention to this Tariff Commission report as he did to the last such report on cheese imports, we know now that our dairy producers will continue to face serious economic problems.

The fact remains that the price support for milk is now at 81 percent of

March 17, 1971

parity, the lowest level since 1966-67 when parity was at 78 percent. At that time, many dairymen sold their herds and went out of business. If farm operating costs go up this year as much as they did last year, we could even find ourselves with a support level below the 75 percent of parity required by law.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the President told the Congress that—

Rural Americans deserve a full share in the nation's prosperity and growth.

It is certainly hard to believe he takes his own words seriously when the Secretary of Agriculture's decision Friday could very well lead to a drop in the price of milk this spring.

I have long felt, and still do, that the price-support level for milk ought to be set at the full 90 percent of parity authorized by law. I shall continue to press the Secretary of Agriculture to establish the support price as close as possible to that level, and as a start I am joining several other Members of the Congress today in the introduction of a bill which will require the support level for milk to be set at a minimum of 85 percent of parity for the marketing year beginning April 1.

I include a copy of a letter to Secretary Hardin more fully explaining my justifications for such a support price increase in the RECORD below:

MARCH 10, 1971.

Hon. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On or before April 1st of this year you must make a decision with regard to the price support level for manufacturing milk.

I hereby ask that you raise that price support level from the present \$4.66 per hundredweight, which is equivalent to 81% of parity, to the full 90% of parity authorized by law. It is my understanding this would set the support price level at approximately \$5.16 per hundredweight.

I would like to urge you also to recommend to the President that action be taken immediately to halt the tremendous influx into this country of cheeses selling for over 47 cents per pound.

Just one month ago Undersecretary of Agriculture Phil Campbell was discussing the reasons why you decided to increase the price support for milk to \$4.66 cwt in April, 1970:

...Dairymen's capital investments needed to be protected in order to supply milk demands 5 or 10 years hence—otherwise, a milk shortage might have resulted. The price support increase works out to the advantage of both the producers and the consumers."

And, said the Undersecretary:

"Consumers must realize that if they want to be assured of a continuing abundant supply of wholesale milk, they must pay the producer enough for his milk to make dairying worthwhile."

Mr. Secretary, I believe the justifications cited by Mr. Campbell which led to an increase in the price support level in 1970 are just as relevant today.

While there was a small overall increase in milk production in 1970, due largely to good weather and a decrease in pork and beef prices, the 12 north central states—those economically producing 48% of the nation's total supply of milk—showed a net decline in production of 394 million pounds when comparing the first eleven months of 1969 with the same period for 1970. With an increase in the prices of pork or beef this year, and with a decrease in our present unemployment

rates which may siphon dairy farmers off their farms, the possibility certainly exists that the production of milk may drop below adequate levels in the future.

Mr. Secretary, as the Undersecretary said, we must encourage those on our dairy farms to continue their operations so that our citizens are assured of an adequate supply of milk in the future.

In the past there have certainly been many factors which have pushed hundreds of these farmers off their farms and proved to be of great hardship for those who have stayed.

From 1952 to 1970 production costs have increased 36%. Wages farmers paid increased 7% from 1969 to 1970. Farm machinery costs increased 6% in the same period. Farmers' state and local taxes have skyrocketed, increasing 11% from 1968 to 1969. Certainly we know they haven't decreased since then.

Unless we encourage our dairy farmers to stay on their land—and we can do so by raising the price support for milk—there is always a risk that even with increased production by those who continue their operations, we may find ourselves with an inadequate supply of milk and milk products in the future.

In addition to the frustrations to our dairy farmers such as those I mentioned above, a very large increase in dairy imports over the past 3 years has caused a great deal of concern within many dairy farm communities in my District.

I am particularly concerned now with the imports of cheese selling for over 47 cents per pound.

Cheese selling for over this amount now enter the country quota-free. This 47 cents price-break has resulted in an evasion of our import quotas through the use of export subsidies, rebates and artificial pricing arrangements. Imports of such products in 1970 were 237% of what they were a year ago. Dairy imports, in general, totaled 1.92 billion pounds of milk equivalent, 119% over last year. There is adequate information, I believe, to indicate that such a large volume of imports is doing serious harm to our domestic dairy support program, and I believe action by the President is justified.

Rapidly increasing costs of production, competition from large volumes of foreign dairy products and the lure of non-farm employment all are and will continue to be of concern to our dairy farmers.

Our concern must be to provide the incentives needed to keep these farmers in business. If farmers do not have price stability, we won't have a stable milk supply. And if the price support is not set at a level which will keep these farms going, then short milk supplies will increase consumer prices well above any level that might evolve as a result of an increase in the price support level.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I believe we have ample evidence to indicate that action on two levels is needed: that we have an increase in the price support level to 90% of parity, and that action be taken to curb the importation of cheese selling for over 47 cents per pound. It will be a tremendous encouragement economically for our dairy farmers—they have little else nowadays to cheer about.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID R. OBEY,
Member of Congress.

SST: FACTS AND FOLLY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, during these next few days the Congress will decide

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the future of the supersonic transport, or SST aircraft. In making that decision, we will commit our country either to an enormous investment of money and technological resources with questionable returns in terms of profits and operational performance, or we will choose to postpone this project until such time as research enables us to build an aircraft whose performance and effects on the environment have been carefully tested to meet accepted standards.

In making a decision such as this, that will affect so critically the future of aviation in this country, we must consider not only the environmental questions, not only the economics, but the justification in terms of benefit to the public for using tax dollars to subsidize a project undertaken by the commercial aviation industry.

I insert in the RECORD an especially cogent article written by Nancy L. Chance which recently appeared in the Oyster Bay Guardian, one of the fine weekly newspapers in the Third District of New York, which I believe reflects the views of many people concerning this vital issue:

THE SST: FACTS AND FOLLY

The history of the super-sonic transport, which in our abbreviating mania we label SST, continues to be written with strong rhetoric. Every major group concerned with ecology and conservation has spoken emphatically in opposition to it, and many are lobbying actively against it in Washington. Yet its advocates remind us that other nations must not be allowed to replace us in the forefront of this headlong race for technological glory, and President Nixon has placed his administration firmly behind this argument. Since what is at stake is essentially an immense federal subsidy to the commercial aviation industry, as taxpayers we must examine carefully the potentialities of this project for which so much of our money may yet be spent.

Any evaluation of the relationship between price paid and value received must begin with a statement of actual monetary cost. Development of a single prototype will cost a minimum of \$1.5 billion, of which \$1.3 billion will come from federal funds. At least 300 SST's must be actually built and sold before the government can break even on developmental costs alone, and if the industry is subsequently unable to attract sufficient private capital for actual production of planes, the government will then be faced with the unpleasant prospect of rescuing the entire project from impending financial disaster. The argument is circular of course: possibility of future profit justifies the original expenditure, which becomes in turn the justification for massive additional expenditures so that the original investment may not be wasted. It should be noted here that the SST would cost more than twice as much per plane to build, and would consume twice the fuel per mile as the 747, which carries many more passengers. Similarly, unprofitable seat-mile costs have brought about a suspension of production in the Anglo-French Concorde, for lack of firm orders from any airline.

The total price however is paid in somewhat different coin—it is a question of the quality of life itself. Potential environmental dangers are enormous, but for the sake of current polemics no one possesses sufficiently verifiable data. The proof must wait upon the fact, but the point once proven may be irreversible: what shall we do if we discover that, in truth, disturbance of the upper atmosphere can permanently change the earth's weather patterns? And there is the noise. We are told that super-sonic flight will not be allowed over heavily populated areas. Where

then will the sonic boom come on transcontinental flights—Pittsburgh? Cleveland? Kansas City? On Aug. 28, 1970, Laurence Moss, executive secretary of the Committee for Public Engineering Policy of the National Academy of Engineering, stated before a Congressional Committee hearing on the SST: "Sideline noise will be highly objectionable at distances of 15 miles from an airport of heavy use, such as JFK."

And for the price, what is the value received? A little prestige, a bit more speed, profits for the aircraft industry—perhaps. Common Cause believes the government should end this wasteful project and instead support efforts by Boeing and other aerospace firms to diversify into fields such as antipollution activities, where their technical abilities could be better used. House and Senate Appropriations Committees will hold hearings on the SST the first week in March and the resulting Appropriations Bills will be reported out to the House the second week of March and to the Senate shortly thereafter. Common Cause urges those who feel strongly about this issue to communicate with their elected representatives in Washington.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL REVENUE SHARING PROGRAM

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that most Members of this Congress, perhaps some reluctantly, will admit that the programs of recent years designed to aid farmers and people in our small communities have been something less than successful. The same problems still exist in a greater or lesser degree, with little accomplished in a positive turnaround of direction or trend.

The Nixon administration has attempted under the existing framework to achieve better response for and within rural America. More funds have been allocated in most categories of assistance than in previous years. But, a massive assault upon the problem has not been possible because planning is on a stopgap basis rather than on intelligent long-range development.

Now this Congress has before it the first real opportunity to reverse tired, unworkable thinking and approach the problem from a new direction.

The rural development special revenue-sharing program proposes that people in the 2,600 rural counties be given decisionmaking on projects which will benefit their communities the most. In addition, the bill would return more of the financial resources which are being currently siphoned from these communities for Federal use.

We have an opportunity to offer 65 million people a chance to manage their own affairs, while benefiting the entire Nation. Harnessing the talents of rural leaders to adequate revenues to carry out projects determined to be most feasible by local planners would seem to be the best possible means of eventually reversing the flow of people into our overcrowded and troubled cities.

Freeing the Congress and national leaders from the constant specifics of determining each rural project is another

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

plus to be gained from block financing of locally conceived expansion programs.

Having been close to people in rural America for a number of years, I am convinced that there are few problems they cannot handle on an efficient plane if permitted to make use of more resources originating in rural areas—both human and financial. Coupling local initiative with a minimum of Federal assistance is surely preferred to the maze of strings tying projects presently to the Washington bureaucracy.

We have plenty of proof that existing governmental conditions have not permitted proper development of rural America. We stand to gain much, and lose nothing, by trying a different and logical course offered by this revenue-sharing legislation.

SOVIET SUBMARINE BASE AT CIENFUEGOS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Defense Laird, in his recent report to the House Armed Services Committee on March 9 of this year, pointed out that the Soviet ballistic-missile submarine fleet is presently the fastest growing element of the military threat which the Soviets pose to the survival of our Nation.

Secretary Laird stated:

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.

In the light of these facts the Soviet submarine base in Cuba takes on added significance. In order to help acquaint my colleagues with this aspect of the situation in Cuba as it develops I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point the latest intelligence report from Dr. Manolo Reyes, a noted expert on Cuba, as it was passed on to him from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance.

Following Dr. Reyes latest report is an article which appeared in the December 21, 1970, issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine which also contains information bearing on the Soviet submarine base at Cienfuegos, Cuba.

The two articles follow:

SOVIET SUBMARINE BASE AT CIENFUEGOS, CUBA

We have just received new information from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance referring to the Russian Naval Base in Cienfuegos Bay, in Cuba. The new information reveals, among other things, the perimeter of that base. On the water, the extension of the Russian Naval Base is of about 4½ miles. On land, on closed littoral, from La Milpa to Punta Gorda, it is of almost 15 miles.

According to the report received from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance, The Russian Naval Base in Cienfuegos occupies the South, South East, East and North East parts of the Cienfuegos Bay. That is, from the tip of La Milpa towards the East of the Laguna de Guanaroca. From there, towards the Ensenada de las Calabazas, including, of course, Cayo Colorado, Punta de la Trompada, the mouth of the Caonao River, the Estero de Bada, the tip of La Hierba up to Punta Gorda. Therefore, the sections of Laredo, Playa Alegre and Punta Gorda have been vacated. All of these places mentioned before, and that form the perimeter of the Russian Naval Base, are precisely in the hands of the Russians.

In Punta Gorda, where the Naval Base mentioned before, ends, the militaries have taken possession of all the houses, according to the Resistance. In the attached photograph, taken some years ago, you can appreciate the extension of about two blocks of Punta Gorda, where there are some ten houses. All of them have been occupied by Russian Naval officers, while the so called Bulgarian and Russian technicians are staying at the Hotel Jagua in Punta Gorda.

The Resistance also informs that the house marked with an arrow, and of which you can see the top part of the building, belonged for many years to the Cacicedo family, from whom it was stolen by the Castro-communist regime. The house is two stories high, with eight rooms, six bathrooms, a wide hall on both floors and is of Spanish style. At present, that house is constantly visited by Fidel Castro. And the offices of the Communist Party have been established there and it is where the Russian Naval Staff meets, sometimes by itself, sometimes with Castro. Not over six Russian Naval officials of high rank have taken part of these meetings. Raul Castro has also been at the meetings.

The high Russian Naval officers that go to Cuba, according to the Resistance, meet in Punta Gorda. But later they go, apparently, to rest at the facilities built in Cayo Alcatraz. Facilities that are far superior to the ones available to the noble Cuban people at present. The Resistance informs that the facilities at Cayo Alcatraz are also for the change of crews from the surface units and submarines of the Soviet Union. According to the report, Fidel and Raul Castro have gone to Cayo Alcatraz. No other Cuban is permitted at present in that key. The same is totally in the hands of the Russians. Finally, the Resistance says that Fidel Castro has ordered the fast construction of a bridge over the Caonao River where a strictly military road passes towards the Russian Naval Base. That military road leaves from a point of the Cienfuegos road to the Tomas Asea Cemetery, and goes directly South, passing over the Caonao River, near its mouth, crossing the San Mateo farm up to a place called El Laberinto de los Naturales, near Guanaroca. Up to here the latest information received from the Cuban Patriotic Resistance about Cienfuegos.

SOVIETS BOOST CARIBBEAN PRESENCE
(By Cecil Brownlow)

WASHINGTON—Soviet Union is building towards an impressive strategic naval strength in the Caribbean to pose a direct, immediate threat to the U.S. mainland and to provide

political-military muscle for Moscow-oriented organizations throughout Latin America.

Home base for these operations is Communist Cuba, where the Russians already have in place a base for nuclear-powered submarines that could become operational in a matter of days. From this base in Cienfuegos (Hundred Fires) in south central Cuba, Russian Y-class nuclear-powered, ballistic-missile submarines could launch their ordnance from port, if necessary, striking U.S. East Coast targets as far north as Boston. Primary mission of the base, however, would be to provide a replenishing point for the submarines, substantially extending the time they could remain near their assigned stations off the U.S. coast in the Caribbean and Atlantic.

The Y-class submarine carries 16 1,500-mile range ballistic missiles that can be fired while the vessel is surfaced or submerged. It is similar in range and ordnance-delivery capabilities to the U.S. Navy's Lockheed Polaris fleet ballistic missile system. Weapons accuracy and submarine reactor safety are considered somewhat inferior to those of the Polaris, but U.S. officials believe the Soviets are rapidly overcoming these shortcomings. Pentagon authorities also estimate the Russians will have 35-50 Y-class submarines operational by 1974-75.

The Soviet buildup in the Caribbean is a further reflection of that nation's increasing strategic strength and assurance in comparison with the relatively-declining position of the U.S., with its reduced defense budgets and a creeping public sentiment for a return to its isolationist past. Russia has continued to build additional intercontinental ballistic missiles and ballistic-missile submarines. The U.S. has stood on the quantitative par it reached in 1969.

The buildup also closely follows the pattern of the Soviet navy's expanded presence in the Mediterranean, once considered a U.S. "mare nostrum" as is the Caribbean today. The increasing Russian strength in the Mediterranean, designed to increase its political posture in the Middle East and to intimidate members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's southern flank, already has virtually pushed the U.S. Navy from the eastern end of that particular ocean (AW&ST Mar. 30, p. 14).

The Russian presence in the Caribbean may never reach its Mediterranean proportions so far as numbers of ships are concerned. Logistics is more difficult, and intimidation of the U.S. and Latin American governments from there much easier. But, there is little doubt the Soviets are moving into the Caribbean to stay. Among the indications aside from Cienfuegos:

Soviet nuclear- and diesel-powered submarines plus surface vessels have been carefully charting the Caribbean ocean floor and operational conditions for the past several years, particularly the two major passages through the West Indies to South America. Searches usually are conducted by flotillas composed of no more than four ships to dampen U.S. concern. Submarines have included the November-class anti-submarine-warfare (ASW) nuclear-powered attack vessel with excellent sonar facilities to help chart the ocean depths.

A Russian task group currently is visiting Cuba, docked at the southern Cuban naval base of Antilla. Force is composed of a Foxtrot-class diesel-powered submarine, an ASW frigate, with good sonar capabilities, and a tanker.

Soviet Tupolev Tu-95 Bear long-range reconnaissance aircraft have begun to make regular visits to Havana on nonstop flights to and from Russia, establishing a presence and gathering reconnaissance at the same time. Four flights of the four-turboprop air-

craft, with an unrefueled range of 7,800 mi., have been recorded by the U.S. since April. Three of the four were composed of two-aircraft formations; the third had three.

The first two flights were detected in April, during the course of the wide-ranging Soviet Okean fleet maneuver exercises. The third came in May. The fourth flight of two Bears was observed earlier this month by U.S. Air Force General Dynamics/Convair F-106 interceptors flying off the Florida coast. Estimated Russia-Havana flight time for the aircraft without refueling is 17 hr. U.S. officials believe a backup crew is carried on such missions.

Thus far, no Soviet nuclear submarines have pulled into Cienfuegos, primarily because of sharp U.S. protests to Moscow when the construction of shore facilities was detected in September by USAF/Lockheed U-2 high-altitude aircraft. This detection was later confirmed by Navy/Lockheed P-3 reconnaissance planes hastily dispatched from the mainland to Guantanamo Bay, the isolated U.S. Navy enclave near the southern end of Castro's Cuba, to aid in the surveillance.

But there is no doubt that Cienfuegos can be transformed to operational status within a minimum of time, despite Soviet assurances that it has no plans to take such a step and apparent State Dept. willingness to accept them.

Best reason to suspect Soviet intentions—and its October announcement that it is not constructing "its military base in Cuba"—is the continued presence in Cienfuegos of two specially constructed Russian barges. They have been built to accept the radioactive effluent salt-water waste from Soviet nuclear-powered submarines.

Soviet submarine reactors use salt water as a coolant, as opposed to the pressurized distilled water reactors employed on U.S. nuclear vessels. The former method creates an in-port radiation hazard since the salt crystals in the water become highly irradiated during the cooling process.

The two barges are designed to accept the effluent waste from any visiting nuclear-powered submarine. They then would be towed into the Caribbean or Atlantic to dump the radioactive water. The submarines do not discharge the water while at sea. To do so would leave an easily identifiable trace for tracking U.S. ASW aircraft and vessels.

After the U.S. September complaints concerning the Cienfuegos buildup, the Russians did remove a submarine tender from the harbor, perhaps the second best after Guantanamo as a ship anchorage in the Caribbean. The tender, however, has continued to hover in the region.

At least some military specialists concerned with the problem believe the Russians will continue to "low profile" their Cienfuegos capability until their production permits them to base approximately 10 Y-class submarines in the harbor. Then, their military presence might be strong enough to resist U.S. political efforts to force them to leave.

The shift in strategic nuclear power since 1962 leaves the U.S. in a much more vulnerable bargaining position than it enjoyed at that time when it forced the Soviets to remove their growing network of ground-based/intermediate range ballistic missiles from Cuba. The Cuban-based fleet ballistic missiles could achieve the same intimidation objectives with the added factor of mobility.

In addition to the barges, Cienfuegos harbor has been equipped with a steel submarine net stretching across the deep channel of the harbor from the mainland to the island of Cayo de Carenas. Shallow water areas of other portions of the bay would make it difficult for U.S. attack submarines to penetrate the area without detection.

A recreation area and barracks complex for enlisted men from the submarines also have been constructed on Cayo de Carenas.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Logistics storage areas, a communications center and 40-mm. anti-aircraft gun emplacements to defend the harbor have been built on the mainland. The emplacements had been occupied, but the guns were withdrawn following the U.S. complaint. The mobile weapons could be returned to position on short notice.

There are no submarine repair facilities on the island or mainland. Nor is there any indication that the Russians plan to stock missiles there to resupply the submarines after they have expended their initial stores of ordnance. The supposition is that the submarines, if ordered to launch their missiles, would then be instructed to return to their home base in the Soviet Union.

The U.S. contends it reached a "verbal agreement" with Soviet authorities in October that the latter would not establish a nuclear submarine base in Cuba, reaffirming terms of an earlier 1962 pact under which Russia removed its land-based IRBMs from that island. But, both State Dept. and Pentagon officials have been chary of dwelling upon the specifics.

Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird has conceded, however, that the Soviet tender in Caribbean waters might still be employed to service nuclear submarines outside Cuban territorial limits, increasing their time on station by 33-40%. Y-class submarines have been operating off the U.S. Atlantic coast for the past year.

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the over 1,600 American men listed as Prisoners of War/Missing in Action in Southeast Asia has been the subject of much discussion in this Chamber. The mistreatment of these men at the hands of their captors has been echoed by concerned individuals and groups, both at home and abroad. And what has been, and what must continue to be emphasized is the dual imposition of torture by the North Vietnamese Government. Not only are the American prisoners of war being maltreated and being denied the decency and care to which they are entitled, but their wives, children and parents have undergone untold suffering from being denied even the most basic information on the condition and whereabouts of these missing and captured servicemen.

What has been lacking in this drive to force the North Vietnamese to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Accords, which they have signed, is a joint effort on the part of all Americans, a unified show of support for our men who are being held prisoner or whose whereabouts are unknown. Because of this, Congressmen MYERS, ZION, and I introduced a bill to designate the week of March 21-27 as a "National Week of Concern for Prisoners of War/Missing in Action." We were very gratified to have over 170 Members of the House join us in cosponsoring this legislation which has been passed by both Houses of Congress and is due to be signed into law by the President

this week. I am hopeful that this week of concern will mark the beginning of a renewed effort on behalf of these American men. We have taken out a special order on Tuesday, March 23, and we would like to invite our colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join us on the floor that day in expressing support for our POW/MIA's.

The present administration is very much aware of the need for a revitalized effort in this area. President Nixon chose the occasion of the annual Gridiron Club dinner on March 13th to pledge once more his own firm commitment to "obtain the release of all our prisoners as soon as possible." In the President's words:

Let us give it our continued dedication and continued public understanding, for the sake of the prisoners, for the sake of their families, and for the sake of human decency.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to commend the full text of the President's statement to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, READ BY SECRETARY OF STATE WILLIAM P. ROGERS AT THE GRIDIRON CLUB DINNER

It is appropriate that, as the one solemn note on this evening's program, the Gridiron Club has chosen a matter of deep humanitarian concern to all Americans—the plight of more than 1600 U.S. military men captured or missing in Southeast Asia. Some of our men have been in Prisoner of War camps for more than six years, many with no word ever to their families. Many of the families endure the anguish of not knowing whether their man is dead or alive.

There are many kinds of heroism in wartime: the raw courage of the soldier or marine in the field; the skill under pressure of the air crew in combat; the dedication of the corpsman going after the wounded under fire. Another kind of heroism is that imposed in meeting the ordeal of prolonged captivity.

The three men standing before you have survived that test—but they know, and we all know, that there are hundreds of others who continue to endure prolonged confinement. We salute these three men tonight, and in doing so we honor their comrades who remain in enemy hands, and the many who are missing. And also we honor their comrades who have given their lives to the service of our Nation.

I know all of us are concerned about the problem of those who are Prisoners of War or missing in action. As journalists many of you have reported on this humanitarian problem. Growing public interest and concern about our POW's stems to a large extent from what the news media have done. Your reporting has brought information to citizens around the world and comfort to the families by letting them know these are not forgotten men, far from it. We believe that some of the progress that has been made in obtaining information about those captured in Southeast Asia results from the awakening of public opinion as a result of your news reports.

All of us are concerned also about your American journalist colleagues who are missing or captured in Southeast Asia as well as the dozen other journalists of other nations who may be in communist hands.

I fervently hope that all Americans will continue to support efforts to obtain the release of all our prisoners as soon as possible, as I proposed on October 7, 1970. So let us join our prayers to this purpose. And let us give it our continued dedication and continued public understanding, for the sake of the prisoners, for the sake of their families, and for the sake of human decency.

TRUTH ARISES IN AG CRISES

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is often difficult under the best of circumstances and the most sincere purposes to ascertain the truth when conflicting allegations are bandied about.

The truth is even more difficult to ascertain when the subject is remote and willful efforts are made to deceive.

The farm-labor crises in California are examples of how the truth can be subverted and persons can be misled when they are able to learn only from a single source.

The truth about the farm-labor crisis is emerging; however, more information is necessary. The tone of the eastern press has begun to reflect a new and more informed attitude concerning the reasons for the attempted strikes and boycotts of California lettuce; however, more accuracy is necessary. Some light is beginning to shine; but much darkness remains.

I urge Members of the Congress to keep an open mind until all of the evidence is in. I urge the committees of the Congress which may be called upon to consider legislation in the farm labor field to conduct hearings in the field, to solicit testimony and evidence from the persons involved and affected before any decisions are made.

I insert a copy of a recent editorial from the Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, which I urge everyone residing outside of California to read:

TRUTH ARISES IN AG CRISES

Slowly but tellingly, the truth about the continuous crisis in California agriculture—first in grapes, then in melons, currently in lettuce—is coming to light. Fact after fact has been produced. And, as each fact appears the effort of Cesar Chavez's United Farm Workers to control crop production is revealed to be the nefarious scheme that it is.

Within the past week came the debunking by health authorities of UFWOC's cry that field workers have been physically harmed by pesticides and fertilizers used by growers. Chavez has claimed that "hundreds of workers" are poisoned each year.

State Department of Agriculture officials checked with the chief health officer of Monterey County, which contains the world's lettuce-growing capital—Salinas. "In 1969 there were no cases of harmful effect caused by this source," replied Monterey's Dr. R. S. Fraser. "In 1970 there were three cases. The three cases were extremely minor in nature and after treatment the workers returned to their jobs." Studies in other leading crop counties—Kern, San Joaquin, Imperial, Sacramento, Fresno—produced similar reports.

Only a few dozen incidents in a two-year period, among more than 20,000 workers, could be found. Which, says the Free Marketing Council in Los Angeles, is ample evidence that UFWOC has spread an untrue story of death and rampant disability across the country.

Meanwhile the Marketing Council is sending representatives across the United States, showing civil leaders that our harvesters do not live in the neglect and poverty painted by Chavez—but, in fact, are the highest-paid in the nation. State figures show workers average \$2.90 per hour. In specialized lettuce-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cutting, income averages \$160 per week for 39 hours of work, or \$8200 per year for 50 weeks of labor. UFWOC propagandizes that farm housing is a disgrace. The State Department of Housing and Community Development points to 2000 new living units built for workers in recent years and with no shortage of homes. In California, under a deal with the federal government, migrant workers are paid to build their own prefabricated homes—after they are given free training in construction work.

Lack of protection under law for the field hand is still another old UFWOC allegation.

This week the U.S. Department of Labor stated that of 10 protective laws recommended to the states by Labor, California has nine in effect. In the protective-law area, no state other than this one has more than six of the prescribed statutes on its books. This is the only state, for instance, which provides temporary disability insurance (\$25 to \$87 per week, plus \$12 daily hospital benefit) to ill or injured farmworkers. We are among the few with a minimum wage law, wage-collection laws and farm-labor-camp regulation laws.

Boycotting of lettuce has been called a "success" by militants under Chavez. If so, the Teamsters Union is not aware of it. As of Feb. 7, the Teamsters refused to truck any "black eagle" insignia UFWOC lettuce into Los Angeles or San Francisco and this week reported their act had been close to 100 per cent effective. At the moment, very little lettuce carrying the Chavez stamp of approval is available in either city.

Point after point, fact after fact, has been hammered home to those outside the state who have been misled.

And, the farm industry assures us, this is only the beginning.

BRIDGE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND ARAB WORLD

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a lot of thinking is going on in Israel today about the political future of the area. While in Jerusalem recently, I read with interest an article in the Jerusalem Post which was introduced by the editor, as follows:

An economic and political federation of independent Jewish and Arab states on both sides of the Jordan is the only hope for lasting peace in our area, writes Naftali H. Bein in this Personal Viewpoint column. Such a development might take 10 to 20 years, and the resultant commonwealth would serve as a genuine bridge between Israel and the Arab world, he believes.

The text of Mr. Bein's article follows:

FEDERAL WAY TO M.E. PEACE

If we genuinely want peace, security and the integrity of the character of our own state within the wholeness of the Holy Land, within its historical borders on both sides of the Jordan—as we do—and if the Arabs demand a similar status for themselves—as they do—then both parties can have that only in the form of an economic and political federation of two independent states, Israel on one hand, and an Arab Palestinian-Jordan state on both sides of the Jordan.

The latter should receive Gaza as its seaport and a free-zone in Haifa port. No corridors should be needed, because both peoples would be accorded full freedom of move-

March 17, 1971

ment and residence, and gradually also of work and settlement, in all parts of a joint federal commonwealth. This would develop through vision and goodwill, in natural stages during 10 to 20 years, into the flourishing whole of Eretz-Yisrael and "Falastin" respectively.

DEFENCE COOPERATION

Such a union could begin its common administration with a joint committee for defence and foreign affairs, backed by some kind of a joint defence organization. This nucleus would gradually and necessarily develop, in the course of time, into a full-fledged federal government under which the final borders between the two states would certainly lose much of their present importance. The name and constitutional character of the Arab state would be for the Arabs alone to decide. Any representative leadership of it should be welcome to us.

The Arab Palestine-Jordan state thus federated with Israel would serve as a genuine bridge between us and the Arab world, whose moral backing it would enjoy. Israel, on the other hand, would be a convenient bridge for the Arabs to the best achievements of western civilisation, without any strings attached. Our present efforts in the West Bank represent a good start for such beneficial co-operation. Mass tourism would enter from both sides to the Holy Places of the three great religions, all properly supervised by their own autonomous religious authorities and their integrity internationally guaranteed.

Re-united Jerusalem, never in history any nation's capital other than that of the Jewish people, should remain a united municipality and Israel's capital. It should, however, also become the federation's central administrative seat and in its final stage its capital. An Arab local government constituency arrangement and the option of Jerusalem's Arab residents to choose between the citizenships of Israel and the Arab state, without prejudice to their full municipal rights, should go far to meet Arab national aspirations in the Jerusalem region. Without underestimating the many difficulties and obstacles in the way of its execution, such a solution should be attainable.

A federation on such lines would probably become in due course the stable nucleus for some kind of a Middle Eastern Common Market.

A federal solution would considerably facilitate an equitable solution of the refugee problem, obviously one of the pre-requisites of a lasting peace with the Arabs. The economy of the Arab federal partner, rapidly developing with our constructive aid, would eagerly absorb a good deal of the valuable man-power, senselessly wasted for so many years in dreadful refugee camps. The grievances caused by the harsh conditions in the camps would disappear and with them a good deal of the hostility of the previous camp inmates.

For other refugees within and outside the occupied territories places of work and resettlement should be found elsewhere by joint efforts and with international assistance. It goes without saying that generous compensation should be provided for all those whose property was expropriated or destroyed or should also be made for the reunion of families and other hardship cases in Israel proper.

A TURNING POINT

The public declaration of this peace concept might mean a turning point in our political situation and in that of the Middle East. A new wave of goodwill would be created among our friends and would-be-friends in the world. It would help to forestall the superficially conceived or inimical peace plans offered so generously by friend and foe alike.

It would certainly strengthen the hand of the moderates in the Arab countries and

especially on the West Bank. It would soon make armed resistance against us appear superfluous and would help to clip the wings of the terrorists. In the absence of any other solution, all sides might ultimately be won over, hopefully, to such an equitable and attainable compromise.

Unfortunately, the Arab-Israel conflict, originally confined to the Palestine problem, has gradually expanded into a power conflict between Israel, with the Jewish people in the world behind it, and the Arab world, the latter mainly represented by Egypt, its strongest and most ambitious power. Dangerously behind it looms a possible super-power conflict. Obviously, the Jarring talks' main task will have to be to defuse this dangerous conflict and to disengage both sides from the heavily armed confrontation on the Egyptian front. Even this, however, will hardly be possible, if we cannot show at least a tangible concept intended to solve the Palestine problem, the origin and hard core of the conflict.

ANNEXATION

The idea of an Arab-Israel coexistence, based on a federal solution as elaborated above, has steadily gained support during the last years in Israel. Events and developments in this area since last summer have strengthened the tendency in this direction. It may well be assumed that such a peace movement should now be endorsed by a majority of our population. It may replace the senseless movements for and against withdrawal from the occupied territories. It certainly should take the sting out of the suicidal movement for large-scale annexations. Contrary to all these movements, which can only destroy the unity of our people without reaching anything positive, the proposed peace movement would tend to unite most of them.

WAVE EDITORIAL RECOMMENDS STIFFER SENTENCES FOR DRUNK DRIVERS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, WAVE, a radio and television station in Louisville broadcast an editorial pertaining to the fatalities that have occurred on Kentucky and Indiana highways attributable to drunk drivers.

The editorial cites the experiences of Judge Baymond Berg, of the Cook County, Chicago traffic court who imposes a minimum sentence of 7 days in jail and a year's suspension of a driver's license for anyone convicted of drunk driving. A reduction of 40 percent in traffic deaths in Chicago during January and February of this year as compared to 1970 is attributed to the judge's stern punishment.

I commend the editorial to the attention of our colleagues.

I include the article as follows:

DRUNK DRIVING

More than 1,200 people might be alive in Indiana and Kentucky today if drinking drivers had stayed off the highways last year.

National statistics indicate that roughly half the traffic fatalities are caused by people who drink and drive. Most of them are social drinkers. And the great majority of those who have a few drinks believe they are still capable of driving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Safety authorities have tried everything. There are fines, assessment of points, traffic school, suspension of licenses and a continuing appeal for the traffic courts to be tough. The results are only partly successful.

However, we've heard of one program that seems to be quite effective. In Chicago, Cook County Traffic Court Judge Baymond Berg has a simple formula he applies to anyone convicted of drunk driving. Loss of license for a year and at least seven days in jail. Judge Berg started his plan in December. During January and February of this year there were 19 fewer traffic deaths in Chicago than in the same period a year ago, which represents a reduction of 40 percent.

Kentucky recorded more than 1000 highway deaths during 1970. The state of Indiana had more than 1500. Drinking and driving is blamed for about half the total. Which means about 1200 people were victims of drivers who had had too much alcohol.

Judge Berg's plan might also work in Kentucky and Indiana. We admit it's harsh punishment. But measure that against the loss of a life.

EARTH DAY

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I introduced House Joint Resolution 406 calling for the designation of March 21, the Vernal Equinox, as "Earth Day." I want to advocate this resolution as proper and fitting for Congress to enact.

First, I think such a congressional designation would be appropriate to set 1 day aside to focus national and world attention on our earth. The environmental enthusiasm we all know is being expressed is not a transitory expression but an expression that I think will prove a lasting, as well as a very legitimate, concern. The Congress should foster and commemorate this concern.

The Vernal Equinox is an appropriate day as historically the beginning of spring has been a time of celebration. Unfortunately, relatively few people today, except perhaps for lovers and poets, pay enough attention to this fundamentally appealing occasion. We in Congress can repair this oversight by encouraging everyone to participate in Earth Day.

The Vernal Equinox, March 21, marks the day when most of the world's population, those of us who live in the increasingly crowded and increasingly polluted Northern Hemisphere, put drab winter behind and welcome spring. Traditionally with spring, the earth itself forces all of us to observe a certain equality; namely, whether you live in Greenland, Gambia, New York, or the Netherlands, on the first day of spring you enjoy exactly 12 hours of daylight and 12 hours of darkness. The beginning of spring emphasizes man's equality and is a time symbolic of hope and the regeneration of life.

The United Nations Secretary-General, U Thant, has already signed an Earth Day proclamation for the celebration of Earth Day on March 21, 1971. This commemoration by the U.N. is a fresh example of what President Eisen-

hower called a "people to people program." This proclamation has already been signed by a number of eminent personalities, including Col. Buzz Aldrin, U.S. astronaut; Luther H. Evans, former director-general of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; Miss Margaret Mead, anthropologist; Miss Estelle Feldman, chairman of the Commission on Man and Environment of the 1970 World Youth Assembly, and Chief S. O. Adebo, executive director of the United Nations Institute for Train and Research. This country can follow the U.N. lead and take the leadership to designate a day for environmental focus. We should do this.

The UN Secretary-General will issue a message in connection with the observance of Earth Day, and will attend a private ceremony at United Nations Headquarters at which the Peace Bell will be rung. The ceremony will take place at 2 p.m. on Sunday, March 21, the hour of the signing of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

Many fine groups such as Kiwanis, church groups, and neighborhood associations organized for a variety of other purposes are endorsing Earth Day and are making plans for this purpose. Under the uniting slogan "Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of their planet" organizations with more traditional direct connection with the fight to improve our environment, especially in high schools and colleges, are planning to take time out from their daily activities in this field to rededicate themselves by joining in what could easily become a worldwide event.

A single day could provide the sharp focus for nationwide media and could perhaps best foster an awareness and careful examination of our environmental predicament.

I urge the Judiciary Committee's consideration of the designation of Earth Day and the reporting out of House Joint Resolution 406.

POSTAL CLERKS CELEBRATE 40TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize the 40th anniversary of the United Federation of Postal Clerks, Santa Clara Local 1832 which will be this Saturday, March 20. This group deserves our recognition not only as a valuable and responsible labor organization, but also as a civic-minded group. They have been active in community projects, such as the youth athletic league as well as other programs for the benefit of the people of the city of Santa Clara, Calif. I would like to congratulate all the members of the local on this 40th anniversary and commend their efforts to be of service to the city of Santa Clara.

SST—SYMBOL OF EXTRAVAGANCE
FOR THE WEALTHY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, since my election to Congress I have at every opportunity opposed the continued Government subsidy of development costs for the supersonic transport plane. Since my last vote, I have followed the arguments for and against this project, and find I still oppose this expenditure of taxpayers' money.

Although I share the deep concern of conservationists about the possible long-range consequences to our environment should this plane become a reality, my basic objections are and have been, economic and social in nature. For us to pour billions of taxpayers' dollars into a project which, even should it prove successful beyond the wildest dreams of its promoters, would admittedly provide only additional luxury transport for a handful of rich world travelers is, in my opinion, both questionable economics and bad governmental policy.

Every government at any time must make the choice between socially useful and socially useless activity. It is essentially on the balance of these two extremes that governments and nations rise or fall. For any government such a symbol as the SST which represents concern for the rich over the needs of the many, would be questionable. But for a country whose mass transportation system is a shambles, a country in which the average citizen in average circumstances cannot travel 50 miles with any degree of comfort or speed, such a symbol of taxpayer money lavished on such a travel luxury item as the SST is a symbol of social irresponsibility. It is a choice for a socially useless project as opposed to potential socially useful activities which surround us.

There is no question that the SST once in production will provide employment. The problem in my mind, however, is that it is socially useless employment.

With our cities fast becoming crime-ridden, bankrupt shambles; with our Nation's railroads either bankrupt or teetering on the edge of bankruptcy, with mass transportation virtually nonexistent; with the danger of this once clean and beautiful land of ours becoming a septic society drowned in its own pollution, surely this \$290 million we are being asked to lavish on the SST can be put to some greater social good. The scientific knowledge and engineering talents of our Nation could be directed to meeting these critical, immediate concerns. These are the needs of all Americans.

As to the supposed economic necessity of this proposed project, I place into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this date, which deals quite fully and explicitly with that fallacy.

SWALLOWING A LEMON

The economic arguments against the supersonic transport continue to pile up. In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Prof. George W. Rathjens of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology warned Congress against buying "a pig in a poke." He demonstrated that design changes intended to reduce the SST's severe noise level would almost certainly mean such increases in the plane's weight and operating costs that it could not be a profitable plane.

However, on the other side of the Capitol yesterday the House Appropriations Committee approved the full \$290 million requested for SST by the Administration. The House will vote later this week on the measure, which will then be taken up in the Senate.

Prof. Paul Samuelson of M.I.T., a Nobel Prize winning economist, has described the plane succinctly as perhaps "the biggest lemon ever devised" in Washington. He refuted the contention that this country has to build its own SST to compete in the world aviation market with the Anglo-French Concorde. The plane's backers use this argument on both sides of the Atlantic, insisting in London and Paris that the Concorde is needed to head off the Americans and insisting in Washington that the SST is needed to head off the Europeans.

SST advocates also like to have it both ways in another stage of the argument. When the possible danger of the plane's vapor to the thin air of the upper atmosphere is pointed out, they plausibly insist that only two or three prototypes are being built for test purposes. But when the possible jobs and profits are being glowingly described, they admit that they want fleets of these planes built.

Professor Samuelson testified that the SST would be "relatively ineffective" in providing jobs. This is the answer to the theme that the labor unions are hammering hard in their pro-SST lobbying. There is a case to be made for stimulating the economy, and the expenditure of \$2 billion in public funds, whether spent for this useless airplane or for building pyramids, would be a stimulus. But with schools, hospitals, housing, mass transit, medical research, care of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded and dozens of other social institutions and programs desperately pinched for money. It is fantastic that the A.F.L.-C.I.O. is beating on Congressmen's doors in behalf of this supersonic lemon.

The Machinists Union hopes that additional jobs may develop for its members if the SST proves viable and if the airlines buy it. But most of these hypothetical jobs are some years in the distance and may never materialize if the plane's operating costs make it a commercial failure. It is one thing to invest public funds in a worthwhile social project. It is another to gamble them against the economic odds in a project for which there is no dependable market, no customer demand, and no redeeming social purpose. It is strange that the A.F.L.-C.I.O. cannot tell the difference.

Mr. Speaker, for these reasons, without even touching upon the environmental questionability of this project, I shall continue to vote against additional funds for the SST.

DR. FREDERIC SUTTER

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, early this year Staten Island lost a distinguished citizen and churchman when Rev. Dr. Frederic Sutter died at the age of 95. A church in Stapleton,

March 17, 1971

built under his direction in 1914, stands as but one monument to his humanitarianism; his greater monuments are the thousands of islanders who were touched by his gentleness and belief in God. An article from the Staten Island Advance, written by Christine Keene, describes the work of this tireless champion of the community. I commend the article to my colleagues:

CHURCH, COLLEGE, COMMUNITY IN LAST
FAREWELL TO DR. SUTTER

(By Christine Keene)

The Rev. Dr. Frederic Sutter, whose list of achievements and honors stretched as long as his 95 years, was buried yesterday from Trinity Lutheran Church in Stapleton, an institution that is synonymous with the Sutter name.

The son of a German stonecutter, Dr. Sutter rose to prominence on Staten Island for his tireless efforts on behalf of his Stapleton church, his alma mater, Wagner College, and the Island community. He died Sunday in Staten Island Hospital following a stroke.

Hundreds of mourners crowded into the 57-year-old church, filing past a stone bust of Dr. Sutter that was given to Wagner College 17 years ago.

BUILT IN 1914

The towering, stone church, built in 1914 under Dr. Sutter's direction, seemed a fitting place to pay tribute to the clergyman who had ministered there for more than six decades.

The clergyman's grandson, the president of Wagner College, the assistant pastor of Trinity Church and the president of the Metropolitan Synod of the Lutheran Church in America took turns conducting the funeral service."

The Rev. Carl R. Sutter of San Francisco, a grandson of Dr. Sutter and the third generation of Sutters serving the Lutheran Church as clergymen, delivered the invocation prayers and read a psalm, while the Rev. Robert C. Wakefield, assistant pastor of the Stapleton church, read the Bible lessons and gave the benediction.

The Rev. James A. Graefe, president of the Metropolitan Synod, delivered the address praising Dr. Sutter's "unselfish service" in "never losing sight of living hope" throughout all his years of work.

Dr. Arthur O. Davidson, president of Wagner College, an institution Dr. Sutter bolstered and shaped in its early history on Staten Island and continued to watch over ever since, gave the eulogy.

KEEP COLLEGE ALIVE

"Chairman of the board of trustees for over 40 years, instrumental in moving Wagner College to Staten Island from Rochester, N.Y., in 1918, acting president of the college three times and chairman emeritus the last 12 years, he kept the college alive, then firmed its foundation and directed its purpose and growth," Dr. Davidson said.

Dr. Davidson stressed the late clergyman's continuing interest in the college and its students.

"He spent much time on the campus," he continued. "He talked to freshman classes on opening day for 52 years, attended athletic events until last year and participated in the planning, groundbreaking and dedication of every building on the campus erected since 1918."

In 1951, Dr. Davidson said, the college that Dr. Sutter often referred to as "the baby left on his doorstep" named its newly constructed gymnasium after him.

The Wagner president said Dr. Sutter would be remembered as "pastor . . . not to Trinity alone . . . not to the Lutheran Church . . . not to Wagner College alone . . . but to us all."

At the conclusion of the service, the pur-

ple-draped coffin was wheeled from the church and placed in a hearse across from Dr. Sutter's residence at 332 St. Paul's Ave.

The esteemed clergyman's family, including his three sons, the Rev. Dr. Carl J. Sutter, pastor of Trinity Church, and Herbert, and Frederick; his five grandchildren and six great grandchildren followed the hearse to Moravian Cemetery, where Dr. Sutter was buried beside his wife of 55 years, Emma, who died in 1954.

The tributes and memorials to Dr. Sutter are likely to continue for several months.

The Rev. Frederick Boos, principal of Trinity Lutheran School, conducted a memorial service for Dr. Sutter this morning in the church attended by the children of the school.

Wagner College also plans a memorial to him at the beginning of the spring semester.

THE LATE WHITNEY M. YOUNG

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I mark the death of Whitney M. Young, executive director of the National Urban League. He was a man of integrity, honor and high conviction who was devoted to protecting the civil rights and promoting the economic improvement of the black citizens of the United States. He was a practical man, knowledgeable in politics and government, and yet he was deeply committed Commonwealth of Kentucky and spent equality for all Americans.

Whitney Young was a native of the commonwealth of Kentucky and spent his early, formative years there. His father was a prominent educator in Kentucky and doubtless young Whitney learned much about life and love of his fellow man at his father's knee.

Upon receiving his army discharge at the close of World War II, Whitney Young enrolled in the University of Minnesota for graduate study and was awarded a master's degree in social work. In 1947 he accepted a position as director of industrial relations and vocational guidance with the St. Paul, Minn., chapter of the National Urban League, an agency dedicated to the eradication of racial prejudice and job discrimination in America. With the exception of a few years' service as dean of the School of Social Work at Atlanta University, he was to remain with the National Urban League for the rest of his life. In 1961 he assumed the position of executive director.

Under the authority of Whitney Young, the National Urban League was to become one of the truly influential non-governmental forces in the United States working toward the self-sufficiency of the poor American whether black or white. There were 60 chapters of the Urban League when Whitney Young took over the reins a decade ago. Today there are 98 chapters. It was mainly through his strong efforts that many millions of dollars are spent yearly by various agencies, public and private, to aid poor and deprived citizens of this country.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Whitney Young did not stress public protests to call attention to the inequities suffered by his people. But, rather, he worked hard and untiringly in the halls of Congress and at all levels of Government to find and fund cures for these inequities. He was quite effective in his dealings with governmental officials and private citizens, and he became quickly one of the most influential civil rights leaders in the world.

In the early days of the administration of President Johnson, Whitney Young proposed a number of recommendations designed to help poor people get back into the mainstream of America. Many of these proposals were adopted as parts of the antipoverty program which continues to brighten the lives of millions of Americans.

Whitney Young opposed violence and destruction as strongly as he opposed prejudice. He stood always for reason and rationality and understanding at a time in American history when such traits are rare commodities.

He will be sorely missed. But, hopefully, his counsel and his wisdom will live on to help America weather the crises of the future.

PUBLIC MAY LOSE MILLIONS ON SST CONTRACT DEFICIENCIES

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have supported Government participation in the development of the SST. I recognize the seemingly distorted sense of priority of investing vast sums in this highly sophisticated area as contrasted to devoting the money to other highly deserving programs. But, in the ultimate sense, I do not believe that the Nation can afford to cast the SST in terms of an all-or-nothing alternative. Development of the SST is not necessarily at the expense of our continuing struggle against poverty, ignorance, and disease. In fact, technological breakthroughs offer much hope for the advancement of our sciences and often contribute many times their cost in benefits to mankind. The SST program is a vital part of this search for technological breakthroughs, and I have supported this effort up to now.

One facet of the SST program, however, which has not received the attention it deserves is whether the United States is prudently investing tax funds in the development of this aircraft which will be returned in the form of royalties, or whether we are simply making a gift of tax funds to the airlines and the airframe manufacturers. With hundreds of millions of dollars in tax funds involved, this question is of utmost importance as we consider the appropriation of more funds for this program.

In my opinion, the present arrangement between the Federal Government and Boeing does not fully protect the taxpayers' interest.

The original SST contract provides for

the Government to recover its "airframe investment" by means of royalties to be paid on the first 300 production SST's. In the contract, an "SST" is defined as an airframe "principally of titanium structure and that achieves or is designed to achieve a maximum safe cruising speed of not less than mach 2.2 nor more than mach 3.1." The two prototypes, incidentally, are required to be designed for mach 2.7.

In the original contract, there was no provision for royalty payments on any supersonic planes designed for a maximum speed below mach 2.2. FAA maintains that such a plane would have to be an entirely new design concept incorporating little or none of the SST technology and requiring totally new development expenditures by Boeing and, therefore, no royalties should be paid.

I am not at all convinced that the FAA is correct in that assumption. Although a plane designed to do less than mach 2.2 might differ considerably in that it could be made of aluminum rather than titanium and with much less sophisticated construction techniques and, therefore, technically not an SST as defined in the contract, there is no reason to assume that much of the design technology and support systems developed under the contract would not be used.

After the Subcommittee on Government Activities, of which I am chairman, began an investigation of this problem, a provision was added to the contract providing for additional royalties to be paid on aircraft designed to achieve a maximum safe cruising speed of more than mach 1.0 and less than mach 2.2. This provision, however, provides for a much lower royalty return and might result in the Government's receiving little or nothing. The primary deficiencies in the agreement are as follows:

First. The slower plane must be the same as or substantially similar to the SST prototype. This description is much too vague for us to rely on for the return of hundreds of millions in tax funds. For example, could it be of aluminum, or would it still have to be made of titanium to qualify for the royalties?

Second. Royalties would be paid by weight on sections or systems of the SST used in the slower aircraft. Weight obviously has no relation to cost or value.

Three. Royalties would be limited to 13 percent of the average royalty payable on each mach 2.2-plus SST. Since the royalty on the SST is calculated to return the Government's investment on 300 production models, limiting the return on the slower aircraft to 13 percent of that amount would either require the production of 2,310 slow SST's to return the Government's investment, or would mean that the Government only recovers 13 percent of its investment if no mach 2.2 SST's are built. The contract assures that the latter will be the case because the additional provision also limits royalties to the first 300 of the slower aircraft.

Fourth. Most of the royalty provisions in the additional agreement ultimately depend on after-the-fact "good faith negotiation by the parties." In essence, it constitutes a lawyer's nightmare sus-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ceptible to numerous interpretations that could reduce the Government's return to zero.

The provisions concerning the return to the Government on the slower than mach 2.2 aircraft are of major importance in considering the continued funding of the SST because it is quite possible, if not probable, that Boeing and the airlines may agree on a production aircraft designed to do mach 1.9 or mach 2.0 since there is a significant difference in production costs. I have not been able to get a reliable economic analysis from the FAA on the incremental cost/benefit relationship of the mach 2.2-plus SST to the mach 2.2-minus SST. A simple comparison with the Concorde is not sufficient because of basic differences in capacity and design. Nor is a comparison with a mach 2.7 SST being operated at a slower speed useful, since there would be an inherent overinvestment. I have been given no figures on the economic feasibility of a U.S. version of the SST designed to do less than mach 2.2.

In conclusion, I am not at all convinced that the ultimate supersonic transport produced by Boeing and sold to the airlines will not be designed to do somewhat less than mach 2.2 and, therefore, will not come under the royalty provisions of the SST contract. If so, the Government will be cut entirely out of its return or at best limited to a return of 13 percent of its investment. I see no reason for the Government to continue to invest these funds if they may ultimately end up as a windfall to Boeing and the airlines.

While it would be impossible to identify with exactitude the precise value to Boeing of the public's investment, I do believe that the circumstances I have discussed today necessitate changing the definition of the SST on which full royalty payments would be required to include aircraft falling within the mach 1.95 to mach 3.1 area. An additional contract provision could provide for a graduated percentage reduction in royalties covering supersonic production aircraft that fall within the mach 1 to mach 1.95 area. Amendments to the contract of this type would not be unreasonable insofar as Boeing is concerned as they would simply reflect the public's heavy investment in aircraft development. Nor should arguments as to the unlikelihood of the SST production aircraft having a speed below mach 2.2 sway our considerations. After all, if that contingency does not occur, then, of course, neither the public's interest nor Boeing's would be affected. I feel that that contingency, however, is likely enough to occur that we must protect the public's investment.

Although I have favored the continued development of the SST, I do not think the taxpayers should continue to fund the supersonic transport program until the contractual definition of the SST is revised to assure that the Government will realize the full return of its investment upon the production of any supersonic transport utilizing the technology for which the taxpayers have paid.

CBS DOCUMENTARY ON SOUTH AFRICA PROVEN REPLETE WITH DISTORTIONS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, only recently the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HÉBERT) exposed distortions of actual information contained in the CBS documentary on "The Selling of the Pentagon." The errors there recorded have been thoroughly confirmed.

My attention has been called to another film, also replete with errors. I am referring to the CBS documentary on "Black View of South Africa."

This raises the question of why any responsible news media in this country should engage in misrepresentations concerning that nation. We all know that South Africa is a consistent and reliable ally of this country, both in war and in peace. Our Nation, beset as it has been with racial violence, riots, and bloodshed, is certainly in no position to give advice on the subject to South Africa, or to any other country, on the best way to deal with racial problems.

The film to which I have referred has been challenged by Mr. John H. Chettle, director of the Washington office of South Africa Foundation. In a letter to the president of CBS, which pinpoints some obvious distortions in the show, Mr. Chettle addresses himself to some of the contents. The letter follows:

SOUTH AFRICA FOUNDATION,
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1971.

Dr. FRANK STANTON,
President, Columbia Broadcasting System
Inc., New York, N.Y.

DEAR DR. STANTON: I have always followed with admiration your statesmanlike approach to the responsibilities of television, and your strong defense of the objectivity of the news media.

Perfection has, of course, its own special obligations. I hope, therefore, you will not take it amiss if I point to at least two dozen verifiable errors of fact in the thirty minute CBS presentation on December 15, 1970 of the film "Black View of South Africa."

It is not the purpose of my Foundation to act on behalf of the South African Government, or to disseminate its views. The Trustees of the Foundation are made up of a cross-section of South African opinion, ranging from those vigorously opposed to the Government, to those equally vigorously supporting it. The Foundation does, however, believe that truthful, factual and objective reporting are required to deepen understanding of a highly complex situation. It was this element which I found so sadly lacking in your programme.

It is for this reason that I have attempted to do the work which should have been done by your Research Department, and I itemise for their information and your own ten of the major errors in the programme.

1. Your correspondent, John Hart, set the tone for the whole melodrama on an appropriately sinister note.

"This is an illegal film . . . made in South Africa by black South Africans, violating laws, risking prison and even death."

We are not told what laws they are supposed to be violating. In fact, the legal posi-

March 17, 1971

tion is as follows: There is a law in South Africa which prevents anyone from photographing a prison [for prison security reasons], and strategic nuclear and defense installations [a similar law covers nuclear installations in the United States]. Outside these exceptions, anyone, whether white or black, may photograph anything and may freely remove the photographs or films from the country.

2. Mr. Hart continues:

" . . . It is daring indeed. The camera equipment was smuggled in, and so was the film."

One can only regret that the makers of the film put themselves to so much unnecessary expense. All photographic equipment is freely available in South Africa.

3. Mr. Hart then has a fleeting flirtation with truth when he says:

"The government here spends as much as \$7 million a year to make us familiar with this South Africa."

But he omits to note that that amount represents the annual budget of the South African Department of Information and covers not only its internal operation but also its offices in seventeen countries [by comparison the U.S.I.A. Budget is \$183,000,000]. Seen in this perspective, the allocation made to the Department would seem, to the average detergent manufacturer, contemptibly small.

4. One has often noted the tendency of some American commentators to be more harsh to countries friendly to the United States than to its enemies. There was an interesting example of this kind in the course of Mr. Hart's introduction when he said that:

"It is easier for an American newsman to get into Hanoi than into South Africa."

The Department of State has given us the following figures showing the number of American newsmen who went to Hanoi over the past five years:

1966	1
1967	4
1968	1
1969	0
1970	4

More than one hundred American newsmen have visited South Africa over the same period. Further newsmen are based in South Africa. The two main wire services, AP and UPI, have bureaus there, as have Reuters, Agence-France Presse and others.

5. The errors in the film itself are much more serious. Referring to Bantu townships adjoining white urban areas, the statement is made:

"Some of these slums were condemned as long ago as the early thirties as being unfit for human habitation. But they linger on with their pollution and poverty."

This is an extraordinarily misleading statement. If there is one achievement in which the South African Government can take pride it is in the provision of housing. At the end of the Second World War, most of South Africa's cities were disfigured by slums. Almost no slums now remain. Since 1948, more than 250,000 houses have been built for Bantu outside the Bantu homelands. If the U.S. were to have made a comparable housing effort, in terms of its Gross National Product, it would have had to build more than 16 million such houses. Most of these houses have three rooms plus kitchen and bathroom. Every home has its own garden. They are fully serviced, and rent for approximately \$7 per month.

6. The narrator Mr. Mahomo, goes on:

"It requires a minimum of forty-eight dollars a month for a family of four to live here. The average earnings of a man-wife team is thirty-eight dollars a month."

Moments later, however, Mr. Mahomo states:

"A black man is paid sixty-three dollars a month."

Any auditor would list that as unreconciled. Moreover, even a generally unfriendly source like *Newsweek* pointed out in its December 7, 1970 issue, that:

... A black city dweller in South Africa now earns an average \$70 a month in a continent where the median income for blacks hovers at \$70 per year. More impressive yet, some 120,000 urban blacks in South Africa now earn more than \$350 per month, and in Soweto a fair number of professional men, traders and entrepreneurs have made small fortunes."

7. Mr. Mahomo:

"The land in this park-like eighty-seven percent of all the land in South Africa, is by law, for whites only."

Also:

"These are remote areas in South Africa certified by the government as homelands for the black. Much of the land is unfit for agriculture."

Between 65 and 70% of this "park-like" country is either arid, with less than 15" annual rainfall, or mountainous and unsuitable for agriculture. Of the arable land, some 45% lies within the Bantu homelands. Despite this the Bantu—for perfectly understandable reasons, including conservatism, the tribal practice of communal tenure, and the belief that agriculture is women's work—produce a negligible proportion of South Africa's agricultural production. The Government has been adding land to the homelands every year, but it is obvious that to do this too rapidly would mean more land badly farmed.

Of course, these facts lack the emotional stimulation and the apparently self-evident simplicity of Mr. Mahomo's version, which is no doubt why your Research Division evaded the tiresome necessity of correcting the record.

8. Mr. Mahomo continues:

"No precious minerals have been discovered there [in the Bantu homelands]."

On the contrary, a large portion of the rich Bushveld igneous complex falls within the Tswana homeland. Here we find the world's largest single producer of platinum. An article in the *New York Times* of October 18, 1970, mentioned that this mine, "which is expected to bring in about \$70 million dollars a year in foreign exchange, will make Tswanaland one of the richest tribal homelands in South Africa."

There are also, among other deposits major coal and asbestos mines within the homelands.

9. Mr. Mahomo:

"The miner's contracts are for periods of twelve months renewable until the effects of consumption or tuberculosis make them unproductive for the gold mines."

Mr. Mahomo fails to explain why 350,000 blacks annually apply, quite voluntarily, to go to the mines, 220,000 of them quite inexplicably coming from other countries in Africa to do so. They enjoy the benefits of board and lodging, medical attention, first-class sporting facilities, free entertainment, etc. The large majority of the annual recruits are those who are returning for a second, third, fourth or even a fifth term of service—again voluntarily.

Living conditions on these mines are of a higher standard than in many European countries. In 23 South African gold mines, the average daily intake of calories was 4,077 as compared to the following categories in England:

Miner, 4,030 calories.

Army serviceman, 3,814 to 4,114 calories.

Factory employee, 2,910 calories.

All recruits are under constant and strict medical supervision, and their physical condition is excellent.

The 220,000 blacks who come from abroad each year to work in the mines form part of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

about one million blacks from outside South Africa working in that country. This must be the only case in history where a supposedly persecuted group flocks yearly in such numbers to the land in which they are supposedly persecuted.

10. Mr. Mahomo:

"The families of the Indian girls who work for the sugar estates: Theirs is a life contract. Often if only one member of the family leaves this world the entire (sic) is evicted from the land."

There is no life contract for any families of any race.

The Tongaat Sugar Company, on whose property the film shown was taken, provide rent-free accommodation to all personnel, and no charge is made for fuel, light or water. The company has a homeownership scheme for personnel of all races, and the company assists those who wish to purchase their own houses.

A permanent Tongaat employee who has a house is required to vacate should services terminate for any reason but this applies uniformly to all races. On the death of an employee, his family is allowed three months to find alternative accommodation. On some estates, however, the deceased's widow and his family are permitted to remain in occupation of a company house, even though they may have no further connection with the company.

These conditions can be considered typical because basic conditions of employment are governed by an industrial agreement covering remuneration, overtime, annual and sick leave, hours of work, etc.

The program contained other errors of fact, not to mention quotations taken out of context, allegations impossible to substantiate and impossible to disprove, vague generalizations, instances of the particular referred to as if it were general, and other tricks of the age-old art of special pleading.

In these circumstances the CBS offer to the South African government of a few minutes on this program must be seen as highly disingenuous. To reply to a program of such length, and containing so many errors would require equal time rather than five minutes comment. If this program is any indication of your network's objectivity or desire to be fair, I am not surprised at the South African Government's reaction, or at their reluctance to let a CBS camera team go to South Africa.

In closing, I must question your choice, as your expert on South Africa for this program, of Mr. Carl Rowan, a man who, for all his great achievements and considerable stature, has no background in South African affairs and has spent all of three weeks in the country.

In short, the whole program emphasized rather poignantly for me the truth of Mr. Rowan's assessment, spoken in another context, when he said that, "The major deficiency of this film is that it does not tell enough of the truth."

Copies of this letter have been sent to the Federal Communications Commission and other interested people.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. CHETTLE,
Director.

CAMPAIGN SPENDING REFORM

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, campaign spending reform must be comprehensive, if it is to be effective. It must

include precise ceilings on general and media expenditures, enforceable reporting requirements, equal opportunities for the challenger, strict limitations on individual contributions, and new incentives for participation by the small-income donor. One of these reforms without the others would be of little value. A limit on general expenditures, for example, without controls on the size of individual donations, would merely preserve and perhaps intensify the present reliance on small numbers of large contributors. Similarly, a ceiling on general campaign advertising, without a limit on TV ads, would guarantee the final takeover of political broadcasting by packaged candidates, for, with reduced amounts of dollars to spend, they would simply seek maximum exposure through repeated, short-spot commercials.

A piecemeal approach, therefore, simply cannot work. We must take the broadest possible view of this increasingly complicated problem.

The most apparent defect of our present system is its price tag. Candidates for most major offices must usually be either independently wealthy or backed by a few big-money interests.

Moreover, these candidates, in many instances, spend too much for too little—huge amounts for taped TV spot advertisements when they could be buying half-hour segments at a comparable price. As a result we find the broadcast media bombarded at election time by slick, but meaningless advertisements, which give little, if any, real picture of the candidate.

The bill I am introducing today would limit the amount of spending for all campaign items in all elections—primaries included. In this way, the citizen of average means, who can gain the confidence and support of his fellows, would have as much access to public office as the rich or the influential.

Candidates for the office of President and Vice President would be permitted to spend an amount equal to 10 cents a vote cast for that office in the previous election. Candidates for the Senate and House could spend 20 and 30 cents per vote, respectively, in both the primary and general elections.

At the same time, the bill would provide Government funds to purchase blocks of TV time for Federal candidates. This concept of "Voter's Time" was proposed by the Twentieth Century Fund Commission and is designed to replace spot commercials with more informative, more personal discussions of the issues in 15- or 30-minute shows.

Candidates of both major parties for the Presidency would receive six half-hour blocks in the 35 days preceding a general election, candidates for the Senate three half-hour, and three 15-minute blocks, and candidates for the House two half-hour, and three 15-minute blocks. The bill also provides a formula for distributing lesser amounts of time to minor party candidates.

The cost of the shows to the Treasury would be set at the lowest commercial rate made available during prime time and aired simultaneously by all stations in the particular jurisdiction.

As a corollary to "Voter's Time," my

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

bill would limit TV spending by the candidate personally to 1 cent per vote. This is an extremely severe limit, intended to further discourage reliance on the spot announcement.

I might add at this point that the bill does not authorize "Voter's Time" for primaries, where too many candidates would practically eliminate television as a form of entertainment. But TV spending for primaries would be limited to 3 cents per vote, again a much lower level than we have at present.

A second major area of reform must be the disclosure of campaign contributions. The present *Corrupt Practices Act* does not require reports of contributions for primaries, does not include intrastate committees or candidate's committees organized in the District of Columbia, and does not provide an adequate central depository and administrative agency to process candidate's reports and determine violations of the law. With so many loopholes, most candidates—even after they spend millions of dollars on an election—can legally report no expenditures.

Not only do these loopholes allow widespread violations of the law's intent, but they increase as well the public's mistrust of the electoral process. If we are to restore faith in the political system, a most important first step will be to open campaign giving to the full light of public scrutiny. The ineffective *Corrupt Practices Act* is just not going to help us here.

The measure I am introducing would correct each of the three deficiencies I noted in the *Corrupt Practices Act*.

First, primaries as well as general elections would be covered.

Second, all committees formed to support one or more candidates would be required to register with the Federal Government, have the candidate's explicit permission to spend anything over \$500 on his campaign, and file itemized reports of their financial activities with the Government.

Finally, a registry of election finance in the GAO would be created, designed to collect, process, and analyze reports by candidates and committees and to monitor the law for violations.

The improved definitions, disclosure procedures, and data processing will give us a law that is finally enforceable, enabling us to insure observance of the spending limits imposed earlier in my bill. In doing so, it should renew the confidence of the people in their election system.

The third problem we must consider is the advantage of the incumbent. I personally believe that this advantage will always exist, but that we can attempt, at least, to minimize its effect.

My legislation would equalize to some extent opportunities for the challenger. It would allow each candidate for the House or the Senate, a chance to provide the voters at least one reasoned statement of his views on the issues. Incumbents, of course, can and must do this year round while challengers usually find the cost of such a statement much too high.

My bill would provide a special campaign frank to all House and Senate

candidates in the 35-day period before both primary and general elections. This would include two pieces of mail for every registered voter in the district for major party candidates in the general election and one piece for any minor party challenger whose candidacy meets certain minimum requirements. During a primary election two pieces of mail for every registered voter would be allotted to candidates filing petitions bearing the signatures of 5 percent of the registered voters in their jurisdiction and one piece of mail for candidates filing petitions bearing the signatures of 3 percent of the voters.

The two final areas of reform—limiting individual contributions and encouraging broader giving by the public—must be considered hand-in-hand. Under our present system a large percentage of campaign funds—aside from the candidate's personal wealth—come from a small number of big contributors, who thereby have a large claim on the attention of the public official. Too often this claim covers only the most narrow special interests, not the broader needs of the elected official's constituency.

The campaign bill I am introducing would limit contributions by any individual to \$5,000 to candidates for President, \$2,500 to candidates for the Senate, and \$1,000 to candidates for the House.

At the same time, it would provide a 50 percent tax credit for political contributions aggregating up to \$50 in any calendar year. We can expect, then, increased participation by the average citizen and, as a result, broader responsibility for the elected official.

Mr. Speaker, in a sense, this bill would return the electoral process to the people. It would quell their growing cynicism, give them incentive to participate and encourage candidates to deal with them on a more meaningful and personal level. Our system of elections was designed to express the needs of the people; for too long it has met but the will of the rich and the influential. I suggest, therefore, that this bill be given the most careful consideration.

THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT REVENUE SHARING BILL

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, many times in recent years I have expressed the hope that rural America could have a greater hand in its own destiny. I have worked toward this end. Now I am pleased to be a part of the change taking place which will accomplish a long cherished goal.

The special rural development revenue sharing bill can become the spark-plug to ignite the energy that is ready and waiting in our smaller communities and farming areas.

True decentralization would be achieved by the measure. To this point, rural planners have labored mightily

March 17, 1971

and thousands of ideas have evolved which could be of benefit in stemming the exodus of people to the cities. But, many were stopped by the formidable mountain of Federal bureaucratic involvement. Others could not be consummated within the time bracket to make the projects workable simply for lack of funds.

I have knowledge of small community sewage disposal projects which have been waiting for years to be accepted and funded, as one example of the massive backlog awaiting action. Discouragement on the part of local people follows this kind of delay.

Under this proposal Federal revenue will be shared by the States in direct proportion to the true rural needs. The State legislatures will determine where and when the funds are to be spent on what appears to be an equitable prorate basis. The peculiar needs of one State, or any one area of a State, can thus be properly and quickly provided for in contrast to the past when nationwide criteria often failed to fit local requirements.

It is pleasant indeed to be present as a witness to a vital change in course which can mean so much to the future of our country, not just for rural America but for our cities as well. Migration of population to the metropolitan areas has added to the vast problems of the cities as they became more congested year after year.

Because 2,600 counties containing 65 million of our citizens would share in this new plan, I feel we are on the threshold of a new era. Certainly we have proven that all the laws and authorizations for stopgap or pump-priming projects of the past have not accomplished satisfactory results. Rural America has continued to wither, while the cities became obese and unhealthy.

Passage of this measure may not be the entire answer to the problems, but it is a start in the right direction—a reversal of years of pyramiding control of Federal assistance in the Nation's Capital. The processes became so cumbersome that ordinary citizens were bewildered and unable to take advantage of the 800 or more programs scattered throughout the Government.

AN UNCOMMON MAN

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of men in life who are outstanding in one field, there are few who are leaders in many. Such a man was the late Armand Grover Erpf, of New York City, and a summer resident of Arkville, N.Y., located in my 28th Congressional District.

Although much has been written on this man since his death, few of the articles I have seen so well sum up a life which could serve as an example to all of us, as does an editorial which appeared in the Catskill Mountain News, of

Margaretville, N.Y., which I insert in its entirety:

AN UNCOMMON MAN

To many who live in this area, Armand G. Erpf was almost a legendary figure. His brilliant achievements in business, finance, the military, the arts, philanthropy, and many other fields placed him in a select circle among his peers and in the public eye. By concentrating on the lustre of the public figure, the tendency among many was to give too little thought to the personal qualities of the man.

Like many persons of high station, he was direct and down to earth. He had little patience with the sham of putting on airs. Conversation and friendships with persons from all walks of life were one of his great enjoyments. He could often be seen stopping in the midst of one of his many walks in and around Arkville to visit with a passer-by or local resident. He truly cared about the thoughts and feelings of his neighbors in the community. His last illness may have come from subway travel in New York City, which he insisted on because it enabled him to sense the moods and feelings of the working man. His employees and friends will always remember the genuine concern he had for their lives and problems.

He loved the mountains and the natural surroundings of the Catskills. He treasured the times to be with his family in the peace, relative solitude and the glories of the changing seasons. He often said that he came home to Arkville to "recharge his batteries" to prepare himself to face once again the rigors of Wall Street and the hectic round of activities in New York and the rest of the world.

He was dedicated to the preservation of the beauty of the Catskill environment and to the conservation of its resources. No cause was closer to his heart. Yet at the same time, his perspective was not a narrow one. His business acumen and technical wisdom led him to recognize the need of the area for increased jobs and business opportunities. He tried to initiate patterns of approach which would balance the two tendencies for the over-all benefit of both residents and visitors.

This balance was typical of his approach in all areas of life. He was impatient with hypocrisy and dogma and the simplistic solutions of both the left and the right. A voluminous reader, he had an amazing knowledge of a wide variety of seemingly unlike subjects. He had an ingenious ability to isolate and put forward the side of an argument which had been ignored. He liked nothing better than to have his partner in dialogue to do the same in return. He was far more interested in having someone disagree intelligently with him than in being a "yes-man." His brilliant mind was able to penetrate extraneous facts to get to the heart of problems quickly, often suggesting unorthodox, but sound, solutions.

He was impatient with the easy rejection of religion which he found typical of a secularistic and rationalistic age. He never took himself so seriously as to think that there were not other philosophies in this world which none had dreamed of. His interest in mazes was a symbol of the profound perception he had of the mystery of life and of the invisible powers which guide and affect us.

He was enthused about the turmoil and dissolution of the present age, discerning therein the roots of new spiritual awareness and a religious revival which would assume patterns different from the past and yet be vital. At the same time, he was more familiar with the orthodox religious tradition than many were aware. When asked what was his favorite passage from the Bible, he replied, "The words of Jesus, 'I came that they might have life, and have it more abundantly.'" John 10-10. Nothing he said could be a more fitting epitaph.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ARSENIC DUMPING

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to learn that the Nixon administration, acting through the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, has taken prompt and decisive action to stop the planned disposal in the ocean this past weekend of 70 tons of material containing arsenic.

Calling the effects of the material on marine life "deleterious and probably lethal," Mr. Ruckelshaus asked the two firms involved to seek alternate methods of disposal. I am including a copy of his telegram immediately following my remarks.

The controversy over the disposal of nerve gas a year ago should have taught us that a practice which can have severe and possibly long-lasting effects on the environment should not be allowed to continue just because it has always been done that way. The immediate cost of disposal by this method may be cheap, but the ultimate costs to the environment are anything but cheap.

Bills are now pending in the Congress to prohibit or to license ocean dumping. By the terms of a proposal submitted as part of the administration's legislative package on the environment, the Administrator of EPA would issue permits for transportation from the United States of material intended for dumping, and for the dumping itself.

An applicant for a permit would be required to prove that the transportation or dumping would not "unreasonably" degrade or endanger health, welfare, or environmental amenities.

Until this legislation is enacted, enlightened actions like that taken by the Nixon administration will insure that the values of the environment and of life itself are considered along with matters of convenience and cost.

The text of Mr. Ruckelshaus' telegram follows:

ARSENIC DUMPING

My attention has been called to reports of the booking by your company of a ship leaving Saturday from Philadelphia carrying about 70 tons of an arsenic compound to be dumped about 150 miles out in the ocean.

The discharge of this material will have deleterious and probably lethal effects on fish and other aquatic biota.

The concentration of such material in marine fauna and flora may give rise to long range damages. The Council on Environmental Quality, in its recent report to the President on ocean dumping setting forth a national policy stated that ocean dumping of materials clearly identified as harmful to the marine environment or man should be stopped.

Accordingly, it is requested that you suspend the arrangements made for Saturday's shipment and dumping of the arsenic compound and seek alternate methods of disposal.

The staff of the Environmental Protection Agency will be available for consultations with you on this matter.

GEN. FREDERICK CLARKE SEES FUTURE U.S. WATERWAY DEVELOPMENT AS A NEW BALL GAME

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers delivered an excellent speech to the members of the Arkansas River Basin Development Association at their March 12 annual meeting, and it was my privilege to be among the large gathering who heard General Clarke speak at the Friday noon luncheon.

The theme of General Clarke's remarks was that in the future, river basin development projects will be undertaken in light of new concepts in resource planning. These new concepts are an outgrowth, General Clarke says, of the realization within Government that immediate efforts must be made to relieve swelling urban pressures, and relocate a larger percentage of our citizens in less densely populated areas. Pointing to the thousands of newcomers who have already been attracted to the Arkansas River Basin region, General Clarke cites the great Arkansas River navigation project as proof that future flood control and river navigation projects can and will be one solution to easing urban pressures elsewhere in the Nation.

General Clarke called attention to recent court decisions involving the Refuse Act of 1899, and subsequent decisions within the Government which will put the Corps of Engineers at the forefront of cleaning up our country's polluted streams and harbors, and protecting those yet unspoiled waters. I commend General Clarke not only for his very fine speech to the association, but for once again demonstrating the kind of leadership which has made the Army Corps of Engineers one of the most significant agencies in the Federal Government. I include his speech at this point in the RECORD:

It's good to be back with my friends in Arkansas Valley. I never cease to be amazed by the rapid change taking place in this region.

I regret that I was not with you January 21 when the first commercial tow tied up with a load of newsprint at Tulsa's new port of Catoosa. It seems appropriate that the first tow to navigate the entire 440-mile length of the McClellan-Kerr Arkansas River Navigation system should carry newsprint since the event was big news indeed for this valley and also newspapers played a significant role in helping make this project possible.

When your Mayor LaFortune and his official party met the barge at the dock, it was the end of a long journey of development and the beginning of a new era for this basin. Truly your ship had come in.

But long before construction was completed this waterway was already making transportation history.

Although it has been in limited operation a short time, it is producing results that exceed even the rosiest expectations of its proponents. You well recall that this project was once lampooned as "the innards of a fat pig", a boondoggle, and so forth. But

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

the skeptics who expected pork now find they must eat crow.

The economic growth along the McClellan-Kerr waterway is well ahead of the forecast in justifying the project—these forecasts were first derided as impossible and over optimistic by the project's detractors. But hasn't this been the story of waterway development down through the years? We saw the same thing happen on the Ohio River, the Upper Mississippi, the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, and many others.

One of the important things about the Arkansas River achievement that comes to my mind is that those industries and factories, those jobs and new communities which are rising in this region represent so many people and enterprises which are not crowding into congested cities and adding to the almost insuperable burdens of our great urban complexes.

For our Nation is adding more people; those people will require more employment and services; these in turn will necessitate the development and use of more natural resources of all kinds, and will generate more waste for disposal. This will happen wherever those people live. But the effects can be worse if they locate in certain areas—say, our already over-strained cities—than if they are more equally and optionally distributed about the country.

I don't think the American people will ever go for the kind of managed society in which bureaucrats will arbitrarily move people about, tell them where they must invest or work, or determine the fates of geographic regions from on high. But I believe that our resource-management programs provide a means by which, through the democratic process, we can find out which regions have the potential for economic development and want to encourage it. Appropriate forms of enterprise will then find their own ways to such areas, just as they have migrated to the Arkansas Basin. In this way, within the framework of our free enterprise, democratic system, we can encourage and help direct the decentralization of our population which I believe is imperative to the future quality of life in this country.

Also, this is perhaps the most sensible way to develop a region for its expanding population while at the same time protect priceless environmental resources for the future generations.

It is within this frame of reference that I view future waterway development in this country.

In line with this, many of my talks during the past year have revolved around the theme: "It's a new ball game." The old rules, the old strategies, the old formulae will no longer serve. Those who keep trying to do business as usual are finding that they aren't doing any business at all.

What's new about the new ball game is not simply the injection of a new factor, the environment. It's not even the emergence of a new source of opposition to development-preservation for preservation's sake. It is rather the evolution of a new way of looking at resources and their environment, a new concept of resource planning. Nobody, not even those who are most energetic in bringing it about—can define this new concept or its impact on our resource programs with any precision. It's something we must all work out together. But the first step is to realize that the old rules are no longer any good unless, after testing and scrutiny, they can be shown to be relevant and useful to the new concepts.

With respect to waterway projects, we aren't going to discard considerations of national economic efficiency. But such considerations will not be the dominant factor that they have been in the past. For it is not enough—you are misleading yourselves if you think so—to assume that future major proj-

ects will be planned on the basis of economic efficiency plus some more or less separate environmental superstructure. When the issue at stake is whether there should be any further regional economic development at all, we miss the point if we merely dress up our waterway proposals with some environmental landscaping.

It seems to me that we as a Nation are gradually feeling our way toward an approach in which water or other transportation will be only one element to be considered in preparing the whole future destinies of major regions. The basic questions to be determined first are the temper and tempo of the people. Do they have the drive, the urge to build and grow? Do they want to slow down, preserve their present comforts about as they are, but not seek further ventures? Or do they even want to go back, undo some of what has been done in the recent past, and try to restore values that may have been sacrificed to growth? Our people may not ever make a flat decision on such questions in such direct terms; but their preferences will be indicated by the trend of their resource decisions.

I do think we may have a problem in helping the people in each region preserve their autonomy of choice. Naturally, all regions are entitled to a share in national decisions. But the population centers of the Northeast, with their great numerical and financial and political advantages, and their dominant position with respect to the media of opinion, should not be allowed to determine the future of the Southwest, Alaska, the Lower Mississippi Valley, or other regions quite different from their own. If the people who called the Arkansas project a "fat pig" had had the deciding voice, the project would not have been built, and the region would have stagnated, while the problems of the great cities would have been worse even than they are now.

As you can see, this kind of approach is quite different from the traditional approach based on engineering and economic feasibility. To demonstrate the advantages of a proposed waterway project, we now must go back and demonstrate the advantages and implications of the very existence of the waterway, no matter how feasible it may be in the traditional sense. We must relate our proposal to a whole context of resource proposals and decisions, some of them contrasting or competing, involving the same lands and waters. We must shape our waterway proposal to accommodate and adjust it into those other considerations, which may be very broad and varied. Any waterway built in the light of such scrutiny may well be quite different from those we have been accustomed to.

Concurrent with the changes in our planning process, a new factor begins to emerge into the water resource management picture whose significance is not yet generally appreciated. On the basis of some laws passed and court decisions rendered last year, the Federal Government has discovered that it has, in the permit system established under the Refuse Act of 1899, the power to regulate the use of water and of riverside lands in the public interest. And the Government has decided to exercise that power on a large and thorough-going scale. Several agencies participate in the shaping and exercising of this authority, including the new Environmental Protection Agency, the Council of Environmental Quality, and the Corps of Engineers, just to name a few.

The decision to apply this authority could be one of the most far-reaching ever made by any Government in all history.

We have not yet come to grips with this regulatory power in terms of its impact on our comprehensive river-basin planning. Until and unless we do, conceivably we might find ourselves planning and even building a waterway under a regional framework plan,

and then not letting anybody use it when we come to apply specialized environmental criteria.

For instance, what's going to be the impact of new permit policies on the different criteria on which River Basin planning is based? The Federal Government is still committed to the river basin as the geographic planning unit. This means that we should have different approaches to resource management in, say, the economically expanding Arkansas or Lower Mississippi Valleys, the rural Missouri and Upper Mississippi Valleys, and the wild and rugged Snake. As we apply nationwide water-quality standards and nationwide criteria on permit applications, therefore, we might consider providing for some exceptions to accommodate the differing goals and concepts embodied in the different framework plans in the respective river basins. I think we need some common denominators to help us fit our various approaches together, and keep them from mutual interference.

When we consider the disposition of a given resource—whether through a permit application, a local flood-protection, a navigation or water supply project, a reservoir, or whatever form it may take—I suggest that we consider formally what will happen to the people affected by it if it is approved, and what will happen to them and what will they do if it is turned down.

Will the people have to relocate? In a big city, perhaps?—or will they stay where they are and be underemployed, or even unemployed?

If we prohibit construction of a proposed powerplant, or navigation channel, will they have to be built elsewhere? Economic activity which does not take place in one locality or valley or State must surely take place in another area, if we are to maintain our economic growth at its expected levels. To what extent do our environment-based decisions result in net gains and to what extent mere displacement of problems; and what is the impact of such displacement?

Obviously, today many questions need answering and many more community elements will now participate in the past. The Engineers and navigation interests, for all their expertise, must be prepared to listen to, and learn from, and perhaps be vetoed by, other kinds of interests, just as we may properly expect those other interests to heed our views in our important fields of competence.

I know that many of you are aware that the Midcontinent Environmental Center Association has been programmed to use the best skills of the academic and business communities to study the total environment in this region. I had my first contact with MECA last month. Perhaps this consortium approach in coordinating and undertaking programs related to the region's environment may be a good solution. MECA certainly represents an effort to blend the best of the two worlds in attempting to gain a better insight into the environmental and economic needs of this region.

The institutions and techniques and even the community climate for such a joint participation and cooperation have not yet been fully developed throughout the rest of the country. Consequently, there are many questions; for which we have no answers; there are many clouds through which we cannot yet see.

In times of community disunity and strife, each turns his hand against his neighbor, and those who seek to serve all are denounced by all. But such are the times, and this is not the way to promote the well-being of all the people. This is the cause to which the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Government are devoted. And so, I believe, are each of you and the organization which you represent.

Thank you.

DR. JEROME WIESNER

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the new and distinguished president of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology is a constituent of mine in the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts. Dr. Jerome Wiesner, who will very soon succeed Howard W. Johnson as the president of MIT, is about to enter another complex assignment as the head of one of the world's leading centers of research in the natural and social sciences.

Jerome Bert Wiesner grew up in Michigan, where after a boyhood during which he sold newspapers and caddied regularly on the golf course, graduated from the University of Michigan with a degree in electrical engineering. He went on at the same distinguished university to receive the degrees of master of science and doctor of philosophy. Mr. Wiesner first joined the faculty of MIT in 1942 as a member of the radiation laboratory where radar was being developed. Later Dr. Wiesner worked on many military projects and became an authority on communications science, microwave theory, and other aspects of electronics.

Dr. Wiesner became the dean of science at MIT in 1946 and was appointed provost of the university in 1966. In that position Dr. Wiesner had overall academic responsibility for the 23 academic departments, the 25 research and teaching laboratories, and the 2,200 members of the faculty.

Dr. Wiesner has always combined with graciousness and charm his role as a distinguished academic administrator and his extraordinarily important role as a consultant to and a member of several governmental agencies and panels. It was his work on the Gaither committee to which Dr. Wiesner was appointed by President Eisenhower that convinced him that all of us must recognize the futility of the arms race. Dr. Wiesner continued his thoughtful work in the general area of disarmament when he was the science adviser to President Kennedy. Dr. Wiesner is credited with a major role in bringing about the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963.

Dr. Wiesner is the author of several volumes, one of which centers on the ABM. This document, put together in connection with Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, denounces the anti-ballistic-missile system—ABM—as unsound strategically, militarily, and economically.

Dr. Wiesner and his wife, Laya, live in Watertown, Mass., where Jerome Wiesner has been for some years an elected member of the school committee of that town. The Wiesners have four children, Stephen J., Zachary K., Elizabeth A., and Joshua A.

The 79-member board of the MIT Corp., the faculty and administration, as well as the 7,800 students of the 110-year-old university of MIT are to be congratulated for selecting Dr. Jerome B.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Wiesner, a shrewd statesman of science and a militant opponent of the war in Indochina as the leader of this great institution at a particularly difficult moment in our history for private colleges and universities.

SENATOR McCLELLAN CALLS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING OF ARKANSAS BASIN RESOURCES

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, it was a pleasure to attend the Arkansas Basin Development Association annual meeting this last weekend in Tulsa, Okla., and to visit with members of this fine organization. For more than 25 years, members of the ABDA have contributed their time and energy in support of the Arkansas River navigation project.

The keynote speaker at the closing banquet was a man for whom the waterway has been named—Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Senator McCLELLAN has for many years led the battle to keep the project on schedule, and without the leadership and dedication of men such as himself, the return of navigation to the Arkansas River would still be only a dream in men's minds.

In his address, Senator McCLELLAN reminded members of the association that much work remains to be done to assure orderly and pollution-free development along the river. Pointing to the millions of dollars which have already been invested by new industries along the river, Senator McCLELLAN forecasts the need for immediate comprehensive planning to avoid manmade pollution—a task far easier than trying to control and cure pollution which has already occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Senator McCLELLAN's speech to the association contains the blueprints for successful economic development along the Arkansas River, and similar public works development projects throughout the country. Under unanimous consent I include his remarks and very thoughtful analysis of this subject in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN L. McCLELLAN

Your association was organized more than a quarter of a century ago. Since then, you have held your annual meetings here in Tulsa. It has been my very great pleasure to attend many of those meetings and to participate in some of your programs. I am happy to be with you again tonight.

In those annual sessions, you planned your future programs and activities, you made assessments of your progress, and you resolved with renewed inspiration and encouragement to pursue vigorously and relentlessly the attainment of the ultimate goals and objectives of your organizations.

In the beginning, following Congressional authorization of the project, you sought to get planning started and funds appropriated therefor. Your next task was to secure construction funds for the building of the separate units which are included in the over-all

plan. And, once there had been established a time schedule for completion of the navigation system to Catoosa, you were concerned with keeping construction of all the dams and other components of the project on schedule—to the end that we would have navigation operable to Catoosa by 1970.

That goal has been reached, and tonight we acclaim and rejoice in the success you have achieved. Your labors, your patience, and your perseverance and dedication add up to a superb job—to a job "well done."

I see the completion of this gigantic project as a great triumph—as a most rewarding victory. It is truly a victory of the people, by the people, and for the people. A victory by the people who with vision, pride, and determination have wrought an achievement that is monumental in both its extent and its potential.

Within the next three months, we shall witness the formal dedication which will officially record the completion of this navigation system. That dedication ceremony will be a testimonial to and will mark the fulfillment of our aspirations and the transformation into a reality of our long-time fervent dreams of this major development in the Arkansas River Basin.

I know we all look forward to June 4-5 with anticipated exultation and with a deep sense of pride and gratification.

To me, that day of celebration will be in some measure analogous to graduation day at college and the receiving of a diploma. Dedication day will not signify the end of our endeavors, but rather it will signal the beginning of renewed interest and effort.

I compare the dedication of this River Basin development to the life of a student who for the first 25 years of his life—up to the day of his college graduation—builds a foundation of knowledge through the channels of education. He has thus equipped himself for citizenship responsibilities, for an active career, and for the many vicissitudes of life. But, in reality, graduation day for him is the beginning of his productive life—of fruitful services to himself, to his family, to his country, and to his fellowman.

And, so it is that the completion of this original Arkansas River multipurpose project has laid the foundation for and its dedication will mark the beginning of greater opportunities for the full development of the valley's natural resources and economic potentials. Thus, we are now better prepared to accelerate economic growth and expansion and to enhance the welfare and prosperity of our people.

As it does to the young graduate, the future now brightly beckons to us with exciting challenge and promise. We face it with resolve and purpose to pursue new objectives and to attain further goals of improvement and progress. Our work is not done. Your Association is not through. Instead, we now have the momentum and strength to forge the instruments of continued progress, development, and expansion and to utilize fully those advantages that we have already secured.

Mr. Marcus R. Tower, in his letter inviting me to address you this evening, said: ". . . again this year our meeting will mark the time when we turn our attention to the many other important water resource development needs of the Arkansas Basin," and that the theme of this meeting tonight is: "Future Water Development—Key to Environmental Protection and Economic Growth."

With Mr. Tower's statement and the general theme of this meeting, I am in full accord.

Now that the most dramatic part of this big river development is completed, we could encounter greater difficulty in getting future authorizations and appropriations necessary to start new projects—auxiliary proj-

ects—either on the main stem of the river or on its tributaries.

There are major extensions of the barge canal on up the Arkansas hopefully to Wichita and possibly with a branch, or lateral to Oklahoma City, which may already be, or may soon be, economically justified. These prospects certainly compel our continuing interest and attention.

We want to see the day when the whole vast Arkansas River Basin will reflect the image of pure water, pure air, clean space, and beautiful forests. We want to see its hills and valleys made even greener with growing things, including a rich endowment of native trees, of grass, and of fish and wildlife—all living and thriving. I believe we can achieve this, and if we do, we will have here in this valley one of our country's finest environments and one of the best ecological conditions to be found anywhere in our nation.

For 40 years, I have been actively engaged in trying to improve the environment and, I hope, the ecology of our rivers and river basins. I have sought by legislation and appropriations to harness and control their destructive power and to divert and convert their mighty energies into a constructive force for the benefit and service of mankind. At the same time, I have supported programs to manage and improve our forests—both state and national—to enlarge and improve our national park system, and to provide greater protection for our wilderness areas.

I believe that all of these vital resources are basic to the beauty and unity of nature, which it is our duty to protect and preserve. But, I also believe that we can develop both our large rivers and their tributaries and simultaneously improve their watersheds; thus, enhancing their total contribution to the ecology and to a better environment.

To me, this marvelous development in the Arkansas River Basin is a classic showcase example of putting nature to work to help solve some of the serious ills that plague our country. This River Basin program was not conceived and it has not been executed in the framework of a governmental bureaucracy in action—telling the people what to do and when to do it. Rather, it has been a project where the people determined the kind of improvement that was needed and, working through their Congress and the appropriate Federal Government agencies, developed a partnership in a resource-managed program that will be a profitable investment for our government while at the same time re-enforcing and strengthening our traditional free enterprise system.

Yes, it is truly a profitable investment and not an irredeemable expenditure. Its cost to the government will be repaid many times—both directly and indirectly. Direct revenues into the U.S. Treasury will be derived from the sale of hydroelectric power and from taxes that will accrue by reason of the increased prosperity of the inhabitants of the valley. Indirectly, our nation will profit by controlling the natural water runoff, by preventing soil erosion, and by preventing heavy property damage and human suffering caused by ravaging floods.

This great Arkansas River development borne on the wings of the seventies, is the largest civil works project ever constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers. Indeed, it is the biggest water success story of our generation. It has already produced results greatly exceeding our fondest expectations and the predictions made when its cost-benefit ratio was established. Barge shipping has already more than doubled those predictions.

The articles of commerce that are now moving on the River in world trade make an exciting list. Timber and agricultural products are going out to Rotterdam and other world ports. We are getting imports of steel

from Belgium and bauxite from South America. There are many, many other items and products being carried. They are too numerous to mention.

A recent innovation in world shipping is the new "LASH" barge—LASH meaning "lighter aboard ship."

These LASH barges are now being loaded on the Arkansas. Somewhere down the Mississippi or at New Orleans, whole barges are simply lifted aboard a "mother" ocean-going freighter and moved intact to the foreign port of their destination. This innovation not only increases the speed but also reduces the cost of delivery.

More than 50 different items of cargo—food, feed, clothing, and shelter products—are now being barged down the Arkansas River destined for foreign markets and ports abroad. All of this barge commerce represents a savings in cost both to the shipper and to the consumer.

Although still in its infancy, this navigation system has attracted several hundred million dollars in new industry and pledges for new plants in the Arkansas Valley.

With these barge-shipping attractions to industry and the recreational opportunities and advantages provided by the vast reservoirs and lakes of sky blue water which this development has created, we can make this valley come alive with activity—with new industries, new businesses, new jobs, new homes, and new happiness.

Such an economic surge will keep our people in the valley, attract others to come here to live, and thus reduce the burdensome migration that is now flowing to our already overcrowded and congested cities.

Recently, I introduced two bills in Congress, which, if enacted into law, will make a major economic contribution to the future development of the Arkansas River Basin and also to the solution of two of our most pressing national problems.

Seventy percent of the American people are now living on only two percent of the land in the United States. This high concentration of population results in increased pollution, critical problems of housing, unhealthy living conditions, congested transportation, and increased crime. It is anticipated that our national population will increase by another one hundred million persons within the next 40 to 50 years. These people will have to live somewhere, and they obviously cannot be properly accommodated in our great metropolitan centers.

During the past decade, because industry expanded in already overcrowded and congested areas, one-third of the counties in the United States lost population, thus denying equal opportunities for economic advancement in the rural and less populated communities of America. This trend must be reversed.

One of the bills to which I have referred, which now has 40 cosponsors, would establish a national policy designed to encourage and promote a greater decentralization and a more balanced pattern of industrial growth throughout the country. It would help to revitalize the rural economy of our nation and to prevent the migration of people from the rural areas to the larger cities in search of jobs that are often not there. Today when they find no job, they join the ranks of the unemployed and swell the relief rolls that are already heavily burdensome and rapidly becoming intolerable in many of the cities to which they go.

The bill would require government agencies to give preference to the maximum extent practicable to the communities in which new industry locates, particularly in connection with the administration of our multi-billion dollar federal-aid programs, namely, such aid programs as housing, hospitals, schools, parks, streets, and water and sewer facilities. Thus, when a new industry locates in a rural town necessitating the construc-

tion of such improvements, federal assistance from existing programs would be made available to assist the local community in meeting the demands which growth imposes.

Such a policy, properly administered, will stimulate industrial growth and revitalize the economy in rural America while at the same time bringing urgently needed relief to many of the already overcrowded, overburdened, and virtually bankrupt metropolitan centers of our nation. The implementation of such a policy will enrich the lives and enhance the welfare of all Americans.

The other bill which I introduced, S. 907, if enacted, would authorize states to enter into interstate environmental compacts. This would enable Arkansas, Oklahoma, and all other states to work cooperatively together to prevent pollution and to solve environmental problems. Thirty Senators have co-sponsored this measure.

Man-made pollution is much easier to avoid and prevent than it is to control and cure. It is much easier to keep our streams clean and clear than it is to restore them and remove pollution once they are seriously contaminated.

States working together can apply and administer effective preventive measures.

I have great faith in the future of the Arkansas River Basin. We can never develop it into a Utopia, for we all know that the building and perfection of a Utopia is not within the power of man. Utopia is still locked in the book of fiction and beyond man's achievement.

But, if we pursue and capitalize on the great opportunities of this River Basin, we can build within this valley an economic empire—agricultural, industrial, and recreational. In doing so, we will strengthen the whole nation.

That is the challenge we face—the great task that now lies ahead of us. With continued faith, perseverance, and dedication, we will successfully meet that challenge and move on to the achievement of our further goals and aspirations.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS' SUPPLEMENT ON THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to a collection of articles on environmental problems which appeared as a special supplement in the Washington Daily News on March 9, 1971. Mr. V. S. Choslowsky, director of the special projects department of that newspaper, asked a number of leaders of the administration, Members of the Congress, and leaders in private organizations to contribute their thoughts to this feature publication. I ask that certain of these articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order that the Congress will have the opportunity to become familiar with the statements by Interior Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton, Chairman Russell B. Train of the Environmental Quality Council, Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency, Chairman John A. Blatnik of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives, Congressman Guy VANDER JAGT, and others of these contributors:

PRESIDENT'S COMMITMENT TO ENVIRONMENT REACHES EVERY LEVEL

(By Rogers C. B. Morton)

It is a national characteristic of Americans that we work together when it counts. Everywhere today, we find that traditional cohesion applying to the environment.

An alarmed American populace has awakened to the self-destructive potential of its material emissions. Conservation groups are no longer voices in the wilderness. They are being heard, and the public clamor and determination rises accordingly.

INDIVIDUALS, TOO

Recently, I observed that the interests which brought our civilization to its present development were more concerned with economics than with the preservation of resources and environment. That was not a rebuke intended for the "interests" alone, for in his smaller way, the Sunday driver who throws a beer can from his car window shares the guilt of a callous industrialist whose plant pollutes a river.

With this realization, we have taken on a commitment that reaches every level of national life and aspiration. That means government, commerce, industry, and no less, the individual.

President Nixon has set the goals for this national effort. In making environment the first priority of the new decade, the President proposed a 37 point program last year. He has added even more definitive plans in this year's State of the Union message.

These are initiatives to clean up our air and water, to preserve and restore our surroundings, even to eliminate the scourge of excessive noise. The President has enlisted all citizens in the crucial campaign now underway.

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

We have tough decisions to make along the road. The Department of the Interior must decide in the months ahead how best to transport oil from the rich north slope of Alaska to closer domestic markets. The proposed Alaska pipeline could be one answer but we need more time to evaluate its possible effects and viable alternative methods. There must be full provision made for the economic claims of native Alaskans, as well as safeguards for the migratory habits and the well being of wildlife.

The Santa Barbara channel presents another difficult question mark. The Interior Department must conclude if renewed offshore oil drilling would again unnecessarily endanger the Santa Barbara beaches or whether the oil resources there should be placed in reserve.

These are delicate matters involving contracts signed in good faith with the government. Furthermore, the decisions will have to be made under the pressure of a growing fuel and energy shortage in this country.

In other areas of concern, the Administration and the Congress are imposing stringent regulations on the industries that might poison water with waste and pollutants. The penalties for violation will be anything but mild. We are demanding that the strip mining companies restore the land they use, and that mine safety be their watchword.

LONG RANGE GOALS

In the long haul, the Nixon Administration is drafting environment plans that transcend the immediate future. We are making the initial moves toward a national energy policy, designed to streamline government management and to enhance our resources.

These are ambitious projects, but well within the national capability. Placed on a par with the economy and military defense, environmental programs will preserve and protect this abundant land. I foresee, before the end of this decade, a renaissance of quality in the American experience.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

POLLUTION CHARGES: VALUABLE ADJUNCT TO FIRM REGULATIONS

(By Russell E. Train)

The Administration has proposed an important new approach in our effort to find ways to enhance environmental quality by using charges on pollutants to stimulate abatement.

In his environmental message of Feb. 8, the President recommended charges on sulfur oxide emissions in the atmosphere and a tax on lead in gasoline. Even earlier, in his 1970 State of the Union message, President Nixon said:

"We no longer can afford to consider air and water common property, free to be abused by anyone without regard to the consequences. Instead, we should begin now to treat them as scarce resources, which we are no more free to contaminate than we are free to throw our garbage in our neighbor's yard. This requires that, to the extent possible, the price of the goods should be made to include the costs of producing and disposing of them without damage to the environment."

AN UNDERSTANDING

We are beginning to understand that pollution is costing us money. Air pollution, for example, increases our medical expenses, requires us to repaint our homes more frequently and may even lower the value of our urban real estate by making the area less esthetically pleasing.

Without pollution control measures, these costs are not reflected in the costs of products.

Our economic system today provides no incentive to clean up pollution. Indeed, because firms attempt to minimize costs in order to compete in the market, the incentive is to incur as few pollution-control costs as possible.

But if pollution itself becomes a cost thru a charge system, the incentive is then reversed. The firm would attempt to reduce pollution to the lowest level that is economically feasible to reduce the charges applicable to his production. Hence, the powerful forces of the market system would be working to enhance environmental quality.

UP TO EVERYONE

The administration is firmly committed to a comprehensive and firm regulatory program. But we simply do not have the resources to police the hundreds and thousands of individual sources in the United States.

Pollution charges provide a valuable supplement to regulatory authority in achieving our environmental goals faster, stimulating the development of new technology and methods of reducing pollution, encouraging more economic solutions and achieving higher levels of abatement than those required by standards.

But, they will never supplant regulatory authority nor will payment of the tax provide immunity to enforcement actions.

It is ultimately to everyone's advantage to stop pollution. The pollution charge approach will add a powerful tool in our battle to enhance and maintain high levels of environmental quality.

NEW ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY HAS A DUAL CHALLENGE

(By William D. Ruckelshaus)

The alarm of the environmental pollution crisis has been sounded and heard. Now we must begin to act.

In the Environmental Protection Agency, the United States has gathered together in a single Federal agency the responsibility for research, standard-setting, monitoring, and enforcement with regard to the air, water, noise, radiation, pesticide, and solid waste pollution problems.

DUAL CHALLENGE

We have been presented with a dual challenge—to attend to what is urgent and, at the same time, to foresee and respond to what is ahead. We shall exercise these responsibilities as an independent agency, be-holden by no obligations to promote commerce or agriculture.

Besides what we may do technically, our larger mandate is to exercise leadership. This includes informing and guiding those people responsible for and affected by pollution, which at present excludes no one.

We must work closely together, not only on the national level, but on the local level as well. Towards this end, we hope to have set up by mid-year ten regional offices to deal primarily with local people on local issues, to coordinate closely with local and state governments, in order to bring about a united effort of environmental enhancement.

Close contact with local people is vital, as the crucial environmental decisions to be made in this decade are really societal decisions.

One of the first and most important steps we can take in making these decisions is realizing the necessity of working towards the development of a new environmental ethic.

We need to discover a new reverence for all forms of life and their systems of support. We must come to understand that we can no longer afford the myopic type of progress which results in denuded forests, sterile land, and polluted water. Technology unchecked has as much potential for diminishing the quality of life as it has for enhancing it.

Throughout these endeavors we must continually realize that what we seek is progress and cooperation, not scapegoats. We do not seek to point the accusing finger of guilt, but rather we seek to pinpoint areas of difficulty and together, at all levels, work towards a common solution.

The levers of making beneficial change are in our hands. It is up to all of us to realize, whether we act in government, in industry, or as a private citizen, that we must work together. Pollution is everybody's problem; the solutions are difficult, but obtainable if we pull together.

ECOLOGY WAS A FOUR-LETTER WORD

15 YEARS AGO

(By Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK)

Ecology has caught on—the idea that we Americans have come close to destroying the water we drink, the air we breathe, the land which sustains us and that we'd better act fast if we want to see the year 2000.

No one could be happier than I at this vast groundswell of public concern, and at the great impact individuals and local groups have had on the effectiveness of the movement. The nation, Congress and the administration stand firmly committed to preserving and enhancing the environment.

LITTLE SUPPORT

But 15 years ago, when I wrote the first water pollution control legislation, we "ecologists" could have written our legislation and planned our strategy in a phone booth—with plenty of room left over. Our early legislation came thru only after bitter fights, and one bill was actually vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Even then, when our waters were relatively clean, you could see the crisis coming down the pike like a 10-ton truck. Our cities were growing up and out, like atomic clouds and with consequences as disastrous for the environment. Our industries were spewing out ever more complex wastes, which were increasingly more difficult to find and remove by available technology.

But we knew full well that that clean-up could not be accomplished by federal dictum

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

alone. The federal government would have to play a positive and constructive role, enlisting the cooperation of state and local governments as well as industry. We wanted to encourage industry to clean up its pollution voluntarily, and to avoid the extremes of "close-'em-down" or "let-'em-pollute." To that end, the federal government has coupled tax incentives and federal funds for research with tough penalties for polluters.

FIRST PROGRAM

My first bill, signed into law in 1956, set up the first permanent national program for pollution control. It brings federal and state officials together with representatives of the source of pollution—be it federal government installation, municipal facility or industry—to work out a schedule and method for ending the pollution or keeping it within tolerable limits. If the offender does not follow this schedule or refuses to abate its pollution, he faces court action and possible shutdown.

Since that first law, federal jurisdiction has expanded to cover all navigable waterways of the United States, established federal water quality standards and strengthened the enforcement mechanisms.

Our most recent law, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970, provides stiff penalties for oil companies who, thru negligence, allow oil spills from tankers or on or off-shore wells. This same act, for the first time, requires the companies to prove their innocence, rather than the government to prove their guilt.

The 1965 law also began channeling funds into construction of municipal waste treatment plants, and to date, the federal government has invested over a billion dollars in 10,000 plants treating sewage and other wastes which would otherwise be dumped directly into our rivers and lakes.

LONG ROAD AHEAD

The fight for clean water is far from over. Tho there are some success stories, our waters are generally worse now than they were 15 years ago. But they would be far more polluted without the legislation and federal funds.

Within the foreseeable future, I think we will see a marked improvement in the quality of our waters, as present techniques are more widely applied, as research bears fruit, abatement measures take hold and we build more treatment plants.

It will be difficult. It will be costly. But it is possible.

I am confident that we will win the battle—because I believe in the people's lasting commitment to clean water. I believe the American people will continue to demand action by all levels of government and by industry, and that both government and industry will be responsive to these demands.

COMMON SENSE IS NEEDED TO CONTROL WATER POLLUTION

(By Representative GUY VANDER JAGT)

With timely stimulation from Rachel Carson and others, with environmental problems reaching proportions unacceptable to the general public, with the long heard but commonly ignored cries of conservationists suddenly making sense, the American people have entered the 1970s with a great desire to halt the degradation of their land, clean up their water resources, and restore the quality of air to levels insuring survival of human beings.

In 1969, I joined with other members of Congress who were also on the House Government Operations Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee in calling for an environmental decade in the 1970s—ten years of concentrated effort to solve environmental problems. Our goal then, as it is now, is a harmonious relationship between man and the earth on which he lives.

JOIN TOGETHER

Government, industry, individual citizens and organizations have rallied to the environmental flag. While remnants of opposition to the cause remain, the sound logic of arguments supporting the need has carried the day. America has the motivation to solve these problems. And the dollars are being spent.

The question, then, becomes one of effectiveness. Are we going to solve problems, or are we simply going to contribute to human frustration?

Some of our programs seem to be built on shaky foundations. Take water pollution control, for example. The basic premise on which standard primary and secondary treatment systems are constructed (we have a national goal of a minimum of secondary treatment or its equivalent for every city) is that the removal of organic matter to a substantial degree from sewage, coupled with chlorination to kill bacteria, will solve most of our water pollution problems. The effluent from such systems is disposed of in the nearest river or lake.

Have you ever lived on a river or lake "blessed" with the results of such treatment? Such bodies are usually weed filled or algae covered; trash fish, which can survive in low oxygen content water, have displaced more desirable species; and the "no swimming" signs are up.

Until fairly recent times it seemed reasonable to dispose of effluent from sewage treatment plants in such a manner. Our surface waters were capable of diluting those effluents to a point where the environmental damage was minimal.

But there are now too many of us, using too much water, producing too much sewage for natural bodies to assimilate even when current secondary treatment concepts are employed.

The answer lies in applying a little common sense to the problem. First of all, we should decide that we do not want that stuff in our water. We should permit no discharge of industrial or municipal waste into any surface water. Our lakes and streams are better used for swimming and fishing and supplying drinking water.

What are the alternatives? One is disposal of sewage sludge by burning, but burning introduces pollutants into the air, and destroys many potentially valuable elements in wastes.

We are acutely aware that the components in treated sewage causing pollution problems are, for the most part, basic fertilizer elements—phosphorous, nitrogen and potassium. They come from the food we eat and the detergents we use, and farmers buy them to spread on the land to produce food for livestock and human beings. But when they enter our lakes and streams, they make weeds and algae grow. Could we get those fertilizer elements back on the land where they came from, where we need them to produce food?

Yes, we can. Present day technology allows us to treat raw sewage to a sufficient degree that the resulting effluent can be safely spread on the land by irrigation systems to help make crops grow. And the costs are reasonable. Muskegon County in my Congressional District in Michigan is about to establish such a system.

Substantial amounts of land are needed for these systems, and it is necessary to pipe the sewage outside high land cost urban areas. But the system will help pay for itself because it does provide the land with water and fertilizer.

Back on the land, these elements are not pollutants at all, but precious resources, resources that we would otherwise waste. In "disposing" of them on the land we are recycling scarce resources which would otherwise be lost.

One additional argument for this approach to water pollution control relates to viruses, which cause diseases like hepatitis, influenza

and the common cold. Some researchers think viruses could even be the cause of some forms of cancer.

Primary and secondary treatment systems with chlorination do not kill a substantial share of the viruses in sewage. But 100 per cent are killed when water in which they are present is filtered thru the first seven inches of surface soil. The electrical charge in a virus attaches it to a soil particle, and the bacteria in the soil then break the virus down to simple, harmless protein.

Land disposal of treated sewage will accomplish what we really want in our water pollution control programs. We can have drinking-water-pure lakes and streams. We can recycle precious resources for economic benefits to our children and our children's children. We can reduce the threat of water-borne disease. All we need to do is apply some common sense in our water pollution control programs.

And we must apply this same kind of thinking to other pollution problems such as solid waste disposal. We must plan and design and engineer within an "environmental framework." If we look at pollutants as simply "resources out of place" and plan accordingly, we will have gone far down the road towards solving our environmental problems.

THE ENVIRONMENT IS AN INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM

(By Charles S. Rhyne)

Co-operation by all nations to protect and improve man's environment around the globe will be studied and acted upon by some 4,000 lawyers from 128 nations attending the Fifth World Conference on World Peace Thru Law at Belgrade, Yugoslavia, July 21-25.

Pursuant to the theme of the Conference, "The Law of the World and Man's Environment," the participants will hear reports from experts on environment problems and will then consider ideas for improving existing international laws and for creating new laws and legal bodies to combat the rapidly-growing menace of pollution of land, sea, air and space.

MODEL TREATY

A draft of a model treaty proposal is now being prepared by Dr. Carl A. Fleischer of the Institute of Public and International Law of the University of Oslo, Norway, an outstanding authority of the international legal aspects of environmental problems.

Norway, along with Sweden and Denmark, has a special interest in international pollution matters, having experienced the effects of a fall-out from the smokestacks of the Ruhr Valley.

Dr. Fleischer will review the actions taken by eight European nations in June, 1969 on pollution by oil in the North Sea and by a meeting called in December, 1969 by the Nordic United Nations Associations in Stockholm.

A proposal on weather control is being prepared for the conference by Professor J. W. Samuels, Faculty of Law, University of Western Ontario, Canada. This is in accordance with a resolution adopted by the Fourth World Conference on World Peace Thru Law at Bangkok in 1969 which stated that "weather control can be either a threat to international peace, or a means of bettering mankind's condition."

Chairman of the World Peace Thru Law Center's Committee on law and environment is James L. Elsman, a Detroit attorney. Mr. Elsman will propose an amendment to the United Nations Charter on environmental control, and will suggest that the World Court be given jurisdiction over disputes arising from international environmental agreements.

Mr. Elsman is chairman of the Michigan State Bar Association's International Law Committee and has served for the past six

years by appointment of the Secretary of Commerce on the Regional Export Expansion Council.

Chairman Elsman has been aided by a panel of experts from groups such as the World Health Organization, World Meteorological Organization, International Atomic Energy Agency, and United Nations Economic Council for Europe as well as private conservation organizations and law professors.

UNIFIED EFFORT

The decisions arrived at on international environmental legal problems at the Belgrade Conference will be circulated to all interested persons around the world—legislators, government officials, national leaders, specialists, universities and the press—and should give a tremendous impetus and cohesion to the many scattered efforts underway to combat the many forms of pollution now being identified.

The Belgrade Conference will, of course, take up many other subjects besides environment, including the exploration and exploitation of the seabed, airplane hijacking, investment in Socialist nations, legal urban problems, strengthening the United Nations, international courts and tribunals.

Every lawyer in the world is welcome to attend the conference in their private capacity. Concurrent with the conference will be a meeting of the World Association of Judges, which has as its prime object the promotion of world peace by providing for a year-round exchange of experience and for leadership initiatives.

Laymen are also invited to attend the conference and to become associate members of the center, which is headquartered in Geneva.

This will be the first time the two meetings will have been held in a Socialist country. Previous world meetings have been held in Athens, Bangkok.

INDUSTRY LEADERS BAND TOGETHER TO FIGHT POLLUTION

(By Bert S. Cross)

American business, governments and the public have all moved rapidly in the past year to undo decades of neglect to our environment.

The changes which are taking place are as fundamental as any economic or social development in our time. The resources of clean air, clean water and a quiet environment are the raw materials necessary to production of the good and services essential to our economy.

The leaders of every American industry are joining in constructive response to this new recognition of our basic environmental concerns. Large investments are required to clean up the sources of pollution which most urgently threaten the environment.

It is essential that the standards and enforcement programs established by Federal, state and local governments take into account not only that which is technically feasible but the time required for implementation and the economic consequences involved as well.

The National Pollution Control Council, advisory to the President on industrial environmental policies and programs, is working with both government and industry to build the cooperative partnership necessary to achieve our environmental goals.

Our task is to find the most expeditious and effective ways of reducing pollution. This we are well on the way to doing.

It means new and different products and new and different practices for both industry and the public.

Change is the order of the day. Industry welcomes this change, this challenge and this new environmental role.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT: BIGGEST MASS MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(By William Steif)

Nancy Batora of Bannister, Mich., mailed a letter to an office here a few days ago. In a painstaking teen-age scrawl, she wrote:

"I am a freshman at Avid-Elsie High. Recently in my earth science class I have seen a group of movies concerning air pollution in America. I am very concerned with this problem, as most of my classmates are. Could you please send me some ideas on cleaning up our community? We could make a class project of it. Thank you for your time."

POTENT MOVEMENT

Nancy's letter was almost routine. Between 40 and 50 similar letters come to Environmental Action Inc., 1346 Connecticut-av., n.w., every day, nearly a year after the whoopla of the 1970 "Earth Day."

These letters are an index to the fact that saving the environment has turned into one of the biggest, most powerful mass movements in American history.

The key word is "mass". Many millions of people are involved. It is not a fad. It will not go away. Indeed, the movement has broadened and deepened and become more a part of the American fabric than ever before.

Here are a few suggestions of the movement's potency, as drawn from two days' mail at Environmental Action:

Brent B. Bleier, acting president of Appeal for an Environmental Alternative (AWA), Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., sent along a report of his group's "county-wide glass recycle program," a \$10 check, asked for information and signed this letter "ecologically yours."

The Rev. Ronald Haseley of Bethlehem Lutheran Church, Round Top, Tex., asked for materials on "forming a local society, the purpose of which would be to help create a better environment by protecting wildlife, conserving and recycling raw materials, and disseminating information."

Mrs. David G. Rose of Hastings, Neb., reported she was "very short on factual, statistical data" and, among other items, asked "how many trees are needed to make 12 dozen boxes of Pampers?"

John Richter of the Bridgewater State College biology club, Bridgewater, Mass., said that "even if there is no national teach-in scheduled for this year, we are going to attempt one of our own."

Mary Anne Deutschmann of Alexandria wrote that "our church youth group is holding a pollution awareness program to make our church members, about 500 families, aware of what they can do."

Thomas S. Neoyen, loan officer of the Northern State Bank, Appleton, Wis., told of the bank's display and informational activities and reported "we gave away Colorado blue spruce seedlings to whomever expressed a desire to plant them."

Gilbert R. Tortolani, president of the Ecology First Federation (EFF) of Pacific Grove, Calif., wrote of plans to "involve not only the individual but industry as well in combatting the pollution problem" on the Monterey Peninsula 100 miles south of San Francisco.

Mrs. Craig B. Smith of New Hartford, N.Y., sought information on behalf of her local ecology committee and asked: "Also, if you have any information on the voting records and actual positions (on environmental matters) taken by our representatives, Sens. Jacob Javits and James Buckley, and Congressman Alexander Pirnie, we would appreciate receiving it."

Joe F. Johnson II, a student at Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville, Ark., said he was "forming a chapter of Zero Population Growth."

"A SURPRISING RESPONSE"

Unsolicited contributions rain in on Environmental Action amounting to between \$25 and \$200 daily—and a donation to the group is not tax-exempt. A biweekly newsletter begun a year ago now goes to 20,000 subscribers, and 25 new subscriptions come in daily. A pamphlet called "Do-It-Yourself Ecology" has sold 15,000 copies, at 25 cents per, and the order backlog for it is 20,000. This will be satisfied when a new printing of 50,000 copies is delivered shortly.

A new \$1.25 paperback, "Earth Tool Kit," will be published April 1. Initial printing is 100,000 copies. The "kit" offers detailed instructions in how to bend industry and government to the environmentalists' will.

Sam Love, long-haired and bewhiskered, sits in the cluttered seventh floor office where he, Dennis Hayes and a dozen other young environmentalists have built their organization and says in a slow, Southern drawl: "We've had a surprising response... We hope to give the movement direction."

Young organizations like Environmental Action, David Brower's Friends of the Earth and the Environmental Defense Fund, together with the new breed of public-interest lawyers, have played key roles in bringing the movement to its present potency. But the older groups, inevitably, have carried the biggest load in broadening its constituency.

Membership increases in some of these older groups are instructive:

The National Wildlife Federation, basically a conglomerate of state organizations of hunters and fishermen with an increasingly strong conservation bent, has more than 1.6 million members today, up more than 300,000 over last year at this time. It also has an auxiliary of nearly 400,000 high school and grade school members.

In three years, the National Audubon Society's membership has leaped from 70,000 to 150,000. In a decade, the Wilderness Society has grown from 8,000 members to its current 74,000 members. And the 79-year-old Sierra Club, originally just a western regional group, has increased from 70,000 members two years ago to 120,000 today.

These membership figures represent commitment. For example, it costs \$12 a year, plus a \$5 initial admission fee, to belong to the Sierra Club, and the club is getting 2,000 to 3,000 applications a month. Two new chapters have just been organized in the Canal Zone and the Governor of American Samoa has written to say he wants to organize a chapter there.

Lobbyists and press agents in this often-cynical city are clamoring to jump aboard the environmental bandwagon. Politicians, recognizing vote power when they see it, are hastening to sublimate their normal Babbittry to embrace the movement.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wis., one of the politicians who became involved early, reports that 15 Governors already have "proclaimed" the third week in April as "Earth Week," even tho no national observance is planned this year.

The six million Boy Scouts of America have been enlisted in the movement. They will "keep America beautiful" by picking up litter June 5.

Hundreds of college, high school and grade school ecology courses have sprung up, like daffodils blooming on a warm April day.

JUMPING ON

Almost every industry is looking for ways to gratify the new-found American taste of an improved environment. The beer and soft-drink people move toward recycling cans, in conjunction with the steel and aluminum producers. The scrap metal companies work with the government on re-use. Pulp paper firms look to Europe for recycling methods. Steel, copper and chemical companies try

to cut air and water pollution, and brag of their efforts.

The detergent folks, trapped between algae-producing phosphates and the false promise of the chemical NTA, thrash about desperately in search of substitutes. General Motors hires a real air pollution authority from the University of California, and all the auto makers—pressed by a new law—hunt despairingly for ways to produce clean internal combustion engines.

Government at all levels has felt the environmentalists' impact. For instance, think of what's happened recently at the Federal level alone:

The President created his Council on Environmental Quality and the enforcement-oriented Environmental Protection Agency.

Still new water and air pollution laws breezed thru Congress, the latter over the anguished opposition of the nation's biggest industry, the auto makers.

Legislation authorizing increased private-industry cutting in the public forests has been beaten.

Use of DDT and other pesticides has been reduced drastically.

The proposed supersonic transport has been placed in grave jeopardy.

Oil drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel has been foreclosed.

The 789-mile oil pipeline in Alaska has been delayed indefinitely.

The cross-Florida barge canal has been stopped cold, as has been a big airport planned to lie adjacent to Florida's Everglades National Park.

Environmental protection on Gulf Coast oil platforms has been strengthened immediately.

The Department of Transportation is approving new highways in a much more gingerly manner and moving against billboards, at last.

Hundreds of thousands of public acres—beaches, forests, mountains, deserts—have been newly dedicated to national parks and wildernesses.

Even the Supreme Court reads the papers. Just the other day the court stalled, for several more years at least, local efforts to drive an Interstate highway thru Overton Park in downtown Memphis.

A typical impact at the state level has been a German company's abandonment of plans to build a giant petro-chemical complex along the South Carolina coast.

"The state legislatures are flooded with environmental legislation," says Charles Callison, executive vice president of the National Audubon Society. "New York State, for instance, enacted a bill banning the sale of rare animal and bird skins. Now 8 or 10 other legislatures—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Nebraska, some others—are doing the same thing. At the county and city levels, it's just the same."

The movement represents a consolidation of two distinct trends in American life.

One is an essentially romantic view of nature and the untouched American wilderness. This view grew up in the 19th Century in the writings of H. D. Thoreau and later in the writings of John Burroughs and John Muir, and blossomed in the early years of this century in the conservation movements led by Gifford Pinchot.

Typical of this somewhat mystic view is a part of the Wilderness Society by-laws, which says: "We believe that wilderness is a valuable natural resource that belongs to the people and that its preservation . . . is part of a balanced conservation program essential in the survival of our civilized culture."

ACADEMIA

The second trend is academic-scientific. It is a climax of a century of furious industrial growth that has produced a nation in which 6 per cent of the world's population consumes 50 per cent of the world's manufactured goods.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

There is a price for such habits of consumption, or over-consumption. Scientists like Stanford biologist Paul Ehrlich, Cal Tech chemist Arie J. Haagen-Smit and Washington University biologist Barry Commoner insist our consumption patterns have led us to poison our air, foul our water, ruin our earth and destroy our wildlife.

When the romantic and scientific views were joined, they formed a powerful counter to the common notion that never-ending industrial expansion could be equated with "progress." Many people began to notice that there were costs—in manufacturing, in agriculture, in the retail industry, and in our life styles—that had never before been counted.

The costs can be summed up in a word: pollution.

Where are we now? Where are we going? President Sydney Howe of the Conservation Foundation says:

"I am absolutely certain that the problems that have roused public concern are profound and that, so long as they fester, they will continue to develop public response. The human animal is so basically affected (more) as an organism by the environment's continuing worsening that, increasingly, we are going to have to accept losses or reductions in profits.

"This means a larger share of public expenditures to control environmental problems."

What would Howe put at the top of his list of problems?

"Energy production and its use. This is intimately connected to our style of living. Transportation is close, thereafter."

He adds that "the Alaska oil pipeline hearings may be a significant turning point in making national decisions about where we get our energy and how we use it. We may wind up with a national energy policy soon."

Stewart M. Brandberg, executive director of the Wilderness Society, says "we are all caught living on one little planet . . . We have failed to bring population growth into equilibrium, we continue to make more demands on technology, our effluents are getting more and more out of hand.

"The pinch on the environment grows stronger, we are running out of resources, and we are not cutting back on our life style. The hopeful note is that more and more people are becoming aware of our dilemma—and are willing to take steps to call a halt. And they no longer focus on a single issue, they recognize the need to join hands."

The message from Michael McCloskey, executive director of the Sierra Club, is similar. The movement, he says, now "conflicts with almost every major American industry"—primarily because industry normally wants to put its products on the market before those products' environmental effects are known. McCloskey says it may be necessary to change the ground rules, so the environmental constraints dominate commerce.

He says his crystal ball is too cloudy to predict the future, but adds that he operates on "one premise—the laws of nature can't be tampered with indefinitely."

A sentence in the "Earth Tool Kit" sums up what has been happening: "As roses wilt from air pollution, the garden club becomes a hotbed of social activities."

LOGARITHMIC SCALE GAME

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, I read the statement recently, prepared by a

March 17, 1971

so-called expert, that said the 707 is equal in noise to 50 SST's on takeoff. The author of this statement is playing games with the logarithmic scale. For many years the professional societies such as SAE, ATA, and AIA have been working with universities and industry to establish a meaningful noise measuring system. They have settled on PNDb, and effective PNDb. What our expert has done is to ignore this measuring technique and to use only the pressure aspects of noise as measured in decibels. Using his method of measuring, the noise generated by 50 SST's over the community after takeoff would be the same level as that produced by one 707 aircraft. On landing, 25 SST's would make the same noise as one 707. Playing this kind of number game, gentlemen, is neither productive nor reasonable.

TACTICAL AIR COMMAND, SILVER ANNIVERSARY

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on March 21, 1946, Tactical Air Command was created as one of the combat commands of the U.S. Air Force.

From rather humble beginnings, Tactical Air Command today stands as a decisive deterrent force in modern diplomacy.

During these past 25 years, the men and women of this Command have researched, defined, studied, tested, and perfected the tactical or limited warfare capability of the U.S. Air Force.

The growth of the Command reflects the increased importance of tactical air-power since World War II.

The Korean conflict emphasized the need for a "limited war" capability. This has been and continues to be the mission of the Tactical Air Command. TAC serves as the primary force in developing Air Force doctrine, techniques, tactics, and training for limited warfare.

Through such developments as the composite air strike force concept, the United States was ready to respond effectively to the Lebanon and Formosa Straits crisis which erupted in 1958.

As the air arm of the U.S. Atlantic Command and the U.S. Strike Command, TAC made significant contributions during the Cuban crisis of 1962, the Congo rebellion of 1964, and the Dominican Republic uprising of 1965.

This steadfast command has also trained and deployed professional aircrews and ground personnel in support of Air Force efforts in Southeast Asia.

No matter what the crisis, the men and women of Tactical Air Command have responded. They have helped survivors of earthquakes in South America, hurricanes and floods in the United States and overseas, and stopped a dreaded insect from spreading an epidemic throughout the Southwest United States.

Whether on military or humanitarian

missions, Tactical Air Command has set an enviable record in these past 25 years.

I take this opportunity to salute the Commander of Tactical Air Command, Gen. William W. Momyer and his professional military organization as it completes a quarter century of dedicated service to this Nation.

MILITARY MANPOWER PROCUREMENT IN THE EARLY 20TH CENTURY

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the historical tradition of military service in America, it is clear that the use of compulsion has been the exception, rather than the rule. According to a background study prepared for the Gates Commission by Jack Rafuse, the tradition of universal service in the militia has existed only on paper. The study states:

The Militia Act of 1903, perpetuated the fiction of universal service by the same device as the earlier law had done—it simply defined "militia" to include nearly everyone. The 1916 law, with amendments, is still in force. The exemptions are few relative to the entire male population. On paper, then, every male adult is a militiaman, in accordance with the "American tradition."

The fact is, of course, that only a minority of the population is ever called to military service, in spite of the "universality" of the law.

During the First World War, the Nation resorted to compulsory military service for the first time since the Civil War. The study stated further:

The arguments used to justify conscription in World War I focused on the potential surplus, rather than lack of volunteers. The Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, admitted that the number of volunteers might be adequate, but felt recruitment of volunteers would lead "to the earliest sacrifice of the bravest, most zealous, most active men." Senator Calder of New York stated that "under a volunteer system there is no way of preventing men from leaving necessary industries and crippling resources that are just as important as an army itself."

Actually, the World War I draft provides us with the first dramatic example of how an affluent majority can use conscription to reduce the cost of war to the general public:

The alacrity with which Congress passed the draft law seems incredible, unless one accepts the view of the draft as a tax by the politically powerful on the less powerful. Men 18-21 years old did not vote in most states, but they provided the bulk of the military manpower, and at low wages. Negroes often were prevented from enlisting, but were drafted in disproportionate numbers.

The World War I experience is particularly relevant to the current discussion of the use of the draft to shift the defense burden onto a minority of the young, and the use of the draft to compel the poor and the black to serve disproportionately. I commend this item to your attention:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

U.S. EXPERIENCE WITH VOLUNTEER AND CONSCRIPT FORCES

(By John L. Rafuse)

PART FOUR: THE MILITIA LAWS AND WORLD WAR I

Militia reform laws of 1903 and 1916

One direct result of the Spanish American War was the reform of the militia system. During Theodore Roosevelt's presidency, Secretary of War Elihu Root initiated a military reform. The Militia Act of 1792 was repealed and replaced. The new law made broad beginnings at forming the militias (now called the National Guard) into a true national reserve force by aligning them, at the request of the individual governor, more closely with Regular Army officers, drill, and discipline. The law also perpetuated the fiction of universal service by the same device as the earlier law had done—it simply defined "militia" to include nearly everyone. The exemptions were basically those of the 1792 statute, so 20th century America kept 18th century exemptions. The Act's read, in part:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the militia shall consist of every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and every able-bodied male of foreign birth who has declared his intention to become a citizen, who is more than eighteen and less than forty-five years of age, and shall be divided into two classes—the organized militia, to be known as the National Guard of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, or by such other designations as may be given them by the laws of the respective States or Territories, and the remainder to be known as the Reserve Militia.

"That the Vice-President of the United States, the officers, judicial and executive, of the Government of the United States, the members and officers of each House of Congress, persons in the military or naval service of the United States, all customhouse officers, with their clerks, postmasters and persons employed by the United States in the transmission of the mail, ferrymen employed at any ferry on a post road, artificers and workmen employed in the armories and arsenals of the United States, pilots, mariners actually employed in the sea service of any citizen or merchant within the United States, and all persons who are exempted by the laws of the respective States or Territories shall be exempted from militia duty, without regard to age: Provided, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to require or compel any member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization at present organized and existing whose creed forbids its members to participate in war in any form, and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein, in accordance with the creed of said religious organization, to serve in the militia or any other armed or volunteer force under the jurisdiction and authority of the United States."

The next legislation which related to service obligation was the National Defense Act of 1916. It perpetuated the "tradition" of universal militia service, stating:

"Composition of the militia

"The militia of the United States shall consist of all able-bodied male citizens of the United States and all other able-bodied males who have or shall have declared their intention to become citizens of the United States, who shall be more than eighteen years of age and, except as hereinafter noted, not more than forty-five years of age, and said militia shall be divided into three classes, the National Guard, the Naval Militia, and the Unorganized Militia."

The 1916 law, with amendments, is still in force. The exemptions are few relative to the

entire male population. On paper, then, every male adult is a militiaman, in accordance with the "American tradition." The Act did change some things, however. It provided federal pay in peacetime for those National Guard units which met standards, drilled regularly, and had a set number of encampments per year. In time of war, the President could call those units into federal service with the Regulars.

World War I

In theory, the army was ready with 210,000 men (133,000 Regulars and 77,000 National Guard) when war was declared on April 6, 1917. But the men lacked training. Except for a few demonstration units, eight months passed before American troops began arriving in quantity in Europe. Eighteen of the 29 American divisions which saw action in France (7 divisions of Regulars, and 11 of Guardsmen) were all-volunteer divisions. That proportion is striking since in World War I voluntarism was curtailed by law and volunteers were a minority among armed service men.

In World War I, as in the Civil War, the U.S. resorted to conscription, though for a different reason. In 1863, insufficient volunteering was cited, whereas in 1917 the reason was ostensibly to prevent indiscriminate voluntarism. Again, as in the Civil War, the Congress acted quickly. On April 6, 1917, the U.S. declared war and the following day the draft law was requested. On May 18th it was signed into law. The law acknowledged and corrected many of the mistakes which had been made in the Civil War draft law—men registered themselves and were not registered by the military, draftees and deserters were not processed by the same group, and the approach to conscription was different.

There were no widespread draft riots nor violence in World War I, and some claimed that this was because the draft was more or less self-imposed and administered. On the other hand, there were an estimated 171,000 "draft evaders" who never registered plus another 360,000 "draft deserters" who never responded to induction orders. Since approximately 2,800,000 men were drafted, this means another 20 percent of the eligibles evaded. In addition, 64,693 men filed as conscientious objectors of whom 20,973 were inducted and another 500 of whom were court-martialed. All was not smooth, despite President Wilson's statement that the draft "... is in no sense a conscription of the unwilling; it is, rather, selection from a nation which has volunteered in mass."

The arguments used to justify conscription in World War I focused on the potential surplus, rather than lack of volunteers. The Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, admitted the number of volunteers might be adequate, but felt recruitment of volunteers would lead "to the earliest sacrifice of the bravest, most zealous, most active men." Senator Calder of New York stated that "under a volunteer system there is no way of preventing men from leaving necessary industries and crippling resources that are just as important as an army itself."

Conscription lasted for nineteen months in the U.S. during World War I. On May 18, 1917, the Selective Service Act became law. By June 5, 9.6 million men had registered, and in the broader (18-45) registration of 1918, another 14.6 million registered. Of the total 24.2 million, only 2.8 were actually inducted. All manpower enrolled (or registered for the draft) was divided into five classes "... in the inverse order of its industrial importance; the fifth class containing those exempted from all liability under the terms of the selective service law. Class I was to constitute the reservoir of manpower, the drain of which for military duty would least disturb the domestic and economic life of the nation. The other classes were to contain the men whose domestic and industrial relations were such that their call to the

colors be deferred as long as the exigencies of the military situation would permit."⁵

The statement sounds as if the primary concern had been the convenience of the Selective Service rather than the conduct of the war. The incongruity of the 1917 draft rationale was equalled in its application: enlistment in the Army by draft registrants was discontinued on 15 December 1917 and on 8 August 1918 all voluntary enlistments in all branches of service were discontinued. The "right" had been taken from those who most wanted to volunteer and the state was allowed to decide which citizen had the "right and duty" to serve. The Provost Marshal General⁶ cites the reasoning which lay behind the curtailment of enlistments:

"Such recruiting played havoc for a time with the orderly process of selection. During the period in which enlistments were permitted, 1,300,000 men were withdrawn from the available sources of supply, upon which the selective service organization relied.⁷ The volunteer plan took no heed of economic value; it received as readily the man indispensable to production as it did the industrially worthless. We were presented with the strange anomaly of a nation which had intrusted its manpower to a selective organization, at the very breath turning over the same resources to an indiscriminate withdrawal by the agencies of recruitment. The task of accounting became highly difficult; an equitable of efficient apportionment of manpower between the military and industrial realms was impossible. Recruitment disturbed every phase of the scientific administration of our task and impaired the efficiency of the whole organization."

Despite the inflation in the U.S. economy and the rising demand for the services of those in Class I, military pay and allowances did not change at all during the war—there was no need to manipulate incentives since men had no freedom.

This was the first war in which America fought that draftees were sent out of the country to fight. It was also the first in which military compensation, pay and allowances, or enlistment bounties remained unchanged. It was the first in which reliance on the draft was so complete. The use of draftees in combat outside the United States was an important break with any pretense of tradition. Previously that had been a job for the Regular Army, but draftees were not Regulars. The legal justification for a draft had always related conscription to militia service, and retained the distinction between the militia, and army, missions. This distinction was eradicated without mention in World War I. Class I manpower was a minority⁸—in scarce supply relative to the enormous demand. Yet there was no change in military compensation. As the war continued draft calls drew more and more people from the minority in Class. Negroes totalled only 9.63 percent of total registrants, but more than 13 percent of those inducted were black.⁹ To state it another way, 52 of every 100 black registrants was placed in Class I, only 33 of each 100 whites. Further, 34 of every 100 black registrants were inducted, while fewer than 26 of every 100 white registrants were.¹⁰ The breakdown is shown below:

TABLE 7—Registrants in Class I and inducted, by race
[In Percent]

Class I	
Colored	51.6
Class I	
White	32.5
Inducted	
Colored	34.06
Inducted	
White	25.51
Class I and inducted	
Colored	66
Class I and inducted	
White	78.5

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 9.6-to-13 percent effect is a result of more Negro registrants being Class I, rather than more Class I Negroes being drafted. The disparity was primarily due to their social and economic standing. Negroes were not allowed to volunteer in National Guard or some other armed service branches prior to the war, but were a relatively large part of the Class I pool once it was set up.¹⁰

The World War I draft was passed within days. The alacrity with which Congress passed the draft law seems incredible, unless one accepts the view of the draft as a tax by the politically powerful on the less powerful. Men 18-21 years old did not vote in most states, but they provided the bulk of the military manpower, and at low wages. Negroes often were prevented from enlisting but were drafted in disproportionate numbers. The new draft enactment passed Congress without consideration being given to higher taxes for increased military pay.

All in all, because of differences in rationale, approach, justification, and sheer size of the undertaking, the World War I draft had no link with any previous draft. It provides another legal precedent for today's conscription, but offers no parallel and no direct link with any other. It is, then, no part of "tradition."

FOOTNOTES

¹ "An Act to promote the efficiency of the militia, and for other purposes" is included in its entirety in *United States Statutes at Large*, Vol. XXXII, 57th Congress (1901-1903), Part I: Public Laws, Chapter 196, pp. 775-780.

² H.R. 12766, Public Law No. 85 of June 3, 1916. Section 57 is cited.

³ The statistics in this and the following several paragraphs are taken from *The Second Report of the Provost Marshal General* (Washington, 1918).

⁴ Wilson's *Proclamation on Registration for the Draft*, May 18, 1917.

⁵ *Second Report*, p. 2.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 6.

⁷ The full total of American troops and sailors who saw active combat service was about 1,390,000. Morrison, *Oxford History*, p. 867.

⁸ *Second Report*, p. 170.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 191-193 gives the data on which these figures are based.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 191-199.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said lately about the depressed state of the American economy. The textile industry faces the problems generated by a sluggish economy and carries the added burden of an ever-increasing flow of foreign textile imports which are threatening to make one of America's most vital industries extinct. This week one of the largest textile producers in the United States, Dan River, Inc. of Greenville, S.C., announced that over 600 salaried employees will be permanently removed from the Dan River payroll. The president of Dan River, Robert S. Small, cited losses which the company had sustained during 1970 and said:

We regret losing many capable and loyal employees, but there is no alternative to this major cost reduction if the company is to regain its forward momentum.

March 17, 1971

Mr. Speaker, I know many of Dan River's employees, and I know that they cannot find solace in rhetoric which promises an upturn in the American economy. For months we have been promised a brighter economic picture, but the layoffs continue and families face an uncertain future.

I believe that this Congress has a responsibility to the American public to provide an impetus for our economy. As a beginning, I would suggest, as I have on numerous occasions, that the Congress provide relief for our textile industry from unfair foreign competition. In my judgment, viable textile quota legislation is long overdue, and I believe that such legislation would help to stop the erosion of one of our most essential industries.

IMPROVED PASSPORT PROCEDURES

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, by holding hearings on legislation to improve passport procedures, the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Affairs of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs this week took an essential step toward assisting America's travelers. The bill there under consideration, S. 531, identical to one which I introduced in this session of Congress, authorizes the Secretary of State to pay to the U.S. Postal Service the execution fee of \$2 for each passport application executed before postal officials. It would implement and expand a successful passport application test program that has been operating in Connecticut for the last half-year. It could also provide a source of considerable revenue to the Postal Service.

During yesterday's hearings, I testified that this legislation would provide an invaluable addition to several steps that have been taken in the past year to ease the passport crisis. For instance, the use of probate courts, 96 in number, in Connecticut to accept passport applications, in line with a suggestion I made to the State Department during hearings of this subcommittee last year, has provided prompt and accessible service to many citizens. This week's primary witness, Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs for the State Department, the Honorable Barbara M. Watson, stated:

At our request, the Probate Assembly of the State of Connecticut approved the participation by Connecticut Probate Judges in the taking of passport applications. As a result, some 96 Probate Courts in Connecticut are now accepting passport applications. These measures have ameliorated the problem in certain areas of the country. They are not, however, a complete solution.

In March 1970, Secretary Rogers appointed a State Department committee to facilitate travel. I expressed to this committee my hope that passport procedures could be improved through immediate administrative action. In June

1970, the State Department announced that 12 first-class post offices in 8 Connecticut and in 2 cities in 2 other States would take passport applications on a 6-month trial basis.

As Miss Watson asserted, this test program has been quite successful, especially for citizens of Connecticut. During the 6-month trial period, 12 first-class post offices in 8 Connecticut cities processed 7,074 passport applications. The 2 other post offices participating in the program, Detroit, Mich., and Houston, Tex., processed 2,408 and 1,485 passports respectively.

The legislation considered by the subcommittee acknowledges the success of this test program. Miss Watson urged approval of this bill as the most efficient means of improving passport procedures, with a minimum of new bureaucracy. I hope that the committee will approve and the House will accept this proposal. Passage of this legislation will mean better service for America's travelers.

THE AMERICAN CRISIS—FREEDOM OR SLAVERY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, with Russian naval strength frequently sighted off all of our coasts, a Soviet nuclear naval base in Cuba, and red diplomats in Canada, our President sedates the American people with reassurances that we are winning the peace—that we are withdrawing our men on all battle fronts, and that the present hostilities in South Vietnam will probably be our last war.

And all this while reports reach us that the President has already offered U.S. ground forces as a "peace keeping" Army under U.N. control in the Middle East—a most unpeaceful position between the Arabs and Israelis.

Can any American predict the national indignation when we start tallying "peace keeping" casualties from either or both the Arabs and Israelis? And rather than POW's we experience POP's—prisoners of peace in the Middle East.

Does it really make a difference whether a casualty statistic results from losses in a war or a "peace keeping" police action hostility?

Quite interestingly, other distinguished Americans disagree most emphatically with the disengaging pacifist rhetoric of our President. In California, retired Air Force general, Curtis E. LeMay, a former head of the Strategic Air Command, has predicted that within 18 months Russia will serve a capitulation-or-else ultimatum on the United States and that President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

The celebrated journalist, author, and lecturer from Nashville, Tenn., Tom Anderson, explained the upcoming crisis this way:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

When and if the Russians attack us, many conditions will prevail which we in this country have never known. We have never known war on our own ground, except during the war between the States. In a war with Russia, thousands of "Americans" and maybe hundreds of thousands will be for the enemy and/or for our surrender. Professors, students, hippies, appeasers, cowards, anarchists, one-worlders, "peaceniks." Thousands of them deliberately brought us to the brink. Any red-blooded American will know what to do with them when the time comes.

Warfare presents many calculated risks. One which I feel that the enemy, its "dear American friends," and our peace at any cost, soft on communism collaborators in the administration have overlooked is the last ditch determination of the individual American citizen.

Free people who have had a taste of individual liberty may be hard to convince that their freedom is in jeopardy, but woe unto those on the wrong side once the people wake up to what is taking place and identify the enemy among them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert several pertinent newspaper clippings at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Santa Ana (Calif.) Register, Feb. 24, 1971]

LEMAY PREDICTS RUSSIAN "YIELD-OR-ELSE" ULTIMATUM

(By Len Davis)

Retired Air Force Gen. Curtis E. LeMay Tuesday predicted that within 18 months Russia will serve a "capitulation-or-else" ultimatum on the United States, and that President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

He would not speculate on what the "demands" would be, other than complete withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam.

Asked to define the words "or else," LeMay replied:

"Nuclear weapons."

Interviewed at the South Coast Gun Club, Santa Ana, the 64-year-old former Air Force chief of staff said "while the United States is wasting money on TNT for use in the jungles and rice paddies of Southeast Asia, Russia is spending money on what today is the finest strategic weapons system in the world.

"We have become a second-rate power," he said, "and our whole military establishment is rapidly going downhill because our weaponry—both offensive and defensive—is outmoded and the general public lacks the proper spirit and respect for our nation's leaders."

The former head of the Strategic Air Command (SAC), who built from the remnants of World War II an all-jet bomber force manned and supported by professional airmen dedicated to the preservation of peace, had this to say about the nation's defense capabilities:

"We lack superiority which, to win," he said, "should be overwhelming—more than is actually needed."

"It isn't just the money that is being misspent or not budgeted," he added, "it's the whole basic philosophy of our people which needs a greater demonstration of patriotism and a stronger manifestation of confidence in the leadership of our country—at all levels."

He attributed the "sorry state of our nation" to "the growing Communist menace" and said racial troubles and draft protests, for example, "are all Communist-inspired."

"Like it or not," he said, "we are at war with the Communists—and we'd better do something about it, fast, before it's too late."

"All they (the Communists) have to do is infiltrate our police and military organizations to the point where they are in control," said LeMay.

"The rest will be easy, and they'll take over our country," he added.

LeMay urged the American people to "stand up and shout down the radicals, learn their tactics so you can combat them, and support our men in uniform."

"Quit tearing things down. Quit believing everything that's told us. Investigate. Read the history and development of Communist methods and see how they apply to what's happening across our land today. Then act accordingly," said LeMay.

He said the American people "would be derelict in their duty to believe we have a strong national defense system."

"That's what we're told," he said, "but it's not so—really."

"And I know," added the four-star general under whose leadership at SAC for 10 years plans were laid for the development and integration of the nation's intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capability.

Speaking on the controversial subject of military discipline, LeMay said:

"The ones who criticize rigid disciplinary measures the loudest are usually the ones who have never been in combat and are unaware of its tremendous importance when it comes to saving lives and winning battles."

"Discipline is a team operation," LeMay continued, "and at some point in the military everyone's life is on the line."

LeMay posed this question:

"How can you expect to have effective discipline in the service today when civilians are constantly criticizing the military and belittling those in uniform?"

He said "the boys in Vietnam, for example, are at a great disadvantage, knowing that the people back home are not behind them as they risk their lives almost daily."

"Their will to win is diminished," he added.

"I've said my piece time and time again," he explained, "but no one listened."

"The war should have been won five years ago."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 10, 1971]

THIS WAR PROBABLY THE LAST, NIXON SAYS
(By C. L. Sulzberger)

President Nixon, in a rare on-the-record interview, said that the Vietnam war was ending and added, "In fact, I seriously doubt if we will ever have another war. This is probably the very last one."

During a conversation Monday in his private office in the Executive Office Building across from the White House, Nixon summed up the crux of his foreign policy.

He spoke easily, sitting relaxed in an armchair and more or less thinking aloud as he began to recapitulate his aims, methods and hopes.

As soon as the President confirmed that the contents of the conversation could be published, he was asked for permission to take notes, and he nodded agreement.

Later, asked if he would like to see a text of the notes, he declined.

While repeatedly emphasizing that the Vietnam war was winding down, the President made no secret of his concern at being caught in a "vicious cross fire" between those he termed the Superdoves and those he termed the Superhawks. He thought each offered an unreasonable course of neosolationism that was impractical and dangerous.

It disturbed him that the establishment and many former ardent internationalists were now wedded to what he viewed as neosolationism.

"I'd like to see us not end the Vietnamese war foolishly and find ourselves all alone in the world," he said. "I could have chosen that course my very first day in office. But I want the American people to be able to be led by me, or by my successor, along a course

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

that allows us to do what is needed to help keep the peace in this world.

"Part of the answer is simply that Americans, like all idealists, are very impatient people," he commented. "They feel that if a good thing is going to happen it should happen instantly."

Nixon, recalling the ideals of his mother, a Quaker, described himself as a deeply committed pacifist but added: "It is not enough just to be for peace. The point is, what can we do about it?"

"No one who is really for peace in this country can reject an American role in the rest of the world."

He described the Vietnamese conflict as exceedingly difficult for people to understand and "a war where there are no heroes, only goats."

Nevertheless, he recalled having told Mrs. Golda Meir, the Israeli premier:

"If America winds up the war in Vietnam in failure and an image is developed that the war was fought only by stupid scoundrels, there would be a wave of isolationism. This would embrace the U.S. role everywhere—including the Middle East."

"Mrs. Meir saw the point immediately," he added.

The greatest concern of the President, as he made plain, is that the U.S. withdraw in orderly fashion from Indochina but without falling into a mood of isolationism or stripping national defenses.

He does not contemplate any risk of falling behind in the arms competition with the Russians, nor does he foresee withdrawing American forces from Europe until balanced reductions can be arranged by mutual negotiation.

"We must not forget our alliances or our interests," he said. "Other nations must know that the United States has both the capability and the will to defend these allies and protect these interests."

But he stressed a desire to continue negotiations with Moscow and open the door of cooperation to Peking so that "there will be a chance of building a world that is relatively peaceful."

The President emphasized the importance of a non-Communist Asia and the fact that the U.S. was itself a Pacific power. This fact will soon be underscored, he said, when a supersonic transport is developed—by others, if not by the United States—and brings it within three hours flight of Japan.

He expressed deep concern for the internal problems of this country—environment, poverty, education—but said the nation had to deal both with those and with the mantle of responsibility imposed upon it abroad.

"After all," he said, "if we manage to improve the environment and living conditions in this country, we must also assure that we will be around to enjoy those improvements."

Asked if he could give any precise indication of how many American troops he expected to be in South Vietnam by mid-1972, Nixon grinned and replied:

"Well, you know I can't disclose the withdrawal figures. But let me say this: Those who think Vietnam is going to be a good political issue next year are making a grave miscalculation."

"LAOS BATTLE HELPING"

"Now I am not applying our policy there for political reasons but for reasons of national security. Nevertheless, those who are counting on Vietnam as a political issue in this country next year are going to have the rug jerked from under them."

"Certainly the way the Laotian battle is going is helping our withdrawal program. And I can tell you that if I were running as a political candidate, I wouldn't select as an issue something that is likely to become a non-issue."

At that point Nixon was asked if he felt that it was essential to his long-range plans that he be re-elected to a second term. Again he smiled in a relaxed manner and replied:

"I work here as if every day was going to be my last day. My theory is that you should never leave undone something that you will regret not having done when you had the power to do it."

ROLE OF SUPERPOWER

"The fact of the matter is that for the next 25 years the United States is destined to play this superpower role as both an economic and a nuclear giant. We just have to do this. We cannot dodge our responsibilities."

"If I lived in another country that wanted to be sure and retain its right to self-determination, I would say: 'Thank God that the United States exists at this moment in history.'

"We are not bent on conquest or on threatening others. But we do have a nuclear umbrella that can protect others, above all the states to which we are allied or in which we have great national interest."

"This is the moral force behind our position. We could be a terrible threat to the world if we were to lose that restraint or if we were to sacrifice our own power and allow ourselves to become too weak to uphold the weak."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 12, 1971]

PRESIDENT'S PLEDGE TO ISRAEL

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A tough international commitment guaranteeing Israel's security after total withdrawal of Israeli forces from Egypt's Sinai Peninsula is now being hammered out at top echelons of the Nixon administration.

That commitment would not only place American soldiers on the strategic heights of Sharm El-Sheik but would pledge the use of American military power to prevent any possible Egyptian military power to prevent any possible Egyptian move across the Israeli-Egyptian border.

With final details subject to minor change, the commitment would take the form of a signed agreement between President Nixon and the government of Israel backed by a Congressional resolution underwriting the presidential pledge. There is no question in high administration quarters about congressional willingness to pass such a resolution.

That would give the guarantee something less than the full force of a treaty—which many experts here think Israel really wants—but enough legal backing to remove all doubt about the U.S. commitments to guarantee Israel's territory.

Israel's main argument against total withdrawal from the Sinai is its claim that the international guarantees "by their very substance cannot but be tenuous" (in the language of an Israeli embassy policy paper widely distributed here this week).

The Nixon administration is trying to give the lie to that claim by saying this: While the U.S. will not underwrite Israel's occupation of territories seized by war, it will guarantee its security against possible Arab aggression aimed at Israel proper.

The focal point of Israel's refusal to evacuate the Sinai under the plan originally drafted by Secretary of State William P. Rogers is Sharm El-Sheik, the promontory controlling the strategic Strait of Tiran, the entrance into the Gulf of Aqaba and Israeli's port of Eilat.

To put teeth into a U.S. guarantee of Israeli passage through the strait, the Nixon administration is prepared to put a small contingent of U.S. troops on Sharm El-Sheik and keep them there as long as needed. Private agreement has been reached with the others in the Big Four—the Russians, British,

and French to do the same, under the umbrella of the United Nations.

These contingents would be housed at Sharm El-Sheik itself, flying national flags and commanded by a non-Big Four military officer responsible to the U.N. Security Council. They could not be removed without a unanimous vote of the Security Council, where the U.S. has a permanent seat.

Thus, the plan being devised here is not remotely comparable to what Israel rightly calls the "mixed bag of international arrangements . . . which were to collapse upon their first real testing" following Israeli withdrawal from Sharm El-Sheik after its first military takeover of the Sinai in 1956. That plan had no built-in safety features, and no U.S. presence. Nor did President Eisenhower offer Israel the assurance of a signed agreement pledging U.S. military intervention to enforce it.

Despite these obvious differences, the Israeli government shows little interest so far in discussing this proposition seriously with the Nixon administration as part of a total Sinai withdrawal. Clearly, it would rather keep its conquered territory. The vast gulf now separating Washington and Jerusalem on the withdrawal question is, if anything, wider today than before Israel rejected U.N. Ambassador Gunnar Jarring's Feb. 8 appeal for withdrawal to the old border.

That reply asserted that "Israel will not withdraw to the pre-June 5, 1967, lines," an assertion that U.S. diplomats in Tel Aviv and here begged the Israelis not to include. What the Nixon administration wanted, at the very least, was that Israel tell Jarring what it was for and refrain from blocking the negotiating route by announcing an unequivocal negative.

In rejecting those appeals, Israel undercut not only the U.N. but the basic settlement formula for total withdrawal from Sinai that for 16 months has been the heart of President Nixon's policy. Presidential advisers are counting heavily on the offer of U.S. military guarantees in their tenacious effort to soften the hardening posture in Jerusalem.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1971]

NIXON SEES U.S. ARMS AS KEY TO PEACE; STRENGTH HELD KEY TO CURBING FUTURE WARS

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

NEWPORT, R.I., March 12.—President Nixon today criticized "the new isolationists" who would cut the nation's defenses to the bone and said that America "must have strength" to prevent future wars.

The President also said that U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war "is coming to an end" and that the nation's men in uniform will become a "peace force."

Their responsibility will be to keep the peace, he said in an address to the 216-man graduating class of the Naval Officer Candidate School, including his son-in-law Dwight David Eisenhower II.

The President stressed the theme, developed in several recent statements and interviews, that he is pursuing a middle course between the hawks and the doves and that he believes peace can be guaranteed only if the nation maintains a strong defense.

He did not name the "new isolationists," who, he suggested, do not understand "the cost of weakness."

The President told the new ensigns that although America has fought four major wars in this century, it did not seek or begin any of them. Yet there are those, despite the evidence of that record, he said, who have refused "to learn the hard lessons in the history of tyranny."

"They would tell us—as their predecessors in other times have told us—that the appetite for aggression can be satisfied if only we are patient and that the ambitions of the

aggressors are justified if only we understand them properly."

The President said he was never surprised by such arguments. "But I am always astonished to see them held in the name of morality," he declared. "We know too well what follows when nations try to buy peace at the expense of other nations."

"We know that when force is rewarded, the cost of peace and the only alternative to war will be tyranny," Mr. Nixon said. "This fact dominated the first half of this century. We are determined that it will not dominate the last half."

"For this reason, we have accepted the necessity of war. But our purpose is peace."

If the world were free, he said, there might be no need of arms. But while "the values we cherish" are threatened, "we must keep the strength we need to keep the values that we cherish," he said.

Mr. Nixon said that the "new isolationists" say that although defense spending has been cut it has not been cut enough and that the administration can never increase domestic spending enough.

"I understand these arguments," he said. "But I understand the cost of weakness, too."

Even if the nation has the most extensive urban renewal programs, the most far-reaching medical programs and the finest schools, but is unable to defend itself "we would soon enjoy none of the fruits of our efforts," the President argued.

"So we will look at the possibilities of the future with a careful regard for the realities of the present and the lessons of the past," he said.

"We have been and we continue to be willing to pay the price for peace."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1971]

U.S. ENVOY IS OPTIMISTIC ABOUT ARMS AGREEMENT

VIENNA, March 12.—Gerard C. Smith, chief of the U.S. delegation to the strategic arms limitations talks, expressed optimism tonight about reaching an agreement with the Soviet Union although he added that "significant differences remain to be overcome."

In a statement issued upon his arrival for the fourth round of SALT talks starting on Monday, Smith said: "It is the view of the U.S. government, as recently stated by President Nixon . . . that the basis of an agreement may be emerging. Thus the fourth phase of our talks may reach a significant stage."

Smith did not elaborate on the differences between the U.S. and Soviet delegations.

It is reported that the United States rejected a Soviet proposal for an agreement limited to defensive missiles, or ABMs. The United States is understood to seek a package agreement on big offensive missiles and long-range bombers, as well as ABMs.

"The rate of progress in the discussions during the first three phases of the talks has been influenced by the differing perspectives of the two sides and the inherently complex issues involved," Smith said.

He termed it of "considerable significance" that the delegations were engaged "in the most searching examination of strategic relationships ever conducted by the United States and the Soviet Union.

"We anticipate that this examination will continue."

He said that during the first three phases, the two delegations were able "to move in a fairly short period from the preliminary explorations of issues to concrete negotiations."

This resulted in mutual understanding "how an agreement could deal with concerns that each has about the present and prospective posture of the other."

The SALT sessions opened in Helsinki, Finland, in November, 1969. Last April, the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

talks were moved to Vienna, then returned to Helsinki in the fall for the third round.

Last month, the Soviet Union took issue in public for the first time with Smith, accusing him of maintaining a "strange position."

The government newspaper Izvestia said U.S. senators are puzzled by Smith's "extremely negative" view on the question of whether to reach an agreement on defensive missiles as a first step toward a broader agreement.

There has never been any official disclosure, but word leaked out that the United States presented an outline in the Vienna phase for a package deal.

According to American sources, the Soviets never came up with a comprehensive outline themselves.

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 10, 1971]

DEEP GLOOM IN PENTAGON: RUSSIA TAKING ARMS LEAD

(By Mike Miller)

The nation's top military officer warned today that nuclear superiority by Russia "must be avoided at all costs" both because of its military implications and the adverse impact it might have on U.S. foreign policy.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said clear-cut strategic superiority by the Soviet Union could cause U.S. allies to lose faith in the deterrent power of the U.S. nuclear forces.

And Adm. Moorer, in his annual appearance before the House Armed Services Committee in support of the Defense Department budget, said that in his opinion the overall strategic balance "has drastically shifted in favor of the Soviet Union" over the past five to six years.

"Our comfortable lead has now all but vanished, and within the next five or six years we could actually find ourselves in a position of overall strategic inferiority," he said.

"We will pay a very high price in the effectiveness of our diplomacy if we permit the Soviet Union to achieve a clearly evident strategic superiority, even were that superiority to have no practical effect on the outcome of an all-out nuclear exchange."

Adm. Moorer said overall strategic nuclear power must be measured as a combination of three factors—megatonnage, numbers of delivery vehicles (missiles and planes) and numbers of nuclear warheads.

He said the Russians already have a substantial lead in megatonnage and could surpass the United States within one or two years in numbers of delivery vehicles.

"Only in numbers of strategic offensive warheads is the United States likely to maintain its lead over the Soviet Union during the 1970s," he said.

While the Russians recently have slowed construction of ICBMs, Adm. Moorer said, they have continued full speed in building new missile-carrying nuclear submarines at the rate of about eight per year. He predicted the Soviet Union will have 20 of these nuclear submarines at sea by mid-1971.

The United States has 41 Polaris missile-firing submarines. Defense officials estimate that at the current rate of construction, the Russians will overtake the United States in strategic nuclear submarines by 1974.

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Feb. 15, 1971]

SOVIETS DEVELOP POWERFUL NEW WARHEAD: U.S. AUTHORITIES THINKING TWICE ON MISSILE FREEZE

(By Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—American military and intelligence authorities are having some second thoughts about Russia's apparent decision to slow down or halt temporarily at least the

deployment of its huge SS-9 intercontinental missile.

Hailed as highly encouraging news when first detected last December, the SS-9 freeze is now taking on a very ominous meaning because of some very recent intelligence on new Russian nuclear warhead development.

Hard evidence has been gathered by the Central Intelligence Agency linking the SS-9 halt to a new Soviet breakthrough in the perfection of MIRVs, independently targeted warheads over a long range. This is double the target capacity that American officials believed the Russians would be able to achieve.

In other words, the Soviets now have an intercontinental missile which can carry six separate warheads with up to $2\frac{1}{2}$ megatons of nuclear explosives to as many separate targets at the same time.

To fully grasp the magnitude of this military breakthrough, one should consider the recent frank report of John Foster, the Defense Department's chief scientist, to Congress.

In discussing the SS-9 development, Foster stated that the Russians would need approximately 420 missiles to seriously threaten the backbone of U.S. retaliatory force—the 1,080 Minuteman missiles.

This assumption was based on the Soviets being able to fit three MIRVs in their SS-9s as the U.S. is doing in our far less powerful Minuteman III missiles.

Foster revealed that the Russians now have approximately 300 SS-9s deployed and operational and that it would take from eighteen months to two years to obtain a force of 420 deployed missiles.

If the Russians now equip 210 of their presently deployed 300 SS-9s with their new "six pack" warheads, Defense Department officials admit privately that the Minuteman retaliatory force will be seriously threatened for the first time in history.

THE DANGER PERIOD

Satellite reconnaissance photographs of several of the SS-9 installations indicate that the Russians are already at work fitting their huge 5,000 mile missiles with the six independently targeted warheads.

The estimate is that the Russians will be able to complete the change-over of warheads on 200-plus missiles within the next twelve to fourteen months depending on the production rate of the MIRVs.

This development would permit the Soviets to gain missile superiority over the U.S. without the deployment of any large number of additional costly SS-9s.

The SS-9s now have an immense single warhead containing an explosive power of from 25 to 30 megatons as against the Minuteman's one megaton. These super-warheads are believed to be designed to destroy all communications in large areas of the U.S. in addition to hardened missile sites.

While the Russians are expected to keep from 50 to 75 of their SS-9s loaded with these super-warheads, they will probably put their "six packs" on all the other missiles—giving them a first strike nuclear force unequalled in the world.

THE CHANGING BALANCE

What all this would mean to the U.S. in another Cuban type confrontation with Russia is now being carefully studied by President Nixon and his military and intelligence advisers.

At the time of the 1962 Cuban crisis, the U.S. enjoyed a three to one advantage in ICBMs over the Soviets. We also had a spy, later caught and shot, in the Kremlin who kept the late President Kennedy informed that the Russians weren't prepared to go to war.

Now, the U.S. has neither. It is also why the President's intelligence advisers are urging him to take a new look at the continuing unproductive Strategic Arms Limitations

Talks (SALT) with the Soviets. They want the President to make sure that he doesn't get trapped into making concessions to the Russians that might limit this country's capability of dealing with the growing Soviet missile threat.

The new Soviet MIRV development has caused both the military and intelligence community to recommend to the President that he reject the Soviet proposal for eliminating all anti-missile (ABM) defenses except those in the Moscow and Washington areas.

Acceptance of that proposal now, they warn, would leave the backbone of U.S. missile strike force completely naked to attack by the Russian SS-9 force.

VITAL SUPPLY ROUTE

Russia has supplied more than 30,000 trucks, and 2,000 anti-aircraft guns to the North Vietnamese during the past two years. This is the latest CIA estimate of Soviet war material being delivered to Hanoi through the port of Haiphong. In addition to these supplies, the Russians have given the North Vietnamese 160 jet aircraft, 470 radars, equipment for 40 surface-to-air missile battalions. The CIA report states that "if this route of supplies to the North Vietnamese could be cut off, Hanoi would have to pull all of its troops out of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia within six months".

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 16, 1971]
UNITED STATES ENDS LAST RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL TO COMMUNIST CHINA

(By Frank Starr)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The United States today lifted a 19-year-old passport restriction barring Americans from traveling to Communist China.

The decision was the latest in a series of moves since July, 1969, conforming with President Nixon's policy of encouraging greater communication with Red China, State Department officials said.

Restrictions on travel to North Viet Nam, North Korea and Cuba, which like the Chinese restriction come under review every six months, have not been lifted and are to be reconsidered next September.

NO RECIPROCITY BY CHINA

State Department officials cautioned that the lifting of travel restrictions did not imply that the United States could now provide consular protection to Americans inside China. They also said that there have been no reciprocal moves from the Chinese side in response to American initiatives to ease contacts.

The U.S. does not officially recognize the government in Peking.

In July, 1969, the U.S. permitted Americans with special reasons—newsmen, students and academics among others—to travel to Red China and to make noncommercial purchases worth up to \$100.

Since then, a thousand U.S. passports have been validated for travel to China, 270 of them in the last year, officials said. The new rule means that any American who wants to go will, as of today, need no validation stamp.

CHINESE ADMIT ONLY THREE

In the last year, however, China authorities have accepted for travel there only three Americans with valid passports, a journalist, Edgar Snow, and his wife, and John S. Strong, a nephew of Anna Louise Strong, who died in China last year after participating in the postwar revolutionary activities of Chairman Mac-Tse-tung. Strong has been living there ever since.

State Department officials said no action had been taken against Americans who violated passport restrictions since federal courts in 1967 invalidated several of them.

In the best known of these cases, Staunton Lynd, a former university professor, visited

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

North Viet Nam without using his passport, and a federal court ruled that it could not therefore be revoked.

The chief remaining statute, officials said, provides a fine of \$2,000 or five years imprisonment, or both, for using the passport in violation of restrictions printed on it.

Among other moves intended to free communications with China, the government allowed in December, 1969, unlimited purchases of Chinese goods by tourists, universities, and museums for private, noncommercial use, and also allowed American controlled subsidiaries abroad to trade in nonstrategic goods.

[From VFW Magazine, March 1971]

THE RISE OF THE SOVIET NAVY

(By Hymen R. Kaplan)

At the end of World War II the Soviet Union was a second-rate naval power, but in the intervening quarter century America's major Communist adversary has developed a fleet capable of challenging the free world everywhere at sea—from the Indian Ocean to the Caribbean.

For the first time in modern history, the navy plays a vital role in the highest circles of the Kremlin and ship construction is being given a top priority.

As an indication of the greater status being accorded the navy, the Soviet fleet's commander-in-chief, Adm. S. G. Gorshkov, has been given a rank equivalent to that of a field marshal.

Reflecting the Soviets' new confidence in their naval strength, Gorshkov recently said the United States "will have to understand it no longer has the mastery of the seas" because the flag of the Soviet navy "now proudly flies over the oceans of the world."

Capsized, the Soviet navy shapes up like this:

A submarine fleet of 385, of which 65 are nuclear-powered.

Some subs armed with the equivalent of the powerful Poseidon missile.

Heavy-missile armed cruisers, two helicopter carriers and many destroyers and smaller vessels.

It is estimated that at the present rate of Soviet submarine construction, the U.S. Polaris-Poseidon force will be matched or outstripped by the mid-1970s.

To answer the question of how the Soviets have managed to forge ahead so rapidly, one has to review the whole story of the Russians at sea, including a substantial shipbuilding industry of their own, dating back to long before the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917.

At the turn of the century Tsarist Russia had the world's third largest fleet, ranking just after those of Britain and France.

However, the crushing defeat of the Russians at the hands of the Japanese at Tsushima in 1904 during the Russo-Japanese War eliminated the Tsar's navy as a serious factor in any calculations of world naval strength.

The Russians' naval tradition goes back some three centuries to Peter the Great who gave his country its first navy. Catherine the Great, who had the help of John Paul Jones, further strengthened it on the Black and Baltic Seas in the days when Swedes and Turks were Russia's major threats.

Coupled with the long nautical tradition is the record of ruthless exploitation of ships and shipbuilding facilities made available to the Soviets after the war and the acquisition of large naval craft from the U.S. and Britain at war's end.

One of the great weaknesses of the Russian navy has been its on-again, off-again status; treatment as a junior service, or a kind of seaward extension of the land forces, as shown in its lackluster performances in the two World Wars.

Political unreliability under the Tsars and the Soviets has been one reason the navy

March 17, 1971

has not until recently been accorded a higher status. Widespread mutinies by sailors in the Baltic and Black Sea fleets during the Russo-Japanese War. Further uprising just prior to World War I diminished imperial confidence in the loyalty of seamen.

So militant were the Russian sailors during the Bolshevik Revolution that Lenin himself singled them out for special praise, but this was only a short-lived accolade. In 1921 the men at Kronstadt, the big naval base outside Leningrad, rose in revolt. Finally, Marshal Tukhachevsky in a brutal campaign over the ice crushed the rebels, only to be liquidated in the purges of the 1930s.

It took years for the Soviet navy to recover whatever esteem it had, so noxious was its reputation among Red leaders for rebelliousness.

At the outbreak of WWII the unimpressive Soviet fleet consisted of four battleships, eight cruisers, an aircraft carrier, 28 destroyers, 109 submarines and a few other odds and ends. Five of the cruisers were of the fast, heavily armed *Leningrad* class, patterned after the French anti-torpedo boats the Soviets greatly admired. Many were patched up and rearmed hold-overs from the old imperial days and considered inferior to Allied ships. Officers and crews, though brave, were poorly trained. In short, Soviet emphasis on land forces, combined with disdain for the navy's reputation for political unreliability, had destroyed much of its effectiveness as a fighting arm.

Stalin's paranoia by 1946 brought him to the conclusion that the Soviet fleet should be reconstructed to counter the free world's might.

Despite the brief interval of collaboration with the Western Allies during what the Russians call the Great Patriotic War, Stalin never trusted the West. Communist ideology demanded unceasing war against the "bourgeois democracies" to clear the way for Soviet world dominion.

Booty Stalin gained as post-war reparations made the naval building program easier. At the 1945 Berlin conference, the Soviets got 10 German submarines, 10 destroyers and the cruiser *Nurnberg*, renamed the *Makarov* after a Tsarist admiral in the 1905 debacle, plus hulls of three German cruisers under construction at war's end.

Further, with the consent of the Americans and British, the Italians provided the Soviets with one battleship, the *Giulio Cesare* of 23,822 tons, a cruiser, the *Duca di Colombo*, two submarines, the training ship *Cristoforo Colombo*, three coastal craft and a variety of small vessels. For a long time Stalin had coveted the Italians' fast cruisers of the *Condottieri* class, of 5,000 to 8,300 tons and a speed of 37 knots.

Stalin seized the spoils of victory from Hungary and Romania. Their reparations included many Danubian river craft to augment the Soviets' river flotillas. But more important, they established control of Danubian navigation, regarded as a free highway up to then.

Britain and the U.S. were generous to the Soviets after the war. Transfers made to the USSR included the British *Royal Sovereign* and four submarines, eight American destroyers, four modern American submarines and 49 steel submarine chasers loaned to the wartime Russian navy.

U.S. contributions also included 62 destroyer escorts and 28 frigates.

At the end of WWII 100 of Russia's 500 shipyards were out of operation. As an emergency measure, the Soviets took full advantage of reparations rights gained by their peace treaty with Finland. The Finns undertook to build 571 ships for the Reds' military and mercantile fleet. As a result, expansion of Finnish shipyards gained for the greedy Soviets a further advantage. They also took over the shipbuilding facilities of the satel-

lites. (A fifth of the Soviet merchant fleet now is Polish-built.) All during the 1950s the Soviets were working steadily towards their goal of a powerful, modern navy.

Since virtually the whole Russian WWII fleet was either obsolete or fast becoming so, the Soviets had the additional advantage of starting from scratch to shape a navy of their own determination, incorporating the newest advances in ship design and architecture.

Stalin took an active part in the program, even down to the details of ship design and construction. He sought a compromise between the defensively oriented "young school" of naval strategy with its emphasis on submarines, aviation and light, fast surface craft and the "old school" which leaned towards a balanced fleet of larger, more heavily armed vessels.

By 1950, the navy had gained Stalin's approval for a 10-year plan, which envisaged the building of four aircraft carriers. Before construction could begin several heavy and light cruisers being built had to be completed. In the three years between 1950 and 1953 the Soviets built 50 destroyers and expanded their submarine construction.

Stalin's right-hand man was Admiral N.G. Kuznetzov whom he had ignominiously dismissed some years before for confiding too much in Russia's wartime allies! But in the rough world of Kremlin politics such sudden twists of fortune are the rule.

Stalin died in March, 1953, just when his long-frustrated vision of a big, balanced fleet was beginning to take shape. His passing gave the free world a respite which it did not use.

Stalin's heir, Nikita Khrushchev, had virtually no comprehension of the strategic importance of sea power. A Soviet-style politician, he was essentially land-oriented in his military thinking. Shortly after assuming power, he and his defense minister, Army Marshal Grigori Zhukov, hero of WWII and friend of Gen. Eisenhower, turned away from Stalin's naval doctrine and towards the concept of a defensive navy of nuclear-equipped submarines, light surface vessels and land-based aviation. This decision was politically expedient in the face of growing economic problems and shortages of consumer goods.

During a 1959 visit to the United States, Khrushchev announced the Soviet navy was scrapping 90% of its cruisers and would concentrate on submarines and smaller fleet units.

Failure of Khrushchev's plan was due largely to Gorshkov's skillful maneuvering. While paying lip service to Khrushchev's views, the admiral pointed out the continuing need for larger surface ships. In an article in the authoritative army newspaper, *Red Star*, he said in 1962:

"Conventionally-powered and armed ships hold an honored position and are assigned a great role in naval combat operations. These and their armaments are very complex and are still being perfected in order to acquire new and modern capabilities."

Gorshkov had gained an indefinite reprieve for the larger fleet units, no small achievement in the Kremlin's rigid bureaucracy.

But even the admiral could not alter the Soviets' overwhelming reliance on its undersea fleet. This is still true. It constitutes the Soviets' principal naval weapon, although lately, the missile-carrying cruiser has begun to emerge on the world scene. It appears that the Russians regard the submarine-cruiser combination as their answer to the power of U.S. attack aircraft carriers.

Yet, to many naval authorities, the submarine is a defensive rather than a strategic weapon which does not give a fleet the sharp, cutting edge of attack aircraft carriers, an area in which the Russians are notably deficient.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

They possess only two helicopter-carriers of the cruiser class. The enormous cost of carriers and the disadvantageous positions of the Soviet fleet on the Baltic and Black Seas have deterred the Soviets from carrier construction.

Nevertheless, they do have 25 of the larger-type cruisers, some carrying missiles. The remainder of the fleet consists of escort ships, minesweepers, missile patrol boats, motor torpedo boats and landing craft. About 500,000 officers and men are serving in the Russian fleet, as compared to about 750,000 in the U.S. Navy. But the "numbers game" is always tricky, and figures don't always tell the whole story.

The Soviets are showing increasing skill in fleet deployment in support of diplomatic and economic offensives. They have always been adroit in the propagandist art of making maximum display of whatever new naval hardware they possess. In less advanced areas of the world, such as the Middle East, a naval show of force can be very effective.

The recent strengthening of the powerful Sixth Fleet in the eastern Mediterranean, however, has obviously given the Soviets pause, judging by their reaction. "Gunboat diplomacy," the Soviets have reminded us, even in these times, can be highly effective.

The U.S. still regards the Soviet fleet as essentially defensive, although it is fully aware of the enormous damage of which nuclear-armed submarines are capable, especially if they are launched from a Cuban base, a new element in the delicate balance of forces.

Nevertheless, the U.S. is still placing its bets on the attack aircraft carrier whose sea-based aircraft can pierce deep into the heart of the foe. The Polaris/Poseidon-armed submarine fleet is also a powerful deterrent.

But U.S. ship construction has been faltering. The rapid decommissioning of many aging ships of the line could leave this country in a relatively weaker position at a time demanding maximum naval capability. There is also evidence of war-weariness in the country. None of this works to American advantage.

Much has been made of the rapid rise of the Soviet merchant marine in recent years, but in event of war much of this tonnage would be bottled up in the Baltic and Black Seas. Nor would merchant ships be able to count on adequate fleet protection since the Soviet fleet has been fashioned to serve as a shield for the "Soviet Fatherland."

To the Soviets, the Baltic Sea in particular represents a long salient reaching into the very heart of the north. It must be controlled at all cost, otherwise the enemy could strike a lethal blow. This means a good part of the fleet would have to remain constantly on guard on this vital waterway.

Soviet boasts of their naval capabilities do not change basic factors of the disadvantageous Russian geography, a limited and severely strained economy lagging far behind that of the U.S. and the NATO countries and party control over military thinking.

The United States and its Free World allies far outclass the Soviets at sea. The Soviets probably do not seriously entertain dreams of opposing them. Their satellites provide important bases of operations, but little else.

Unquestionably, the Soviet navy is powerful and is capable of inflicting great losses on the West and under the Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership it is faring very well. Generous appropriations are being made for naval construction. With a gross national product of only half the Americans', Soviets are spending as much as this country on naval building.

The cloud of suspicion which has hovered for so long over the navy appears to have lifted. The new leadership gives every indi-

cation of understanding the uses of sea power.

What should be U.S. reaction to the Soviet naval challenge? Adm. Arleigh Burke, former chief of naval operations who is consultant to the V.F.W. National Security Committee, summed it up like this 10 years ago and today his words seem strangely prophetic:

"The Soviets will continue to nurture the growth of Communism everywhere, especially in the Middle East. They will promote unsettlement and chaos, for in such fertile soil, subversives have a greater chance to take over. They will attach themselves to local issues and keep the pot boiling while proclaiming unselfish interest in the well-being of the people they intend to enslave. When it suits their purpose they will shift sides and put on a new mask: some years ago they championed Israel; in 1956-58 they were comrades to the death of Egypt and Syria.

"They will loudly beat the frayed dog of colonialism and devouring western capitalism while practicing the most ruthless imperialism and colonialism of prison camps, slavery, mass deportation and execution.

"They will continue to maintain military strength to support these policies—from the nuclear missile and its delivery vehicles of submarines, aircraft and rockets to the foot soldier with his rifle and the coastal mine-layer with its load of sudden death."

Time has shown how right Adm. Burke was. Today, the Soviet goal is still world dominion. Their immediate thrust is towards the Middle East with its valuable oil reserves and its strategic importance to the West.

The sea power of the United States and its NATO allies is one of the chief obstacles to that ambition. For the sake of free peoples everywhere, it must not be diminished.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 17, 1971]
ISRAELI PULLBACK, U.N. PEACE FORCE PRESSED BY UNITED STATES: ROGERS VOWS COOPERATION FOR SECURITY

(By Marilyn Berger)

Secretary of State William P. Rogers yesterday sought to induce Israel to withdraw from Egyptian territory in return for a contractual peace agreement, an international force to assure security and continued American support.

"We don't think that geography is solely responsible for security, or even to a large extent responsible for security," Rogers said at a news conference. "What is important is the political arrangement..."

In terms that combined a plea with promises, Rogers laid out the case that the United States was expected to impress on Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban when he visits Washington Friday, that security is a political, not a geographic concept.

The Secretary said explicitly that the United States sought Israel withdrawal from the edge of the Suez Canal and from the Sinai Desert to the international border between Egypt and Israel prior to the 1967 six-day war. But he specified that this did not include the Gaza Strip.

His words were in sharp contrast to the Israeli position as stated by Premier Golda Meir in an interview last week. Mrs. Meir called for retention of Sharm el-Sheikh at the southern tip of the Sinai, as well as access to it.

To Rogers, Israel's territorial demands were understandable but not the answer to Israeli needs. "Certainly, in modern day world situations, geography is not ordinarily important," Rogers said. "What is important is the political arrangement that is made—the agreement itself, whether the parties are belligerent and hostile."

The Secretary reaffirmed U.S. readiness to participate in a peacekeeping force as part of an agreement. A U.S. presence, he said, "is the most adequate possible guarantee that you can conceive of in modern life." In addition, he hinted at long-range military, economic and political commitments.

To underscore that he anticipated a long-term binding U.S. role, Rogers said congressional approval would be sought. "I would think," he said, "and I feel sure that this is the position of our government, that in an undertaking of this magnitude, in which we took part with other nations we would expect congressional approval."

Rogers said he thought Congress would be "favorably disposed" toward U.S. participation in a peacekeeping force to guarantee a "satisfactory agreement."

Such an agreement, in Rogers' definition, would rule out "anything that does not provide security to Israel."

Rogers said that the 1967 international boundary should be re-established, "provided that satisfactory arrangements are made for demilitarization of the Sinai . . . and that satisfactory arrangements are made concerning Sharm el-Sheikh." These arrangements he said, "should be negotiated between the parties."

Rogers returned to his main theme repeatedly: "It is not necessary to acquire territory to make adequate provisions for security."

The Secretary drew an intriguing distinction between acquisition of territory and what he called "use of territory."

As one example of "use" he said that Sharm el-Sheikh could become the site of a U.N. peacekeeping force, "which would include the permanent members of the Security Council and other nations." Egypt has explicitly accepted the stationing of a U.N. force in that region.

Another and quite different "use" would be a suggestion by Israeli Foreign Minister Eban that his country might propose "leasing" the strategic strongpoint. Such an arrangement would leave sovereignty to Egypt and control to Israel.

In addition to an international force, which would be stationed in critical areas, would continue for a definite period of time and could not be removed unilaterally, Rogers said there would be additional assurances of Israeli security.

The new situation, he said, would be different from the one that existed in 1957, when Israel accepted international promises and U.S. assurances in return for a withdrawal from the Sinai. What was being proposed now, he said, was not mere U.S. assurances, but a U.S. presence and a "contractual agreement . . . with reciprocally binding commitments, signed, sealed and delivered."

Under the new arrangement belligerency would cease, Rogers said, and there would be a commitment not to interfere in each other's internal affairs. By contrast, in 1957, he said, there was a continuation of the armistice in a state of belligerency.

The Secretary said the United States was not now thinking of "bilateral guarantees" for Israel, but sought to leave open the question of some kind direct assurances. These, he said, "would be a very important factor in Israel's attitude toward its security."

Rogers said, "We would continue to give support to Israel in terms of economic assistance and other assistance . . . we would be prepared to continue to play a supportive role to Israel."

His remarks, while general, were understood to encompass a whole range of long-term military, economic and political commitments which are known to be under consideration in the administration.

Rogers stated strong support for the mission of U.N. mediator Gunnar V. Jarring, and optimism that the current impasse could be broken.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

On other issues Rogers:

Regretted that negotiations about Japanese textile exports to the U.S. had been unsuccessful but said that the differences would not impair basic relations between the two countries nor upset arrangements for the return of Okinawa to Japan.

The United States is watching Soviet naval movement around Cuba. He said the "understanding" with the Soviet Union "has recently been clarified." He added: "We, I think, understand each other."

NATIONAL WEEK OF CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR/MISSING IN ACTION

HON. DAVID N. HENDERSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the only hesitancy I have in helping to highlight this week as a national week of concern for our prisoners of war and men missing in action is that it could be misconstrued to mean that we are not steadily, regularly, and constantly concerned for these brave Americans and not just concerned during 1 week.

There can no longer be any doubt in the minds of the leaders in Hanoi that the American public is concerned—deeply concerned—about the Americans who have fallen into the hands of North Vietnam and have never been even properly accounted for since.

Petitions, letters, and other expressions signed or joined in by millions of individual American citizens ranging from school children to elderly, retired persons have been obtained and delivery attempted to sources which would bring them to the attention of Hanoi.

We can no longer tolerate Hanoi's ignoring of our petitions on behalf of these men.

We are told that Asiatics do not place the same value upon the lives of individual humans that we do and that Hanoi just cannot believe that our country is really concerned about a few hundred prisoners of war.

Let me say that in my judgment, the average American would support this war more strongly and be far more insistent upon military victory than he now is if he were told that we seek to liberate American prisoners than he does when he is told that we are fighting for abstract principles.

Not that we do not believe in abstract principles or are unwilling to fight for them, but above almost everything else, we believe in the dignity, the value and the worth of an individual human being. This is true partly and largely because of our belief in God and God's concern, revealed through Christ, for every individual. But it is also true because we long ago, as a Nation, rejected the idea of slavery, of royalty, and a "class society," and embraced the concept that all men are created equally free.

I have joined my colleagues in the House in a letter to Ton Duc Thang, President of the Hanoi Government urging him, in the name of humanity and truth, to grant a request that a repre-

March 17, 1971

sentative group from the U.S. Congress be permitted to inspect the POW camps in North Vietnam.

I hope that he takes our request seriously. I can assure him that we are serious in making it.

DR. LOUIS JONES, DEDICATED TO COMMUNITY, FAMILY, AND PROFESSION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I direct my remarks today in tribute to an individual from my hometown of Roseville, Calif., whose entire life has been spent in service to his community, his family, and his profession.

Dr. Louis E. Jones has dedicated a lifetime to a single responsibility of caring for and assisting his fellowmen. In this day and age, we hear much about specialization in many areas of endeavor including the medical profession.

With a general awakening of the importance of the rapidly disappearing general practitioner, including congressional efforts to encourage the general practitioner of medicine, it is appropriate that we applaud one who has devoted his life in this area. In addition to his medical work, Dr. Jones has contributed his talents, energies, and knowledge to the service of his community in many other ways in numerous professional organizations and associations as well as many service and community groups.

Dr. Jones was born on April 5, 1900, near the old Rattlesnake Bridge on the American River at a homesite which has since been inundated by Folsom Lake. The son of a hard rock miner, William Owen Jones, who worked in the Zant-Graff mines near the American River, Dr. Jones had an uphill struggle in achieving his goal in medicine, particularly since he lost both of his parents when he was very young. Intermingled during his school days was summer and after-school work, especially during his college days when he had jobs washing dishes, mowing lawns and, during the summers, working for the Southern Pacific Railroad building snow sheds in the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

He came to Roseville in 1909 and attended local schools, graduating from high school in 1920. He left Roseville to gain his AB degree at Stanford University in 1924 and followed that with 4 more years in the St. Louis University Medical School.

Returning to Roseville, he set up his practice in 1929 and has practiced there since. In the same year, Dr. Jones became the assistant district surgeon for the Southern Pacific Co., attaining the position of district surgeon in 1934. This Saturday evening, March 20, 1971, the community of Roseville will pay its tribute to his long and dedicated service in this capacity and I am proud to be serving as master of ceremonies at this event.

The benefit of Dr. Jones' energies has

been felt by the State Board of Medical Examiners on which he served as secretary for the last 6 of his 12 years of membership, and his service to other professional organizations includes the Federation of State Medical Boards of which he served as president, the Western Association of Railroad Surgeons also having served as president, president and member of the Placer-Sierra Counties Medical Society, member of the California Medical Society, the American Academy of General Practice; his community affiliations include the Masonic Lodge, the Sciots, the Ben Ali Shrine, the Redmen, Eagles, Moose, and Lions clubs. He served as a director of the Placer County Fair for 30 years and was president of that board as well as serving as a member of the Roseville City Council. Dr. Jones was very instrumental in the establishment of the Roseville District Hospital where he served as chief of staff for 10 years.

As I mentioned above, it is especially appropriate that we recognize the professional contributions made by one who has "specialized" as a general practitioner. Certainly this is the case with my old friend Louie Jones, and I thought his remarks based on 40 years of the practice in medicine exceptionally pertinent, and I would like to share some of his comments with you:

I never use the appointment system. I see the patients as they come in and I believe I see more each day than the so-called highly organized offices. The old-fashioned general practitioners came to know the patients better. They trusted your judgment and even today they drop in to see me and to talk about many things which are not concerned with medicine or illness.

I always wanted to be a small country doctor and I was for many years. I don't like the idea of bringing the city to me. I used to be able to laugh with the people—and to cry with them—because I knew nearly every one of them.

Dr. Jones and his wife, Frances, who were married in 1931, are nearing their 40th wedding anniversary. They have a son, Louis E. Jones, Jr., an assistant superintendent of Grant High School District, and a daughter, Mrs. Martha Romero. They are very proud of their seven grandchildren.

In Dr. Jones' words:

I wouldn't change a single part of my life if I had it all to do over again.

I am glad that our good Dr. Louis Jones, while he is setting aside his railroad company responsibilities, will remain with a practice, however limited, in the community.

Dr. Jones has assisted at the birth of more than 2,300 children to local residents. Roseville residents might say that it takes a good doctor to keep a community going and growing.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

being the "laughing stock of the cocktail circuit" and it was implied that he was a mere figurehead. Lucian Warren, the very able Washington bureau chief of the Buffalo Evening News in this article takes a look at Secretary Rogers at work, and the resulting characterization shows a dynamic, able, and influential man. I suggest my colleagues read Mr. Warren's article to see how the American public views Mr. Rogers and not rely, instead, on sensational, headline-seeking remarks for their picture:

ROGERS' RECORD BELIES SYMINGTON'S APPRAISAL

(By Lucian Warren)

(NOTE.—The following article is in part an editorial analysis based on material from various sources and in part an exclusive Buffalo Evening News interview, the 12th and final one with the Nixon Cabinet. Although previous interviews were tape recorded and the texts reproduced, ground rules set by the State Department forbade use of a tape recorder and specified only limited direct quotation.)

WASHINGTON, March 6.—Secretary of State William P. Rogers deserves a better rating than that accorded him this week by Sen. Stuart Symington (D., Mo.).

While history will be the final judge of his effectiveness, certain facts are emerging which would seem to negate Sen. Symington's assertion that Mr. Rogers is the "laughing stock of the cocktail circuit" and that presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger is the actual secretary of state in everything, but title.

As Mr. Rogers candidly acknowledges, the President doesn't always take his advice. But he does so a good share of the time, and when he doesn't, time might well rule that Mr. Rogers was right.

There was, for example, the decision to send U.S. troops into Cambodia last spring. Mr. Rogers advised against it and was overruled.

While there appears to have been a military success in Cambodia, this must be balanced against the domestic uproar that resulted in the fatal shooting of students at Kent State University in Ohio.

Mr. Rogers was a dove on the Cambodia decision while Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird supported his military advisers in favor of the incursion.

The opposite was true as regards a proposed reduction in U.S. troops in Europe. Mr. Laird supported a demand on Capitol Hill to reduce U.S. troop strength. Mr. Rogers was opposed. The President took his secretary of state's advice and the troop strength remained at about 300,000 men.

The decision was extremely popular with the nation's European allies in NATO, and it is one of the secretary's satisfactions that NATO morale is extremely high. As the secretary noted recently: "There is a good spirit of unity there."

While the oil crisis was at its height in the Middle East and the prospect for agreement among the oil-producing states and the consuming nations was dim, the secretary dispatched his undersecretary, John N. Irwin II, to the area. An agreement was reached.

Rogers was directly responsible for improving U.S. relations with the black African nations by closing the American consulate in Southern Rhodesia. His counsel has prevailed on the U.S. attitude on the ABM question with regard to SALT talks with the U.S.S.R.

Perhaps more than any other one man, Rogers can be considered the author of President Nixon's Vietnamization policy.

In April, 1969, the secretary of state, addressing a meeting of Associated Press editors and publishers in New York, suggested

that the U.S. should not put all its eggs in one basket, i.e., the Paris peace negotiations. He advocated a twin policy of regular U.S. troop withdrawals. The Vietnamization policy soon after was announced by President Nixon.

These are some of the actions which may well provide the foundation for a coming historical label on Rogers as a great secretary of state.

Rogers was reluctant to talk about the Nixon Administration's decision-making process in a recent exclusive interview with this correspondent. He also declined to talk about his relations with Dr. Kissinger.

However, it is perhaps significant that another State Department official pointedly noted this week that an understanding has been worked out with the White House as to Dr. Kissinger's contacts with foreign diplomats. Most of such contacts henceforth will be arranged through the State Department, the spokesman said.

But the secretary was willing to talk about some of the satisfactions of his job.

First on his list was a general feeling about the status of U.S. foreign policy.

"I think it is generally recognized," he said, "that foreign affairs have gone quite well in this Administration."

As proof, he cites the fact that foreign policy was not an issue in the 1970 political campaign.

The handling of the crisis involving Nigeria's civil strife is one of the secretary's quiet satisfactions. Although the crisis is long since over, Rogers well remembers the pressures he resisted to intervene politically or militarily or both.

The U.S. did provide economic and humanitarian aid, but stopped short of activity which might have plunged the U.S. into a disastrous deep involvement.

As to the Middle East, Secretary Rogers is happy about the way the area seems to be slowly progressing towards a peaceful settlement.

He notes there was constant turmoil there for nearly 25 years. When he assumed office, the situation was bleak with the continued Israeli bombings, many casualties among the Egyptians, a stepped-up loss of Israeli Phantom jets and continued trouble in Jordan with Fedayeen activity.

Prospects for peace were "very dismal," he recalls. He gave the problem his early attention and worked to come up with something "simple and direct" which would have an appeal to both sides to halt the fighting.

Rogers hatched the idea of a peace initiative which would get the parties to "stop fighting and start talking," but which would not get bogged down with the complicated issues involved.

As the peace initiative was perfected, Rogers happened to see on May 1, 1970, a broadcast by Egyptian President Nasser in which the latter offered a six-month cease fire.

The secretary seized this opportunity to merge his cease-fire formula with the Nasser offer.

"We made it a major initiative and it worked," he explains.

Rogers, however, is under no illusions about the elusiveness of a permanent peace. He feels there are still many things that must be ironed out before peace can be achieved.

"There are signs of progress being made," he says.

While "optimistic" would be too strong a word to use, the secretary is willing to say: "I now feel there is some hope for peace in the area."

The secretary feels he has made a start on improving relations with Communist China. His policy has been to reduce trade barriers and reduce travel restrictions with Red China while at the same time offering a U.S. dialogue with China at the ambassadorial level at Warsaw, Poland.

By such a "step-by-step" policy, relations between the two nations may well continue

ROGERS' RECORD BELIES SYMINGTON'S APPRAISAL

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, recently the Secretary of State was characterized as

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

to improve, although he will not hazard a guess as to when U.S.-Chinese diplomatic relations might be resumed.

Nor will he offer an opinion as to whether the U.S. should or eventually will recognize Communist Cuba. He notes in passing that Fidel Castro seems to be having troubles, as evidenced among other things that he forced the Cubans to forego a Christmas holiday this year.

Elsewhere in the Western Hemisphere, Secretary Rogers finds relations with Mexico particularly excellent. He took satisfaction in U.S.-Mexican settlement of an old border dispute that means the U.S.A. has no border dispute anywhere for the first time in 100 years.

The secretary is not unduly disturbed over reported friction between Canada and the U.S. over business and cultural matters. He considers all this a natural outgrowth of problems connected with the "largest trade between two countries ever experienced in the history of the world."

He says the business problems stem not only from the larger investments by U.S. interests in Canada, but from the reverse flow of capital.

He notes that the Canadians have a larger per capita investment in the U.S. than the other way around. He feels the Canadian government has a good understanding of the problems involved and will act responsibly in settling differences in trade policies.

Rogers was asked about his "major frustrations".

It could hardly be said, he replied, that he was "really frustrated about anything."

Relations with the Democratic Congress?

"I've had very good relations there," he said.

Presidential interference with foreign affairs?

The secretary said he refuses to become disturbed when the "President doesn't always do as I suggest."

While he declined to estimate his batting average on presidential acceptance of his advice, he said the President often consults with him several times a day on foreign policy matters.

Rogers acknowledged that one minor disappointment was to achieve only one third of a goal he had set for himself—a restoration of diplomatic relations with Cambodia, Egypt and Algeria.

Although the latter two have not resumed diplomatic relations, Rogers feels these two nations are showing a much friendlier attitude to this country than when he became secretary.

U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations do not fall, in the secretary's view, either on his list of satisfactions or frustrations.

Relations between the two superpowers, he feels, cannot be described with "adjectives like good or poor." Rather, he says, they should be viewed in terms of "realistic" attitudes by both nations towards each other.

Thus, he concludes, while there's no great spirit of detente at the moment, neither is there a "cold war" or "overt hostility."

Rogers would not hazard a guess when the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with Russia would be concluded or how they would turn out.

How long would he remain as secretary of state?

"I am not a candidate for a second term," he declared half-in-jest, but there was enough earnestness to indicate he meant it.

In any event, the secretary still manages to get in an occasional game of his favorite sport, golf, despite his strenuous routine.

His game is improving, he says, and he's proud that he has broken under 80 for 18 holes twice within the last couple of months.

Perhaps his score will be as good in the history books.

THE DAV—A TRIBUTE TO QUIET COURAGE

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

March 17, 1971

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Boston, Mass., February 24, 1971.
Hon. TORBERT MACDONALD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MACDONALD: Time has been set aside in the House on March 3, 1971, to commemorate the golden anniversary of service by the Disabled American Veterans to America's wartime disabled.

This day is called "DAV Day In Congress—A Tribute to Quiet Courage."

The Disabled American Veterans, Department of Massachusetts, has surpassed its membership quota for the 1970-71 year. Increases in our life and annual membership combined gave us a total of more than 20,329 members, which is the largest membership in the history of the Department. This year we organized three new Chapters—Rockland Chapter No. 50, located in Rockland, Massachusetts, General George S. Patton Memorial Chapter No. 58, located in Hamilton, and Falmouth Memorial Chapter No. 81, located in Falmouth, Massachusetts. The DAV has 103 active Chapters throughout the Commonwealth.

We have four National Service Officers who are located in the John F. Kennedy Federal Building, Government Center, Boston, Mass., who maintain our Service Program for veterans, widows and their dependents. They are Arthur Wilson, National Service Officer In Charge, Albert Hubka, Thomas J. Tomao and John Blake.

The five VA Hospitals and two Soldiers Homes in Massachusetts have individual DAVS appointees. The first Sunday in December is proclaimed DAV Hospital Day by the Governor, at which time we visit each of the five VA Hospitals and two Soldiers Homes.

The DAV has many successful activities to continue the patriotic services the veterans have rendered to their country. We also have a very active Legislative Program in the Commonwealth.

We are enclosing for your information and use a copy of the Chapter and Department Offices here in Massachusetts.

As our Congressman, we urge you to participate in this program.

If I can furnish you with any additional information, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH R. HAROLD,
Department Adjutant.

DAV CHAPTER LIST: SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—MASSACHUSETTS

Arlington DAV Chapter No. 49—Commander Richard P. Danton.

Chelsea DAV Chapter No. 62—Commander John P. Hanlon.

Everett DAV Chapter No. 51—Commander George Desiderio.

Malden DAV Chapter No. 59—Commander A. B. Hoffman.

Malden Lt. Dexter W. Clifford DAV Chapter No. 85—Commander George O'Farrell.

Medford Mystic Valley Gold Star DAV Chapter No. 21—Commander Robert M. Booker.

Revere Beach DAV Chapter No. 112—Commander Guy Festa.

Saugus Irving Campbell DAV Chapter No. 115—Commander Herbert D. Redden.

GOV. THOMAS E. DEWEY

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, today, I, like all those who knew him, am deeply sad-

dened by the news of the sudden death of former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey at the age of 68. For me, perhaps, the loss is more deeply felt than for most, as he was a longtime neighbor in Dutchess County, and until last year's redistricting of New York State, the leading constituent in my old 28th Congressional District.

As one who knew him, I can say that Governor Dewey was one of this Nation's outstanding leaders. From his beginning in public life as a driving, racket-busting New York City district attorney, to his 12-year record as one of New York State's most outstanding Governors, to his position as Republican presidential standard bearer in 1944 and 1948, Governor Dewey never lost his drive, his loyalty to the Republican Party, and his dedication to the public interest.

Even in defeat in 1948, he did not become embittered, but went on as titular head of our Republican Party and was chiefly responsible for the nomination of Dwight Eisenhower as the presidential candidate in 1952.

Through his death this Nation is the poorer. But, because of his life, we are all much, much richer.

INEQUITIES IN THE MILITARY PAY SCALE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fact that over 50,000 serv-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

icemen now qualify for public welfare should not surprise anyone who has looked at the history of military compensation. According to the Army Times:

As recently as 1967 new recruits received less than \$100 a month. Their monthly basic pay remained at \$78 for one 12 year period! (1952-1964).

Low rates of military pay are the direct result of the use of the draft to force young men to serve regardless of the wage rate:

The government's rationale was that they received food, clothing, and shelter for free. And, anyway, they had an obligation to fulfill, so why pay them more, officialdom reasoned. Also, there were so many E-1's that even small raises amounted to big expenses.

Consequently, we have maintained a large military force at relatively small cost to the taxpayers by forcing a minority of our young men to serve at poverty level wages. In a democratic society, particularly in an affluent democratic society, it is intolerable that we use compulsion to reduce the burden of defense to the general public. It is time to implement the pay raises in H.R. 4450, the Voluntary Military Manpower Procurement Act of 1971, and end the inequities in the military pay scale.

I commend this item to your attention:

RECRUITS' PAY LAG IS NOT NEW

WASHINGTON.—The government's failure to raise the basic pay of military recruits for so many years underscores the reasons billions of dollars are needed quickly if their pay is to be made respectable and the all-volunteer force idea given a fair chance of success.

The accompanying chart, tracing the course of military basic pay for over 60 years,

also dramatizes other compensation trends and oddities.

For decades military recruits and draftees have done miserably in the pocketbook department. The pre-war I and War II rates of \$15 and \$21 monthly, while difficult to imagine, and perhaps less incredible than the fact that as recently as 1967 new recruits received less than \$100 a month. Their monthly basic pay remained at \$78 for one 12-year period!

The government's rationale was that they received food, clothing and shelter for free. And, anyway, they had an obligation to fulfill, so why pay them more, officialdom reasoned. Also, there were so many E-1's that even small raises amounted to big expense.

That thinking is changing. Under the all-vol package the Congress is currently weighing, basic pay for an E-1 with less than two years service would rise to \$201.90 on May 1, less than two months from now. E-2s, E-3s, and E-4s with less than two would climb to \$222.90, \$224.20, and \$305.10, respectively. Under-two 0-1s and 0-2s would, on the same day, get a 10 and a nine percent boost—to \$495.66 for the new second lieutenant.

The same package has other new benefits for recruits of all services. In addition, the government is cranking up additional pay raises for under-two service people which may become effective next year. The price tag, if it all comes off, will be huge.

Some lawmakers would provide larger increases for recruits than the Administration is talking about.

The accompanying chart, besides reflecting the recruits' pay dilemma in past years, reveals such things as (1) new second lieutenant basic pay remaining at \$222.30 monthly for over 12 years; and (2) chiefs of staff receiving a raise of nearly \$600 monthly in 1958.

The apparent low pay for many ranks in the 1920s and 1930s wasn't as bad as it might appear, however. Even \$100 a month, which was more than many civilians made, represented considerable purchasing power.

Pay grade	Years of service	May 13, 1908	July 1, 1922	Aug. 19, 1941	June 1, 1942	July 1, 1946	Oct. 1, 1949	May 1, 1952	Apr. 1, 1955	June 1, 1958	Oct. 1, 1963	Sept. 1, 1964	Sept. 1, 1965	July 1, 1966	Oct. 1, 1967	July 1, 1968	July 1, 1969	July 1, 1970	Jan. 1, 1971	
Commissioned officers:																				
C/S.	30					666.67	733.33	954.75	992.94	1,276.40	1,875.00	1,970.00	2,019.30	2,140.20	2,208.60	2,332.20	2,493.00	2,807.10	3,000.00	3,000.00
O-10	30					666.67	733.33	954.75	992.94	1,276.40	1,700.00	1,785.00	1,829.70	1,939.50	2,001.60	2,113.80	2,259.60	2,544.30	2,750.40	2,967.50
O-9	30	916.67				666.67	733.33	954.75	992.94	1,176.40	1,500.00	1,575.00	1,614.30	1,711.20	1,766.10	1,885.10	1,993.80	2,244.90	2,426.70	2,618.40
O-8	30	666.67	666.67	666.67		666.67	733.33	954.75	992.94	1,076.40	1,350.00	1,420.00	1,455.60	1,542.90	1,592.40	1,681.50	1,797.60	2,024.10	2,188.20	2,361.00
O-7	30	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	500.00	550.00	626.50	859.56	967.20	1,175.00	1,235.00	1,266.00	1,341.90	1,384.80	1,462.20	1,563.00	1,759.80	1,902.30	2,052.00
O-6	27	416.67	483.33	483.33	483.33	531.67	669.75	966.54	780.00	985.00	1,085.00	1,112.10	1,178.70	1,216.50	1,284.60	1,370.10	1,546.20	1,671.30	1,803.30	
O-5	22	375.00	393.75	393.75	393.75	433.13	555.75	577.98	639.60	775.00	885.00	907.20	961.50	992.40	1,047.90	1,120.20	1,261.20	1,363.80	1,471.20	
O-4	16	325.00	312.50	312.50	312.50	343.75	456.00	474.24	530.40	610.00	720.00	738.00	782.40	807.30	852.60	911.40	1,026.30	1,109.40	1,197.00	
O-3	10	240.00	230.00	230.00	230.00	264.50	370.50	385.32	436.80	480.00	595.00	609.90	646.50	667.20	704.70	753.30	848.10	916.80	989.10	
O-2	5	183.33	175.00	175.00	175.00	210.00	277.88	289.00	335.40	370.00	465.00	476.70	505.20	521.40	550.50	588.60	652.70	716.40	773.10	
O-1	0	141.67	125.00	125.00	150.00	180.00	213.75	222.30	222.30	222.30	222.30	241.20	294.60	303.90	321.00	343.20	366.40	417.60	480.00	
Enlisted personnel:																				
E-9	28									440.00	500.00	573.00	636.90	657.80	694.20	742.20	835.80	903.60	975.00	
E-8	24									380.00	450.00	461.40	512.10	528.60	558.30	596.70	672.00	726.30	783.60	
E-7	20	99.00	157.50	167.50	179.40	214.50	264.60	275.18	304.20	350.00	375.00	384.30	426.60	440.40	465.00	497.10	559.80	605.10	652.80	
E-6	15	65.00	96.60	110.80	142.50	168.75	213.15	221.68	249.60	275.00	315.00	322.80	358.20	369.60	390.30	417.30	469.80	507.90	548.10	
E-5	10	52.00	79.20	92.80	110.40	132.25	176.40	183.46	210.60	240.00	265.00	271.50	301.50	311.10	328.50	351.30	395.70	427.80	461.70	
E-4	5	33.00	56.70	76.00	81.90	105.00	132.30	137.59	159.90	170.00	205.00	210.00	233.10	240.60	254.10	271.50	305.70	330.60	356.70	
E-3	1	21.00	42.00	64.00	66.00	90.00	95.55	99.37	99.37	99.37	99.37	99.37	111.90	121.80	128.70	137.70	155.10	167.70	180.90	
E-2	1	18.00	30.00	46.00	54.00	80.00	82.50	85.80	85.80	85.80	85.80	85.80	97.50	110.50	106.20	113.40	127.80	138.30	149.10	
E-1	0	15.00	21.00	40.00	50.00	75.00	75.00	78.00	78.00	78.00	78.00	78.00	87.90	90.60	95.70	102.30	115.20	124.50	134.10	

THIRTY-FIVE BILLION DOLLARS MORE IN DEFICIT SPENDING AUTHORIZED

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, 40 years ago, in fiscal year 1930, the Federal Government collected \$4.1 billion in taxes

from the American people and spent \$3.3 billion. The \$738 million surplus was used to reduce the national debt, which at that time was \$16.2 billion.

Since then we have had just nine years when there was a budget surplus, and 31 years of deficits. Federal revenue collections have risen to \$193.8 billion, expenditures to \$196.8 billion, and the national debt to \$382.5 billion—fiscal year 1970. Almost one hundred billion dollars has been added to the national debt

through deficit spending in the last decade alone. The interest now costs us almost \$18 billion every year.

Since 1930 the value of the dollar has been more than cut in half through inflation primarily caused by all this Federal deficit spending which in effect creates money by government fiat. Because this new money is not backed by anything of intrinsic value, it dilutes the value of all the money already in circulation, thereby driving prices up.

On March 4 of this year the House of Representatives voted to raise the national debt limit \$35 billion, from \$395 billion to \$430 billion. We can be virtually certain, in light of past performance, that this guarantees \$35 billion more in Federal deficit spending, with consequent inflation, in the next few years.

The debt limit increase was approved by a vote of 227 to 162. It was encouraging to find so many of my colleagues willing to take a stand against this action, even though the leadership of both parties in the House favored the increase. Some of the statements made in opposition, on the House floor, deserve wider dissemination.

Congressman JOE SKUBITZ, Republican from Kansas, said:

For eight years I have seen this body make a mockery of the term 'debt ceiling.' No longer does it serve as a warning to halt and to re-appraise our position. Our objective seems to be one of crashing through regardless of the ultimate consequences. As much as I regret finding myself in opposition to the administration and its fiscal experts, I simply cannot countenance by my vote the continual increases in debt limits without at the same time witnessing at least the semblance of an effort made to reduce expenditures.

Congressman CHARLES W. SANDMAN JR., Republican of New Jersey, said:

It is all too apparent that our refusal to approve debt ceiling increases is absolutely essential for Congress to retain some measure of control over government spending, notwithstanding hysteria in the various statehouses and city halls.

This is our final weapon, it seems. The question we face today is simply: Do we have the courage and good sense to wield it?

Congressman H. R. GROSS, Republican of Iowa, summed it up:

This is the worst debt-ridden nation in the world. As of January 1, this year the public and private debt is estimated at more than \$1,800,000,000,000 (one trillion, 800 billion). This nation is living on borrowed time and borrowed money. The time has come for Congress and the executive branch of government to start acting responsibly to stop kiting checks.

Mr. Speaker, the backwaters of history are littered with the rotting hulls of profligate governments. This Government is staggering down the road to insolvency and this bill marks yet another milestone toward that tragic end.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

needed to be made. His notable involvement as executive director of the National Urban League and as vice chairman of the Committee for National Health Insurance exemplified his forward looking nature and his interest in just causes wherever they were.

It has been said that a journey of 1,000 miles must begin with a single step. Whitney Young took that step—a step that led America down the path of national conscience.

'TIS A DAY FOR THE IRISH

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, today is the day we Irish like to call our own. Out comes the green and the shamrocks and the songs.

But in all this celebration, what I like to remember are the contributions that the Irish have made to America to help make her great.

My good friend, Joseph T. Karcher of Sayreville, N.J., shares my love of the Irish. Joe and I clerked together many years ago and have been close since then. To express my feelings about St. Patrick's Day and the Irish, I would like to place in the RECORD an article that Joe wrote. It really expresses how I feel about this great day and how I feel about the wonderful fraternity of Irish-Americans with whom I share a great heritage:

WHAT IS AN IRISHMAN?

(By Joseph T. Karcher, Esq.)

He may be one of the policemen or the priest in your home town, or perhaps one of the doctors or lawyers or public officials or the Judge on the Bench, or he may be the man working next to you. Or she may be the school teacher in your public or parochial school, the nurse in the hospital, or the saleslady in the store or your neighbor next door. Their names may be Clancy or Kelly, McCarthy or O'Brien or just plain Smith or Baker or Barnes. They may belong to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the Ancient Order of Hibernians, or the Knights of Columbus—but just as likely to belong to the Moose, or the Eagles, or perhaps the Elks.

Irish men and women come in all sizes, shapes and colors—but you can usually tell them by the lilt in their voices and the sparkle in their eyes because "When Irish eyes are smiling, sure they'll steal your heart away."

Whether it was a year ago or a century or two ago when their ancestors came from "The Old Sod" they still cling to their love of that "one isle in the sea" where hearts are the happiest, laughter the cheeriest, cheeks the rosiest, eyes the bluest, grass the greenest and where laughter and good cheer are a way of life. History tells us that since the time of the Druids they have believed in fairies and leprechauns; the luck of a four leaf clover; the magic of the shamrock and the medicinal virtues of the "cup that cheers". Ancient invaders never quite conquered them because they fell in love with the Irish and stayed there! That's why it is that even today there is an old saying that "There are no strangers here—only friends you have not met."

But they also remember that oppression and persecution did eventually overtake their

March 17, 1971

happy land and that as a result wave after wave of handsome and gifted sons and daughters spread to the four corners of the earth. They always brought with them their mirth; their charm; their love of liberty and their faith in God. Wherever they went they poured out their splendid strength and talents in improving the lot of their less fortunate fellow men!

And so we see from the earliest days they appeared in schools and churches, in hospitals and orphanages—carrying the banner of Christ and His benefactions to the poor and afflicted, regardless of race, creed or color. And as a result their homeland came to be known as the "Isle of Saints and Scholars"!

Here in America the records show that the Irish were with Washington at Valley Forge, with Meade at Gettysburg and Pershing in the Argonne Forest and Patton in the Battle of the Bulge lending their strength and courage and their lives as well in the sacred cause of liberty! We also see that they gave their brawn alongside that of the Italian, the Swede and the Pole, and so many others, in clearing the forests, building the railroads, digging the coal mines, manning our police and fire departments to help America reach its present greatness.

But they brought brain as well as brawn to these shores. Thus we see that their descendants are now heads of universities and colleges and leaders in all the professions, arts and sciences. In the entertainment field their numbers were to become legion, including among them such as John McCormack, George M. Cohan, on down to our present Bing Crosby, Lucille Ball and Jackie Gleason, whose innate, natural born humor has endeared them to millions.

It is safe to say that no race has contributed more in song and story to commemorate their love of life and compassion for their fellow men. A list of Irish songs and lyrics would indeed be endless. When an Irishman tells you in simple English of Tipperary and Killarney and dear old Donegal, his words are lucid and limpid and liquid and dulcet. His language is always lyrical because for centuries good conversation has also been a way of life with the entire race. They are the first to laugh with you when you are happy—the first to cry with you when you are sad. Laughter and tears are their hallmark. The "Top of the morning" to you is as much of a blessing to you as "May God hold you in the hollow of His hand".

Most Irishmen recognize Christmas and Easter as their principal holidays. But it's St. Patrick's Day that is universally recognized by them, when, like Harrigan, they say "I'm proud of all the Irish blood that's in me—cause divil a one can say a word again me!"

And so the Irish race, spread all around the world, goes smiling through the years, with a twinkle in their eyes, a prayer on their lips and a song in their hearts. Erin go Bragh!

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WHITNEY YOUNG

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker: "Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise." This was the ideal. This was the dedication.

The man was Whitney M. Young, Jr. He was a man of courage and commitment; he was a man who lived his convictions in the cause of human dignity.

Whitney Young had faith in America; faith that bridges could be built to span the gulfs between what was and what could be. He looked to the future with hope and determination in all areas of human endeavor, wherever progress

FREE IRAN—OPEN LETTER TO
PRESIDENT NIXONHON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, today I was handed a most interesting copy of Mr. Hossin Habiby's open letter to President Nixon urging him to reevaluate our "position with the present illegal government of Iran."

We have seen countless flyers, pamphlets, and copies of material covering hundreds of subjects. Sometimes they do receive more than cursory attention. I am inserting Mr. Habiby's letter in the RECORD today that my colleagues might take notice of its most important aspect.

The letter has come to our President as the symbol of freedom-loving people everywhere. He has addressed his remarks in the name of the foundations of our country—the freedoms of speech, press, right of assembly and religion. I commend this letter to the personal attention of every Member:

[From the Washington Post, March 15, 1971]

FREE IRAN—OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT
NIXON

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The foundation of your country is firmly embedded on the premise of freedom for all men. Millions of Americans have gone to war to protect not only this country's freedom but the freedom of mankind throughout the world. In order to fulfill this desire thousands of American soldiers have been killed or wounded.

Considering this country's honorable intentions and actions, it is inconceivable that the United States should ally itself with an illegal and corrupt monarchy that has enslaved thirty million freedom-loving people. We are referring to the masses of Iran who have been, and are yet now, enslaved under the yoke of a monarch and his ruthless secret police, SAVAK.

How can this great nation hold its head high when Iran's people are under complete censorship of speech, press, right of assembly and religion? The major concern of Free Iran is not only the tyranny of its present puppet government, but a complete Communistic take-over. The basis for the latter concern is:

(1) During the late 1950's Communists' radios hourly broadcast the corruption of the Royal Family, including its daily improper activities. These broadcasts were received from Baku, Astara, Eriwan, Tiflis, and Ashkhabad, all in the Soviet Union.

(2) Because of these embarrassing truths of these broadcasts to the Royal Family, an arrangement was made between the monarchy and the Iranian Communist Party, Tudeh, to allow an "Open Door" policy among Iran, the Soviet Union and Communist Bloc countries.

(3) The building of a Soviet steel mill in Iran (Isfahan) further solidified Communist take over. The cost of production of Iranian steel is now three times the normal cost.

(4) The laying of a gas line from Southern Iran to Russia. Russia has no need for said gas line.

(5) The planning and building by the Russians of many unneeded plants in Iran.

(6) The Communists now control the Royal Family like puppets on a string. The Royal Family is being led down the dreamy path

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

that when the British leave the Persian Gulf in 1971 that Iran will be the power in that area of the world. In reality, the Communists will then control it.

These things were accomplished through blackmail of the Iranian Royal Family by Russia, whose sole purpose is to infiltrate the country and eventually take it over. The loss of which will be thirty million Iranians. Since the present monarchy is only interested in lining its pockets with bullion, the day will come when they will flee the country in their ever-ready private jet planes and the Communists will control Iran.

The stakes are very high. Not only is Iran the "Bridge to Asia" but also the U.S. has invested billions of dollars in oil wells and allied fields. All will be lost if you continue to acknowledge the corrupt self-interested few.

Last fall a shocking affront to all freedom loving people occurred when Princess Ashraf, twin sister of the Shah of Iran, was invited to the White House in celebration of the U.N.'s 25th anniversary. Her contribution to the goodness of mankind number among the following:

(1) Legalizing the planting and harvesting of opium in Iran. This plant has been and is the scourge of our civilization.

(2) Gambling enormous amounts of ill-gotten moneys at the gambling casinos in the world.

(3) Being deeply involved in illegal and corrupt activities. She has been stopped by French authorities for the possession of suitcase full of narcotics.

The time is now, before it is too late, to re-evaluate your position with the present illegal government of Iran. The time is now to free Iran.

HOSSIN HABIBY,
Chairman.

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION DROP
POINTS TO NEED FOR INVEST-
MENT TAX CREDIT

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the drop in industrial production for the month of February appears to dim hopes that there is any real steam mounting in the economy.

These hopes were based on the fact that for the 2 previous months, December and January, industrial output in America had risen. This was attributed to the end of the General Motors strike and the return to work of thousands of GM workers. It was hoped that this would provide some lasting momentum within the economy. It now appears this was hope denied.

For the month of February the national industrial output dropped four-tenths of 1 percent. This marks, then, another dreary month of listless economic performance during which no progress could be marked by the administration's seemingly impotent policies to get the Nation moving forward on the road to needed recovery.

Obviously stronger medicine is needed and needed soon if 1971 is to come anywhere near fulfilling the economic promise held out by the administration in January.

My suggestion is restoration of the investment tax credit and in line with this suggestion I am sponsoring legislation to reinstate the credit.

There is little doubt that this would give the economy a tremendous lift. Production would be stimulated as modernization and plant expansion were initiated. This in turn would create jobs, reduce unemployment, increase real wages, and stimulate demand for more goods and services. The overall effect would be a very positive boost for the economy.

Mr. Walter Heller in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on February 1 of this year termed the investment tax credit "the biggest bang for the buck" in the arsenal of weapons available in the fight against economic stagnation.

Just recently, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman suggested that the administration should give serious consideration to the investment tax credit because tax incentive may well be the best approach open.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if we wait long enough the economy will work itself into a growth attitude. However, it is not wise nor desirable that we leave the economy to itself. Too many people are out of work. Too many businesses are failing. Too many paychecks are shrinking because of continuing inflation. Too little is being done when much could be done to help speed our way to recovery and full employment.

MAYOR OF JACKSONVILLE, FLA.,
ASKS WHY CROSS-FLORIDA
BARGE CANAL WAS STOPPED

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, when the President halted construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal on January 19, 1971, he apparently acted in a vacuum, because the people most involved in constructing this great national project, one third complete, were not consulted.

The people of Florida—their elected officials and representatives in the Congress—were not given an opportunity to be heard before the President, who in an unconstitutional manner, stopped the construction on the project, which was authorized by the Congress for national defense reasons, and for which \$60 million had been appropriated by the Congress.

The able and fine mayor of Jacksonville, Fla., has publicly asked for an explanation on the halting of construction of the canal. He has not been heard, just as the Members of Congress and local and State officials interested in this vital project have not been heard by the White House. Mayor Hans Tanzler, Jr., of Jacksonville, recently reelected by an overwhelming vote, says the people of Jacksonville "have a right to know" if the President's decision was justified.

The citizens of Jacksonville have a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

right to know not only because it is fair and democratic for all sides to be heard, but also, because taxpayers in Jacksonville have paid \$6.5 million for right-of-way for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

As the elected representative of the Third Congressional District of Florida, which comprises Jacksonville, I have asked to be heard, and have not been heard. The Cross-Florida Barge Canal is an important national defense project, economically justified and it has been approved by many geologists, ecologists and scientists. I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a news report on Mayor Tanzler's concern about the stoppage of the Canal:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Mar. 12, 1971]

MAYOR: CANAL HALT NEEDS EXPLAINING

Mayor Hans Tanzler says the people of Jacksonville and the rest of the state, particularly this community, "have a right to know" whether there was justification in President Nixon's halting of construction on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

The mayor told newsmen Thursday that if there was no ecological justification, then work on the canal should proceed.

Should the construction halt be permanent, he stated, he would instruct the City General Counsel James Rinaman, to do everything possible, including filing suit, to recover the \$6.5 million Jacksonville has contributed toward the canal from an annual half-million ad valorem tax levy.

The mayor said he could not see this community contributing that much money for something that could be turned into a down-state park serving several other counties.

Tanzier said he feels there has been a "great deal of misunderstanding" regarding the city's position on the canal. He said a City Council resolution approved unanimously Tuesday night and signed by him the next day is designed to afford this community participation in any legal determination of final disposition of public funds levied for the canal.

PROPOSAL FOR A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, those Members of Congress who are dubious about the effectiveness of our schools—and most Americans are—will be interested in a bill which 46 of our colleagues and I are introducing today, a bill calling for a White House Conference on Education in 1972.

The prevailing mood convinces me that the first years of this decade ought to be used by the American people for a thorough reexamination of the structure, purposes, and needs of our vast educational enterprise. In particular, we really ought to reexamine the structure and performance of education in light of the ever-accelerating pace of social and technological change. The needs of the final quarter of this century almost certainly cannot be met by institutions designed to fulfill the requirements of the first quarter. There must be change. Yet, almost uniquely in education, change

must be strongly rooted in wide public understanding and support.

A White House Conference on Education similar to that which we are proposing today was held in 1955. The problems considered then included badly organized districts, the teacher shortage, a shortage of facilities brought on by two decades of depression and war, and underfinancing of education at all levels.

We can breathe a little more freely now because our schools are mostly new, and our districts are better organized. Instead of a teacher shortage, we face a surplus of those prepared to teach. And, with total spending for education now reaching \$65 billion a year—representing almost 7 percent of our gross national product—the American commitment to education today is undeniably great.

Just as undeniable, however, is our concern about education. Economic disadvantage, linguistic and cultural isolation, racial discrimination and disadvantage, the deterioration of city ghetto schools, the inadequacy of isolated rural schools, what should be taught, and what teaching format should be utilized are among our concerns today. In sum, they are causing many Americans to question the effectiveness of our schools.

The 1955 White House Conference on Education brought about wide public understanding of our needs in education and support for the changes that evolved. It involved some 1,500 local and State conferences in which almost a million people took part. Every State and territory participated, and the citizen interest and participation that was generated continued in many States and resulted in far-reaching gains for education. We believe that this democratic approach to assessing the condition, needs, and goals of our education system is again needed, that it would serve as a useful and meaningful guide in determining future education policy—hence our proposal for a White House Conference on Education in 1972, patterned after that which took place in 1955.

A summary follows:

SUMMARY

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION

The President of the United States is authorized to call a White House Conference on Education in 1972 in order to stimulate a national assessment of the condition, needs, and goals of education and to obtain from a broadly representative group of citizens a report of findings and recommendations resulting from such assessment.

Section 2 gives wide latitude to the Conference in making up its agenda, but requires 5 areas of study:

1. Pre-school education, including child care and nutritional programs, and calling for particular attention to the needs of disadvantaged children;
2. The adequacy of primary education in teaching the skills of communication—reading and writing—and arithmetic;
3. The place of occupational education in helping to meet the nation's requirements for skilled workers;
4. Higher education, including ways of providing adequate levels of institutional support and student help; and
5. The adequacy of education at all levels in meeting the special needs of individuals.

March 17, 1971

A 35-member National Conference Committee, appointed by the President, is authorized in Section 3. Twelve of the members would be educators, and the other 23 would be representative of the public interest in education. The Committee would describe the guidelines, organize the Conference, and make its final report before December 1, 1972.

Section 4 authorizes grants ranging from \$25,000 to \$75,000 to States to defray expenses of the conferences.

A State is defined to include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

PRIORITIES—JOBS

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of talk lately about the supersonic transport and national priorities. There are some who say the money needed to develop a U.S. SST could be better spent elsewhere. Could it be that they have forgotten an important lesson from history?

Technology as it will be harnessed to develop the SST has fueled our Nation's industrial development for decades. To borrow a phrase from the petroleum industry, advanced technology has been the tiger in our economic tank. Scientific innovation in nuclear power, computers, space systems, jet transports, and the like is producing hundreds of jobs for the Nation's ever-increasing work force. The development of an American SST will do the same.

The aerospace industry is the largest single production element in our economy. Of a total national work force—excluding agricultural workers—of about 70 million, slightly over 1 million now work in the aerospace industry.

During the next two decades the U.S. Government will reap its investment in the prototype program many times over. Federal tax revenues are estimated at \$5.4 billion from industrial and individual participants in the production program, compared to \$1.34 billion of investment by the Government in the development program to be recovered from royalties on the sale of SST's.

We also must consider the significance of the SST in relation to changing job requirements. We have funded Government programs aimed at upgrading and increasing the utilization of the labor force. The SST will continue this process, while at the same time providing a variety of other jobs, not only highly skilled technical ones, but others as well.

It would do well for us to remember what has happened in other countries where large scale, technically sophisticated programs were not carried out. Jobs were lost, placing a ceiling on upward mobility of both the highly trained new entrants to the labor force and on experienced workers. This, in turn, made it more difficult to provide job opportunities for new applicants with lesser

skills. The ultimate result is economic reversal.

The British and French have learned a lesson. That is what the Concord is all about. It would seem to me that we should pay attention to the advances being made by foreign manufacturers with the direct assistance of their governments and not make it impossible for our aerospace companies to compete in the commercial market as they have up to now in sales of subsonic jets.

THE LATE THOMAS E. DEWEY

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to express the sorrow we feel over the passing of Thomas E. Dewey. He meant much to this Nation and to the Republican Party.

Although somewhat out of the public eye over the past few years, he has never been out of our hearts. Speaking as an Ohioan, our esteem for him goes back to 1944 when he chose the late distinguished John W. Bricker, then Governor of Ohio, as his vice-presidential running mate.

Of his many public accomplishments, perhaps the greatest was his strong influence upon Richard Nixon to run as General Eisenhower's running mate on the Republican ticket in 1952. From the relative obscurity of a California Senator, Richard Nixon has journeyed to become the President of the United States, a journey Thomas Dewey was never able to make. It is a fitting tribute.

Because Thomas Dewey was so close to the President, I think it especially appropriate to know the President's feeling on his passing away. Therefore, I include the text of President Nixon's statement to be printed at this point:

TEXT OF NIXON'S STATEMENT ON DEWEY

All America is poorer tonight for the loss of Governor Thomas E. Dewey—a great patriot, a distinguished statesman and a fine human being.

New York will remember him as a man of the law whose services spanned four decades: enforcing the law as a prosecutor in the Thirties, administering it as governor in the Forties and Fifties, and practicing it privately right into the Seventies. The nation will remember him as a man of politics who led the loyal opposition with vigor and vision in the presidential contests of 1944 and 1948, and who played such a vital role in giving Americans General Eisenhower as their President in 1952.

For my own part, I will remember Thomas Dewey as a close personal friend and political associate for over 20 years. His wise counsel has been of immense value to me on many occasions during the years I served in the House, the Senate, as Vice President and as President. I found invariably that when a problem was most difficult he could always be counted on to be at his best in giving his advice.

Governor Dewey was to have been a guest at the White House tonight and the occasion is diminished beyond words for both Mrs. Nixon and me by his death. What consoles

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

us, and what many help to console his family and countless friends, is the high distinction of his long life. John Quincy Adams' dying words—"This is the last of earth; I am content"—speak well the satisfaction which Thomas Dewey also deserved to feel in his full and varied career of service to this nation.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GRACE HAMILTON

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the sweetest, most wonderful people I have ever known has left this world.

Miss Grace Hamilton, who, with her newspapering sidekick, Nina Babcock, made Cedar Springs, Mich., famous as "Red Flannel Town," died March 3 while vacationing in Clermont, Fla., and was buried March 6 in her beloved community of Cedar Springs. Cedar Springs is in my congressional district, 20 miles north of Grand Rapids.

Grace would never tell anyone exactly how old she was—and rightly so. It was her philosophy that the only point of importance about an individual is his or her contributions to the betterment of a community.

Grace Hamilton possessed the sharp, inquiring mind of a natural newspaperwoman. And although she always knew a good story when she ran into one, she always took the human and responsible point of view in writing it.

She and Nina Babcock were New York newspaperwomen back in 1932—in the bigtime, so to speak—but they had always wanted to own their own paper. So they pooled their resources and bought the Cedar Springs Clipper. The Clipper was one of Michigan's oldest weekly newspapers, established in 1869. When Grace Hamilton and Nina Babcock bought it, it had a circulation of 405.

The people of Cedar Springs quite naturally fell in love with Miss Hamilton and Miss Babcock. And in due course, the two women became known as the Clipper Girls.

Years later, an incident occurred which made the Clipper Girls and Cedar Springs known throughout the country.

The New York Sun put a reporter to work during an unusually cold winter to find a suit of red flannel underwear.

After searching the shops in New York City and making phone calls to other cities, the reporter gave up the hunt and wrote a story mourning the demise of red flannel undies.

But no, it is not so, Grace Hamilton and Nina Babcock rejoined in a story in the Cedar Springs Clipper. The fact that the New York Sun story was a fiction could be seen in the red long johns flapping in the breeze on Cedar Springs clothes lines every week, they wrote. Anybody who wanted a pair of red flannel underwear could get them in Cedar Springs, they noted.

An Associated Press man picked up

the story from the Cedar Springs Clipper and it went out all over the country on the AP wire. Newspapers everywhere used the item.

Two days later, orders for red flannel underwear began pouring in to Cedar Springs. When local merchants ran out of them, store owner Jack Pollack persuaded an eastern manufacturer to start making them again.

Red flannels were shipped in to Cedar Springs by the carload and then redistributed throughout the United States and Canada, and even sent to England, Scotland, and Singapore.

In the 1950's a factory was set up in Cedar Springs to produce red flannel nightshirts, night caps and berets. Recently, teenagers have been going in for red flannel granny gowns.

The red flannel craze gave rise to an annual Red Flannel Day in Cedar Springs, appropriately celebrated with a parade and other events wrapped up in a lumberjack atmosphere. Red Flannel Festival-goers traditionally feast on flapjacks.

Red Flannel Day still is an annual and very festive event in Cedar Springs—and it owes its origin to the Clipper Girls, Grace Hamilton and Nina Babcock.

The Clipper Girls once spoke before the Michigan Retail Clothiers and Furnishers Association in Detroit. There they solemnly proposed that delegates to the United Nations begin wearing red flannels. This, they said, would "combat the cold war and make the Russians see red."

Grace Hamilton and Nina Babcock sold the Cedar Springs Clipper in 1955 but they continue to be known as the Clipper Girls—Cedar Springs celebrities, much loved.

Miss Hamilton was active in civic affairs even after leaving the newspaper business. She was a member of the Cedar Springs Chamber of Commerce, the Cedar Springs Woman's Club, the Historical Society, and the National Federation of Press Women. She was an honorary Rotary Ann. She attended Cornell University and University of Michigan.

After Miss Hamilton and Miss Babcock sold the Clipper, Miss Hamilton opened a real estate office in Cedar Springs and operated it until 1968.

The Clipper Girls were always active politically, in a constructive way—not seeking public office or personal glory. Grace and Nina were loyal friends of mine, always ready to help. Nobody could adequately repay them for their many kindnesses to their multitude of friends.

In 1952 Grace and Nina came to Washington for the first inauguration of Dwight D. Eisenhower and were the guests of me and my wife Betty during the many activities on that occasion. I shall never forget the pleasure Betty and I in hosting the Clipper Girls at that moment in history.

Mr. Speaker, everyone who knew Grace Hamilton feels a deep sense of loss. I am especially grieved because of our close friendship. She was one of the finest persons I have ever known. To her dear friend, Nina Babcock, and to her family I extend my most heartfelt condolences.

MAJORITY LEADER BOGGS SPEAKS
ON REVENUE SHARING

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive and persuasive Democratic alternative to the administration's revenue-sharing proposal was presented on Monday by our able and distinguished majority leader, the Honorable HALE BOGGS.

In an address to the paper industry executives meeting in New York, Mr. BOGGS outlined a constructive and attainable program to aid the cities and States of this country. He also exposed effectively the inherent weaknesses of the administration proposal.

Because this is such an important issue, and because Mr. BOGGS has more than two decades experience in the financing of government, I am inserting his speech in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE HALE BOGGS

I am truly delighted to be with you today and to have this opportunity to address the men and women who manage one of our country's greatest and most vital industries—the paper industry.

I have been asked to talk about the work of the 92nd Congress and particularly the prospects of legislation affecting, directly or indirectly, the paper industry.

There can be little doubt that the domestic issue of greatest concern to you, both as businessmen and as private citizens is the condition of the economy.

Americans have had a very sobering experience in the past two years. After the longest sustained period of economic growth in our country's history, our economy has suffered its first recession in almost a decade. Last year, our gross national product declined for the first time in twelve years . . . consumer prices rose 5.5 percent, the second largest increase in nineteen years . . . and unemployment rose to six percent of the labor force, the highest it has been in seven years.

As a result, in 1970 we lost more than \$50 billion worth of production, some of it, no doubt, in the paper industry, corporate profits after taxes have declined eight percent in the last twenty-four months.

The House Democratic Leadership firmly believes that getting the economy back on the right track must be this Country's number one domestic priority. We cannot hope to meet the many pressing needs of our people in the absence of a healthy, expanding economy.

It is therefore clear that the 92nd Congress must devote a major portion of its energies to getting the Nation's economy moving again.

I can report to you that we are already at work. Last week, the House passed legislation extending standby wage and price controls for the President. This legislation will give the President the tools necessary to curb inflation. The Committee on Education and Labor is presently holding public hearings on Public service employment. This proposal will enable hard pressed local communities to receive financial assistance in areas of personnel shortages such as police, fire, hospitals, schools, and sanitation. Last Monday the Committee on public works began hearings on accelerated public works legislation which will provide funds for public works construction in communities suffering from high unemployment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Each of these is tangible evidence that the 92nd Congress is already working to revive the Nation's economy.

Other Congressional Committees are now hard at work drafting legislation in virtually every other field of public policy: from health to housing, from employment to the environment, from education to consumer protection.

If I offer these examples somewhat defensively, it is because Congress is once again the target of criticism.

After almost three decades as a member, I have begun to wonder if there ever has been a Congress which was popular. A popular Congress? It even sounds ridiculous.

The truth is, of course, that the framers of our Constitution intended Congress as the place where social conflicts would be peacefully resolved. It is, as Harry Truman would say, no place for those who cannot stand the heat in the kitchen.

I have served in fourteen Congresses, and I have seen a lot of heat come and go. I was a member of the 89th Congress which was accused of 'rubber stamping' legislation. A short while later I served in the 90th Congress which was accused of being a "do nothing" Congress.

The truth is that Congress has an enormous amount of work to do. It has to consider a budget each year of at least \$225 billion. It has to take a close look at each and every one of the problems of our country, at home and abroad. This is an enormous undertaking, and it requires an enormous amount of human energy.

Ten years ago, we didn't have to worry about the pros and cons of an S. S. T. Twenty years ago, no one would have dreamed that the environment would be one of the great issues in Congress. Thirty years ago, Congress did not have to consider a space program, or anti-ballistic missiles, or nuclear disarmament.

In times past, no one dreamed that our cities would become jam packed with people who had migrated from other parts of the country without skills, or training, or education. No one dreamed that we would one day have 87 million automobiles jamming and packing the streets of every community in our country.

These are the difficult problems which now confront us. It is axiomatic that problems worry people, and when solutions are not forthcoming, people begin to criticize Congress. Congress very often becomes an easy scapegoat for other branches of government, especially when they are controlled by an opposing political party.

A case in point, is the Administration's revenue sharing proposal. The President announced in his State of the Union address that one of his six goals of the new American revolution is the adoption of a revenue sharing program.

Although we have yet to receive the details, I understand that the President proposes a \$16 billion program, of which \$5 billion represents general revenue sharing, to be distributed among the states on a no-strings-attached-basis. The remaining \$11 billion is referred to as special revenue sharing, for it is to be directed into six areas: law enforcement, elementary and secondary education, rural development, urban development, manpower training and transportation. Of this \$11 billion \$10 billion is already being spent in the same six areas and \$1 billion represents additional money.

Neither general or special revenue sharing represent new ideas. General revenue sharing has been kicked around fifty years, and approximately \$30 billion in special revenue sharing—in the form of block grants is now on the books.

Another \$80 to \$90 billion in Federal revenues is shared directly with private individuals, such as social security beneficiaries, and private institutions, such as colleges and

March 17, 1971

universities, and with Cities and States under various other programs.

What the President is really proposing then, is that the Federal control on a substantial amount of money now going to the States, be removed.

The reasoning behind the Administration's revenue sharing proposal is colored with politics. The economic policies of the past two years have produced the economic paradox of recession and inflation. These conditions have had a severe impact on our States and Cities, most of whom were already facing financial crises. There are now two million more unemployed persons than there were two years ago. Unemployed workers and failing businesses do not pay taxes, and State and Local income fell by \$4 billion in 1970.

Increased welfare and unemployment compensation due to high unemployment increased their burden by \$3 billion. Increased costs due to inflation and high interest rates accounted for another \$3 billion. The condition of the economy in 1970 resulted in a net loss of \$10 billion to State and Local governments in 1970 and this, more than anything else, is the proverbial straw which is now breaking the backs of Local and State governments.

In response to the clamor of Local and State officials, the Administration took an old idea, packaged it in a new wrapper, and began an intensive campaign to blame it all on Congress.

Why is the House Democratic Leadership opposed to the President's revenue sharing proposal?

I can assure you that our opposition does not arise from any kind of ignorance or insensitivity to severe problems confronting our Cities and States. It was Democratic Congresses which began the effort to rebuild urban America in the 1960's.

It is precisely our concern for the Cities and States which leads us to oppose the President's proposal.

A recent study conducted by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is revealing: It shows that the Administration's proposal, instead of increasing assistance to the Cities and States, would actually result in reduced aid in such critical areas as elementary and secondary education, the model Cities program and urban and rural community development. There are actual reductions in the new budget in such items as: highway related safety grants, school lunch programs, Federal impact aid to schools, and loans for rehabilitating water and sewer facilities.

I do not believe revenue sharing will strengthen Local and State governments; I believe it will weaken them. Does it strengthen a government—does it make it more effective and efficient—if you make money available to it on a no-strings-attached basis? I think the responsibility of raising revenues is an essential factor in achieving responsible, effective government on all levels. A local or State government, substantially dependent upon Federal revenues, will be a hot house variety of government.

We Democrats in the House of Representatives are acutely aware of the problems of this Nation and particularly of the problems of our Nation's Cities. The great empires in history were built on their cities where commerce and culture thrived and there was a good life for all.

We do not believe that the Administration's answers to the crisis now facing our urban areas are adequate ones. In many instances the Administration seeks to dismantle programs that have been used for many years to overcome urban blight. The oversimplified gimmick of "revenue sharing" has been invented to cynically mislead our municipal leaders into thinking that this is the golden answer to their darkest problems. It is a fool's gold.

But opposition for opposition's sake is not a dictum of the Democratic Party. We will offer alternatives and we will work with the Mayors of the great Cities of this Nation to find them.

Toward this end the House Democratic Leadership has launched a monthly conference with a committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors. We held the first such meeting last Wednesday in the Speaker's office in the Capitol. There we put all our cards on the table. The House Leadership told the Mayors the fact of life about so called "revenue sharing" and we began a meaningful discussion of realistic proposals to help the Mayors face their problems.

Some of the alternatives we discussed, and the Mayors received them with enthusiasm, were:

1. A new proposal to discontinue the various matching fund formulas that Cities are finding increasingly hard to meet as their revenues decline. The idea here is to give outright grants to Cities in need, and "forgive" them on the 10, 30, and 50 percent matching funds that are now required of them. This proposal would let the Cities keep desperately needed funds and allow them to put the money where local officials think it will do the most good.

2. Full funding of programs for the Cities. As you may know Congress first authorizes programs and then, in a separate action, provides money for them. There is often as much as a 30 percent "shrinkage" in the process. The Democrats will work to insure that this does not happen particularly in the case of programs for the inner city.

3. Where the President has recommended little or nothing for existing programs, we Democrats will work to see to it that we provide sufficient funds. At this moment the Administration is holding up \$600 million in community development funds that can be released for the fiscal year we are now in—right now. The breakdown is \$200 million in urban renewal funds, \$200 million in water and sewer funds and \$192 million in public housing contract authority. We are urging the President to release these funds. Meanwhile we are scrutinizing his budget and finding gaps in other programs for the Cities.

4. Federal takeover of welfare costs. Although this would benefit States rather than Cities, we are exploring the possibility of a provision that would make it mandatory for much of these funds saved by the States to be passed on to the Cities.

5. Public service employment. We are now conducting hearings and will have a bill that will help pay the salaries for firemen, policemen and other municipal workers. This will provide much needed jobs for many of our unemployed and will stop the cutback in essential municipal services. Now President Nixon vetoed a bill like this last year and if he does it again we will override his veto. In the year that has passed since that veto, the problem has become worse with no relief in sight.

6. An urban development bank. This bank would provide loans to Cities on a long term, low interest basis, to finance much needed public works and housing projects. Interest rates would be under 6 percent and a borrower would have to prove he could not obtain a loan from private lending sources or at reasonable terms. So this public bank would not be competition with conventional lending institutions.

7. Accelerated public works. Hearings have started on a \$2 billion accelerated public works bill which would immediately provide these extra funds for water and sewer facilities, hospitals and other public programs, local roads and streets, etc., above funds provided through the regular grant-in-aid programs in these areas. This would attack the twin problem of environment and unemployment.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

8. Several Democrats have come forward with a fine new idea for intergovernmental cooperation. This proposal would have the Internal Revenue Service collect for the States and Local governments their income tax. The tax would be coordinated with the Federal tax by being either a percentage of the Federally computed income or the tax. This suggestion would allow the most effective and efficient tax gathering agency in the world (904 of 1%) to collect the State and Local tax and immediately pay it over. Not only would this greatly increase collections—variously estimated at about one billion dollars—but it would eliminate the costs of collection incurred by the States of almost \$200 million. At the same time, the plan would reduce the complexity of return filing for our citizens and business since the State and Local returns would be eliminated and replaced by only one extra line on the Federal return.

This plan would not impinge on any States sovereignty as each would levy the tax at its own rate. I fear greatly that revenue sharing as proposed by the Administration cannot make this claim. It will only be a short time before the States are devoid of revenue potential and completely dependent on the Federal revenue sharing—at that time Federal controls may eliminate State government as real forces.

The Administration's revenue sharing proposal is failing the acid test: All over our Country, Mayors and Governors are finding out that the pot at the end of the rainbow is filled with fool's gold. They are learning that the Administration proposes to undo the hard won legislative achievements of the last ten years. They are finding out that revenue sharing would actually reduce aid to the Cities in a number of key areas.

I assure you that a Democratic Congress—which began the assault on the problems of the cities—is not about to preside over the liquidation of the great legislative achievements of the past decade. We are offering constructive alternatives which will not jeopardize existing programs which are working efficiently to help our Cities and States and the people who reside in them.

Thank you.

THE BRISTOL PRESS CELEBRATES ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, March 9 was a very special day for the community of Bristol and particularly for its outstanding daily newspaper, the Bristol Press, which celebrated the 100th anniversary of its first publication.

These hundred years chronicle the story of a people and the events which shaped the life of this community. These hundred years are marked also by the distinctive and dedicated contributions which the Press family has made to the development of the city of Bristol.

A democratic society reflects and is reflected in the image of the news media. The Bristol Press is among those newspapers which, through honest and complete reporting, has demonstrated the highest standard of journalism. Its past is prologue to a new era of responsibility and service. I am honored to salute the Press on this anniversary and to bring to the attention of my colleagues

a brief history of the newspaper contained in a recent Press editorial:

BRISTOL PRESS 100TH

Back in early January we commented that in this year of 1971, The Bristol Press was observing its 101st year of publication. The appropriate designation under the masthead on page one was therefore Vol. C 1. During the first year of publication, previous to the first birthday anniversary, the designation on the masthead was Vol. 1.

Tomorrow, Tuesday March 9, is quite a special day in our long and eventful history. The first publication of The Bristol Press was on March 9, 1871. So The Press joins the distinguished ranks of Bristol centenarians with Vol. C 1, No. 57 edition Tuesday.

As we did with the 90th anniversary ten years ago, The Press has plans for a special edition later in the year. Naturally we want to review our own history, but of more general interest to the community and our readers, we have plans for reviewing numerous phases of Bristol history in the past century. Preparing such an anniversary edition is a fascinating and challenging assignment. We are eagerly moving in on it.

Right now we will give you just a capsule on The Press. Rev. Charles Hart Riggs, a retired Congressional minister, founded The Press, with the first edition of the weekly newspaper on March 9, 1871. In the 1890's a group of Bristol business men and manufacturers took over the control and operation of The Press and The Bristol Press Publishing Company became the publishers.

In 1902 the officers and directors of The Bristol Press Publishing Company convinced Arthur S. Barnes, a Bristol native, to come back to Bristol from New Haven to take over the management responsibilities of The Press. Arthur Barnes had been in business in New Haven since his graduation from Yale in 1892.

In 1910 The Press became a semi-weekly and in 1916 the move was made to the daily field. Arthur Barnes continued as editor and publisher of The Press until his death at age 85 in 1956. He used to enjoy pointing out that he was practically contemporary with the start of The Press. He was born in Bristol on March 12, 1871, three days after the first issue. He had seen The Press grow from a small weekly publication in the early 1900's to a lively and thriving daily in the 1950's. We pay tribute to him and his associates for their guidance of The Press for over half a century.

And as we move in on the assignment of planning for the anniversary edition, we are conscious of our heritage and our responsibilities. We aim to live up to this challenging obligation.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, today we are all Irish. We all share in the St. Patrick's Day celebrations, parades and merriment. But the holiday spirit should not make us forget the sadness many Americans of Irish descent feel about the terrorism that has plagued our ancestral land for more than 50 years.

Today all Irishmen must assume some responsibility for helping to bring peace

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

to Ireland. On this St. Patrick's Day I have introduced a resolution that could bring an end to the civil strife that has flared anew in Northern Ireland.

My resolution calls for a free election on the question of unification of Ireland under the supervision of the United Nations. I feel this is a step in the right direction toward a permanent and lasting peace.

THE WAYWARD PRESS—TUBE DIVISION

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Air Force and Space Digest magazine has just released a most interesting analysis of the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

The article was written by senior editor Claude Witze, who in my book is one of Washington's top reporters. I have known him for many years and not once have I seen him write anything which could not stand up under close scrutiny for accuracy and objectiveness.

If I were still a city editor, Claude Witze would be the kind of reporter I would want to have working for me. His objective investigation into "The Selling of the Pentagon" has turned up some interesting facts heretofore unknown.

For that reason, I want to insert his article in the RECORD at this point so everyone will be aware of these important aspects:

AIR FORCE AND SPACE DIGEST,
Washington, D. C., March 15, 1971.

On February 23, CBS News presented, on a national TV network, a documentary, one-hour broadcast entitled "The Selling of the Pentagon."

In view of the public interest in this program and the discussion that has followed in the press and in Congress, Air Force Magazine is releasing the attached commentary, prepared for its upcoming April issue, in advance of publication.

You are free to quote from it, or to reprint the article in its entirety, with credit to Air Force Magazine.

JOHN F. LOOSBROCK,
Editor and Assistant Publisher.

THE WAYWARD PRESS—TUBE DIVISION

The winter issue of the Columbia Journalism Review, a quarterly published at the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, is devoted almost entirely to a study of how the press has performed in covering the war in Vietnam. The only possible conclusion a reader of these eight essays can reach is that the press has done a deplorable job. No matter what epithets you might want to hurl at the political administrations in Washington and Saigon, at the military hierarchy, at the military-industrial complex, and at the doves or the hawks, even more heated epithets could justifiably be thrown at the purveyors of ink and electronic signals.

There is one examination of television's performance, written by Fred W. Friendly, a former president of CBS News, who indulges in a bit of self-flagellation, confessing that the "news media, and particularly broadcast journalism" must share the responsibility for public misunderstanding of the situation in

Indochina. Speaking of the years when he, Friendly, was the man in charge at CBS, he says, "The mistakes we made in 1964 and 1965 almost outran those of the statesmen."

One thing missing from Mr. Friendly's recitation is any suggestion that the television medium lends itself in a peculiar way to distortion of fact. This reporter has nearly forty years of experience on newspapers and magazines, including more than a decade operating from the copy desk of a metropolitan daily. Television news was born and brought up within that same forty-year period. I have watched it closely and confess that I never was impressed by its impact until Lee Harvey Oswald was murdered on camera. No newspaper or magazine ever will duplicate that 1963 performance in Dallas. Yet, if I saw it today, I would demand confirmation that the event took place at all and that what we saw on the tube was not a clever compilation of film clips, snipped from a wide variety of source material and glued together to make a visual product that could be marketed to some huckster of toothpaste or gasoline, and then turn out to be a winner of the Peabody Award.

In support of this professional skepticism, we have the performance of Mr. Friendly's own CBS on February 23. The program was billed as a "News Special" and was called "The Selling of the Pentagon." It ran for one hour, with commercials, and featured a recitation of the script by CBS's charismatic Roger Mudd. Mr. Mudd did not write the script; he was burdened with it. The show's producer works in New York. He is reported to be thirty-four-year-old Peter Davis, who says he and his staff spent ten months working on this "documentary." Mr. Davis does not appear to make any claim to objectivity in his work. He is making a charge: that the Department of Defense spends a vast amount of money on propaganda designed to win public approval of its programs. Armed with cameras, scissors, and cement, he proceeded to make his case.

This magazine has neither the space nor the desire to do a detailed critique of "The Selling of the Pentagon," but we have examined enough of it to demonstrate that it leaves CBS with a credibility gap wider than the canyons at Rockefeller Center. Here is an example:

At one point, early in the script, Mr. Mudd, the narrator, transitions to a new sequence in Mr. Davis' portrayal with a paragraph of four sentences. We will examine the sentences one at a time:

Mudd. "The Pentagon has a team of colonels touring the country to lecture on foreign policy."

The team to which he refers comes from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), with headquarters here in Washington. There are four colonels on the team—two from the Army and one each from the Air Force and the Marine Corps. There is also a Navy captain, and, totally ignored by CBS, a foreign-service officer from the State Department. They are not "touring the country." They have a briefing on national-security policy that is given seven times a year, no more and no less. ICAF is not mentioned in the CBS script, and there is no reference to the mission of the college. A TV cameraman who visited the school could easily take a picture in the lobby of a wall inscription that says:

"Our liberties rest with our people, upon the scope and depth of their understanding of the nation's spiritual, political, military, and economic realities. It is the high mission of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces to develop such understanding among our people and their military and civilian leaders."

The quote is attributed to Dwight D. Eisenhower, who spoke those words at the dedication of the college in 1960. He un-

derstood the requirement, perhaps more clearly than any other man in our history.

The ICAF national-security policy briefing is designed for the education of Reserve officers from all branches of the armed forces, not primarily for the general public. The reason the team, including the State Department officer, gives it in seven locations each year is to reduce travel expenses by eliminating the necessity for Reserve officers to visit the college. None of this was explained by CBS.

Mudd. "We found them [the ICAF team] in Peoria, Ill., where they were invited to speak to a mixed audience of civilians and military Reservists."

Here we have a use of the word "found" that would not be permitted by a competent newspaper copy editor. CBS was told that Peoria was on the schedule, and the CBS camera crew spent three days at the seminar in that city with the concurrence and cooperation of the Defense Department, the ICAF, and the Peoria Association of Commerce. Before departing, CBS was given full information on the curriculum, the scheduling, the military and civilian participation, the costs, and the funding. The Association of Commerce was the sponsor, in this case, and was permitted to establish the rules under which civilians were admitted. Their seminar, billed in Peoria as the "World Affairs Forum"—a label not mentioned by CBS—covered all aspects of national-security affairs. That includes economics, resources, technology, social problems, and military affairs, as well as foreign policy.

Mudd. "The invitation [to Peoria] was arranged by Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., which did \$39 million of business last year with the Defense Department."

The Peoria seminar was not arranged by the Caterpillar Tractor Co. It was arranged by the city's Association of Commerce, which provided the auditorium and other facilities. The Association has no defense contracts. A spokesman for the Association, contacted by this reporter, said his group shared the sponsorship with the 9th Naval District. There were two chairmen for the meeting. The civilian chairman was Charles B. Leber, who in his business life is an officer of the Caterpillar Tractor Co. The military chairman was Capt. Paul Haberkorn, USNR. He is the owner and operator of Peoria's Ace Hardware Store. The hardware store also has no defense contracts, which probably explains why it failed to get a mention on the CBS show.

Mudd. "The Army has a regulation stating: 'Personnel should not speak on the foreign-policy implications of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam.'"

The ICAF team, consisting of five military officers and a State Department officer, does not speak on the foreign-policy implications of our involvement in Vietnam, which would be in violation of Army regulations. The regulations governing ICAF say the material used must be cleared for accuracy, propriety, and consistency with official policy. Both the State Department and the Defense Department have a hand in this routine clearance of all ICAF presentations.

In the CBS show, the camera moves from Mr. Mudd, following his recitation of the above inaccuracies, to one of the lecturers at Peoria. CBS does not identify the speaker in this paste-together of film clips, but he is Col. John A. MacNeil of the U.S. Marines, a veteran of World War II and Vietnam. If the TV audience sensed that the next five sentences, out of the mouth of Colonel MacNeil, sounded somewhat disjointed, there was good reason for it. They came from four different spots in the camera record, and the sequence was rearranged to suit the somewhat warped taste of producer Davis. Sentence by sentence, the quotes go like this:

MACNEIL. "Well, now we're coming to the heart of the problem, Vietnam."

This appears on page fifty-five of the prepared, and approved, text of the briefing. Next sentence:

MACNEIL. "Now, the Chinese have clearly and repeatedly stated that Thailand is next on their list after Vietnam."

That one was cut of what the Colonel was saying back when he was on page thirty-six and discussing an entirely different aspect of the presentation. Then:

MACNEIL. "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."

This is found on page forty-eight of the script. What is most important is that the statement was not original with Colonel MacNeil or the drafters of the briefing. It is a quotation. The CBS scissors-and-paste wizard deleted the attribution. Colonel MacNeil made it clear, in the words immediately preceding the above sentences, that he was quoting Souvanna Phouma, the Prime Minister of Laos. In other words, Souvanna Phouma said it; CBS distorted the film to make its viewers think Colonel MacNeil said it. It is the kind of journalistic dishonesty that a reputable newspaper would not tolerate. Many reporters have been fired for lesser indiscretions.

MACNEIL. "So, 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 that there would be a bloodbath in store for a lot of the population of the South."

To get this one, the CBS film clipper searched deeper into his filmed record. In the prepared script of the ICAF team, it appears on page seventy-three.

It is easy to see how this technique can be used to make a man say almost anything you want him to say. Once the right words are on tape, they can be rearranged, and were by CBS in this instance, to make a presentation sound inept, stupid, wrong, vicious, or to reach any conclusion that the film clipper wants to get across to his audience. What the speaker actually put onto the sound track cannot be recognized.

Another example of this in "The Selling of the Pentagon" comes out of Roger Mudd's interview with Daniel Z. Henkin, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. Two minutes and four seconds of the interview were used out of forty-two minutes of filmed conversation. Here is one breakdown:

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

Now, this is not easy to explain, but there are two answers to that question from Mr. Henkin. One is his real answer and the other is the answer concocted by the CBS cutting room from the available tape. TV viewers only know the answer CBS put together. We will give you both.

Here is the answer from the transcript of the Mudd broadcast:

HENKIN. "Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. I believe the American public has the 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 we are doing about such problems as drugs—and we do have a drug problem in the armed forces; what we are doing about the racial problem—and we do have a racial problem. I think the public has a valid right to ask us these questions."

If the TV viewers thought that was a bit disjointed for a reply, and, more important, that it did not answer the question about displays at fairs and shopping centers, it was

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

not Mr. Henkin's fault, because—except for the first sentence—that was not his answer to the question. In the transcript of the interview, the answer appears, most of which ended up on the CBS cutting-room floor:

HENKIN. "Well, I think it serves the purpose of informing the public about their armed forces. It also has the ancillary benefit, I would hope, of stimulating interest in recruiting as we move or try to move to zero draft calls and increased reliance on volunteers for our armed forces. I think it is very important that the American youth have an opportunity to learn about the armed forces."

This reply, the real one, of course makes sense and is responsive to the question. The producer of "The Selling of the Pentagon," however, was less interested in responsive answers that made sense than he was in portraying Mr. Henkin as a bureaucratic buffoon. The Secretary, incidentally, is himself an experienced and sophisticated reporter of military affairs but can be portrayed otherwise with the television technique of clipping what amounts to a phony reply from his answer to another question. And the other question, TV viewers did not know, also ended up on the cutting-room floor.

It is not necessary to labor the point, although there are several other instances. Mr. Henkin, in a letter to F. Edward Hébert, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said that after spending his life in the news profession he "could not be pleased by the fact that the program's producer [Mr. Davis] chose to rearrange my words. . . ."

Congressman Hébert himself stars in "The Selling of the Pentagon." He also is a former newspaperman and stands completely shaken by this experience with television, although he had been quoted earlier as considering network TV "the most vicious instrument in America today."

That opinion appears to have been reinforced. Lou G. Burnett, who is Mr. Hébert's press aide, testifies that he was contacted early in the CBS effort by one James Branion of the network's New York office. Mr. Branion said CBS was planning to do a documentary on the prisoner-of-war situation. He said the show would explore the plight of the POW and his family. He was seeking film clips that might contribute to this exercise. Mr. Burnett responded with alacrity because he knows his boss is deeply interested in the problem and eager to help the POW families. In New Orleans, he knew, station WWL-TV—had a film clip from an old "Congressional Report" program, in which the Congressman had interviewed Maj. James Rowe, a former POW. The interview was in the form of a report to Mr. Hébert's constituents. Mr. Burnett, Mr. Hébert's press aide, had the film shipped from New Orleans to New York and helped CBS's Mr. Branion round up other films dealing with the POW problem. The Hébert clip wound up in "The Selling of the Pentagon" and was offered as an example of how "sympathetic congressmen" are used by the Pentagon "to counter what it regards as the antimilitary tilt of network reporting."

Mr. Hébert's ire, it should be suggested, was aroused more by his depiction as a patsy for the Defense Department than it was by the misrepresentations used to obtain the film. The chairman is, of course, proud of his reputation as a stern critic of military transgressions wherever they occur. In many years as an inquisitor for the House Armed Services Committee, he has never been accused of being unfair, but often accused of being tough. From the time of his famous "Chamber of Horrors," which depicted military procurement waste and had officers squirming at their desks, to the most recent congressional inquiry into the My Lai incident, he has been one of the Pentagon's most uncomfortable hair shirts.

Mr. Henkin's office estimates that it expended 840 man-hours of labor assisting

CBS in the production of "The Selling of the Pentagon." No reasonable request for help was denied. CBS reimburse the government for the cost of one guard and one electrician employed during photography one day in the Pentagon.

Out of this day's effort came a short clip of a news briefing that was deemed suitable by CBS for inclusion in "The Selling of the Pentagon." The CBS crew filmed an entire DoD press briefing, at which Jerry W. Friedheim, a deputy to Mr. Henkin, responded to routine queries from the Pentagon's regular press corps. During the session, the reporters asked thirty-four questions. Thirty-one of them brought replies from Mr. Friedheim. In three cases, he was unable to be responsive. As the film was edited for broadcast, CBS used six of the thirty-four questions, including, of course, all three of the ones that could not be answered. Why couldn't they be answered? In one example, used by CBS, Mr. Friedheim was asked about the size of some warheads. He said he had nothing to give out on that. If he did have something, and gave it out, he could go to jail.

There are a number of small factual errors in the CBS script that represent nothing more than sloppy reporting. For example, narrator Mudd has a line referring to "30,000 Pentagon offices." There are only a few more than 26,000 persons employed in the Pentagon, all but the top executives sharing an office with many other people. An educated guess is that there may be 5,000 offices in the building.

One interesting fact, denied to viewers of "The Selling of the Pentagon" by CBS editors, is the origin of a clip introduced by Mr. Mudd as "an excerpt from a film called 'Road to the Wall' [in which] the Pentagon has James Cagney tell of a Communist plan that encompasses even more than the world." The excerpt was shown. What CBS did not disclose is that "The Road to the Wall" was produced by CBS itself in 1962 and that James Cagney was the CBS choice as star of the picture. Also, that CBS was paid about \$100,000 of the taxpayers' money to turn out the picture. At the time, CBS Films said in a press release from its offices—on Madison Avenue, of all places—that the picture would be "an historical treatment of the Communist Party in operation throughout the world—its doctrine, its pronouncements." In 1962 CBS was far from derisive about the project and was proud that "it will be distributed for showing at all military bases inside and outside the USA and will be backed with pamphlets, posters, and other informational material on communism."

Once all the facts about "The Selling of the Pentagon" are on the record, and someone has examined the clips on the cutting-room floor, it will be interesting to find out what Fred Friendly will write about it in the *Columbia Journalism Review*. From where we sit, watching the tube, the broadcast industry continues to carry its share of responsibility for public misunderstanding. The incredible thing is that the camera is not to blame. It's scissors, paste, and a collection of calloused consciences.

SST TRAVELERS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the SST research and development prototype program clamor that the U.S. Government is embarked

on a program for the "jet set," the "privileged few," the "pompous, self-important fools," the "less than one-half of 1 percent of our population." Well, let us examine just who is traveling overseas by air.

In 1970 over 18 million overseas air trips were taken between the United States and foreign ports of which more than 6 million were business trips. This equates to more than 6½ million individual Americans who availed themselves of this service.

By 1985, these numbers will have grown to more than 59 million annual air trips including 15 million business trips or more than 25 million individual Americans flying to overseas ports. And are these travelers "jet setters"? Well, less than 8 percent of them have combined yearly household incomes more than \$25,000. Nearly one-half have combined household incomes between \$5,000 and \$15,000 annually. Do the opponents of this program really believe that these passengers will not want the fastest way of getting there—that the history of the introduction of the present jets will not be repeated? For those who do not remember, more than 10 years ago, there was a surcharge imposed to "protect" the piston engined transports but the passengers—"jet setters," and ordinary tourists alike still opted for the jet transports because they cut the flying time in half, were more comfortable, and less tiring. The same thing will happen again and for the same reasons with the introduction of the SST.

Let us talk a little bit about that much disdained businessman who travels by air. The Universal Air Travel Plan, one of several air travel credit card companies, has more than 100,000 individual business accounts and 2½ million cardholders among businessmen. We know, for example, that all of the top 1,000 industrial firms in the United States use this form of travel for their personal contacts in pursuit of business for their companies. Who benefits by these air trips? Well, these top 1,000 industrial firms alone did nearly a half a trillion dollars worth of business in 1969 and employed almost 17 million direct employees. In addition, a special survey was conducted by the Department of Commerce in 1969 of 158 U.S. exporting firms—all but 11 of whom are included in Fortune's magazine's "1,000 biggest industrials"—and all of whom use air travel as essential to their business. These 158 firms estimated that by 1973, their exports would be \$11.3 billion or one-third of the expected export of total U.S.-manufactured products.

The development program to prove the economic and social acceptability of the SST is an imperative national goal if we hope to keep our aeronautical leadership. As Nobel Prize winning economist Paul Samuelson states: His textbook:

Having more people and more machines of the 17th century variety would not be likely to take us far beyond the standards of living of the Mayflower Pilgrims. Obviously better machines—not simply new machines—are needed for progress.

He goes on to say:

The single least controversial measure for

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Inducing greater growth is promotion and subsidy of more research and development.

The SST and its development program meet the test of these criteria.

CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS ASKS YOUR OPINION

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am again mailing a questionnaire, which I send out periodically, to the residents of my congressional district, the Sixth District of Florida. I insert this questionnaire in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that my colleagues will have an opportunity to see the type of questions which I am asking.

92D CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION,
March, 1971.

DEAR FRIEND: Many of the important issues before the 92nd Congress—including health insurance and revenue sharing—will first be considered by the Ways and Means Committee on which I serve.

Your views on these and other matters before the Congress are important to me. The reverse side of this card contains some questions with which we must deal, and your response to these questions will be helpful.

If you have additional comments on any of these questions or on other issues, I hope you will write me. I am always glad to hear from you.

Sincerely,

SAM.

If you have not been receiving my monthly Legislative Reports and would like to receive them, please fill in your name and address in the space below. I will be glad to add your name to my mailing list.

INSTRUCTIONS

Read each question carefully and decide on your answer. Push out appropriate box with a sharp pencil. Remove punched tabs from back of card. Return your questionnaire in a stamped envelope and mail to: Congressman Sam Gibbons (Opinion Survey), House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS ASKS YOUR OPINION

1. ECONOMY: What should the Federal Government do to control inflation? (a) institute wage and price controls, (b) establish voluntary guidelines, (c) intervene in specific cases of abuse, (d) not intervene with wage-price structure.

2. POLLUTION: How would you assess the Federal Government's role in the areas of pollution control? (a) more efforts needed, (b) done enough, (c) has been oppressive.

3. DRAFT: (a) eliminate the draft, (b) ensure adequate volunteer army before eliminating draft, (c) require some form of military or public service for all men, (d) continue the draft.

4. MID-EAST: The United States should (a) aid Israel to maintain balance of power in Middle East, (b) improve relations with Arab nations, (c) participate only in diplomatic negotiations, (d) discontinue involvement in Middle East crisis.

5. SST: Government should (a) eliminate development of SST, (b) suspend development pending further research into possible drawbacks of SST, (c) continue develop-

ment, but at slower spending rate per year, (d) continue development of supersonic transport.

6. VIETNAM: (a) withdraw all troops immediately, (b) announce fixed timetable for withdrawing all troops, (c) present policies are best alternative, (d) accelerate and "win" as quickly as possible.

7. REVENUE SHARING: Federal Government should (a) share tax revenues with states, (b) share revenues only if budget is balanced, (c) local government should raise its own revenues to solve local problems.

8. BUDGET: (a) maintaining balanced budget is unrealistic, (b) unemployment is more of a problem than inflation, (c) temporary deficit spending to reduce unemployment is acceptable, (d) balanced budget is first essential.

9. HEALTH INSURANCE: (a) establish federally subsidized health insurance program for all citizens, (b) establish program for persons in need and for catastrophic illness, (c) present programs are sufficient, (d) Federal Government should not subsidize health insurance.

10. FOR PRESIDENT IN 1972: (a) McGovern, (b) Muskie, (c) Nixon, (d) Wallace.

11. Optional information:

BAD PROCEDURE EQUALS BAD LAW

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1971

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, today, in a single vote, this House granted a deserved increase in benefits to millions of social security recipients, and then wiped out the beneficial effect of that increase by voting to raise the ceiling on the national debt and open the door to runaway inflation.

I personally was forced, counter to my conscience, to vote against the social security increase because I did not feel I could rightly vote in favor of this startling level of national indebtedness. I believed, even more strongly, that I could not misrepresent myself to my constituents by casting such a totally contradictory vote: I could not honestly support an increase in social security benefits and, at the same time, go along with a deficit spending measure sure to soon render that increase null and void.

Mr. Speaker, how long is this House going to downgrade its status as a co-equal party in the legislative process by accepting nongermane amendments offered by the so-called upper body? How long are the Members of this House going to stand by and be forced to cast votes which not only misrepresent their views to their constituents, but run counter to their consciences?

If this national debt increase had not been tied to a totally unrelated, and, in fact, contradictory measure, I wonder if the vote this afternoon might not have been different. The fact that when the bill to increase the debt ceiling was originally presented on the House floor 162 Members voted against it indicates it would have been different.

It is interesting to recall that the very reason social security benefits were not

March 17, 1971

increased last year was because some of our friends in the Senate tacked the social security bill to a trade measure. By the time the two measures were separated again, it was too late in the session to get approval of a conference report on social security.

The Legislative Reorganization Act, passed by a near-unanimous vote of the last Congress, was designed to insure that "a clear expression of House opinion would be obtained in the consideration of nongermane matters." It appears, Mr. Speaker, that in the voting today, the House has violated the spirit, if not the letter, of that act.

The vote today forced on me one of the most difficult decisions of my career in Congress. I hope I am not forced into such a contradictory position again. But, unless this House starts rising in protest against the addition of nongermane amendments to important bills, I am sure I and many of my colleagues will be put in that unfortunate position often in the future.

The sad result of this bad procedure can only be bad legislation.

VIETNAM VETERANS USING GI EDUCATION BILL IN RECORD NUMBERS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress and in years past, many irresponsible and inaccurate statements were made concerning the lack of participation by our returning servicemen in the GI education and training programs. During the 91st Congress, Congress updated this law. The wisdom of this action is borne out by a recent report which I received from Donald E. Johnson, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues, I want to highlight the report which I received from the Veterans' Administrator:

In February 1971 there were more than 977,000 veterans and servicemen in training which is double the number in training during mid-1969.

In less than 5 years there have been as many in training under the current GI bill as were trained in the entire 13 years of the Korean conflict program. It is further anticipated that the peak enrollment during April of this year will be 43 percent higher than the peak of the Korean conflict program. The trend indicates that over one-half of the eligible veterans will receive some type of training under the current program.

Three out of five of the GI bill trainees are attending college as compared to 29 percent under the World War II program and 50 percent under the Korean program.

Almost 100,000 are engaged in apprenticeship and on-the-job programs. There has been developed some highly successful public service on-the-job programs

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

where more than 8,000 veterans have been trained in public-safety-type positions. Similar new programs have been initiated in other such areas as water pollution, sanitation, health, hospital care, and recreation type areas.

Approximately 90,000 veterans are now in training who had not completed high school when they were separated from service. One of the new innovative features of the bill passed by the 91st Congress, provides that these veterans can complete high school training without using any of the entitlement earned as a result of military service. This encourages the veteran to pursue higher education goals after completing high school to a greater extent than was permitted under previous law.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that these programs for our returning servicemen have been a great investment in the future—not just handouts. According to the Internal Revenue Service, it is estimated the higher salaries earned by those participating in the GI education and training programs will return, in increased individual income taxes, about eight times more than the outlay which the Government makes for this program.

Mr. Speaker, this is a program which is of great benefit to all America. It is one which all of us can be proud of and I want to commend the Veterans' Administration for the action they have taken to implement this legislation voted by the Congress.

LENT CALLS FOR ACTION ON WILD MUSTANG BILL

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, although I have the honor of representing the largely metropolitan Fifth Congressional District of New York, the need for protective legislation to save our Nation's dwindling wild mustang population has become a matter of prime importance to me.

I was pleased to join my distinguished colleague, Congressman GUDE, in the introduction of H.R. 4221 last February 10, and I would urge the Congress to give this important measure early consideration.

This legislation would empower the Secretary of the Interior to set aside designated areas for the protection of the wild mustang. Stringent fines and jail terms would be imposed on those commercialists found chasing down and killing the wild mustang for pet food.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I call on the Congress to give its early attention to this bill which I have joined in introducing so these beautiful animals which are the remaining living symbols of the historic and pioneer spirit of the American West will be preserved. It was not so many years ago that this country nearly slaughtered the buffalo into extinction. Let us not repeat this senseless killing with the mustang.

WESTMINSTER ROTARIANS HONOR HON. SAM F. REEDER

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Westminster, S.C., Rotary Club recently honored the Honorable Sam F. Reeder with the 1970 Citizen of the Year Award. Mr. Reeder, truly one of the pioneers of Westminster, was three times mayor, and owns a perfect attendance record over a 42-year period at the Westminster Rotary Club. Mr. Speaker, Sam Reeder is a good example of the basic strength and vitality of grassroots America. I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the award presentation address, made by Martin D. Watkins of Westminster:

CITIZEN OF THE YEAR AWARD, 1970

President Raymond, Rotarians, guests: Over the years our Rotary Club has made an annual award known as the Citizen of the Year Award. This award is presented to an outstanding citizen for his contribution to his fellowman. In making these awards I have always felt that the recipients truly portrayed the Rotary ideal of "Service Above Self".

Tonight it is my privilege to make another Citizen of the Year Award. Our recipient this year was born in Seneca some 88 years ago: Came to Westminster in 1902, and has been active in business here since that time. He has always been known as progressive, and, truly, he has seen our country develop from the ox team to routine trips into space.

One of his most outstanding acts was selection of a young school teacher for a mate on October 18, 1913. No man's success is accomplished alone. This was a perfect match and over the years her contribution has meant much to Westminster.

His first official service to Westminster was on the City Council when Mr. K. W. Maret was mayor. This was in the early years when the city hall and jail were located across the railroad where Dr. Hall's office now stands. Time won't permit tonight but get him to tell you the story of his work on the street committee. In later years, he served three terms as Mayor of Westminster.

In the early days Westminster had a band—he played coronet in that band. He was drafted in World War I, but the war ended before his induction into service. He served as chairman of our county selective service board until age made retirement mandatory.

He was the organizer and the first president of the Oconee County Planning and Development Board, now the county planning commission, and spent untold hours with the late John Duncan in the early industrial development of our county.

Here in Westminster he was one of the organizers of the Westminster Industrial Corporation and was one of its largest stockholders. This building is presently leased by Jantzen.

He has always been interested in our county heritage and was instrumental in organizing the Oconee County Historical Society; He served this organization ably as president.

He served as chairman of the Oconee County Recreation Committee. In his church he has served as church treasurer, deacon, building trustee, and still teaches a Sunday School Class every Sunday.

He is listed in "South Carolina Lives—Who's Who In South Carolina". He is a life long democrat and has served his party at the local, county, and state level.

He is a charter Member of our Rotary Club and has a perfect attendance record over the past 42 years. This loyalty and enviable record should, indeed, be an inspiration to all Rotarians.

In behalf of the Members of the Westminster Rotary Club, I proudly present the "1970 Citizen of the Year Award" to one of our own—Sam F. Reeder.

**SENATOR COTTON'S NEWSLETTER
PAR EXCELLENCE**

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, for years the skillful articulation of national problems by New Hampshire's senior Senator, NORRIS COTTON, has been presented in his weekly column to the people of New Hampshire. His columns are renowned among his colleagues throughout the Congress. New Hampshire's senior Senator writes these columns himself and they show his vast experience and learning.

Senator COTTON's most recent column deplored the bombing of the Nation's Capitol states the larger issues of this unfortunate event so succinctly and appealingly, that I am including excerpts from his column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point. As Senator COTTON points out:

Oppression in America is, for the most part, a figment of rhetorical extremism, but permissiveness is a reality.

The courts should help this country to deal justly and firmly, with its deliberately criminal element. The excerpts follow:

It was inevitable that the bomb blasts sweeping across the Nation would eventually hit our historic Capitol. But we didn't admit it even to ourselves, or take security precautions, which is characteristic of the shut-eye, hope-it-will-go-away attitude of the American people. Washington columnist Bill Gold, never a scaremonger, noting the lack of reaction by the public even when their Capitol was bombed, said:

"I am deeply concerned that a revolution has begun and that we are sleeping through all the warning signs of it . . . We're attending to business as usual while the crazies are measuring us for coffins."

To be sure, the Capitol of the United States is no different, nor its occupants more worthy, than other structures throughout the land. But it is a national symbol and the nerve center of the country, and its bombing shows the pass to which we have come. I am reminded of the words of Pastor Niemöller after his imprisonment by the Nazis:

"The Nazis first came for the communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I did not speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Catholic. Then they came for Me . . . by that time there was no one left to speak up for anyone."

So it has been here. A cluster of bombs hits office buildings and churches in Rochester, N.Y. The bulk of Americans are not disturbed. They do not live in Rochester.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Armories, recruiting stations, and ROTC buildings are blasted in cities and on campuses. Too bad, but just the work of peaceniks. A college research center is destroyed and a student killed. Sad, but only a protest against military research. Even the fire bombing of a Camp Fire Girls' headquarters causes hardly a ripple.

To me, the explosion in the Senate wing March 1st brought memories of another March 1st exactly 17 years ago when I sat in the House of Representatives under pistol fire from Puerto Ricans in the gallery. There is a marked difference, however. That was the crazy act of a few unhappy people from an island possession. Today we appear to have an organized, national conspiracy of vicious and depraved Americans bent on destroying the Republic.

As long as politicians and editors excuse violence on the ridiculous assumption that this Nation, the "last best hope" of democracy on earth, oppresses its people, as long as Court decisions hamper investigations, Judges turn habitual criminals loose, and police are degraded and harassed, violence and destruction will thrive.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, for over 1,500 years the world has remembered the passing on March 17 of the great apostle of the Irish, St. Patrick. Primarily a man of religion, St. Patrick was also one through whose leadership the character, history, and destiny of a whole people were profoundly changed. He was, in truth, one of the makers of history. One scholar has defined his historical greatness in terms of his "vast energy, unbending determination, and broad vision", qualities essential to his pioneering missionary vocation.

The world of St. Patrick's day bears striking resemblances to our own troubled times: a world of change and ferment. The Roman empire was engaged in shortening the lives of its military and cultural influences in northern Europe under pressure of barbarian incursions. Born in Britain, then a distant outpost of the empire, Patrick was to dedicate his life to the opening of the frontiers for the spread of Christian faith. His labors won to the universal church a new people, whose native genius, newly baptized in the faith, would radiate throughout the Western World within but a few generations of the great saint's death—in about 461. Irish missionaries would go forth, in the spirit of St. Patrick, to evangelize large sections of Europe and to bring new peoples into the life of the Christian commonwealth. The cultural and religious renaissance which made Ireland a center of European civilization during the Dark Ages owed much to St. Patrick and to his effective planting of the Gospel among the Irish people. Such a work as the Book of Kells, that magnificent example of mediaeval Irish script, ornamentation, and scholarship, survives as a product of

the creative energies inspired by the faith of St. Patrick.

The life of St. Patrick is shrouded in the mist of legend, lovingly retold through the centuries. Yet, beneath the lore, there exists a solid core of fact: by his skills as diplomat and preacher alike, he organized the scattered Christian communities which he found in Ireland, converted much of the pagan west, and brought the whole country into closer relations with the rest of the western church and with the Holy See. He encouraged the study of Latin and raised the general standards of learning.

The light which St. Patrick kindled in Ireland so long ago has never died—the light of learning and, above all, the light of faith. Wherever the Irish people have gone, they have borne that light proudly. The story of the Irish in America is witness to its presence and power. On this St. Patrick's Day I am happy to salute the achievements of Irish Americans and their unique contributions to this Nation. May the faith of St. Patrick continue to inspire in the Irish and in all men everywhere those values and ideals which, under God, give dignity and hope to human life.

GOVERNOR DEWEY—A GREAT CITIZEN

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the death of former New York State Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, is a loss which will be felt by Americans everywhere.

One of the youngest Governors to serve in New York State, he had a long and illustrious career. As a young lawyer and crime fighter in New York City, he demonstrated early in his life his deep concern for good and effective government.

While I did not have the privilege of serving with him during my years in Albany, it was clearly evident that our State's leadership in the Nation was due in no small part to the contributions he had made.

He brought to the task of government a keen and discerning mind. His role in national affairs and in the Republican Party is distinguished beyond words.

Twice a candidate for the Presidency, he remained an eminent and visionary spokesman for his party. History will show him not only one of the great Governors of New York State but a man who served his country with supreme dedication.

Although to the public he sometimes appeared as a man of cool efficiency, he had warmth and wit and deep sentiment, and he carried great affection for the people.

I know I share the view of millions of Americans in expressing my condolences to the relatives and close friends of Governor Dewey. He was truly a great citizen.

March 17, 1971

OIL WAR?

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent a letter to the Honorable THOMAS MORGAN, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, asking that his committee undertake an immediate and complete investigation into the matter of offshore oil leases about to be offered for bid by the Government of South Vietnam. It is my hope that such an inquiry will bring to light all of the facts surrounding the mysterious oil lease situation in South Vietnam.

I use the word "mysterious" because too many questions remain unanswered about this newest aspect of possible American involvement in Vietnam. It is imperative that we now begin talking honestly about the prospect of massive U.S. oil investment in that part of the world.

For too long our entanglement in Southeast Asian affairs has been shielded by a hazy veil of secrecy. For too long the American public has been kept in the dark as to our Government's actions, motives, and participation in this area of the world. For too long we have asked questions only to be given one pat answer, then another, and then a third.

Let me be specific:

We were told in 1965 that we must start bombing North Vietnam to retaliate for attacks on American ships in the Gulf of Tonkin only to learn later that the attacks did not occur.

We were consistently told that victory was just around the corner, only to find out that more American troops were needed by our military planners to carry out what they believed to be their objectives.

When we invaded Cambodia in 1970, the administration told us the invasion was for the purpose of capturing COSVN, the North Vietnamese military headquarters. When COSVN could not be found, we were told that its discovery was not important.

Then, the President announced on nationwide television that the real reason we invaded Cambodia was because Communist troops were massing on the Cambodian border for an attack. When Defense Secretary Laird admitted 2 weeks later that Communist troops were actually moving away from the border, the American people were then treated to a massive propaganda campaign pronouncing the value of all of the rice and supplies we had captured.

News of the American-backed invasion of Laos by South Vietnam was embarrassed by the Department of Defense not for security reasons, but for the administration's own political reasons, since the invasion was common knowledge all over Vietnam, both North and South, weeks before it happened, yet the American people were denied access to this information.

It is small wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a former member of the Nixon adminis-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tration, Daniel P. Moynihan, was moved to write in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 14, 1971, that the Vietnam war "... entailed a massive deception of the American people by their Government."

The American people want and deserve honest, factual answers about the Indochina war and they know when they are not getting them. Several years ago this situation was referred to as a credibility gap. Today, however, the problem has reached such massive proportions that it can best be described as a credibility chasm. In support of this statement, I refer you to a Harris survey reported only 4 days ago which clearly showed that a majority of Americans—51 percent—believe that President Nixon has not told us the real truth about this war.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked and appalled by this finding. The fact that more than half of the citizens of this democratic Nation believe that they have been lied to and deceived about American involvement in Vietnam is a bitter indictment of the manner in which our foreign policy has been conducted up to now.

I believe the time has come for our Government to put an end to its policy of deception and nondisclosure. The citizens of America, our constituents, are asking hard, direct questions about various aspects of our involvement in Indochina. The least that we, their elected representatives, can do is provide them with frank, straightforward answers.

One area of recent inquiry involves the relationship between U.S. oil companies and leases for oil exploration off the coast of South Vietnam. As reported in the press, over 10,000 people from all across the country have expressed an interest in this subject. These people want to know the facts.

The investigation that I am calling for today would provide all of us with this much-needed information.

The evidence that U.S. oil companies are seeking to expand their interests into South Vietnamese waters is indisputable. On December 1, 1970, the South Vietnamese General Assembly promulgated a law authorizing that Government to accept best-offer bids on 18 offshore oil concessions from foreign companies. The response, according to Prof. Gabriel Kolko writing in the *New Republic*, March 13, 1971, was:

Within a month (after passage of the legislation) at least 22 firms—predominantly American—were in Saigon ready to offer bids.

Originally scheduled for February, the South Vietnamese Government has now temporarily postponed its call for bids. According to Paul Cowan and David Gelber in their article, "Oil: A Hidden Factor in the Indochina War," in the February 25, 1971, *Village Voice*, the delay of 60 days was necessary so that the Saigon regime could clarify the terms of its new oil law for the American firms.

What do we know about these South Vietnamese offshore oil deposits? In early 1969 the Ray Geophysical Division of Mandrel Industries, Inc., of Houston, Tex., performed a 4,000-mile seismic sur-

vey on the continental shelf off of eastern and southern South Vietnam. According to correspondence I have had with a number of American oil companies, at least two, Standard Oil of New Jersey and Phillips Petroleum, were sponsors and participants in that survey. The indications are that several other American oil companies were involved as well. Although the results of that survey have never been made public, and although none of the oil companies nor the Ray Geophysical Co. would reveal to me the results of that preliminary reconnaissance, apparently the information has been made available to the State Department. Mr. David Abshire, an Assistant Secretary of State for congressional relations, has informed me that the results of the seismic exploration "have been favorable."

This is the extent to which the State Department acknowledges any information about offshore Vietnamese oil. Other sources, however, have been much more specific.

In the February 1, 1971, *Los Angeles Times*, George McArthur wrote:

... Oilmen have always regarded the vast basin surrounded by Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, South Vietnam and the Philippines as a natural prospecting area. Every major international oil company already has interests or concessions in the area and the Indonesian fields have long been among the world's richest.

Interest in the South Vietnamese offshore area was heightened in 1969 when a geological survey by 10 American firms turned up evidence of oil-bearing sedimentary layers as much as five miles thick.

In January 1971, the semiofficial "Economic Report" published by the Vietnam Council on Foreign Relations stated, in an article entitled, "Green Light for Oil Men:"

The face of South East Asia may change beyond recognition within this decade and the Viet Nam war may take a dramatic turn, if the South Vietnamese oil dream comes true. Somewhere in the continental shelf off the South Vietnamese shore lies hidden one of the most spectacular petroleum deposits in the world.

This at least has become common belief among Vietnamese geologists, mining experts, and government authorities. Expectations already running high have been strengthened by the intense interest of well-known international oil concerns. According to authoritative official sources, about fifteen foreign firms have to date approached the South Vietnamese Government to apply for reconnaissance permit. Reportedly one major company highly experienced in offshore exploration has even offered the Vietnamese unusually advantageous conditions such as bearing all the costs of immediate training of South Vietnamese technicians regardless of whether oil will ultimately be found or not."

The *Wall Street Journal* of September 22, 1970, carried a story by William L. Hartley titled, "World's Major Oil Firms Jam Singapore as Drilling Fever Spreads in Southeast Asia." In that story, Mr. Hartley reports:

Southeast Asia is gripped in the excitement of oil fever and just about every international company with position in the petroleum business has rushed to Singapore, which most use as headquarters, to get in on the action. The tempo is increasing. Pre-

liminary seismic work is mostly finished and exploration drilling rigs are moving in.

The June 1970 issue of *Petroleum Engineer*, on page 51, contained the following:

The projected work pace for all of Asian Pacific could turn out to be woefully conservative, depending on how long it takes to settle the war against the communists in Vietnam. If and when the U.S. wins its objectives there, oil exploration conceivably could be successful enough to turn that part of the world into another South Louisiana-Texas-type producing area. This would be one of the biggest booms in the industry's history. It all depends on the Vietnam war, how long it takes to get the job done and how well the job is done.

Mr. Speaker, I also refer you to speeches which appeared in the *Congressional Record* of Thursday, March 10, 1971, and Monday, March 15, 1971, given by my distinguished colleagues, Representative WILLIAM ANDERSON of Tennessee, and Representative BELLA ABZUG, of New York, which provide additional background information on the Vietnam oil question. I further wish to state that while I have written to every major oil company in the United States requesting information on their activities with regard to South Vietnamese oil, not a single one of them will admit anything more than a casual interest in that oil. In addition, I have yet to hear from the Government of South Vietnam with respect to their intentions in letting bids for oil rights off their coast.

Despite their reluctance to admit it publicly, every indication we have points to the conclusion that U.S. oil companies are preparing, in the very near future, to invest massively in these offshore Vietnamese oil concessions. Without further information, I fear what effects this investment may have on American foreign policy and military presence in this part of the world.

Specifically, I fear that a new economic constituency such as these investments would create, could become a powerful force in seeking to protect their investments. I fear that these companies, after staking huge sums of capital in this venture, would seek from the American Government either an all-out military victory or else a Korean-type solution to the conflict entailing an indefinite, albeit limited American military presence in South Vietnam. I find neither of these protective solutions acceptable.

These facts raise a whole series of grave implications which must be placed openly before the American public. In order to accomplish this, the investigation I am calling for today should address itself to the following questions:

First. To what extent are American oil companies currently engaged in oil explorations off the coast of South Vietnam?

Second. What, if any, assurances have these companies received from the Government of the United States that enough political stability will exist in South Vietnam to protect 30-year lease agreements entered into by these companies?

Third. Whether possible lease agreements between American oil companies and the Thieu-Ky government will tie

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

us into continued support of that specific government? If American oil is to invest billions on the basis of leases which are valid only so long as the Thieu regime stands, does this mean that our policy in Vietnam will change from self-determination to blind support for Thieu and his generals?

Does this mean that even a non-Communist government other than Thieu-Ky would be unacceptable to us if that government did not guarantee continued oil profits for American companies?

Mr. Speaker, the prospect of America celebrating its 200th birthday of freedom by sending her sons to die in defense of oil profits for billion dollar corporations is an abomination. I cannot believe that the American people will permit such a perversion of our founding principles to occur. But, like the war itself, just such a perversion could occur by slow degrees unless we are made aware soon enough that it is happening. For the sake of our Nation, for the sake of every American, I urge the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to look promptly and thoroughly at the dangerous growth of American oil interests in South Vietnam.

The replies I have received from a number of American oil companies follow:

PHILLIPS PETROLEUM CO.,
Bartlesville, Okla., March 12, 1971.
Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABOUREZK: In reply to your letter of inquiry of March 2 regarding participation by Phillips Petroleum Company in exploration off-shore South Vietnam, this is to advise of our activity in that area.

Phillips Petroleum Company, along with twelve other international oil companies, has participated in a very modest reconnaissance seismic effort in this off-shore area conducted under the auspices of the Ray Geophysical Company. This is not an unusual undertaking since we, as well as other international oil companies, are continually making geophysical reconnaissance surveys in off-shore areas around the world where we anticipate a possible oil-bearing sedimentary basin. This type of information, reconnaissance geophysical surveys, is used to determine if our geological theories on the presence of these basins are correct and, if so, if they are interesting enough to pursue with a more intensive seismic and geological survey.

Phillips Petroleum Company as of this date has not made an offer for any off-shore South Vietnam concessions. As to whether we will in the future, I cannot say at this time as many geophysical as well as governmental factors are rather uncertain about this area.

I hope this has satisfactorily answered your question.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. HOUCHIN.

STANDARD OIL COMPANY,
New York, N.Y., March 12, 1971.
Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in reply to your letter dated March 2, 1971 concerning the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) interest in South Viet Nam.

A generally used worldwide practice in collecting preliminary exploration data is to participate in group geophysical surveys. This type survey was conducted off the coast of South Viet Nam in 1969 and 1970. It was sponsored and conducted by the Ray Geophysical Division of Mandrel Industries,

March 17, 1971

Inc., and made available for public participation or purchase. To our knowledge, thirteen American and foreign oil companies elected to participate in this group survey including Esso Exploration, Inc., a Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) affiliate.

On December 1, 1970, South Viet Nam passed a petroleum law giving wide latitude to the government in establishing exact terms. No specific definition of certain important financial conditions has yet been announced.

South Viet Nam initiated requests for expressions of interest in their offshore acreage from the worldwide petroleum industry. Esso Exploration's response to the request was that they would be interested in being advised of the specific terms and conditions under which the offshore permits will be granted. Our understanding is that some twenty additional companies of many nationalities have made similar responses. We have not received additional communication from the South Viet Nam Government and until we do, we cannot evaluate our future interest.

I trust that this will clarify our present position. With kindest regards, I remain

Yours truly,

M. M. BRISBO.

TENNECO, INC.,
Houston, Tex., March 9, 1971.

Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: This is in response to your letter of March 2 directed to our Mr. N. W. Freeman and inquiring about certain activities our company may have or contemplate offshore South Vietnam.

Specifically, your inquiry was whether our company or any of its affiliates has been involved in the Southeast Asian oil exploration, and whether we have offered or will offer a bid on any or all of these South Vietnam offshore oil leases.

Tenneco Oil Company in partnership with Phillips Petroleum Company of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, and AGIP (the Italian National Oil Company) have leases on what is generally designated as Block "A" and "C" of the South China Sea. These leases were acquired from the Indonesian government and lie within Indonesian territorial waters. We have been exploring these leases for something like two years. A part of these leases border on the South Vietnam territorial waters, and we understand that a part of the adjoining waters will be subject to bidding in the forthcoming offshore lease sale of South Vietnam.

We have done no work to date in the South Vietnam territorial waters of the South China Sea. At this writing I cannot advise you whether or not we would bid for leases offshore South Vietnam if they are offered for sale. We have been advised that the South Vietnamese government is considering such a sale, but we do not know the terms nor the date of such sale if it has even been set.

Should this area become available for lease we would have to give it serious consideration. If you know of some reason why we should not bid for oil leases in the territorial waters of South Vietnam we would appreciate your so advising us.

I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.

With kindest personal regards,

Very truly yours,

WILTON E. SCOTT.

GULF OIL CORPORATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., March 8 1971.
Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: In your letter of March 2nd you asked to be advised whether Gulf Oil Corporation or any of its affiliates has been involved in Southeast Asian oil ex-

March 17, 1971

6953

ploration and whether Gulf Oil or any of its affiliates has offered, or will offer, a bid on any or all of the South Vietnamese offshore oil leases that might be offered for sale later this year.

In the area generally referred to as Southeast Asia, through subsidiaries, Gulf Oil Corporation is engaged in exploration activities in Australia, Indonesia and Thailand. Neither Gulf Oil, nor any of its subsidiaries, has any investment in South Vietnam, Laos or Cambodia, nor has any offer been made with respect to any South Vietnamese offshore oil leases.

As an international oil company we have an obligation to our shareholders as well as to the economy to continue our search for the reserves needed to meet the ever increasing demands of the world for petroleum and its products. If there is a possibility of discovering oil in an area belonging to a nation recognized by our Federal Government, if the terms are acceptable and if there is a reasonable probability that the governing body of that nation will honor contractual provisions covering an oil company's rights to explore and produce, then we will seriously consider whether Gulf Oil should take the business risk of investment of sizable sums of money in that area in an effort to locate new petroleum reserves.

The oil business is a high risk business. That is why we are obliged to play our cards close to our chests, so to speak, so far as future plans are concerned. It would be detrimental to Gulf Oil's interests to divulge what our intentions are with respect to future investment and activity in Southeast Asia or, indeed, in any part of the world.

Very truly yours,

B. R. DORSEY.

MOBIL OIL CORP.,

New York, N.Y., March 5, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ABOUREZK: This is in response to your letter of March 2 concerning oil exploration off the coast of South Vietnam.

First, let me state that at the present time Mobil has no operations or concessions in South Vietnam. We do not market there. We have no refineries. We have no exploration and producing operations, nor have we any concessions from the South Vietnamese government which would allow us to engage in exploration and producing work.

We are aware, as you are, that the South Vietnam government did promulgate a law which would allow them to grant concessions to explore for and produce oil in offshore areas falling within the jurisdiction of South Vietnam. As of this date, to the best of our knowledge, the South Vietnam government has not promulgated any terms and conditions under which bids for concessions in these areas could be made. At this time neither Mobil nor any of its affiliates has made any offer for any concessions in South Vietnam, nor are there any conditions in existence which would allow us to bid at this time. Whether or not we will bid, should South Vietnam establish conditions allowing such a bid, would depend upon all circumstances in existence at that time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM P. TAVOULAREAS.

SUN OIL CO.,

Philadelphia, Pa., March 11, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: Mr. Dunlop asked that I reply to your letter of March 2, 1971, concerning offshore South Vietnam.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A number of oil companies recently have been engaged in conducting reconnaissance seismic surveys in the territorial waters of South Vietnam. The purpose of these surveys was to find whether or not geologic conditions exist that may be favorable to the accumulation of petroleum. The actual presence of petroleum, of course, is impossible to determine without drilling a well. Since no drilling has been done, press reports of the existence of a potentially valuable oil field, offshore South Vietnam, are unfounded.

Neither Sun Oil Company nor any of its affiliates have participated in any such exploratory programs off the coast of South Vietnam, nor are we planning to bid for any leases that may be offered in the immediate future.

Yours very truly,

D. DWAYNE TAYLOR.

ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO.,
New York, N.Y., March 12, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: In response to your letter of March 2, I would like to inform you that neither Atlantic Richfield Company nor any of its affiliates is involved in Southeast Asian oil exploration except on acreage in Indonesian waters north of the Island of Java. Atlantic Richfield's International Division is constantly appraising and updating information on potential oil deposits all over the world. Neither Atlantic Richfield nor any of its affiliates has offered any bid on any South Vietnamese oil leases. Whether or not Atlantic Richfield will, in the future, offer a bid on any South Vietnam off-shore oil leases is purely speculative and would depend on the circumstances that exist at the time.

Sincerely yours,

T. S. BRADSHAW.

SHELL OIL CO.,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1971.

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: Your letter of March 2 has been referred to me. In this connection I might mention that Mr. McCurdy retired from Shell Oil Company at the end of 1969. Mr. D. B. Kemball-Cook is now our President.

As you may know, until 1970 Shell Oil Company restricted itself to operations within the U.S.A.; however, beginning last year we embarked on an exploration venture in Canada and are currently looking for exploration prospects elsewhere. I can assure you that our plans thus far have not been projected outside this hemisphere.

Should you have any other questions, please do not hesitate to let me hear from you.

Yours very truly,

J. C. PERKINS,
Vice President.

CITIES SERVICE CO.,

New York, N.Y., March 8, 1971.
HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your letter of March 2 requesting information concerning our interest in exploration and development activities off the coast of South Viet Nam and neighboring countries.

This is to advise you that we have no interest in the Viet Nam area nor are we aware of any bidding activity at this time. However, since 1968, we have been working with a major concession in the Java Sea off Indonesia.

Thank you for writing as you did, and I trust this is the information you desire.

Sincerely,

J. E. HESTON.

ASHLAND OIL, INC..

Ashland, Ky., March 6, 1971.
HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: With reference to your letter of March 2 regarding offshore South Viet Nam oil exploration activities, we have been studying the situation but have not reached a decision on bidding.

As I am sure you can appreciate, while the area may have great geological merit it would, nonetheless, seem to be fraught with considerable political peril.

Cordially yours,

ORIN E. ATKINS.

SIGNAL OIL AND GAS CO.,

Los Angeles, Calif., March 8, 1971.
HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: This is in answer to your letter of March 2nd inquiring as to our interest, if any, in Southeast Asian oil exploration.

As of this date, neither Signal nor any of its affiliates has offered, or had any intention of offering, a bid on any or all the South Vietnamese offshore oil leases. While this states our present situation, it could change in the future.

Sincerely,

F. D. LORTSCHER.

OCCIDENTAL PETROLEUM CORP.,

Bakersfield, Calif., March 12, 1971.
HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: This is in response to your letter of March 2, 1971, directed to Mr. Thomas F. Willers who has handed it to me for reply. Occidental Petroleum Corporation has not been involved in Southeast Asian oil exploration and has not to this date considered offering a bid on any or all South Vietnamese offshore oil leases that may be offered.

Very truly yours,

E. F. REID.

THE STANDARD OIL CO.,

Cleveland, Ohio, March 10, 1971.
HON. JAMES ABOUREZK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ABOUREZK: I have your letter of March 2, 1971.

This company has no plans at all to bid on any of the South Vietnamese off-shore oil leases to which you refer.

Sincerely yours,

ALTON WHITEHOUSE.

SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I support the social security bill and increase which passed the House yesterday. This was consistent with my support for much-needed increases in this legislation over the years I have been in Congress.

GRAVE ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS STIMULATED BY TRANS-ALASKAN PIPELINE PROPOSAL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a statement concerning the proposal for a trans-Alaskan pipeline from R. W. Solberg of Walnut Creek, Calif. Mr. Solberg raises some very salient questions in regard to this project. He calls attention to grave environmental concerns stimulated by the prospect of such a pipeline. Both the environment of the State of Alaska and the posture of the Federal Government in respect to ecological questions are involved. I, therefore, would like to submit Mr. Solberg's comments for consideration by my colleagues in the House.

His comments follow:

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.
March 3, 1971.

DIRECTOR,

Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a part of the Trans-Alaska oil pipeline hearings, will you please include the following statement in the hearing record:

"This pipeline project should not be given the precipitate approval sought by its sponsors. Rather, we should follow Canada's example of deliberate and cautious procedure in examining and testing their pipeline plans, reinforced by appropriate scientific studies. Listed below are some of the reasons I urge such a course be followed.

"1. This project is now the first major test of the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act. That test has crucial and precedent-setting import for the direction in which the Executive Branch will move under the Act. We cannot afford, upon its initial major test, to subvert the purpose and policy of this Act.

"2. In urging all possible haste, supporters are using at least two mutually incompatible arguments; one, that immediate extraction is required for national security, and a second, that America needs this oil to help meet our expanding demand. Obviously, exploitation now will deplete reserves that may be needed later in a national emergency. Moreover, the president of Atlantic Richfield has been quoted as saying that Prudhoe Bay . . . 'is not the answer to a nation's need'.

"3. One of the three amazing conclusions set forth in Interior's January Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Trans-Alaska Pipeline states that 'Construction and operation of the proposed . . . pipeline . . . would reduce foreseeable environmental costs to acceptable levels'. Acceptable to whom? How can environmental costs be classed as 'acceptable' when the Statement itself admits that 376 miles of the proposed 789 mile route are now considered questionable as regards the appropriate mode of construction? When no approved design has been developed for above-ground pipe? When through the southern two-thirds of its route, the proposed pipeline will traverse areas known to be subject to large earthquakes?

"These questions and others are raised in the Statement. In light of their significance, I do not believe we can classify environmental costs as 'acceptable'.

"4. A prudent and sound policy for administering national resources and minimizing environmental destruction should be based on the long-term public interest. It should not be bent or warped to suit the short-term gain of private interests.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"I believe the public interest requires that further exploration of alternatives should be conducted before granting the pipeline right-of-way. Trans-Canada pipelines, now under intensive study, may, in the end, pose fewer problems and hazards than the Trans-Alaska route.

"5. Last but not least is the impact upon fish and wildlife resources, certain to be highly significant; the certain destruction of the isolated character of Alaska's Brooks Range; the impact on the fragile tundra of the 100-foot pipeline right-of-way plus a separate 200-foot right-of-way for the proposed road.

"In the light of the legal, engineering, environmental and other grave doubts with which the Trans-Alaska Pipeline proposal is fraught, I ask that the application for a right-of-way be rejected. Until such time as alternatives have been carefully and thoroughly explored, and until questions of engineering and mode of construction have been resolved, this project should be delayed as a matter of America's national interest".

Thank you, Mr. Director, for the courtesy of including this statement in the hearing record.

Respectfully yours,

R. W. SOLBERG.

SALUTE TO SUZIE METZLER

HON. ROBERT McCLOY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. McCLOY. Mr. Speaker, it is most significant that my long-time friend, Suzie (Mrs. Harvey) Metzler, executive secretary of the Lake County Republican Federation and of the Lake County Republican Central Committee, is being honored in my congressional district on Saturday, March 28, 1971.

The "Salute to Suzie Dinner" provides an opportunity for her many long-time friends and admirers to recount some of the contributions which she has made to the political and civic life of Lake County, Ill., and of the 12th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, there are few if any of us who would question that political activity is among the noblest work which can be performed—for it is through political action that we construct our public leadership and continue to achieve the great goals of freedom which characterizes our nation.

Mr. Speaker, Suzie Metzler is no newcomer to political affairs. During most of her lifetime, she has worked at the grass-roots level of our political system—serving as Lake County Republican chairwoman and as president of the Waukegan Women's Republican Club. For the past 10 years, Suzie Metzler has been at the helm of our Republican county organizations and, in her calm and winning way, she has indeed held the organizations together and combined the various parts into a unified whole. In a sense, she has epitomized the expression which our President has emphasized of "bringing us together."

Mr. Speaker, in addition to her talents as an effective and capable executive secretary, Suzie Metzler has fulfilled admirably her multiple roles as daughter, wife and mother in one of the most dis-

March 17, 1971

tinguished families of Illinois' 12th Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, many will gather to honor Suzie Metzler at the "Salute to Suzie Dinner"—and I expect the privilege of being among those on hand to honor her.

Mr. Speaker, I am most anxious that you and my other colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives are made aware of the respect and affection in which Suzie Metzler is held by her friends and neighbors—and I am proud to be included among those who will be paying tribute to her on "her day." I congratulate the Warren Township Republican Women's Club for arranging this affair, and for the enthusiasm of the club's president—George Anne "Mrs. Robert" Depke.

REORGANIZATION PLAN OF THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE INDIAN

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, for those who might doubt that the reorganization plan of the BIA is felt to be in the best interests of the Indian I urge that he read this forthright and decisive speech. Peter MacDonald is not only a great Navajo leader, a great Indian leader but truly a great American.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF PETER MACDONALD, CHAIRMAN OF THE NAVAJO TRIBAL COUNCIL TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION AT KANSAS CITY, MO., MARCH 8, 1971

Some of you have said that the Navajo Nation has not fully cooperated with other tribes in the common causes of all Indians—That the Navajos have stood apart from the common battle.

You are right! Many times we have taken a position without *due regard* for our Indian brothers. Today we break that pattern. We desire to join with all of you in united support of self-determination for all Indians.

Last July 8, I rejoiced when President Nixon declared "The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions."

Today I no longer rejoice. It is rumored that the administration may abandon that policy. It is said that the reorganization of the bureau, which is Indian-designed and which Indians would put into effect is about to go down the drain. It is reported that those who have always opposed Indian self-determination are now succeeding in their "divide and conquer" strategy. It is reported that area directors who have opposed Indian self-determination for 30 years and who have kept Indians in a state of dependency are continuing their efforts to keep us as dependents.

They are not coming out in the open—they never do—since they are more effective using Indian against Indian. They are spreading confusion, doubt and fear—and the very people who never consulted with us in the past, are now invoking the magic words "lack of consultation" to destroy the first genuine opportunity for self-determination which Indians have been offered in my lifetime. It is likely to be the last such oppor-

tunity if we do not seize it now and hold firmly together as one united group.

For many months there have been press releases indicating that one tribal leader or another was unhappy or insulted because he was not consulted—consulted before policies truly providing us the most freedom and flexibility ever seen were made known to the public. Neither were the Navajos “consulted” but we believe that our freedom is more important than being indignant at the bad manners of the bureau. Surely you all must believe in your hearts that the present opportunity for self-determination is more important than fussing about which of us are offended because we were not treated with the courtesy our posts as leaders should demand. A starving man must get the food in his belly—he does not worry about the correct spoon. He must eat! Likewise, those of us who are hungry for self-determination should take what has been thrust upon us without worrying about how we got such good fortune. Take what has been offered—then complain, if you will, about how you got it.

From the first days when the white man landed on our shores, he was able to find some of us who would pretend to speak for our people and sign away our peoples' rights, our land and our future. And they always give the white man a piece of paper which said the Indians had consented to the “give-away”. So you see we have been “consulted” ever since Plymouth Rock. There will always be Indians who can be used by others as it is with all peoples and nations of the world. It is up to us to make sure that none of our people can be used to prevent self-determination.

It is an old story—Chief Tecumseh told his people in 1810: “A few chiefs have no right to barter away hunting grounds that belong to all the Indians—for a few paltry presents or a keg of whiskey, it requires *all* people to make a bargain for all.”

Today a few chiefs may be bargaining away the opportunity, of all Indian people, for self-determination. It is not solely their fault, as old-line bureaucrats, the area directors and superintendents, have now banded together to attempt to find a few tribal leaders to provide the illusion of Indian opposition—an illusion created from fear, friendship or dependency. Let us work together to stop any internal disorder.

They are fighting this new day in Indian affairs which President Nixon has proclaimed, which Vice-President Agnew has proclaimed and which Commissioner Bruce and his Indian team have moved so effectively to carry out. Do not let your dissatisfaction with the urban Indian situation or other unrelated matters lead you from the feast of freedom which has been offered.

I cannot pretend to speak for all Indian people—only for myself and my own people which make up the largest Indian nation. We are one-third of all reservation Indians.

I plead with all of you to act together in supporting the policy and the actions of this administration.

Let me be more specific:

We should all support the system of rotation of area directors and superintendents.

We should all support the contracting out to Indian tribes the functions which in the past had been carried out by non-Indians.

We should support the use of the “Buy Indian Act” to enable the Bureau to purchase services from Indians which before were performed by Bureau employees.

We should support the redesignation of area offices and area directors as people to provide services and we should support the elimination of the old concept of Bureau officials as people who administer our lives, our affairs and our destiny.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

These are bold changes—important changes—historic changes!

Can any of us dare to oppose these policies and take this opportunity from our people? Surely there can be no more than a scattered handful who insist on making a lot of noise at the expense of 500,000 Indians who have waited so long for real self-determination. Who among us can seriously oppose freedom?

Let us consider who has spoken out—have the urban Indians spoken? No, yet they constitute almost half of our total number. Has Indian youth opposed this policy? No, yet Indian youth represents more than 50% of the total Indian population. Has the reservation Indian spoken? Only a few, and these few have complained more about the bad manners of the Bureau, rather than in opposition to self-determination.

We should not let a handful divide the rest of us.

The Hogan, the teepee, and the long house divided against each other will not stand—and we will not survive. That is exactly what some of the BIA administrators are counting on. They hope to buy time—they want to stop this forward motion. Every delay provides them with a new chance to stir dissension, cause confusion and undermine those of us who work for real change and great progress. Time is on their side unless we take a united stand now.

I have spoken of the complaints about lack of consultation. They are a smoke screen—A phony tactic.

We have been offered a choice: To keep things as they are, or to accept change at whatever pace and in whatever way we decide. Many think that the Bureau has not gone far enough. Our area director believes that the rotation system should have been made mandatory rather than voluntary. That way the ties which the old bureaucrats have, the strings by which they manipulated Indians, the dependency that they cultivate and perpetrate will be destroyed once and for all.

You do not nibble at the chain of slavery—you cut it through clean! Once and for all!

But the Nixon administration has been more gentle, it has said: If we do not want to stand on our own two feet, that is our choice. But if we do want to stand tall, then the administration will respect our wishes—it has said: If we wish to take over certain functions, then we can choose which functions we want to take over; we choose the time period and if we fail or find it too difficult we can give it back and the old arrangement will be restored.

I call that a good deal—no one ever sold me a car with that kind of guarantee and no one ever took anything from an Indian and offered to give it back again when an Indian wants it back.

It is very easy and popular to have someone serve as a whipping boy and scapegoat. It is easy to let someone else make the decision and then blame him for the consequences. Then you can sound like a big militant and declare that if you had the power to make the decisions, you would not make such mistakes. That is easy and irresponsible.

It is much tougher when the Bureau turns around and says: All right, you make the decision—if you want the power, you can have it. If you want the positions, you can have them. If you want to run the programs, you can have them.

But then we have no scapegoat—we cannot pass the blame to someone else. We have to take responsibility and that is what self-determination means.

I have enough confidence in my people and in all Indian peoples to believe that together we can meet this challenge. Some of you may not share this confidence—some may be afraid that you lack the ability or strength to take on the job. No one is forc-

ing any of us, we simply have been offered our choice.

Above all let us not deprive our people of the choice of self-determination by crying “termination”, “coercion” and “lack of consultation”. If anyone wants to keep the Bureau in its old form a scapegoat to blame and to lean and depend on, that is his decision, but do not spoil it for all of the rest of us who have waited so long for the opportunity to enter the world on an equal footing.

As a final word—let us speak with one voice in supporting the self-determination policies presented for our consideration here—let us before we leave this conference pass a resolution unanimously supporting the new policies for self-determination.

NIXON-REAGAN WELFARE REFORM APPROACHES COMPARED

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Nashville Banner, in a recent editorial, discussed the welfare reform approaches of both President Nixon and Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California.

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:

OUR WELFARE PROGRAM A MONSTROUS, CONSUMING OUTRAGE

Welfare—the program known by that name—has been called “the shame of a nation.” President Nixon has characterized it as “a monstrous, consuming outrage.” And the descriptions do not exaggerate. It is monstrous in its dimensions—and growing. It is consuming in the insatiable appetite—feeding at the trough which politicians replenish with greater outpourings of taxpayer dollars. It is outrageous in its contempt for principle, moral and economic; and for any sense of responsibility on either the receiving or the dispensing end of the habit-forming, something-for-nothing handout.

To say that is not to discredit the impulse of charity for the helpless. There are such in this land—and toward them a reasoning humanitarian duty exists. They are the very young and the very old, who cannot help themselves; and they may include the physically or mentally incapacitated. But there are no such numbers of these as to account for the millions now on relief, and the current increase now estimated at 200,000 a month. The valid needs do not exist in such proportions as to require the estimated current cost of \$15 billion a year.

It is a political truism that everybody talks about “welfare”—and the necessity of reforming it—especially at campaign time; but nobody does much about it. It is a sensitive subject, but the sensitivity needs to be on the public side; in which it is not only a thorn, but an infection poisoning the body politic, and threatening to wreck both the social and the economic structure thereof.

The one man in a position of major stewardship, consistent in his treatment of this subject—proposing realistically to match deeds with words—is California Gov. Ronald Reagan. He hasn’t marched up the campaign hill only to retreat when the chips were down. Among his proposals—for whose enactment he is stumping the state—is the requirement that unemployed able-bodied welfare recip-

lents register for public-assistance work force projects aimed at making California a better place to live. That would not only make some jobs—it would go a long way toward getting a job done, looking to recovery of a major principle in constituent character.

Few men in public life, especially positions of leadership therein, have put emphasis on that principle. They have ignored it, or ridden over it roughshod—to the point that welfare has become a way of life, for families now numbering into the millions, some of which are in their third generation of free-loading, and are organized against any reform that would put them to work.

A barnacle load of such weight and dimensions can sink the ship of state—can swamp it financially; and ultimately, if corrective measures are not taken to prevent their political control, can take over whatever may be salvaged.

Significantly, Governor Reagan is beginning this reform movement in his own state—which would be Exhibit A in the matter of responsibility, solvency, and self-respect. It could, as he sees it, show the rest of the country the way out of its problem. It is as elementary as the pride and self-help principles with which this free land started out—further sustained by the conviction stated and shared, that every right carries with it a responsibility; whether it is the unalienable rights stated in the Declaration of Independence—or that of bringing children into the world. These are among the areas where lack of a commensurate responsibility can despoil, impoverish, and sink the ship.

The nation did not reach this day of reckoning in an instant—or last year—or in the last decade. It has been skidding along on this same downhill course for more than 30 years of political welfare-exploitation, and reckless social engineering.

It cannot be corrected, nor wholly reformed, overnight.

But it must begin—somewhere, and now. It could well be by a promising start in California, under the responsible leadership of one who has not changed his tune, or the major premise with which he started out, since constituents accepted him on his declaration of policy and intent.

In the judgment of this newspaper, the absolutely vital reform of a welfare system that is—as called—"a monstrous, consuming outrage" cannot come from the proposals of a guaranteed annual income, as now espoused by President Nixon's administration. That could only worsen the dilemma and compound its costs.

The Banner strongly commended Mr. Nixon's own determined expression, at Knoxville during the presidential campaign, that "Rather than placing more millions on the welfare rolls, we must have more millions on payrolls." It pointed out its own opposition to a guaranteed annual income in an editorial upholding the policy he stated in that campaign—wherein he said, "One of the reasons I do not accept a guaranteed annual income or a negative income tax is because of my conviction that doing so, first, would not end poverty; and second, while it might be a substitute for welfare, it could have a very detrimental effect on the productive capacity of the American people."

You don't, after all, convalesce by intensifying an illness. You don't get people off welfare rolls and onto payrolls by making it even approximately as profitable to stay on the former.

Governor Reagan has advanced a practical plan—an alternative to the route of disaster until now pursued.

He is right, and the majority of adult, thinking Americans know it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OUR POSITION ON INDOCHINA

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the administration is currently going to great lengths and making considerable effort to communicate one message: the United States will not request, pressure, urge, or stop the South Vietnamese from invading North Vietnam.

In fact, administration spokesmen go even further, implying the United States could commit its forces to aid such a mission.

First. During an interview on the CBS Morning News on February 26, 1971, Dr. Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, presumed that the President alone shall decide such matters as whether American forces can be committed to an invasion of North Vietnam.

The following exchange between Mr. Bernard Kalb of CBS News (Interviewer) and Mr. Kissinger is taken from the transcript of that interview.

INTERVIEWER. Dr. Kissinger, could we get your thoughts on what we've been hearing about in a speculative sense of the President not ruling out the possibility President Thieu indicating that something might be underway at sometime in the future, his office charging about some move by the South Viet Nam, that is, into the North?

DR. KISSINGER. Well, it's a novel problem because so far it's North Viet Nam that invaded all the neighboring countries and the idea that any of the Indo-Chinese countries might be invading North Viet Nam would have been unthinkable, even a year ago. So that this indicates a certain evolution in the relative balance of strength.

INTERVIEWER. Any change of the evolution becoming a reality?

DR. KISSINGER. Well, it's not the dominant probability at this moment.

INTERVIEWER. Well, who would decide that, Doctor? The South Vietnamese or us?

DR. KISSINGER. Well, the United States will certainly decide, as the President has pointed out, about any American participation. The South Vietnamese could not involve us in any military move by any American forces even of a purely logistic nature without the approval of the President of the United States.

According to Dr. Kissinger, the approval of the President is all that is necessary for any American military move.

Second. One week later during his nationally broadcast news conference, Mr. Nixon commented on the possibility of the South Vietnamese invading the North. He said:

President Thieu has to take the position that unless the North Vietnamese leave the South Vietnamese alone, he has to consider the possibility of going against the North. That is his position, and I am not going to speculate on what position he might take in the future. In order to defend himself, the right of self-defense, in view of the fact that he is being attacked, he is not attacking North Vietnam.

Now, the third question is this one—whether or not the United States, through its air power, might support a South Vietnamese

March 17, 1971

operation against North Vietnam? The answer to that is that no such plan is under consideration in this government.

He did not rule out the possibility of future consideration or implementation of a plan to invade North Vietnam.

Third. Before the winter conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars here in Washington, Secretary of State William P. Rogers continued public acknowledgment of this Nixon position. Speaking on March 8, 1971, he said:

There is no reason, when the South Vietnamese are as strong as they are, why they should be under any restrictions militarily.

Mr. Rogers continued that the aggressive posture taken recently by the South Vietnamese Army means that it is no longer at the mercy of the enemy. If a nation fights defensive war, the enemy dictates the time and place of battle. "And you all know what that means."

Regrettably, the Nixon administration means that American forces are likely to be committed to supporting, at least, an invasion of North Vietnam. Even though Mr. Nixon did not spell out specifically in his press conference the probability of such American participation, he pointedly refused to eliminate it.

The American people have heard enough of this before—before Vietnam, before Cambodia, before Laos. That is why seven out of 10 Americans recently questioned by the Gallup organization doubted the administration was telling the whole story about our involvement in Southeast Asia.

No wonder so many are confused about what the administration is saying. Just a few hours after Mr. Rogers spoke, Vice President Agnew said the administration would not approve of a South Vietnamese invasion of North Vietnam.

However, he clearly indicated that he did not want to be construed as foreclosing any of Mr. Nixon's options. He added:

And the reason I say "may not (invade North Viet Nam)" is that I cannot really look into the future and foresee the conditions under which a military operation might take place.

Enough. The safe and immediate withdrawal of all American forces is long overdue. The United States cannot continue to pretend to be simply engaged in a defensive commitment to the Thieu-Ky government as it contemplates an invasion of North Vietnam.

The best and only route home for American forces is not through Cambodia, Laos, and North Vietnam. It is a direct route home.

QUEEN DEIDRE, OF CLEVELAND, 1971

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Cleveland has many fine residents of Irish descent who are being honored this St. Patrick's Day.

One of them is Miss Mary K. Cafferkey, a native of Ballycroy County, Mayo, Ireland, who will reign as 1971 Queen Deidre, of Cleveland, at the annual St. Patrick's night dance sponsored by the Cleveland Gaelic Society, Gaelic Football Club, and Irish Musicians Association.

Miss Cafferkey came to Cleveland from Ireland in 1966. She is a secretary for the Hanna Mining Co.

THE PLIGHT OF THE CONSTRUCTION WORKER

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, during a press conference conducted while I was back in my district recently, there was a brief discussion of wages earned by construction workers. Shortly thereafter I received a letter from a construction worker's wife, Mrs. Mildred Spillman, of Creve Coeur, Ill. Her letter sets forth in plain, understandable language the plight of the construction worker when he is prohibited from working because of bad weather, strikes of unions other than his own, and so forth, and I include the text of her letter in the RECORD at this point:

CREVE COEUR, ILL.
March 5, 1971.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: After hearing your comments over the radio last Saturday morning, February 27th, regarding the wages for construction workers, I tried to contact you by phone but found you were in Chicago. I tried to reach you Monday morning at your office and was told you had returned to Washington. I wanted to talk to you, giving you the opinion and comments of a construction worker's wife's view of the situation.

First of all, you said a construction worker could draw unemployment at a high rate of pay. I would like to know how to go about this. Unless unemployment laws have been changed recently, the weekly amount payable to an unemployed person is the same for everyone. Right now the minimum, I believe, is approximately \$40. This, of course depends on the number of dependents.

Next, you must be off work for two weeks. Mr. Michel, don't you know that most time a construction worker is off perhaps one, two or three days at a time, due to rain, snow, cold weather, in between jobs, contractor waiting for another construction group to catch up so that his gang can continue, etc.? How can you draw unemployment in a situation such as this?

The construction worker does not get paid when he is sent home due to any of these conditions. He does not get paid for holidays or vacations. There is no pay for sick leave.

Now, Mr. Michel, look at the risk involved in a construction worker's job. Do you think he should get nothing for the risk? Take for instance the man sitting behind a desk in an air conditioned office in the summer and a heated office in the winter. In the winter these men work hundreds of feet above the ground on beams, sometimes covered with ice and snow, risking their life for that pay. The temperature is down to zero. The man in the office is warm. In the summer the tempera-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ture is 90 degrees to 100 degrees and he is up on those same beams and cat-walks, taking the risk of being overcome by the heat, while the office worker sits in an air conditioned room and the temperature around 70.

There is a lot more that should be taken into consideration Mr. Michel, than just that hourly rate. Try it some time. You'll change your mind, I'm sure.

My husband has been fortunate the last few years and has worked most of the time (due to the fact that there is a lot of construction work going on right now); however, over a years time, he has not earned any more than the man next door sitting in an office at Caterpillar. He did not get paid for his two week's vacation, the time he was off sick, the two days off at Christmas, New Years, Thanksgiving, plus the rest of the holidays during 1970. He has been a construction worker for about twenty years and has never been able to draw unemployment.

My son, who is a steamfitter, was off work four days last week. He was working for a contractor who had a job at Hiram Walker's. Hiram Walker's went on strike so consequently they had to stay out also. The Walker employees can draw strike benefits. The construction worker can't. He could not draw unemployment either. He went back to work on the fifth day, getting one day's pay last week, less than \$48 for the week. Monday and Tuesday of this week they would not let the construction workers in again at Walker's, but they did Wednesday and Thursday. Consequently, he will get two days pay this week. This happens quite often Mr. Michel, so if you will just weigh the construction worker's pay against the others, over a period of a year, you will find that the construction worker's W-2 form is no larger than anyone else's and most of the others don't have the risks involved.

I was at Proctor Hospital when I heard your comments over the radio. My room was \$45 a day. In November I was in a room across the hall and at that time it was \$35 a day. Can you account for this? A raise of \$10 a day in three months and then you can say to freeze the pay of the construction worker? Why not freeze all wages?—lawyers, doctors, dentists, teachers, senators, congressmen, etc. Also freeze the prices on hospitals, pharmacies, prescriptions, groceries, etc.

How can you single out one job when that job over a period of a year gets no more than any other? Most of the time, not as much. I am speaking from years of experience; are you and Mr. Nixon?

Sincerely,

Mrs. MILDRED SPILLMAN.

ARTHUR ASHE AND SOUTH AFRICA'S SUGAR QUOTA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on February 25, 1971, the Government of South Africa once again refused to grant a visa to tennis player Arthur Ashe. As I stated more than a year ago—the last time South Africa excluded Ashe from participating in its national championships—such a decision, while not surprising, is an outrage.

Shortly, the House Committee on Agriculture will continue hearings on the extension and revision of the Sugar Act of 1948. According to section 202(c) of this act, South Africa is permitted to sell 60,000 tons of sugar to the United States

annually. She realizes profits of nearly \$4 million from this sugar beyond what would be received by selling it on the world market.

South Africa's quota will be up for review, as will all other sugar quotas. One criterion upon which such quotas are allotted by the United States is the existence of "friendly government-to-government relations including nondiscrimination against U.S. citizens in the quota country"—source: the "Sugar Program of the United States," House Committee on Agriculture, December 1970, page 49.

In the past I have called for the termination of South Africa's sugar quota, based on, among other factors, that country's treatment of U.S. citizens like Mr. Ashe. I intend to remind the committee of this latest incident when I testify, and again urge the committee to adopt H.R. 600 which would terminate South Africa's total 60,000-ton quota, and redistribute it to Mauritius, the Malagasy Republic, Swaziland, and Uganda.

Reports on the rejection of Arthur Ashe's visa application from the Washington Post follow:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 11, 1971]

ASHE TRIES AGAIN FOR TRAVEL VISA

Black American tennis star Arthur Ashe, twice refused permission to go to South Africa, has applied again for a visa so he can play in the South African Open.

A South African Embassy spokesman said yesterday that Ashe applied for a visa "over the last few days" and the application had been referred to Pretoria.

Ashe, who became a contract professional in October, is playing in a tournament at Philadelphia. He told reporters he did not know what the chances were of getting the visa.

In Johannesburg, tournament organizer Owen Williams said, "No official entry has been received. Ashe's application might still be in the post, but we have nothing concrete so far."

He described Ashe as a "well-behaved, elegant tennis player, adding that South African tennis would benefit from a player of Ashe's caliber competing.

[The Washington Post, Feb. 25, 1971]

S. AFRICA SAYS NO TO ASHE

CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, February 24.—South Africa, for the third time, has rejected an application from U.S. tennis star Arthur Ashe for a visa, Interior Minister Theo Gerdener announced today.

Ashe, a black, applied for the visa to play in the South African Open tennis championships in April. His reaction in New York today was a statement in which he expressed "pity" for South Africa.

Gerdener's statement said: "The application of Mr. Arthur Ashe was again considered and in view of the fact that he is still persona non grata, his application was not granted. No other reason for the refusal was given.

POLITICAL CAPITAL FEARED

His previous applications were turned down because South African authorities felt Ashe would make political capital out of a visit here in the land of apartheid. He has stated that he had no political motives for the latest application and simply wanted to play in the tennis championships in Johannesburg, a major fixture on the world tennis circuit.

South Africa has granted visas to Australian aborigine Evonne Goolagong and a Japanese girl, Kazuko Swamats, to play in the championships.

Official sources verified that Ashe was con-

sidered persona non grata because of his alleged political activities. Ashe's name was the second on a list of 33 American Negro sportsmen who signed a petition for the exclusion of South Africa from the Olympic Games that was presented to the United Nations Feb. 20, 1968, the sources pointed out.

ZAMBIA VISIT CITED

They added that although Ashe had said he was interested solely in playing tennis during a coaching trip to Zambia (formerly Northern Rhodesia) last October he was quoted as saying that he "would always be more concerned with black liberation movements than about tennis."

While declining to say whether he would apply again in the future, Ashe said in New York, "Maybe it's over for me but to South Africa, I say, there will be more after me and more after them."

Owen Williams, director of the South African Open championships, said in Johannesburg he was "very, very disappointed" to hear of Ashe's visa refusal.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 26, 1971]

STATE REGRETS ASHE REFUSAL

State Department officials said yesterday the South African government's rejection of a visa for American tennis star Arthur Ashe was "a regrettable decision, particularly because of its racial overtones."

They said they had not received official word from the U.S. embassy of the formal rejection of Ashe's visa request but had seen news reports of the denial. Ashe, a friend of Secretary of State William P. Rogers, applied for the visa so he could play in the South African Open tournament in April.

BURLINGTON: A FRIENDLY CITY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the March 1971 issue of the *Eagle* magazine carried an article on the city of Burlington, Iowa.

It tells of the friendly atmosphere in Burlington, something I have known for some time. It also tells of the activities of Aerie 150, the Eagle Lodge in Burlington. The community activity record of this organization is excellent and worth emulation.

The article is worth reading and I commend it to the attention of the House. It follows:

BUSY AERIE IN A FRIENDLY CITY—BUSTLING BURLINGTON, IOWA, AND A HUSTLING AERIE HAVE WARM AND WINNING WAYS

(By Art Ehrmann)

A fellow could easily fall in love with Burlington, Iowa.

I did.

It isn't the wild infatuation that some develop for the chic, glittery places where the "in" crowds gather and where being seen is more important than being welcome.

Rather, it is a warm, comfortable affection for a city that is pleasant to look at and pleasant to be in, a community peopled by friendly folk who maintain some old fashioned ideas about the virtue of hard work and who place a high value on neighborliness.

For one who takes Eagledom to heart, an affection for Burlington comes even more

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

easily because its Aerie 150 is, by any standard of measurement and gauge of success one of the very finest Eagle units anywhere.

Burlington, a city of not quite 35,000, is snuggled alongside the Mississippi River and its back yard is the bountiful farmland of Iowa; both of these factors contribute to its character and its charm.

Like many another progressive city in these times, Burlington has developed a growing ring of outlying shopping centers with smart shops, fine restaurants, plush motels and modern commercial establishments. Yet the downtown section keeps pace, retaining its vitality and vigor and showing no signs of the decay that blights the centers of so many cities.

This is a place of rare transportation advantages; it sits astride a major rail system, has air facilities, and is served by a network of highways. And, of course, the Mississippi is a barge-busy artery. Consequently, there are ninety manufacturers and processors in the area. Industry has a healthy diversification here and the economy is sturdy.

Most of the city's residences are single family dwellings; they have the attended-to look of being lived in by people who care.

The early river town heritage still shows in the big, lovely nineteenth century homes that stand in once opulent neighborhoods. Some are maintained to preserve their old-time splendor. Many have been carved up for multi-family occupancy. All are reminders of an enduring tradition.

The city's parks alone would rate a separate admiring article. Adjacent Crapo and Dankworth Parks are vast; they offer a lovely variety of wooded glades and breathtaking horticulture as well as a wide range of recreational facilities. Toward the other end of town, Mosquito Park affords a magnificent view upriver.

Rightly proud of all that is Burlington is able and personable Mayor Raymond Eastin, an active Eagle. He is highly regarded among the Midwest's educators as his city's director of secondary education.

The community's excellent daily, *The Burlington Hawk-Eye*, now in its 134th year, is Iowa's oldest newspaper; it doesn't show its age.

Acknowledged to be the friendliest organization in town—as well as the biggest—Burlington Aerie 150 makes itself a very real part of the community, as opposed to merely being a lodge that just happens to be located there.

With a membership of 3,500, give or take a few, it is undeniably in the big Aerie class. Its size and strength and financial solidity enable it to do things in a big way. Yet its atmosphere is so warm and friendly and personal that a visitor does not get the impression of bigness, except perhaps in the large numbers of people who are enjoying themselves at their club.

One enters the richly accoutered second floor spread that is the hub of the Aerie's social life and he is at once enveloped by a unique sense of being with longtime friends. Everybody seems to know everybody else—and everybody seems to like everybody else.

The plush facility is generally conceded to be primarily the work of Trustee Bryan Lewis who planned and labored for two years to spearhead the team effort which resulted in as beautiful a set of social rooms as exists anywhere in Eagledom.

One of its features is a supper club type dining room which is crowded to capacity each noon and evening. "The reason we do such good business is easy," explains Secretary Norbert Cross. "We serve the best food in town."

Aerie 150 is a busy one. Something always seems to be going on—Saturday dancing on two floors of the club. Auxiliary parties for youngsters, Thanksgiving banquet for 1,000,

March 17, 1971

bowling, golf, charity benefit events. You name it. They do it all in Burlington.

The Aerie keeps growing steadily. A different membership chairman for each month sets up his own plan and handles his own campaign. Last month's membership effort honored Nate Burt, 93, the Aerie's sole surviving charter member, who until fairly recently was at the club every day. The goal was 93 new members to match his age.

The percentage of producers in Aerie 150 is uncommonly large, but the officers are expected to do more than their part. Worthy President Norman Cooper (everybody calls him Ben) personally signed up 132 new members last year.

Outstanding leadership year after year is undoubtedly the key to the Aerie's steady string of successes. But here the generals work side by side with the troops—and work just as hard. Past presidents don't fade away; they stay interested and keep working.

Carl Bergquist edits the splendid Aerie bulletin. Denny Ahlberg is the Aerie's ace charity fund raiser; his chief aides are Harold (Big Ortie) Orton and Denny's pert wife, Lola. William J. Curley, who has held every job in his local and state Aeries, plus a few in the Grand Aerie, stays on as Aerie treasurer and lends his great abilities in many other ways.

Says Dick Peavey, food committee chairman, "Maybe the reason so many are so willing to work so hard here is that officers and leaders like Bob Corrick, Bob Fillmore, Louie Reed (now a Grand Trustee), Dale Stimpson, Milt Bardon, Russ Rawlings, Dick Fuller and Bob Orton, to name a few among many others, are so ready to pitch in and work, too."

The Aerie's list of contributions to community betterment is too long to detail but too important not to mention. They range from things as large as a \$3,000 donation to Hope Haven, a rehabilitation center, to chores as humble as 37 Eagles braving the cold to cut a year's supply of firewood for the YMCA camp.

The Auxiliary is as good as the Aerie—this writer's idea of maximum praise.

Burlington, Iowa, has a lot of things going for it. Looming large among them is one of the truly great Aeries in Eagledom.

TAX CREDITS FOR COST OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. BEN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as one who introduced legislation into the 91st Congress providing for the extension of tax credits for the costs of higher education, and as a current cosponsor of Mr. COUGHLIN's bill which would provide for identical benefits, I have received numerous communications from constituents urging that this bill be adopted.

Higher education has become a necessary prerequisite for bettering one's position in today's society. As the cost of higher education has risen to an all-time high, it is not possible for many of our ablest young people to receive this education. With the proposed tax credit program, middle-income parents would not only be able to afford a college education for their children, but they would be able to know the satisfaction of pro-

viding for themselves what the Government would have to provide otherwise.

For the information of my colleagues, I hereby insert letters received from two of my constituents:

CHAMBLEE, GA.
February 18, 1971.

DEAR SIR: I am a voter from your Congressional District (4). I am also aware that you are on the Banking and Currency Committee in the House of Representatives. I was very interested in the bill that you cosponsored with eight-seven other House Representatives. I also understand Congressman Lawrence Coughlin of Pennsylvania joined with you in introducing the bill. The bill provided for tax credits for the costs of higher education. The provisions were, a tax credit of one-hundred percent to be permitted for the first two-hundred dollars spent on higher education; twenty-five percent of the expenses from two-hundred dollars to five-hundred dollars, and five percent of the expenses from five-hundred dollars but not to exceed fifteen-hundred dollars. The bill also allowed you to pay up to three-hundred and twenty-five dollars. Universities, colleges, business trade, vocational and technical institutions are covered if they meet Federal and State standards.

I feel, that in the long run this tax credit would save the government money. Under the bill, the people would have money for higher education and would not become wards of the government. If people are not financially able to seek a higher education they usually turn to the government or relinquish the thought of a higher education.

I think the biggest crime of all is when people have saved money for years for the college education of their children and have had to pay tax on the interest this money drew. With this in mind and the necessary cost of education and the price of inflation of everyday living, it is unfair to families with several children not to be able to deduct any of the costs of higher education. I am speaking here of middle class income tax payers. The middle class family usually encourages its siblings to seek a higher education, but when their time comes the family financially may not be able to handle these expenses. I agree with you that this bill would lessen the strain on the families where the situation occurs. You suggested it would promote education through private institutions rather than pushing students to tax supported colleges, giving more government money to private institutions. As private institutions are much more expensive, I do not believe this to be possible unless the government would allocate a sizeable sum to private institutions which would cause their costs to be lowered.

The government has given us Job Corps program for lower income families. School drop-outs and children of families who do not provide any higher education can receive up to ten thousand dollars worth of Job Corps training at the government's expense. Yet children of middle class families who stay in school and work for a higher education get no free assistance from the government. Therefore to keep more people from becoming wards of the government, education is the answer to keep more people making a liveable wage and in all fairness to those families spending thousands of dollars on higher education some tax relief is duly justified. I will be anxious to receive a reply from you on the tax credit bill.

Sincerely,

BARBEE COPLIN.

FEBRUARY 19, 1971.

MR. BENJAMIN BLACKBURN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My name is Anne Evans. As a voter and a student in your district, I am

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

much interested in your tax credit for higher education bill. I feel this bill would be very profitable to persons like myself who are sending themselves to college.

I agree with the arguments for tax credits in *Tax Credits: Past Experience and Current Issues*. I believe that tax credits for education could serve as a means of promoting interest in pursuing educational careers. This would also be a help to young people trying to help themselves to a better social position through a better education.

This bill should be a help to cut down on the presence of persistent urban and rural poverty. This helps people to improve themselves without the use of direct government doles. If increased education were made available at this lower cost, there would be a reduction in the number of those needing welfare in this generation.

With the increasing cost of a good education past the high school level, I believe that some sort of government assistance to students will soon become mandatory. The drop-out of students from colleges and training schools represents a substantial waste of highly trained manpower. Many of these students are of superior capacity and could excel in college level work, except for economic factors (Harold M. Groves' *Tax Treatment of the Family*).

There are obviously not enough scholarships to give to all those who qualify. I think that basically your bill is a good one. However, I feel that the introducers of this bill do not realize the cost of a good education.

I attend Georgia State University, which is one of the least expensive schools in the University System. For a full time student attending three quarters a year, the basic tuition cost is \$405. This does not include books, transportation and activity fees which must also be paid. The \$200 tax credit does not begin to cover these expenses. In higher than college education (medical school, etc.), this is only a drop in the bucket. I feel a more realistic rate would be 100% for the first \$300 spent on higher education, 50% for expenses \$300 to \$500, and 5% of expenses from \$500 but not to exceed \$1500.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely yours,

ANNE EVANS.

WHITNEY YOUNG CHOSE THE ROAD TO REASON

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. NIX. Mr. Speaker, it is now for history to decide the significance of the contributions made by Whitney Young, Jr., to his country and to those causes for which he dedicated his life. For myself, I have no doubt of the importance of the role he played in the advancement of social and human rights in America. The passing of Whitney Young leaves a void among responsible black leaders that will not be easily filled.

Whitney Young, Jr., returned to his native Kentucky today and was buried in Lexington. It is now for us to insure that those ideals for which he committed his life will not be buried with him.

Above all else, Whitney Young had an abiding belief that white Americans could be made to recognize injustices

experienced by black Americans and move together to correct them.

He was as pragmatic as he was idealistic, as resourceful as he was imaginative. Whitney Young knew where power lay in America and chose to do battle where it did the most good—around the conference table, not on the street corner.

As executive director of the National Urban League, he called upon the white churches of the United States to integrate their services. The vast majority have.

He shed light on the discriminatory practices of many local labor unions and moved their parent organizations to demand reform.

He proposed a domestic "Marshall Plan" to make up for long years of employment discrimination and economic deprivation of black Americans. Much of that program was incorporated in the national effort to eliminate poverty.

He championed educational programs, job training, and placement programs increased Federal commitment to black businessmen, and had a hand in advancing every civil rights measure adopted in recent years.

He spoke out forcefully against the overindulgence of the news media in revolutionary and cynical protestations which inflamed passions and set Americans apart.

Whitney Young knew that the road to change was inseparable from the road of reason. There are too few men of equal intelligence and ability. His death is a loss to all Americans.

COMMISSION ON UNIVERSAL SERVICE CORPS

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 15, 1971, I introduced a bill to establish a Commission on a Universal Service Corps. The purpose of such a bill is to have a study in depth to determine the manner of creating, operating, and maintaining a Universal Service Corps in which young men and women would be required to serve, and through which they could be provided training to enable them to effectively participate in education, health, conservation, agriculture, and similar programs of service to the needs of this country. I ask further that such Commission look into:

First, the needs that can and should be met by the corps; second, the entities (public and private) through which the corps should work to meet those needs; third, the training that corps personnel should receive; fourth, the eligibility and service requirements and compensation and other benefits for corps personnel; fifth, the relation of military service obligations to compulsory service in the corps; sixth, the relation to existing service organizations, including *Volunteers In Service To America*, the Job Corps, the Teacher Corps, and the Peace Corps; seventh, the effect on employment op-

portunities; and eighth, problems under the Constitution in requiring service in the corps.

Such proposal has been made throughout history and is currently being discussed in relation to the extension of the draft. While many have been advocates of just such a corps, I believe the time has now come to explore the idea in all its ramifications, not only to stimulate a national dialogue, but to emphasize how our domestic needs can no longer be ignored.

We need definitive answers to the questions which the idea of a Universal Service Corps raises. Can we build a corps out of a manpower pool of men and women from all classes of society to serve the needs of life and living?

I propose that the Commission be composed of nine members:

Three appointed by the President from persons who are not employees of any government and who, because of their education or experiences, are especially qualified to serve on the Commission.

Three appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from Members of the Senate. Not more than two Members appointed under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

Three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from Members of the House. Not more than two Members appointed under this paragraph may be of the same political party.

I propose further that such Commission report to the President and each House of Congress no later than 18 months after the date on which the Commission is duly organized. I mandate that the final report contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with recommendations for legislative action.

In establishing this Commission, the Congress will seize the initiative to focus its attention on our youth, on our needs, and on our priorities.

HOW TO BEAT THE "CORRUPT CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has directed my attention to a very entertaining column by Tom Tiege carried in the San Juan, Puerto Rico, Star on Sunday, March 14. I presume the column bears definite factual relationship to some New York City hippie types who are enjoying a truly blissful existence under the benevolent administration of that city's fun-loving mayor.

The article follows:

How To BEAT THE "CORRUPT CAPITALISTIC SYSTEM"

(By Tom Tiege)

NEW YORK.—Let's call the couple J. and K. They are young, early 20's, fairly educated, unmarried but living together and hip with an upper case H.

They live in a rent-controlled apartment in lower Manhattan, but right now are not

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

even paying the city-mandated minimum. They are in the midst of a rent strike because the landlord wants them to pay for their own lights and heat.

Neither is working. He gets unemployment compensation, she gets welfare. Both receive money each month from parents with whom they have nothing to do.

They rise at 10. Or maybe 11. Or maybe later.

They brush with tooth-paste ripped off a local supermarket counter, dry with towels copped from local hotels and dress in clothes supplied in part by the Salvation Army. He wears shoes he kept from the Army. She puts on bell-bottoms, knit blouse and wide belt shoplifted from one of the downtown department stores.

They eat a full breakfast, thanks to items purchased with federal food stamps, off plates which they walked off with from a neighborhood church party, using knives and forks provided by the landlord to whom they refuse to pay rent.

The morning mail is closely checked. There is a state report on their application for a federal education grant. There is a letter from a large manufacturing company apologizing for a fictitious complaint about a fly in its canned goods—"One case of our product has been shipped to you, please accept it along with our regrets that you were inconvenienced." There is also a note from the telephone company, along with stamps worth 75 cents which J. and K. were supposed to have lost (they didn't) trying to make a pay phone call.

The couple is overjoyed at the telephone refund, and decide to try again. They write another complaint on stationery picked up while visiting their congressman's office, and this time they say they lost \$1.50 on an attempted long distance call from a 14th Street pay booth. They use an old Christmas seal for the stamp, since they know Post Office scanners will probably not spot the fake.

They pet their dog, which they got free from the SPCA, and whose veterinary bills are paid for by public assistance, and they leave their pad for the street.

It's to be a routine day. J. must give the employment service a list of fictitious employment refusals to indicate he is actively seeking work. K. must go down to the welfare clinic for new granny glasses and birth control bills.

They kiss goodby. Her lipstick is an Avon sample.

J. takes the subway, but does not pay. He arranges to have a young acquaintance drop a coin at the token attendant's feet, and while the man is distracted he jumps over the turnstiles. He picks up a paper from a garbage can, puts a slug in a candy machine and boards his transportation.

K., meanwhile, takes a bus to her destination. It's free of course. She gets on with a \$5 bill and the driver winces because he is authorized only to take exact change. She winks, wiggles, pleads and he tells her to, oh, well, take a seat. She sits next to an old man whom she engages in conversation, tells him she is a runaway from Seattle who is ever so lonesome for her mom and dad and would he possibly consider lending her \$1 to help buy a ticket home?

In the afternoon, J. and K. regroup at the public library, where they check out several books and read more of the day's newspapers. The newspapers carry lists of upcoming weddings, bar mitzvahs, etc., which they will crash for banquet goodies. The papers also provide them with times and places of free entertainment, such as exhibitions, recitals, lectures, etc., all over town.

For late lunch they go to an automat and eat the left-behind food of other patrons. For dinner they visit a more elegant place, enjoy a large meal, thank the waiter, give compliments to the chef and walk out without paying.

March 17, 1971

Finally, it's evening. And they have an important engagement. J. makes a phone call using a No. 1 washer instead of a dime. He gets instructions which he jots down with a pencil he was given once when filling out forms for veterans' benefits. Then they hitchhike to lower Manhattan and get out adjacent to the Federal Building. They are handed posters by members of a tax-exempt, religious organization and, you guessed it, spend the rest of the night chanting in a picket line, protesting the oppressive, corrupt, capitalistic society.

SPEECH BY VERA GLASER FOR THE MINNESOTA NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, in only a short period of time we have seen a new civil rights movement burst forth on the American scene. A new civil rights movement that is fighting the same kinds of prejudices, unjust laws, and inequities that were targets of the sit-ins of the 1950's. And with the rise of this new thrust for civil rights we are beginning to understand that the theory of male supremacy is as unequal, unjust, and foreign to our American ideals as the theory of white supremacy. The growth of the call for equal rights for women is impressing upon us that old sayings such as "A woman's place is in the home"—that have been supported by the power of law—are as invalid today as the idea that blacks should ride only in the back of the bus.

In any movement there are voices of outrage and by their volume and tactics these voices can sometimes cloud rather than clear an issue. At the same time there are what we have come to know as "responsible" voices. Unfortunately these so-called responsible voices are often said to be those who agree not to push too hard, or, shall we say, make their point and then quietly move to the back of the bus.

I mention that only because the author of the speech I am inserting into the RECORD today is widely recognized as a "responsible" voice for women's rights. But if that term is taken to mean someone who refuses to rock the boat, then the description does not apply. Rather, if it means a person who presents reasoned arguments in persuasive terms, then the description does apply.

The author is Vera Glaser of the Knight Newspaper, Inc., Washington bureau. I have heard people refer to her as "one of the best women reporters in Washington." By such a dubious compliment the speaker reveals the very bias that Vera Glaser opposes. I prefer to believe that she is one of the best reporters in Washington, believing that no qualifying designation of sex, male or female, is necessary when it comes to talent. And in this speech before the Minnesota Newspaper Association the issue of women's rights is indeed cleared and not clouded.

I include the article as follows:

REMARKS OF VERA GLASER, CORRESPONDENT AND SYNDICATED COLUMNIST, KNIGHT NEWS-PAPERS, INC.—AND MEMBER OF PRESIDENT NIXON'S TASK FORCE ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It is an honor to appear before the Minnesota Newspaper Association, and to bring this distinguished group of professionals the latest vibrations from Washington on sex.

Needless to say, we could not have chosen a more fascinating after-dinner preoccupation. Since I come from a city with a man shortage, I am indebted to you for reversing the situation this evening. What a lovely ratio!

As I was scanning this audience, a line from the Broadway musical, "My Fair Lady," came to mind. Do you remember Rex Harrison's complaint about Eliza Doolittle's exasperating behavior? He traced it all to the fact that she was a woman.

Men, he concluded, are a marvelous sex. I agree. And no matter what you may hear, read, or see on television, most of us in the women's movement agree.

I believe it says something very impressive about your Association that this predominantly masculine group seeks to inform itself tonight on the women's issue—an issue which has set off one of the most profound soul searchings of our time—in the United States and throughout the world—and is giving us, as human beings, new insights to ourselves and to each other.

Much of the ferment is erupting in Washington. We reporters in the nation's capital are chronicling the legal, economic and social pressures, directed against Congress, the White House, and the Supreme Court, to enhance the status of women.

I can report that some progress is being made, and hopefully we shall see more. It will come about, I expect, with the understanding and cooperation of fair-minded men.

But first, may I salute you as innovators for inviting the female of the journalistic species to speak here tonight. They tell me this is a historic first—and let us hope I avoid making it an ignominious last.

Seriously, I value this opportunity to communicate on a subject of importance to you as employers, as thought leaders, and as men.

I understand your Association is pioneering also in setting up a Press Council to open a dialog between the public and the news media. I congratulate you for courage and vision, and wish you every success.

When I spoke with Bob Shaw about coming here, I told him I would be happy to take questions after these remarks. Bob thought the group was too large for that. However, this is a broad subject, impossible to cover in half an hour, so I will be available afterward if any of you seek further information.

One of the most remarkable aspects of today's women's movement is the speed with which it has erupted. In two short years women's groups, ranging in philosophy from radical to conservative, are popping up all over . . . a body of research and literature has grown up . . . books on feminism are rolling off the presses . . . colleges and universities are launching women's study courses . . . demonstrations, "rap" sessions, parades, are commonplace . . . new leaders are emerging . . . new thinkers . . . a scattering of men are joining the movement . . . volumes of documentation on the second-class status of women in our society have been built up in the reports of Congressional hearings . . . an intelligence network is keeping women activists informed by at least four very professional newsletters.

So much is happening, in fact, that it may be time for editors to consider assigning full-time specialists to cover the women's movement in the same way specialists dig in on civil rights, economics, and foreign affairs.

Moreover, it is clear to me, as a political

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

observer, that the women's issue not only was a factor in state races last November, but will have an even greater impact in the 1972 Presidential contest.

It is apparent to most of us who cover the White House that the Nixon Administration has been rather slow to recognize the political whammy in the women's movement.

On the Democratic side, however, at least one Presidential hopeful, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana, is making an open bid for the women's vote by pushing the equal rights amendment.

For some women all this may be moving a little too fast. They feel like those monkeys who were shot into outer space. When they realized where they were, one monkey turned to the other and moaned, "What a way to make a living!"

The second monkey snapped back, "Yes, but it beats hell out of the cancer research lab!"

Despite the barrage of publicity, it is sometimes difficult to find men or women who really understand what the movement is all about.

For instance, David Susskind can usually be expected to listen with sympathy to any expounder of liberal causes on his TV talk show. But when it comes to women's liberation, he can hardly conceal his annoyance. He puts it down with sarcasm and ridicule.

Mr. Susskind is not alone. The response from the average male ranges from amusement to intense hostility. Rarely does it include the open-mindedness with which men discuss other issues.

To many men, the issue is either one they cannot take seriously (because they have been trained since birth about women's proper place, and any further discussion of it is frivolous), or it is an affront to their masculinity perpetrated by a handful of uppity women.

A woman's reaction tends to be different, but often no less hostile. Those who consider themselves "feminine," and have prospered by being so, feel superior and scornful of "feminists." Their attitude is "I've made it by accommodating men and working my wiles upon them. The fact that these women are complaining proves they lack charm and feminine instincts."

And many women quite honestly feel secure, happy and protected in their present roles of wife and/or mother. They resent the current trend that appears to belittle that role.

On the assumption that many of you may be mystified by the whirlwind, or disturbed by it, or infuriated with it, may I put one or two things in perspective.

When you read about bra burnings or trumpeting by some women to destroy our society and rebuild it from the bottom up, doing dire things to men—do not be deceived.

The outlandish antics, as we here know, get media coverage. They are not—repeat not—broadly representative of the women's movement. They are extremist fringes, as the black panthers are to the civil rights movement.

The well springs of the women's movement go back a century. When women worked to help free the slaves, they saw similarities in their status and that of the blacks.

More recently, when young women from the campuses went south to join the civil rights movement, they found themselves identifying more easily with the blacks than with the white boys. They knew how it felt to shut up, to take a back seat, accept segregation, exclusion from clubs, restaurants and meetings, to lower their sights and take work which was "realistically" open to them, to cope with imputations of natural inferiority, and to see themselves portrayed in print and picture as stereotypes rather than individuals.

For a hundred years the movement has been growing. It is deep, intense, and it is accelerating. It has been and still is powered by influential women organizations representing millions of female lawyers, educators, business and professional women, black women, republican and democratic women. In fact, the women of the two political parties, in an extraordinary move, have joined forces to push for equal rights. It has swept up the women—and many young men—on campuses. It is reaching into the home.

The women I have mentioned are not kooks. They are potent establishment groups. They are not strident. Their weapon is the law of the land. They are taking cases on behalf of women up through the courts—as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People did on behalf of blacks—and breakthroughs are being made.

Many of these women activists are turned off, as you gentlemen and ladies may be, by extremist tactics.

But you will have to look long and hard to find a woman who disowns the concept—no matter what tactics are employed to convey it—that she be treated as a person in her own right, rather than as an appendage to a man, or an individual whose legal position is inferior to that of a man—which is the role our society and our laws traditionally have ascribed to women.

If women are to move ahead, it is important for fair-minded men to understand that the movement is not a crusade to take over the country or to dominate men.

It is an effort to win a fair share of the nation's economic rewards and political leadership—a share women have been denied by old fashioned attitudes and prejudice—but a share to which our numbers, our education, our training, our experience, and our qualities as human beings fully entitle us.

It is most emphatically not a war against men. It is a battle against a system which downgrades half our citizens, women, and places a crushing burden on the other half, men, bringing on a disproportionate share of ulcers, heart attacks, and early deaths. As such it robs the entire society.

No society is so rich that it can afford to waste educated brain power. Yet that is what we do with our women.

Dr. Estelle Ramey, the distinguished physiologist, wrote recently that women also have noticed that some of our men are willing to pay almost any price for the privilege of getting out of the house, away from the wife and kids, out into the world where the action is, to any job, however dull, anywhere but the security and comfort of the home.

Could it be possible that security and comfort are not the pinnacle of human happiness? Many of us think so. After all, women in harems have reached the ultimate in security and comfort—they don't have to worry about anything. They just have to wait their turn.

When Bob Shaw spoke with me about coming here tonight, he said, "Tell us how a woman really feels about this."

Well, I suppose there are a lot of things I could say about how I feel personally—about how it feels, after a twelve-hour day on the campaign trail with no time for a meal, to suffer the humiliation of being turned away from a restaurant because you are unescorted . . . or how it feels to know you are as well qualified, perhaps more so, than the next person, and to have a prospective employer look you in the eye and say, "I prefer a man in that job." (Can you imagine what would happen if he said that to a black?) . . . or how it feels to learn you've been called a lesbian because you are interested in equal rights for half the population of the country, women.

But those are personal views, and subjective. You will be more impressed, I believe, by a poll taken in January by Louis Harris.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It was the most far-reaching survey of women's attitudes done so far.

In releasing it, Mr. Harris said:

"What we are reporting today is a state of mind among women comparable to black attitudes in 1962, just prior to the emergence of Martin Luther King, or among college students in late 1967, just prior to the surfacing of young people behind Eugene McCarthy in 1968.

"The underlying mood of women in America today," Mr. Harris said, "is one of conflict, frustration, deep division, and change. And yet the enemy barring the gates to the liberation of women is not men, inflexibly blocking the way, but women's lack of confidence in herself."

Mr. Harris did not find women ready to kick over the traces of their motherhood and wifehood. But he did find that 64 percent of them want more day care centers, and one fourth of all women with children under twelve would go to work if day care were available.

A plurality of women also feel that "most men find it necessary for their egos to keep women down."

These are real storm signals, in Mr. Harris' view. Women can be expected increasingly to express resentment at being judged by something other than what is inside their heads. They want to be appreciated for their minds as well as their bodies.

When President Nixon named thirteen of us to a task force on women's rights and responsibilities in late 1969, some of us discovered for the first time the shocking fact that the laws and courts of this country are hostile to women.

A woman does not have the right, as a man does, to retain her own name in marriage.

She may not maintain a domicile apart from her husband.

Prostitution laws punish a woman for selling her body, but not the man who patronizes her.

Women have been given longer prison sentences than men for the same offense in Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and an unknown number of other states.

To top it off, the Supreme Court has never accorded the protection of the 5th and 14th amendments to female citizens, as it has to blacks and others. It has upheld or refused to review laws and practices making discriminatory distinctions based on sex.

The report our task force submitted to the President was called "A Matter of Simple Justice." Some of you may have seen it. It contains a moderate program of change designed to wipe out some of the existing legal inequities between the sexes. It made 22 recommendations and called for a national commitment to changes that will bring women into the mainstream of American life.

More than a year has passed since the report was submitted. What have the results been? Has it done any good?

I suppose if I were writing a headline, I might say, "Report goes over with Nixon Administration like a lead balloon."

But in checking the recommendations point by point recently, I was pleasantly surprised to find that there has been action on about a third of them. It came about largely in response to the fierce lobbying and pressure of women's groups, but certainly the Administration can claim a share of the credit.

Here are some of the accomplishments:

For the first time in history, the Justice Department has filed suit to give women equal employment rights under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act.

Moving against Libbey-Owens-Ford Company and the United Glass and Ceramic Workers Union (unions, incidentally, have

collaborated in the discrimination against women)—moving against the company and the union, the Justice Department won a consent decree giving women employees equal access to jobs from which they had been barred, and a system of redress for past inequities.

The Justice Department also filed a brief on behalf of Mrs. Ida Phillips in her suit in the U.S. Supreme Court against the Martin Marietta Corporation. The firm had denied Mrs. Phillips a job because she had preschool-age children. The Court ruled that unless the same personnel policy applied to men, it was a violation of Mrs. Phillips' civil rights.

Secondly, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare has moved to cancel federal grants to colleges and universities whose hiring and salary practices discriminate against women.

On pain of having its federal money withheld, the University of Michigan became the first to adopt a plan designed to wipe out sex bias on its faculty. The University of Pittsburgh followed.

Complaints are pending against more than 100 other educational institutions, including Harvard, the entire state university system of California, New Jersey, and many others, including I believe the University of Minnesota.

Thirdly, day care for economically deprived kids would receive \$386 million in federal money in the first year of President Nixon's family assistance plan, if Congress passes it.

These are some of the recommendations in our report which are moving toward reality.

On the negative side, the White House is still letting men make the decisions on the women's issue. Presidential Counselor Robert Finch handles the problem, when it is handled, as does Presidential consultant Leonard Garment. The priority it is given is indicated by Mr. Garment who refers to himself as the President's "odds and ends" man.

Our task force also urged passage of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, which would ban sex discrimination by the government. The Administration has paid lip service to this, but has not pushed it.

As you may know, the equal rights amendment passed the House overwhelmingly last summer, aided by intensive lobbying from women. It died in the Senate after Senator Ervin attached crippling language. But a new effort by a coalition of women's groups is under way to get it through the 92nd Congress.

We think the amendment is needed to wipe out existing inequities concerning jobs, education, and domestic law. It would impose as many responsibilities on women as it would confer rights. It would make women liable for military service, although they would not be required to serve in functions for which they are not fitted, any more than men are so required.

When I was here last fall to speak to the Minnesota Press Women, I was impressed with the fact that a number of them are handling jobs not usually regarded as women's bailiwick. They were covering hard news, or serving as news editors. This, too, is a mark of your open-mindedness and willingness to innovate.

But it is only a beginning.

One of the most important challenges for business and government is to open opportunities for women from the bottom up. It is all very well to name women to the high-visibility top Administration positions, and certainly there should be more of that, but even more important is to make certain that women are considered for promotions at the very lowest level. Just because that girl over there is behind a secretarial desk, don't overlook her as a promotion possibility. When

March 17, 1971

there is a steady upward flow of talent in the pipeline, it will be much easier to find women for the top positions.

Mrs. Elizabeth Koontz, head of the Women's Bureau in the Labor Department, believes that the most difficult barriers facing women are the invisible ones, all but unreachable by legislation. These are the barriers that will be lowered only when we have educated the human heart. For the real enemies lies within.

It expresses itself in all those unadmitted prejudices, unthinking assumptions, and outworn myths which, often so subtly, oppose the full development of a woman as an individual.

The grandmother of them all is, "A woman's place is in the home." But there are others:

A woman must choose between home and a job; she cannot do both well.

When a woman works, the chances are increased that her children will become neurotic or troubled.

Women are overly emotional; they can't be cool under pressure.

Women have intuition, but men have the logical, analytical minds.

Women are practical and down-to-earth, but only a man can think abstractly, take the larger, long-range view.

Women just don't have what it takes.

These are the kinds of prejudices women absorb from the world around them from the time they are little girls. From them a girl learns what is expected of her: that she may do things, but not too well; that she may aspire, but not too high.

These are some of the myths which condition a woman to put limitations upon her own expectations, to narrow her vision of the world and what she might do in it.

The really pernicious aspect of these myths is not that men believe them, but that women do.

I would like at this time to ask how many in this audience have daughters. May I have a show of hands? How many are parents of girls? (about half of the hands in the audience went up.)

Well, as you know, in our society little girls are trained from babyhood to be passive and sweet, and retiring. These are the prized "feminine" qualities.

Little boys are trained to be original and courageous and strong. A woman who shows originality, courage, strength and brains is often demeaned as "unfeminine."

Little girls, the studies also show are intellectually superior to little boys through high school. Then something happens. Little girls get the idea fast that brains may be a drawback in snagging a man. And so little girls begin putting on the act which will last a lifetime. The act might be title, "little old stupid me, and great, big intelligent you." The woman has discovered that society may penalize her for expressing her talents—and so education, ability, and the money invested in them go down the drain.

Last fall, when President Nixon was campaigning in Chicago, according to a UPI dispatch, he asked a group of women who greeted him, "Are you women's lib?"

They happened to be members of the Junior League and explained to the President that they concentrated on community volunteer work.

The President said "Good. I like a woman to be a woman."

Well, the President has had two news conferences since then, and one was limited to foreign affairs. You need strong knees and a voice that would cut through concrete to get recognized in the mob of reporters. In neither instance did I have an opportunity to place a question.

But I hope that some reporter, some day, will ask the President what he meant by that, "I like a woman to be a woman."

Did the President mean that the 30 million women who work, who constitute one-third of the country's labor force, should pull out and go home? Millions of them are heads of households with dependents, are helping put kids through college, or supplementing their husbands' substandard wages. More women than men are in poverty and in need of jobs.

Did the President mean that women should maintain a ladylike silence about the fact that their average earnings are sixty percent those of men and that the gap is widening? Or that a woman college graduate, on the average, earns about the same as a man with an elementary school education?

Did he mean that the women who are drawing unequal pay for equal work should meekly say, "thank you, mr. employer?"

Did the President mean that women should be happy about the fact that we stand today constitutionally about where the Negro stood in 1940?

Did the President mean that young women who aspire to be doctors, lawyers and engineers, should shift to such "feminine" occupations as secretary, nurse, and teacher?

Did he mean that the law and medical schools of this country should continue to enforce their unwritten quotas against women—quotas which have kept the percentage of women doctors in the U.S. to six percent while the Soviet Union's medical profession is 70 percent women?

Did the President mean that women reporters, to take one example, should never be considered for positions as city editors or managing editors, as their male counterparts are?

Did he mean that an abiding concern for home and family should cut off a woman—any more than it does a man—from participating in the outside world?

Because if that is what our President means, the youth of this country, the women of this country, and quite a few of the men of this country are light years ahead of him.

No one argues that the woman who chooses to remain at home should not be free to do so. We applaud her, although she may be a vanishing species.

But the woman who wants to contribute in the outside world should be permitted to make that choice without prejudice and withoutonus.

Senator Marlow Cook of Kentucky has four daughters and is a member of the subcommittee which held hearings last summer on the equal rights amendment. I covered the hearings and was fascinated when the Senator questioned one of the witnesses, a gorgeous blonde who happened to be an honor graduate of Harvard Law School.

The young lady told the subcommittee she had been offered no positions with law firms, although young men in her class whose grades did not match hers appeared to be in demand by prestigious firms.

"Did you pay the same law school tuition as the others?" the Senator asked. "Yes, indeed," the witness replied.

Then he asked, "Did the University inform your parents that their tuition money would not buy the same thing for you in the job market as the tuition paid for young men?"

"No," said the witness.

Well, if women are going to be shortchanged in the job market, perhaps they should get cut rates on their education, Cook observed.

Senator Cook's daughters, your daughters, and mine, will reach maturity in a world very different than ours. We grew up in a society which put enormous pressure on both men and women—and particularly women—to marry, as the socially acceptable thing, and to have children.

Today that pressure is falling away as we strive to reduce the world's population.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

More than that, many young women coming out of college no longer see marriage as the be-all and end-all of their existence.

At a result our values are changing. They must change in terms of what it is proper for women to do.

Our daughters must be given an opportunity—if they want it—to supplement or to replace the childbearing and child care function with something meaningful.

This is beginning to happen.

Over and over again, men ask me what do women want?

It can be boiled down to a few words:

Women want the opportunity to climb.

Think back for a moment on the jobs you have had. When you got that promotion, didn't you think at first, "I can't possibly handle this?" But you had to. You forced yourself to meet the challenge. By doing that, you forced yourself to grow.

But first you had to have the opportunity.

One of the great things to come out of the women's movement, it seems to me, is a rise in our self-esteem. The word "feminist" is becoming a badge of pride.

Mr. Harris' findings notwithstanding, women are discovering that they like and respect and trust each other. They are disproving those silly myths that they can't work together, that they are temperamental, catty, or have smaller brains than men.

If you think seriously about it for a moment, you will realize that equality for women is linked to many broader questions of social justice. It is more than an economic issue, more than a social issue, more than a legal and political issue.

Equality for women is a moral issue.

That is the challenge to you as fair-minded men, as communicators, as teachers, as one of the enlightened segments of our society.

One of the brilliant young thinkers in the women's movement, Lucy Komisar, has pointed out that the game we have been playing for centuries says that to be a man one must possess, one must control, one must dominate. Domination sometimes must be assured by force and violence.

Masculinity is equated with male supremacy.

But the masculinity game can't have a winner unless it also has a loser. That has been the classic status of women.

And now comes the beginning of a challenge to the masculine mystique of domination. It comes from those who were its first victims—women.

Today women are demanding new definitions of masculine and feminine that do not require the dominance of one sex over the other.

We reject all the myths about masculine aggression and feminine passivity. We seek to replace them with values that encourage human relations based on equality, compassion and respect.

The caveman mentality outlived its usefulness when technology made the bow and arrow obsolete.

Today men need a kind of courage that is only exhibited by those who have no doubts at all about their manhood, and that is the courage to assert their humanity.

We love you, and we are counting on your help. Thank you.

—
WHITNEY M. YOUNG, JR.

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Whitney M. Young, Jr.,

has robbed the Nation of one of its outstanding leaders.

During the past decade, a turbulent time of hope and despair, Whitney Young served as executive director of the National Urban League. He was a wise leader with a great record in winning job opportunities and working to unify America.

His death at the age of only 49 intensifies our sense of loss because his leadership will be needed so badly in the years to come.

In an address in Elkhart, Ind., in 1967, Mr. Young lamented the "active indifference" of too many Americans. He attributed many of the Nation's problems to this apathy. Whitney Young's philosophy was marked with positive activism, however. And no one could accuse him of indifference or apathy because his commitment to try to solve the problems of America was evident in his work as well as his words.

Editorial comment from the Elkhart Truth and the South Bend Tribune editions of March 13, 1971, indicate the high esteem with which he was held in the Third Congressional District of Indiana. He had many friends there. We all will miss him very much.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting the editorials from these two Third District newspapers as well as a splendid article on Whitney Young by Philip Geyelin, which appeared on the editorial page of the Washington Post, March 16, 1971, in the RECORD:

[From the South Bend Tribune, Mar. 13, 1971]

WHITNEY YOUNG

The country cannot afford to lose men like Whitney Young Jr., whose sudden death at 49 takes from us one of the most effective civil rights workers.

As executive director of the National Urban League, Young worked on a realistic, practical level in seeking to improve the status of Negroes and wipe out the accumulated racial prejudices that mar our country.

He wasn't a propagandist whose posturing for crowd applause repulsed the very people whose attitudes need to be changed, and whose help is required in bringing about change. As he himself once said, "It isn't a question of moderate versus militant, but of responsibility versus irresponsibility, sanity versus insanity, effectiveness versus ineffectiveness."

Because he chose the pragmatic course, he suffered attacks from those who want instant remedies to ancient wrongs and believe erroneously that these can be achieved best by belligerent words and threats. One of the nastiest attacks against Young appeared recently in the New York Times Sunday magazine, which labeled him an Oreo cookie—black on the outside and white inside.

The full extent of Young's achievements cannot be measured today. Many of the programs he helped to create, and the personal impacts he made, are only beginning to show results.

By coincidence, on the same day Young died, former Gov. Otto Kerner of Illinois gave an encouraging report on the racial situation in the United States.

Kerner headed a presidential commission which warned that racism threatened to split the nation. Now he states his conviction that great improvement has been made in the racial situation. While blacks and whites are drifting further apart in some

March 17, 1971

communities, he said, the general mood is improving.

Now a federal judge, Kerner told a press conference that laws alone won't provide the answer for further improvement. He said the problem is "not in the White House, not in the halls of Congress, or the governors' offices or the state legislatures," but between individuals on a personal basis.

Perhaps Kerner's encouraging report is as good a eulogy to Whitney Young as could be made. His persistent, intelligent work contributed significantly to the improved atmosphere.

[From the Elkhart Truth, Mar. 13, 1971]

WHITNEY YOUNG, GREAT AMERICAN

The shocking death Thursday of Whitney Young, Jr., 49, has cost this nation not only an outstanding civil rights leader, but also one of the greatest Americans.

As executive director of the National Urban League, Young dedicated his career to the elimination of segregation and discrimination in U.S. life.

None could outdo Young in expressing eloquent indignation and stinging rebukes against injustices suffered by American blacks.

Truth editorial page readers know this well because we have carried his column weekly since May 31, 1968.

But Young's great talent was in achieving practical results toward his goal—and in doing so within the framework of the American system.

In the spring of 1964, the national Urban League announced plans to fight poverty and despair in black communities.

Two years later, Young was able to report the league had obtained jobs for 40,000 unemployed blacks, and better jobs for another 8,000.

Young was condemned by some black militants for spending so much time with whites. Once he observed, in connection with his job in New York City:

"I think to myself should I get off this train this morning and stand on 125th Street cussing out Whitey to show I am tough? Or should I go downtown and talk to an executive of General Motors about 2,000 jobs for unemployed Negroes?"

His choice was to go down and talk with GM or some other big firm. He inspired a good many other black leaders to take a similarly constructive attitude.

Young said the Negro was in revolt not to change the fabric of society or to seek a special place in it, but to enter into partnership in that society.

Whitney Young was a man of immense personal charm and persuasiveness as Elkhartans well remember. In 1967 he spoke at the annual dinner meeting of the Elkhart Urban League. Also he spoke that year before a jam-packed breakfast meeting of businessmen at Hotel Elkhart, and was well received.

Elkhart's own chapter of the Urban League has reflected Young's own philosophy, with a multi-faceted program for bringing equality and inter-racial good-will in our community.

One of Young's remarks in Elkhart deserves to be remembered in particular, as others seek to fill the big void left by his passing:

Really good or really evil people are not the problem, he said, but rather the "large majority of Americans doing nothing." He called this "active indifference." It remains one of the big problems because while much has been done to remedy racial discrimination, there is a long way to go.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1971]

THE LOSS OF WHITNEY YOUNG

(By Philip Geyelin)

Among the black leaders in the struggle for racial equality, some brought religion to

the movement, some brought the liberals, some brought labor. Whitney Young, more than any man, brought the business community, the men of money and of the power and the influence that comes with money, and in a certain sense this was the hardest part of it although it was not by any means where his contribution ends. Still, it was the role that made him unique because it made him exposed. A black man had to be suspect who dealt with the Rockefellers and the Fords. So Whitney Young was a controversial figure from his first days as the executive director of the National Urban League. His chosen role within the movement was by the nature of things politically precarious. But if this bothered him, it was not in his nature to show it very often; he was too busy getting things done.

Whitney Young had come to the Nigerian capital for a meeting of the African American Institute, as a member of an American delegation which included many of the black leaders he had worked with most closely over the years. As they huddled together in the numbness of their sorrow, after his death, what they remembered best about brother Whitney was not the arguments they may have had over strategy—one rarely does, of course. What they were saying was that "Whitney was always there when you needed him . . . and that somebody had to do what Whitney did . . . and the man could not have done it better . . . and that no man could fill those shoes." And the way they talked and worked together and worried about the future and grabbed for the first signs of leadership by one of their number (the young radical preacher from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Rev. Jesse Jackson) you could not doubt that they meant what they said.

"He was the big man who led the interference around the end," said Bayard Rustin, the veteran from the A. Philip Randolph Institute who had fought the long wars with Young. "And he was also a man you could sing and drink and bull with." So Rustin only spoke briefly at the memorial service in the sweltering Christ Church Cathedral in Lagos on Saturday and then he sang "Death ain't nothing but a robber. . . ."

Jesse Jackson led the final prayer and he called him "a father figure in the civil rights movement." To the former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, he was "a giant laughing man" and quoting Sandburg on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Lincoln's birth, he spoke of the "paradox of terrible storm and peace, unspeakable and perfect."

He was the man who cooled things, was what they were saying, who brought every kind of people, rich and poor, together because he could talk to all of them. And yet, to suggest that his death is somehow a setback to the forces of moderation—as the Vice President did—is to miss the point. There was nothing moderate about Whitney Young's devotion to the cause of humanity and to the redressing of the grievances of his race. "He had an impatient patience" is the way one of his American colleagues described him. "He had a tremendous sublimated anger and he turned it into creative acts." His achievements were very practical ones; they can be measured in the work of the Urban League over the years, in its great effort to improve the lot of the black men who had poured into the Northern ghettos from the South. It can perhaps be best illustrated by the street academies in the ghettos which were his special creation—places where young blacks could gather and study and learn and receive counsel because they could do none of these things in overcrowded homes.

Practical solutions born of a profound compassion for people, a restless, driving energy, unending good humor and a love of living—these were his great strengths. Because he was a sociologist before he was a

national and international figure in the struggle for human rights, he knew what the problems were in an academic, theoretical way. And he knew them first hand as well; not the least of his contributions was what he did to bring the Urban League itself more actively into the political rough and tumble of the ghettos—into the places where the problems are. That was the key to it: he knew the problems and he knew the right people and if this led some of his black brothers to fault his lack of militancy or his close associations with the rich and powerful, it led none of them to fault him for himself, for none could withstand the warmth and wit and wisdom of the man.

His wisdom lay in his acceptance of the realities of what it would take to make his country move. He knew the value of dedication and hard work and rhetoric and organization and all the rest. He felt deep down the rightness of the cause. But he also knew where the levers of power were and how they worked. "Say something that I can go back and scare America with" he told Africans at the meeting here. "What's going to happen—that's the only basis on which America is going to move." He didn't mean it quite the way it sounded, because he didn't believe in fear. "My father said to me you only hate that which you fear and I don't want you to fear a living soul," he also told his colleagues at another point. What he did believe was that America would only act effectively to increase aid to Africa out of an acute self interest in its own security because that was the way it had always been with foreign aid, and he wanted the Africans to tell what would be the consequences if the United States did not do more for the developing nations and the black people on this continent.

Not fearing and not hating, he dealt with the corporate executives and counseled with Presidents; he consorted, in other words, with men who were looked upon by others in the movement with unrelieved hostility. And the fact is that many who were critical of this approach would be the first to admit that in the practical terms that matter he was right—that the movement had to have such an ambassador.

Jesse Jackson said as much in his booming eulogy. Recalling a time when it appeared that Whitney Young might become a member of the Nixon Cabinet, Jackson said he sent him a telegram urging him to accept. "I felt it didn't matter what you thought of the man," Jackson declared. "I felt that I didn't want twenty million or thirty million Americans disconnected from the man who is making decisions about them every week." Jackson said that later he asked Young why he hadn't taken the job and that "Whitney bowed his head in the dilemma that the black man is trapped in and replied that he wanted the job and that he thought he could have done the job but that he thought the brothers would not have understood."

And so he worked on with that patient impatience to the end. "We have to talk to people who are hungry tonight," he said at another point while he was in Lagos. "The rats are biting the kids tonight."

He relished every part of it. "This is great." he is said to have shouted in the surf of a Nigerian beach just before he died and he would have said the same thing about his life's work. He was in Nigeria for a conference of Africans and Americans dedicated to the causes of black men on two continents, and it will be said many times over that there was something appropriate about the fact that he should have died on an African beach while actively and exuberantly engaged in such an enterprise. Perhaps so. But the grief of all the black brothers of many nations who were working with him when he died, and of other men, white as well as black in this country and abroad, is a measure of how little consolation there is in this for his loss.

**CONGRESSMAN WRIGHT CITES
LENORA ROLLA AS DEEPLY DED-
ICATED HUMANITARIAN**

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of Friday, March 19, it will be my privilege to join in a communitywide salute in Fort Worth to one of the most dedicated humanitarians I know, Mrs. Lenora Rolla.

Over the years Lenora Rolla has helped so many of her fellow human beings in so many ways it is difficult to sum up all her altruistic activities. Teacher, journalist, churchworker, government employee, social work volunteer—she has fulfilled all these roles and more.

Perhaps the success that has crowned her efforts is due at least partly to her own unique personal philosophy. She likes to consider herself as "one of the Lord's favorite servants." She says:

He can call on me any time.

As the most recent achievement in Mrs. Rolla's long career, she took the leading role in the establishment of Fort Worth's East Hattie Street Haven. This is a neighborhood center that gives help to people of all ages. It is a real asset to our community.

Friday night Mrs. Rolla will be honored at a banquet in Sycamore Park Recreation Center in Fort Worth. Characteristically, she has insisted that all proceeds from the banquet be used to support the Hattie Street Haven.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the following story by Paul Rowan from the March 9 edition of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram. The article pays a well-deserved tribute to Mrs. Rolla for her dedicated and unselfish contributions to the life and the people of our city:

YOUTH-ORIENTED REFUGE: OPERATING HAVEN TAKES "TIRE" OUT OF "RETIREMENT"

(By Paul Rowan)

Mrs. Lenora Rolla is a very retiring person. But then, she's a very unretiring person, too.

Three years ago, for instance, she unretired as a retired college dean to contribute to the beginning of the East Hattie Street Haven.

She also has retired from governmental work, insurance work, teaching and journalism. "I've retired so many times I hardly remember what I'm retired from."

And sometimes, she says, the retiring and unretiring can become just plain tiring.

"I used to tell the Lord, 'Don't you know that I get tired sometimes?'

"Then I decided that maybe I'm one of His favorite servants, and He can call on me anytime."

The youth-oriented haven, Mrs. Rolla said, is "really a follow-up to this Christmas cheer thing that you hear once a year

"I have always felt that if any group of individuals had the proper assistance and knew that someone was concerned, they could work themselves out of any predicament."

"We work with all ages of people. A man has been in here this morning looking for clothing. As cold as it is, he had on no socks.

"We ask very few questions when they come in. We try first to accept them as people and communicate with them and respect their dignity."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mrs. Rolla also holds many offices at the East Annie Street Christian Church. She does not live in the Haven area, but helped found it because her church was in the area.

"I've been criticized, too, because they say the area around her home on the far West Side is as bad an area as here. But I do go to church in this area.

"For a long time, I felt like an outsider." This feeling passed, she said.

The haven is located in an old firehouse at 1525 E. Hattie. It is rented from the city—"for \$1 per year, and we're two years behind on that."

Despite a volunteer staff and donations, funding is the major problem for the Haven, Mrs. Rolla said.

But part of that problem may be solved soon. Friends and admirers of Mrs. Rolla decided in late January that she has earned some sort of recognition, and began plans for a Lenora Rolla Testimonial Banquet.

A committee was named to set the dinner, and, said one committee member, Mrs. Rolla agreed to the idea "only when she was convinced that any proceeds would be donated to the Hattie Street Haven"

The banquet will be at 6:30 p.m. March 19, at the Sycamore Park Recreation Center, 2525 E. Rosedale.

Tickets, at \$5 per person, may be obtained by telephoning or visiting the testimonial headquarters, 1109-A Evans Ave., 332-2715.

Mrs. Opal Lee, one of the committee members, said anyone may attend.

Mrs. Rolla said the Haven could use some items: "We're short on furnishings and equipment. And we really need professional staff."

Mrs. Rolla is a graduate of Alcorn A&M, with a degree in mathematics. She spent 20 years in the insurance business before becoming a teacher in Mississippi; then, during World War II, she worked with the U.S. Maritime Commission in Washington, D.C., where she also aided Settlement House, a social work project.

She returned to Fort Worth where she worked as a funeral director and burial association manager, then began editing the Dallas Express, the oldest black newspaper in Texas. She left that job in 1955 to become dean of women at Jarvis Christian College in Hawkins. She retired from that job in 1958 and returned to Fort Worth.

And there were other jobs in the meantime, such as an administrative assistant for Sen. Don Kennard.

Mrs. Rolla was asked the most important thing she has done.

"The most important thing? That was to marry Jake Rolla, who lets me do all these things."

Her husband is a retired Texas & Pacific Railroad man. Mrs. Rolla said he has never complained about her activities.

Mrs. Rolla said she feels the Haven is important because it provides aid for persons who live in a community where poverty and misdeeds are commonplace.

But the Haven isn't exempt. Not too long ago, for instance, vandals broke into the building and, among other things, poured paint on the floor.

"The people in the community came in and really cleaned it up," said Mrs. Rolla.

"I know there were more involved in cleaning it up than were involved in the vandalism."

"Until very recently, I stayed awfully long hours (at the Haven). Now the people in the community have started relieving me and I can leave almost any time I desire and leave some responsible person in charge.

"The community is becoming involved. It's not involved yet to the extent that we would have.

"I'm looking forward to the community taking it (the Haven) over any minute now.

"My fishing poles are in the trunk of my car."

THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this is the statement I did not make before the House Democratic caucus today:

Mr. Chairman, I have never opposed use of the seniority system for the purpose of assigning office space to members of Congress. Lining up for better offices and other such conveniences relates to members as individuals, and is along the line of the familiar American practice, "first come—first served."

That's fine for members as individuals.

But we are not here just as individuals. Each of us is here principally to represent the majority view of nearly a half million Americans. And no district of them has seniority over another.

A requirement that these various points of view line up to determine which will be given Committee and Subcommittee chairmanships, rather than putting them to a vote just as they were put to a vote back home—the seniority system which requires this is out of line itself. Out of line with representative government. Out of line, as a matter of fact, with what we call our own Party. Out of line with everything we were taught as children to believe American democracy means.

So I oppose the disproportionate representation function of the seniority system. I'm old-fashioned. I still believe elected representatives should be elected, and representative.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing even worse than the seniority system. And that is the FIX.

Everyone knows full well this is exactly what has taken place in arranging subcommittee chairmanships in the D.C. Committee. The FIX in favor of thought control. The FIX against a valid point of view.

There are many in this Caucus and many in this country who believe that just as in England, and Italy and France and Germany and all the other Western democracies, there should be local democracy in the Capital of the American democracy.

This is a point of view so valid as to have been included in our national Party platform.

Despite this, the Democratic Chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee opposes not only the point of view but also opposes so much as even giving that point of view a fair public hearing.

This is why Mr. McMillan has attempted contortion of his beloved seniority system and passed over me for a Subcommittee chairmanship. After all, he and his collaborators say, Jacobs doesn't believe in the seniority system anyway—which is roughly equivalent to saying that even though you co-operate with the income tax, if you don't believe in it, you shouldn't get your refund.

Though I oppose the seniority system, I have cooperated with it by recognizing the various Committee and Subcommittee chairmen of the House and by not throwing up roadblocks such as unlimited quorum calls and other points of order which would tend to make even slower the operation of this House.

It is obvious that as an individual I have been cheated from a personal honor because of my support for the Democratic Party platform plank of democracy for the District.

One might assume that I come here today to ask for restoration of this personal honor.

I don't at all.

I am content to be the victim whose case has exposed the hypocrisy of a system devoid of democracy.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

I accept being denied the personal honor of a Subcommittee chairmanship. I accept this with pride in the knowledge that I have single-handedly broken the seniority system.

This honor I waive in good conscience because in doing so I waive something which accrues to me personally.

What I cannot waive in good conscience is the democratic right in a Democratic Caucus for this Democratic platform point of view which many D.C. Committee Democrats and I support—the right of this point of view to be represented by the Subcommittee chairman who assumes the post I might have had.

Therefore, bearing in mind the fact that by Mr. McMillan's action the seniority system is no longer relevant in the House District of Columbia Committee, and, in the event that he will have been elected, I shall move the Caucus at its next meeting to instruct that our Democratic nominee for Congress from the District of Columbia, Walter B. Fauntroy, be made Subcommittee chairman in my place.

Mr. Fauntroy has the point of view to which I have referred as being held by many Democrats on the D.C. Committee.

And, if elected, he will have something else, too.

Mr. Fauntroy will have something else which no member of the House District of Columbia Committee and, in fact, no member of either body of this Congress can claim.

Mr. Fauntroy will have "the consent of the governed."

CONTROL OF PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, a United Nations Conference in Vienna attended by representatives from 71 nations has concluded its work on an international convention on the control of psychotropic substances. These new synthetic drugs of abuse are threatening young people not only in American cities but around the entire world. The new international convention is aimed at curbing this growing problem by applying new reporting, licensing, and export-import controls on the manufacture and distribution of manmade psychotropic drugs.

I was privileged to attend the Conference by virtue of your appointment of me as a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation. I am grateful to you for this opportunity and would like to make some brief observations concerning this new treaty, its scope and purpose, as well as the challenge of the job left to be done.

The principal international instrument for the control of drugs of abuse is the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. The United States and nearly 80 other nations are parties to this treaty, which provides for the international control of all opium and narcotics substances. Although the treaty also contains provisions designed to control certain nonnarcotic drugs, such as marihuana and cocaine, it was not designed to control the new synthetic substances.

In the last 5 years, the drugs which make up the pill culture—the amphetamines, barbiturates, hallucinogens, and tranquilizers—have become the major drugs of abuse on our college campuses, in our city elementary and secondary schools, and in our slums. At the same time inadequate and inconsistent regulation of the manufacture and trading of these drugs has permitted them to enter international trade and thereby feed the growing habits of even larger numbers of drug abusers in many nations. This fact coupled with the fact that the Single Convention was not designed to regulate the psychotropics, that is, the pill culture, caused the United Nations, after several years of preparation, to convene a conference in Vienna during January and February of this year to prepare a new treaty governing international traffic in pills and their ingredients.

As a result of this conference, on February 21, 1971, the Convention on Psychotropic Substances was signed by 20 nations and opened for ratification. It provides for a system of international and national controls to insure that these drugs will no longer be abused and that those which are most dangerous will be limited to medical and scientific uses.

The nations which helped draft the treaty agreed to establish the following control measures:

First. Licensing of all those who deal with the drugs;

Second. Restriction of the use of these drugs to legitimate uses by prescription requirements, quota controls or other means;

Third. Maintenance of records and conduct of inspections at all levels of handling;

Fourth. Export and import controls;

Fifth. Submission of statistical reports to an international control body on the manufacture of and trade in psychotropics.

The treaty authorizes an existing international narcotics control body, the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, to publicize violations or abuses of the treaty and to recommend enforcement measures. Worldwide publicity and pressure, combined with the possible curtailment of the trade in drugs with a country which violates the treaty's provisions, are thus the document's only enforcement measures. Given the great desire of the international community to control this devastating traffic and the consequent public pressure which can be brought to bear against any country which willfully violates the treaty, I am hopeful that these enforcement measures will produce broadscale and meaningful compliance with the provisions of the convention.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the conduct and competence of the U.S. delegation. The U.S. delegation, composed of representatives from Justice, HEW, State and Treasury—Customs—and from the Congress, was active and effective, both in the formal conference sessions, and in the parlors, corridors and coffee rooms, where much of the most useful work of the conference was accomplished.

The head of our delegation, John E. Ingersoll, Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, and U.S.

Representative to the U.N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs, did a thoroughly professional job. Mr. Ingersoll was spokesman for the United States on the entire range of complex technical treaty provisions as well as on the important and delicate international political issues of the Conference. Under his astute leadership, the U.S. delegation played a leading role in the formulation of some of the most important provisions of the treaty. Additionally, Mr. Larry Hoover, the highly competent and resourceful legal officer for the U.S. mission in Geneva; Mr. Harvey Wellman, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Narcotics; Mr. John Miller, Chief Counsel, Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs; and Mr. Charles Bevans, assistant legal adviser, Department of State, were also unusually effective.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. negotiating team clearly and persuasively asserted its leadership role in the field of international controls over drug abuse. The positions which it took on the various issues were basically sound and were consequently accepted by the Conference. Some delegations from the Western developed nations were identified either as opposed to meaningful controls or else in favor of the strictest theoretical controls regardless of the practical problems they might create. The U.S. delegation took a realistic rather than a doctrinaire approach. Consequently, it was able to enlist strong support from manufacturing as well as developing countries on some of the most important issues.

In fact, one of the highlights of the conference came during one emotion-laden debate when the representative from Togo strongly criticized several of the European representatives for trying to weaken the treaty by adding loopholes and escape clauses. He then warmly endorsed the U.S. compromise proposal as a realistic contribution to a sounder, more effective, more widely acceptable treaty. Indeed, he heartily congratulated the United States for its strong leadership throughout the conference.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. delegation to this important conference has helped create a workable international instrument for the control of synthetic drugs. Our Government showed a healthy recognition of the dangers of psychotropic substances and demonstrated its desire to take a leading role in controlling their use and abuse. Any other tactic would have caused our Nation great embarrassment, since we are demonstrably one of the principle manufacturing sources of these new drugs.

Our Government made it clear to the international community that we intend to do everything in our power to curtail the abuse of these substances. By seeking strong controls on these new drugs of abuse, we have enhanced our ability to press for more effective controls in the traditional narcotics field, where we have yet to develop adequate action programs to regulate and control the world supplies of illicit opium and heroin.

Mr. Speaker, the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and its predecessor documents have provided the legal and administrative framework for effec-

March 17, 1971

tive control of the international traffic in those narcotic substances which are required for medicinal and scientific purposes. But, while the international community has successfully prevented the diversion of legitimately grown and manufactured narcotic substances into illicit channels, it has failed totally to build upon this solid foundation to eliminate the illicit traffic in opium, its derivatives, and the other narcotic drugs, which have found their way into virtually every town and hamlet of America.

The danger exists that we shall commit the same error when the Protocol on Psychotropic Substances takes its place alongside the Single Convention. We have learned by experience that treaties are not enough. America must play a more vigorous, more effective leadership role in developing a specific and comprehensive program of tough international controls which will build upon these two international documents to eradicate completely the traffic across national boundaries of mind-altering drugs, to keep them out of our neighborhoods, and out of the hands of our kids. I will shortly present such a program to you and I hope that my colleagues in the Congress and the administration will consider it as a useful basis for discussion.

We must act and we must act quickly if we are to stop this scourge which is literally killing our cities and our youth.

CONSTRICITIVE ANSWERS TO THE PROBLEM OF LOGGING RESIDUALS

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, Montana's First Congressional District is large, some 65,000 square miles, comparable in size to the State of Washington. Of this area, approximately one-half is Federal land with 23,000 square miles of national forests. We, in western Montana, live and work in little enclaves located within these Federal lands.

We are not independent of these lands. While they provide us with no taxes, they do provide us with resources. I would like to concern myself with wood as a resource in these remarks.

The manufacture of wood products is one of the mainstays of our economy. It is our largest manufacturing industry. It has grown more rapidly in Montana than has the wood industry over the rest of the country. Since World War II, it has provided new jobs for our people while such giants as agriculture and mining have provided fewer jobs. It is of great importance to us.

Two-thirds of the wood used in our wood products operations come from the national forests through Forest Service timber sales. It is incumbent upon us to utilize this resource wisely so that we will be assured of a future for the industry.

The Forest Service, as custodian of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

these forests, has worked hard to manage them to the benefit of the public to whom they belong. Of late, superconservationists have seen fit to turn on the Forest Service, criticizing their custodial practices. Many of these critics have done nothing more than criticize, castigate roadbuilding and for leaving debris—logging residuals—behind, but never proposing a solution to the problem.

It is refreshing to read a prospectus for a study designed to come up with constructive answers to problems. Logging residuals, commonly known as "slash," are the target of this study. How can we best deal with this unsightly and wasteful timber refuse?

The proposed studies seek ways in which this slash can be utilized to the economic good. An answer to this problem would move us toward full utilization of a tree. It would remove some of the stigma from necessary clearcuts, would eliminate air-polluting slash burns and would provide a wood resource that would save standing trees. It is a move in the right direction. I would commend the reading of this prospectus to all my colleagues.

I include the article as follows:

PROSPECTUS FOR PROPOSED STUDIES OF DISPOSITION OF LOGGING RESIDUALS IN THE CENTRAL AND NORTHERN ROCKY MOUNTAIN AREA

Timber cutting on the National Forests—especially clearcutting—causes an impact on the forest of substantial and not fully understood dimensions. Logging alters the short term forest cover, affects big game ecology, watershed behavior, and most of all appearance. It is the visual impact, probably, that provokes the greatest amount of adverse public reaction. The fact that timber provides important rural jobs, taxes, federal revenues, and badly needed products appears to some to be insufficient justification for continued harvesting unless public opposition is ignored. It is not nearly enough, apparently, to point out that clearcutting has certain biological justification under many circumstances. Nor is it nearly enough to point out that substitutes for wood and paper drain heavily against non-renewable resources, require costly imports, or are the product of industrial systems that have high social costs. The fact remains that far too many people reject clearcutting as a viable means of meeting multiple use forestry objectives.

The problem is more than finding the economic and biological balances under which logging can be maintained. The social impacts of clearcutting must be determined and a way found to continue this vital practice within some favorable level of public acceptance.

The public rarely objects to the existence of large, grassy, natural openings within forested areas of the central or northern Rocky Mountain region. No one, really, suggests seriously that these treeless openings should be planted to forest. No one, really, worries about the hydrologic function of these slopes nor about the wildlife carrying capacities. Given the same set of conditions, however—the same size, aspect, slope, or locale—but with the addition of stumps, cullogs, or other logging leftovers—and most of the public cries "forest destruction" and demands instant rehabilitation. When foresters point out that such an area has either reestablished itself naturally or that it has been planted, or that the area will provide intermediate crops of big game forage, or that clearcutting might in some cases improve total water yields or timing the cry still goes up, "destruction."

If the fundamental difference between public reaction to natural openings and forest cutovers is one of appearance, i.e. stumps and logging leftovers, much of the adverse reaction must be psychological. It could be assumed, therefore, that much of the adverse reaction to clearcutting could be alleviated by a satisfactory level of post logging cleanup. Unfortunately, conventional practices of broadcast burning or piling and burning seemingly fail to meet the desired standard, especially when residues are made up of large pieces.

Americans have a powerful ethic regarding waste, real or imagined. We are trained by our mothers to "clean our plates" for fear of being wasteful. Similarly, Americans possess a powerful ethic regarding neatness. Generally speaking we abhor cluttered desks, unmade beds, or littered forests. Both of these ethics must be involved in the formulation of adverse public reaction to logged-over forests. Forest leftovers, especially in old growth western forests, often represent as much as half of the total stand volume; this appears to be wasteful. And residues that are left are scattered helter-skelter alongside roads, landings, skid trails, or throughout the cutover. This is grossly untidy.

The material left behind is not waste in an economic sense, at least most of it. True, much of it has the physical properties to be converted into lumber, fence posts, pulp chips, or particles for reconstituted boards. If it had value in place, however, it would be removed as part of the profit-making, free market system into which forests products are fed. To convert a logging area, then, to resemble a natural opening will require costs above those related to the economic utilization into the free market system. In other words, costs for a total logging and cleanup job may well exceed values from the products. Whether the logging residues are reduced in place by burning or by on-site chipping and grinding, or whether they are removed to some manufacturing site for conversion into lumber, posts, paper, or particleboard it is apparent that total costs—including site rehabilitation—might exceed total commercial values. The difference, costs above value, are the social costs that must now be associated with supplying forests products into the national raw materials requirements. Whether these costs are passed along as part of product pricing or are provided by government is not the important issue. The important thing, now, is that no means are available to make proper management decisions as to how much material should be removed, under what sets of circumstances these amounts could be varied, what the possible uses are for removed materials, or what the costs might be for various degrees of removal. Most important of all, there is no way at present to determine the degrees of public acceptance at various degrees of post logging treatment.

The Forest Service, Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station is proposing a major research thrust directed towards providing criteria that can make logging on the National Forests acceptable to public scrutiny.

The proposed research will provide answers to the following questions:

1. What is the nature and amount of residues now left on various sites following logging, including live standing and live down boles dead standing and dead down boles; tops, branches, and needles?
2. What products can be manufactured from this material by categories of residues and mixes?
3. How can these residues be moved most efficiently from the forest to the wood-using plant?
4. To what extent will regeneration problems be changed by removal of residues, and

what steps will need to be taken to assure adequate, rapid regeneration?

5. To what extent will the removal and utilization of residues, and the processes used in removal alter or enhance esthetics, air quality, water quality, and wildlife habitat? To what extent will it alleviate the need for slash disposal by burning?

6. Is the conversion of residues into products economically feasible and does conversion as part of a total land management system have a suitable cost-benefit ratio?

The studies will provide badly needed hard data for analysis as well as a series of demonstrations of various levels of logging residue employment. From these studies, land management decision makers on both public and private forest lands can determine in advance to the total social, biological, and economic impact timber cutting will have.

The research would be multi-disciplinary involving economists, biologists, hydrologists, utilization technologists, and social scientists. The results would be applicable to National Forests of Montana, Idaho, Utah and Wyoming. Although scientists of several disciplines and at several laboratory locations will be engaged in this research, the project headquarters will be at the Forestry Sciences Laboratory in Missoula with primary project responsibility assigned to the Forest Utilization research project.

Preliminary and exploratory studies along the lines outlined in this proposal are now underway in cooperation with a major wood products manufacturer in Wyoming. Additional studies are badly needed in adjacent states. An initial annual budget of \$200,000 is recommended. This will need to be appropriated as an increase to the Forest Utilization Project, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Missoula, Montana.

SONIC BOOMS OVER WATER ONLY

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, Federal aviation regulations prohibiting commercial SST flights in the United States at speeds generating sonic boom which may be heard on the ground are in the process of being issued by the FAA. But in the absence of established sonic boom standards, the SST program directors have long presumed that the public would find sonic booms objectionable and that flights over populated areas at supersonic speeds would therefore be prohibited. All U.S. SST program decisions, economic and technical, have therefore been made on that assumption. The airlines sharing in the development costs of the SST support this assumption and there is an estimated market for over 500 SST's.

With regard to the possible effect of the SST sonic boom on marine life, Dr. John C. Calhoun, Chairman of the National Academy of Sciences Committee on Oceanography, informs us that—

A substantial amount of work has been done on the effects of explosions in air, which demonstrates clearly that acoustic energy is transmitted very inefficiently from the atmosphere to the ocean. Other experiments on attempts to influence fish acoustically are trivial if detectable.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A special report to the Secretary of Interior also indicates that it seems unlikely that the pressures from sonic boom could have any effect on aquatic life, especially "since the overpressures from sonic booms are much less than differences in pressure between the top and bottom of a small ocean wave."

For more than 20 years, military aircraft, generating sonic booms of considerably greater magnitude than SST's, have been conducting extensive supersonic operation off the east and west coasts of the United States, as well as other ocean areas throughout the world. To my knowledge, to date, no Government agency including the Air Force, Navy, and the Coast Guard have received any sonic boom complaints or damage claims resulting from this overocean-supersonic operation. During this period of time, boats and ships of all classes, fishing industry operations and the like have been frequently exposed to sonic boom. We, therefore, must conclude that supersonic flights over water presents no threat to man, ships or marine life.

ST. PATRICK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the words and deeds of relatively few men have directed the course of history throughout the ages. One of those rare individuals was St. Patrick, apostle to the Irish people, who during the historic Dark Ages set forth to evangelize Ireland.

Patrick, a onetime captive slave, not only shed the chains of slavery which bound him as an individual, but through his selfless devotion he brilliantly adapted the Christian faith to the tradition and customs of a proud and honorable people, thus laying the foundations for the future Irish nation.

Today, the commemoration of St. Patrick is one of the most universal feasts and one which unites all those who are Irish by heritage or in spirit. For St. Patrick remains a vibrant symbol for that which is Irish. The customs and traditions—indeed, the contribution of the Irish to America has surely been the fulfillment of his spirit in this land. The strengthening of family life, the Christian ethic, the pride and vitality of this people have immeasurably enriched this Nation.

These very qualities are required today to reconcile the tragic divisions which separate countryman from countryman in Northern Ireland. St. Patrick's Day is an appropriate occasion not only to salute the Irish-Americans for the unique cultural heritage with which our own Nation has been gifted; but it is a timely occasion to reaffirm those bonds which unite all Irishmen in the spirit of St. Patrick to a new birth of unity and peace.

March 17, 1971

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN JOE DIES?

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, an article by Miss Barbara Tillman of Long Beach, Calif., titled "What Happens When Joe Dies?" reflects a refreshingly sincere concern for the future welfare of our Nation, an aspect of the younger generation which unfortunately commands little attention by the press.

Miss Tillman is presently earning her masters degree in mathematics at Louisiana Tech University, and I submit her essay for the RECORD:

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN JOE DIES?

(By Barbara Tillman)

Americans are dwarfed by the size of our society and by its creations. We are so conscious of the interdependency within society that we have forgotten the most important part of society: the individual.

Surrounded by our modern conveniences, we have forgotten that these were created by individuals. The catering of these conveniences has given Americans a complacent attitude towards individual exertion. As individual accomplishments diminish, we have become more egotistical over the accomplishments of our generation. We've forgotten those who have laid the foundation for "our" achievements. We've forgotten the true value of history.

Why? Is it because history is incomplete? Is it because we are apathetic? Is it because too many historians tend to worship history rather than try to understand its significance in today's world? Or is it because, in a desire for brevity, we have condensed the meaning, significance and excitement out of the infinite number of historical facts?

Perhaps, because of our ignorance of history, we have forgotten some of the words and meaning of our important national documents. In the Declaration of Independence we were guaranteed the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Each individual must discover his own definition of happiness. It is not the duty of any government to try to define it in monetary terms and dole it out in "care" packages.

The success of a republic is based not only on the people's ability to govern themselves, but also on their desire to assume this important responsibility. A republic is not a perpetual motion machine but an old car that is forever in need of repair. When a government creates the environment that suffocates the repairmen, the "Joes" of the country, it has carved for itself a place in history but not in the future. No republic of the magnitude of the United States has survived the test of time. Each has succumbed due to lack of interest.

The American car can continue to run only if those riding in it stop worrying about which seat they occupy and realize that it is all part of the same car. The ideas of the riders need not be identical, but all must possess the desire to keep the car running. The vital parts must be repaired. No amount of "extras," disguised as necessities, can ever replace one vital part.

Our car is presently running at a speed faster than it ever has in its history. The major difficulty is that this engine was built for slow country driving. As maintenance needs increase, will the additional repairmen be found or will we find out what does happen when Joe dies?

March 17, 1971

TO ROOT AGAINST YOUR COUNTRY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters from my constituents about an article that recently appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle by Mr. Arthur Hoppe. It is a sad day, indeed, when some Americans feel ashamed of what their country is doing around the world. It is sad and unfair, because we all love our country and we all need to feel a pride in our Nation's actions. Today, many citizens feel chagrin and dismay over what this country is doing in Southeast Asia. We have succeeded in stalling and waging the natural love the people of this country feel for America. I think we should all read this article and consider the price we are paying at home for this horrible and immoral war in Southeast Asia. The article follows:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Mar. 1, 1971]

To Root Against Your Country
(By Arthur Hoppe)

The radio this morning said the Allied invasion of Laos had bogged down. Without thinking, I nodded and said, Good.

And having said it, I realized the bitter truth: Now I root against my own country.

This is how far we have come in this hated and endless war. This is the nadir I have reached in this winter of my discontent. This is how close I border on treason:

Now I root against my own country.

How frighteningly sad this is. My generation was raised to love our country and we loved it unthinkingly. We licked Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini. Those were our shining hours. Those were our days of faith.

They were evil; we were good. They told lies; we spoke the truth. Our cause was just, our purposes noble, and in victory we were magnanimous. What a wonderful country we were! I loved it so.

But now, having descended down the torturous, lying, brutalizing years of this bloody war, I have come to the dank and lightless bottom of the well: I have come to root against the country that once I blindly loved.

I can rationalize it. I can say that if the invasion of Laos succeeds, the chimera of victory will dance once again before our eyes—leading us once again into more years of mindless slaughter. Thus, I can say, I hope the invasion fails.

But it is more than that. It is that I have come to hate my country's role in Vietnam.

I hate the massacres, the body counts, the free fire zones, the napalming of civilians, the poisoning of rice crops. I hate being part of My Lai. I hate the fact that we have now dropped more explosives on these scrawny Asian peasants than we did on all our enemies in World War II.

And I hate my leaders who, over the years, have conscripted our young men and sent them there to kill or be killed in a senseless cause simply because they can find no honorable way out—no honorable way out for them.

I don't root for the enemy. I doubt they are any better than we. I don't give a damn any more who wins the war. But because I hate what my country is doing in Vietnam, I emotionally and often irrationally hope that it fails.

It is a terrible thing to root against your own country. If I were alone, it wouldn't matter. But I don't think I am alone. I

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

6969

think many Americans must feel these same sickening emotions I feel. I think they share my guilt. I think they share my rage.

If this is true, we must end this war now—in defeat, if necessary. We must end it because all of Southeast Asia is not worth the hatred, shame, guilt and rage that is tearing Americans apart. We must end it not for those among our young who have come to hate America, but for those who somehow manage to love it still.

I doubt that I can ever again love my country in that unthinking way I did when I was young. Perhaps this is a good thing.

But I would hope the day will come when I can once again believe what my country says and once again approve of what it does. I want to have faith once again in the justness of my country's causes and the nobleness of its ideals.

What I want so very much is to be able once again to root for my own, my native land.

THE SST

HON. JOHN ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, in the past, the Federal Government has worked in close partnership with private enterprise in the development of worthwhile transportation systems, such as railroads, and I have generally favored this copartnership. In providing funding for the development of two model—prototype—SST's, the Federal Government has entered into a unique loan arrangement with private enterprise. The funds provided by the Federal Government will assist private industry in the construction of two prototypes and 100 hours of flight testing. The main use of a prototype aircraft is to provide a model in order to test the performance, basic design, operating economics, and environmental criteria before production. Government funds are not committed beyond the prototype development phase; the production phase will be financed by the private sector of the economy.

The total cost of developing the two prototype planes will be approximately \$1.7 billion. The Federal Government is providing \$1.3 billion which is considered a loan and will be repaid; the Government's investment will be returned when the 300th plane is delivered, but the Government will continue to receive royalty payments. Both the British-French Concorde and the Russian Tupolev TU-144 are entirely government funded.

A recent article in Aviation Daily stated that the Russian TU-144 supersonic transport is scheduled to enter limited commercial operation in October 1971, on both domestic and international flights. The Russians are vigorously attempting to market their SST—TU-144—and such advertisements have appeared in Aviation Week and Space Technology. In addition, it is my understanding that the two British-French Concorde prototypes are already being tested. It is expected that the British-French SST will be ready to enter commercial operations in 1974 or 1975. If the development of the U.S. SST is continued as planned, it will probably enter

commercial service in 1978, and it is believed that the U.S. SST will be the most superior in design and ability and will operate at a lower cost.

While I think that it is important for our Nation to maintain its leadership in the transportation field, I would not advocate the continued development of the two SST prototypes if I believed that that such action would be detrimental to our economy or our environment.

The following economic facts must be considered:

First. As of the end of March 1971, the U.S. Government will have invested \$864 million in the SST. To cancel the program now would mean a loss of this investment, and an additional expenditure to pay the cost of cancellation and reimbursement to the contractors.

Second. The difference between the cancellation costs and the Federal funds needed to complete the project amounts to about \$200 million.

Third. Considering the unemployment rate in the aircraft/aerospace industry, it is important to note that the SST represents employment for more than 150,000 people.

Because of my special concern about the environment, I have thoroughly considered the following available data:

First. According to well-qualified scientists, development of a prototype SST will have no environmental impact. It is estimated that total emissions from all jet aircraft will contribute less than 1 percent of the measurable air pollution.

Second. If the United States continues its research into the SST, it will be accompanied by an extensive program to investigate all environmental aspects.

Third. Regardless of whether the United States continues its development of the SST, foreign development of the aircraft will make an environmental research program still necessary.

Fourth. The answers to the questions about the environmental impact of a fleet of commercially operated SST's, whether they be a foreign or U.S. model, can best be determined through the environmental research program and the flight testing of two prototypes.

Not only have I thoroughly reviewed technical information on the SST, but I have also attended detailed briefings and discussed this matter with local, State, and Federal officials. It is my conclusion that, at this time, the best course for the United States to follow is to continue Federal funding for the development of two prototype supersonic transports.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this St. Patrick's Day I wish to command a true Irishman, Michael B. Comer.

Today he will be grand marshal of Cleveland's annual St. Patrick's Day Pa-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

rade in recognition of his many years of dedication to Americans of Irish descent.

For 10 years Mr. Comer has hosted Cleveland's best known Irish radio program, "Echoes of Erin." He has never forgotten his days of his youth in Glenamaddy, Ireland, County Galway. An engineer, he came to this country and started his own construction company. Now that he is retired, he devotes even more time to activities associated with his Irish homeland.

Mr. Comer has been a leader in Cleveland's Irish community for many years. It is most appropriate that he should lead this year's St. Patrick's Day Parade.

HAWAII'S FIRST FAMILY

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been privileged to know and to count as friends the distinguished Governor of Hawaii and his lovely wife, the Honorable and Mrs. John A. Burns. Jack Burns is, as many of my colleagues know, one of the Nation's more dedicated men, a man whose public service has run from his police duties in Honolulu to Governor of his beloved State. He was the brilliant and successful leader in the fight to bring Hawaii into the Union and he still fights to make Hawaii one of our brightest stars. His concern for his State and people was also exemplified in his successful efforts to establish Hawaii's East-West Cultural Center in Honolulu, a bridge leading to cooperation and understanding between the United States and Asia. I was privileged in 1959 to join Jack and the then Senator, Lyndon B. Johnson, in establishing this center.

But this is only a part of the story of Jack Burns. The rest cannot be told without telling of his gracious and selfless wife, Beatrice. In a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star, a writer named Marian Burros notes that "The island's cordiality and warmth, epitomized by the gracious Mrs. Burns . . ." and goes on to describe how her loveliness spills over even into the Burns' official life. All during his career, Jack has been blessed with having Bea at his side. I can only add that I wish all my colleagues were lucky enough to know this wonderful lady.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point the article on Mrs. Burns published in the Washington Evening Star:

HAWAII'S KEY HOSTESS

(By Marian Burros)

"Receiving lines," Beatrice Burns says, "are boring. You can't say anything relevant. When you mingle at least you have a fighting chance to talk to people."

So the governor of Hawaii, John Burns, and his wife dispensed with them when he first took office in 1962. They are symbolic

of more formal living, inappropriate to the 50th state's friendly, casual image.

Even though there may be three to four "protocol-type" receptions each week, which makes Honolulu one of the entertainingest state capitals, few of them are formal. Thinking of their constituency, where an aloha shirt is the dress for most social occasions, Mrs. Burns explains that they don't have many black tie functions "because it would eliminate a lot of people who might like to come."

The island's cordiality and warmth, epitomized by the gracious Mrs. Burns, extends to spur of the moment entertaining—what she calls "ad lib." It is a fairly frequent occurrence for the governor to call her at 5 o'clock from his office across the street and say, "By the way, I'm bringing three couples home for dinner." On a recent night that meant liver and bacon.

When Luci Johnson Nugent was visiting Hawaii with her son, Lynn, Mrs. Burns had been told she had very little time, but as the dinner hour drew near and the little boy was playing happily with Mrs. Burns' grandchildren, the Nugents were invited to stay. The young mothers fed their children in the kitchen and the adults "sat down to potluck."

As different as Hawaii is in climate, attitude and people from the mainland, modern communications and transportation have made it very much like its sister states.

Along with poi, shushi, papayas and long rice on the grocery shelves, there are all of the name brands familiar to anyone who goes to the supermarket. And what the Burns enjoy eating reflects the Americanization of the island as well as its influences from Polynesia and the Orient.

Family favorites include devil's food cake, sukiyaki and poi.

A typical official reception buffet will have a cheese platter, roast beef and shrimp. But it will also have cherry tomatoes stuffed with lomi-lomi salmon, wun tun and roast sucking pig.

The pig is not a favorite of Mrs. Burns since it is always presented to her flaming on a platter, "like an offering," she says. Her reaction each time is, "what did the poor thing do to deserve that?"

Mrs. Burns' days are spent very much like other governors' wives, except that she is confined to a wheel chair, the result of polio some 30 years ago. She attends teas and lunches, oversees the "somewhere around 19" room house, plans menus and struggles with her voluminous correspondence. She insists on answering all the letters herself whether it is a request for "recipes, hats, buttons, leaves or Hawaiian dolls."

"I have a feeling that if they wrote to me, I should answer them."

Keeping up Washington Place, as the governor's residence has been known since 1848, presents less problems than most such official residences. There are "no restrictions, within reason—no budget," Mrs. Burns admits, not quite sure if the information should be spread abroad.

The white porticoed house was built by a New England sea captain in 1846 and bought for \$40,000 by the government in 1917. In 1922 a new section was added; in 1953 a patio off the living room. It is the most Hawaiian looking part of the house.

Though it fronts on a six-lane highway, the cool impressive looking mansion is set so far back from the road and is so sheltered by lush tropical foliage, that all one can hear is the singing of the birds.

It's a beautiful place to live, in a magnificent part of the world. Life is paced more leisurely, the entertaining more casual and no one does it better than Beatrice Burns.

March 17, 1971

PITTSBURGH'S THREE RIVERS—
WHO'S WHO GOVERNMENTALLY
SPEAKING ON OUR THREE RIVERS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment TRIAD, the Three Rivers Improvement and Development Corp. of Pittsburgh, a non-profit corporation, on its success in achieving cooperation by the industries and municipalities to improve our Pittsburgh waterways. TRIAD was formed to improve and develop Pittsburgh's rivers through coordinated planning.

TRIAD has done such a good job on conservation and restoration of our rivers that I believe this can set an example for other river areas in the United States.

TRIAD was created to carry Pittsburgh's renaissance to the rivers—to continue a renaissance that, over the next 10 years, could produce one of the most beautiful waterfronts in the world right here in western Pennsylvania.

I include the following:

WHO'S WHO GOVERNMENTALLY SPEAKING ON
OUR THREE RIVERS

(By Three Rivers Improvement and Development Corporation (TRIAD))

. . . was created to carry Pittsburgh's renaissance to the rivers—to continue a renaissance that, over the next ten years, could produce one of the most beautiful waterfronts in the world right here in western Pennsylvania.

TRIAD serves as a sounding board for innovative ideas for the enhancement of the commercial, industrial, and recreational potential of the three rivers; works to stimulate the development of walks, parks, and picnic areas for public use along the riverbanks; and coordinated programs to foster clean riverbanks and clean waterways.

But TRIAD is not alone in its efforts—a number of federal, state, and local government agencies are also concerned. Some of the major organizations are briefly described in this pamphlet.

Neither TRIAD nor government agencies can do the job alone. The beautification, improvement, and development of our rivers requires the cooperation and combined energies of all of the people in the Western Pennsylvania community.

These flowing waters mean that "new" rivers pass the Point every day; and all of us should work to make each river day better than the day before. The result of all these efforts will be a beautiful, viable community attracting vital people and retaining the bright young graduates of our educational institutions.

Additional information on the organizations described in this pamphlet can be obtained by writing to the addresses listed on the back cover.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Water quality office, Ohio basin region

The federal water pollution control program began on a small scale in 1948 with the passage of Public Law 845. This basic law has been strengthened and expanded several times since then. When the President signed the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1968, it marked the beginning of the present program of pollution abatement.

Within the federal government, the Water

Quality Office has the principal responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the law. In its assigned function in the new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Water Quality Office bears a special obligation to assure that our water resources are conserved and that they are managed to produce optimum yields in order to contribute their full measure to the progress and prosperity of America, both now and in the future.

The assigned work area of the Ohio Basin Region is the Ohio River watershed with the exception of the Tennessee River. Upper Ohio Basin Office at Wheeling, West Virginia, and the Lower Ohio Office at Evansville, Indiana, carry out all activities that can best be performed near the geographical areas involved.

Important continuing programs of the Water Quality Office include:

Making grants to any state, municipality, inter-municipal or interstate agency for the construction of waste treatment facilities. The Ohio Basin Region administers this program in the four states of Indiana, Kentucky, Ohio, and West Virginia. Though designed basically to aid municipalities, the grant program has a side effect which benefits industry. Cooperative projects designed to provide both industrial and municipal waste treatment can get financial assistance through a federal grant, thus providing better economics for all.

Making grants to states and interstate agencies to assist them in meeting the costs of establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of water pollution—including the training of much needed manpower. These grants are intended as realistic incentives for more vigorous action in pollution abatement and are a most effective means to foster and expand the role of the states in pollution control.

Making grants to state planning agencies to assist with the development of basinwide comprehensive pollution control. This means a coordinate effort at eliminating or reducing the pollution of an entire river basin rather than isolated, individual projects.

Executing an enforcement campaign against the pollution of inter-state or navigable waters including the establishment and administration of adequate Water Quality Standards by the states for these waters. This includes upgrading water quality where water is now polluted, and protection of water quality where it is currently high. All of the state Water Quality Standards are under continuing scrutiny and, as new knowledge becomes available, efforts will be made to encourage the states to upgrade their existing standards.

Advising and assisting federal agencies responsible for the construction of reservoirs which regulate streamflow to include adequate water storage to facilitate downstream water quality control.

Encouraging cooperative activities by the states for the prevention and control of water pollution, including uniform state laws and interstate compacts. State lines are not barriers to the spread of pollution. Pollution in one state or locality can—and often does—affect people living in another. Cognizance is taken of the primary responsibility of the states to abate water pollution. However, when complications and inequities arise concerning interstate waters, the Director of the Environmental Protection Agency has been delegated enforcement responsibilities. Enforcement action is initiated: (1) when Water Quality Standards are violated; (2) when the health and welfare of persons in another state are endangered; (3) when requested by a governor due to damage of health and welfare of persons within his state; (4) when shellfish are damaged and the marketable product in interstate com-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

merce is affected; and (5) when international pollution exists.

Supporting and conducting research and development aimed at finding better methods of controlling all forms of water pollution. The multiplication of varied and complex water pollution problems has been faster than the development of solutions to combat them. The Water Quality Office's research and development activities include actual work in its own laboratories and demonstration projects; and grants for research in colleges, universities, and other public and private institutions and agencies.

Collecting and disseminating information on chemical, physical, and biological water quality and other data pertaining to water pollution and the prevention and control thereof.

Providing technical advice and assistance to other federal agencies in order to prevent, control, and abate water pollution by federal activities; and providing review and surveillance of all such activities to assure that pollution control standards are met on a continuing basis. Applications from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Coast Guard for permits to do work in, on, over, or under navigable waters are examined for consistency with federal law and Water Quality Office policy on water pollution and water quality control. Applications for licenses from the Federal Power Commission or the Atomic Energy Commission also are reviewed for consistency with water quality control plans developed by the Water Quality Office, and considerable effort is currently being expended in the Ohio Basin Region on reviews and recommendations relating to power companies' requests for adding hydro-power facilities to the high locks and dams on the Ohio River.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The history of the Coast Guard goes back to 1790 when it had its beginnings as the Revenue Marine and operated ten cutters. It was later known as the Revenue Cutter Service until it received its present name in 1915. Though originally formed to enforce customs laws and to stop smuggling, both the Coast Guard and its responsibilities have grown over the intervening years. These responsibilities include conducting search and rescue missions, weather patrols far at sea, oceanographic missions, the nation's ice breaking duties to keep sea lanes open, merchant marine inspection, maintaining over 43,000 aids to navigation including a world-wide loran system, patrolling regattas and enforcing federal laws and regulations on the navigable waters of the United States.

In pollution control, the Coast Guard's role emphasizes both preventative and punitive measures; and its jurisdiction extends from the tank vessels carrying cargo to the shoreside facilities where the cargo is transferred.

Tank barges carrying petroleum products and other dangerous cargoes are subject to Coast Guard inspection and certification to ensure that they meet all applicable regulations, and can safely carry the cargo for which certificated. Each vessel is inspected from the day the keel is laid until it is ready to be put into service. At this point, it is issued a certificate of inspection. Although the certificate is valid for two years, the vessel is inspected again half-way through the life of the certificate. And when the certificate is renewed, the vessel undergoes another inspection. Further, any time a tank barge develops a leak, repairs are mandatory and are inspected and tested to the satisfaction of a Coast Guard Marine Inspector.

On the rivers, tank barges either receive or transfer cargo to oil terminals located along the banks. The safety and pollution functions of the Coast Guard Captain of The Port also extend to these terminals. Person-

nel in charge of cargo transfer operations must be qualified to perform these operations, and persons handling petroleum products are examined by the Coast Guard and issued certificates attesting to their competency. At facilities where oil and other dangerous cargoes are handled, the Coast Guard is provided a list containing the names of individuals qualified to handle the company's various cargoes. In addition, these companies are now required to notify the Coast Guard 24 hours in advance of any cargo transfer. This permits the Coast Guard to have an observer on the scene to ensure that all safety and pollution regulations are being complied with.

Besides the preventative functions described above, the Coast Guard has other duties to perform when an actual pollution occurs. All oil pollution incidents in navigable waters are reported to the Coast Guard. These reports are investigated to determine the source of the pollution so that it can be stopped as promptly as possible and held to an absolute minimum. The type of oil and extent of pollution are ascertained and, if necessary, steps are taken to contain the oil to prevent its spread. During the course of the investigation, the Coast Guard also obtains samples of the pollution and pictures for use as evidence.

Once the spreading of the pollutant has been controlled, clean-up operations are started. Normally, clean-up is performed by the party responsible for the pollution. If those responsible fail to act, then the oil is cleaned up by the Coast Guard and the costs assessed against the responsible party.

The Coast Guard is the federal agency designated to assess the penalties authorized by the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. Any person who knowingly discharges oil into the river in violation of this Act, is liable to a civil fine not to exceed \$10,000.00. The enforcement of this provision will be vigorously pursued by the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard District Commander will determine the amount of the penalty. The Act also provides for a penalty of not more than \$10,000.00 and/or one year in jail for failure to report the discharge of oil into the water. Such cases will be referred to the U.S. Attorney for prosecution. Evidence gathered and documented by investigative teams will be preserved in the event it is needed in these cases. The important aspect of this Act, however, is to encourage the responsible parties to report the discharge of oil into the water, and to take it upon themselves to clean it up.

UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Pittsburgh engineer district

The Pittsburgh Engineer District has functioned as a civil works arm of the Corps of Engineers since 1864. For over a century, it has been active in water resource development, and has provided navigation improvements and flood control measures on the upper Ohio and its tributaries. Like many other government agencies, the Corps is also concerned with the deterioration of our natural water resources and has taken steps for improvements within the scope of its authorized ability.

Navigation improvements

Transportation by boat on the Ohio, Monongahela, and Allegheny Rivers started, no doubt, with their discovery. However, river navigation and transportation as we know it today began in the eighteenth century when English settlers started building boats at Fort Pitt.

In 1824, the rivers gained federal recognition by enactment of the first River and Harbor Bill of significance to this area. A part of the bill provided ". . . that for the purpose of improving the navigation of the . . . Ohio from Pittsburgh to the junction with the Mississippi, the President of the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

United States is hereby authorized to take prompt and effectual measures for the removal of all trees which may be fixed in the bed of said river . . ." President Monroe directed that the superintendence of such improvements be assigned to the Corps of Engineers.

Then, more than one hundred years ago, an Act of Congress transferred responsibility for government surveys from the Army's Topographical Corps to the Army's Corps of Engineers. This new responsibility made it possible for the Corps to complete surveys of the Ohio River with a view to improving the river to accommodate increasing traffic. The opening of the Davis Island Lock to traffic in October 1883 was the forerunner of a navigation project that ultimately provided slackwater from Pittsburgh to Cairo through a series of locks and dams that totalled 53 in 1929 when the project was dedicated.

In 1898, the Monongahela Navigation Company facilities were purchased by the Federal Government and the tolls were lifted. In succeeding years, the Corps completed canalization of the Monongahela River from the Pennsylvania line to the headwaters above Fairmont, West Virginia, and rebuilt all of the Navigation Company's original locks. Canalization of the Allegheny River also began at the turn of the century, reaching upriver to Lock and Dam No. 9 by 1938, and providing 72 miles of slackwater as far as the Bradys Bend area.

Today, there are now more than 300 miles of river improved for commercial navigation in the Pittsburgh Engineer District.

Flood control measures

In 1911, the Pittsburgh Flood Commission recommended a plan for flood control reservoirs; and predicted that, without them, Pittsburgh would some day experience a flood stage of 43 feet. In March 1936, a flood stage of 46 feet was reached.

Since 1936, the Pittsburgh Engineer District has constructed and is operating 13 multi-purpose flood control reservoirs in the Beaver, Allegheny, and Monongahela Basins. The cost of this 13-dam flood control system has been approximately 280 million dollars. To date, however, it is estimated that this system has prevented flood damage in excess of half a billion dollars.

Plans for further flood protection for Pittsburgh and other communities in the Pittsburgh Engineer District include three reservoirs in the French Creek Basin in Pennsylvania and two in West Virginia, one on the Cheat River and one on the West Fork River. In Pennsylvania a major reservoir on the Clarion River is proposed in the current Appalachia Study.

The District has also completed some 35 local flood protection projects involving widening, deepening, and straightening a stream; building flood wall and/or dykes; the construction of cut-off channels; or various combinations of these methods to contain a troublesome stream within its banks and thereby eliminate a flood problem.

The environment

At no other time in our history have so many people been conscious of the value of our natural scenic areas and realized the need for clean, unpolluted water. Unfortunately, population growth and the expansion of our economy has led to the widespread deterioration of our natural water resources.

While the Corps of Engineers is taking steps to improve the situation, much of what has been done is already contributing to this objective. The 18 flood impoundment reservoirs built by the Corps in the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Beaver River basins not only have reduce flood damage and enhanced the river environment of this region, but the government lands around the reservoirs also provide protected forest and open areas where the natural habitat can flourish and

be rebuilt safe from outside interference. Together with the extensive reservoir lakes, these areas provide refuge for wildlife and recreation and scenic enjoyment for people.

Eight of the reservoirs, in addition to their flood control purposes, also help to improve the water quality in our rivers by providing additional water flow for areas where either water quality or flow is critical.

Current studies

Current work in the District involves two comprehensive basin studies; one in the Youghiogheny River Basin, and one in the Monongahela River Basin. Public meetings are being held throughout these basins to develop problem areas and needs that are related to water resources and land use. Each study will require a minimum of five years to complete.

Flood plan studies have become a continuing work item in the District. The studies are conducted by the District when requested by a community through the state. Comprehensive reports compiled as the result of such studies have definite value for purposes of zoning in flood plains by regional planning boards and other groups.

PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

In order to ensure that wastes are adequately treated before being dumped into our rivers and streams, the Clean Streams Law requires that all industrial operations, mining operations, and municipalities in the Commonwealth obtain a permit before discharging new or increased loads of waste water into the waters of the Commonwealth. The responsibility for administering the Clean Streams Program, and seeing that the best interests of the people of Pennsylvania are served, rests with Pennsylvania's Department of Environmental Resources. In the continuing struggle against pollution, the policies of the Department of Environmental Resources are designed to ultimately return all of Pennsylvania's rivers and streams to a clean, unpolluted condition and prevent future pollution.

Since the control and elimination of water pollution is a highly complex and technical business, the cooperative effort of people of many different skills are required. More than a hundred of such technical and professional people serve in the Department's Bureau of Sanitary Engineering. Included are sanitary engineers, mine drainage engineers, chemists, biologists, geologists, laboratory technicians, and environmental protection specialists. Their activities vary from making regular inspections to preparing comprehensive river basin programs.

Environmental protection specialists make regular checks of mines and industrial and municipal waste treatment plants to make certain that they are complying with the state's Clean Streams Law. Samples of plant discharges are taken and sent to the Department's laboratory in Harrisburg for analysis. Hundreds of stream samples and waste discharge samples are analyzed by chemists and technicians each week. Analysis determines which chemical characteristics of the water have been altered by its prior use, and the degree of waste treatment that is needed. Aircraft and boat patrols supplement the "on-foot" program.

The number and kinds of fish, aquatic plants, and fish food organisms in streams, lakes, and reservoirs respond significantly to changes in water quality. By analyzing the biological life as well as the chemical and physical conditions of surface waters, the Department's aquatic biologists can determine whether or not pollution is occurring, and to what degree. Such analyses are an important means of evaluating the effectiveness of a water pollution control and abatement program.

In order to make certain that the quality of Pennsylvania's rivers and streams remains

high, the Department operates a 175-station water quality network. Water samples are taken regularly at each station and analyzed in order to evaluate the progress of the Clean Streams Program. This information is also made available to potential municipal and industrial water users.

While all of the professional people engaged in water pollution control are college graduates, their learning never stops. Each person—professional and technical—receives many hours of additional in-service training designed to acquaint him with the responsibilities of his position and the latest knowledge in his particular field. In addition, these college graduates are encouraged to study for higher technical degrees. The Department of Environmental Resources also conducts and stimulates research programs aimed at discovering new knowledge which will help protect Pennsylvania's waterways from the many kinds of waste and pollution.

But rivers know no political boundaries. They flow wherever nature decides—from city to city and often from state to state. This makes the problem of pollution of streams between states one of mutual concern. Pennsylvania cooperates, therefore, with other neighboring states in solving water pollution and water management problems on a drainage basin basis. Through compacts, Pennsylvania has joined four interstate agencies representing 14 states, the District of Columbia, and the Federal Government. The objective of these agencies is to prevent the discharge of wastes in one state that would affect the interests of other states.

Pennsylvania is also represented on the Lake Erie Pollution Abatement Advisory Board of the International Joint Commission. The function of this board is to provide for cooperation between Canada and the United States in controlling the pollution of Lake Erie.

Even though the last half-century has seen a gradual increase in the role of federal, interstate, and state governments in the water pollution control field, it is still the people who must ultimately pay the price for clean water—through taxes and through the cost of products and services they purchase. Much progress is being made, but much work remains to be done.

Reports of pollution, fish kills, and similar complaints should be made to the Regional Sanitary Engineer's Office in Pittsburgh for Region V, (Allegheny, Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Indiana, Washington, and Westmoreland counties). Reports may be made to the Chief or the Field Supervisor of the Operations Section at the address listed on the back cover.

PENNSYLVANIA FISH COMMISSION

Having celebrated 100 years of conservation progress in 1966, the Pennsylvania Fish Commission is now moving into its second century of continuous operation. During its long existence, the Commission has grown from a one-man operation into an agency employing over 300 people concerned with conservation and protection of our fisheries and waterways.

Initially, the fisheries program was supported by legislative appropriations. In 1921, however a fishing license fee was established and the revenues derived became the source of financial support for the work of the Commission. Since then, these license dollars have not only paid for the operation and maintenance of a program to perpetuate fishing resources, but have financed the construction of nine fish hatcheries, and have paid for the acquisition and construction of over 400 acres of lakes and more than 100 public access areas on fishing and boating waters. In fact, the present day assets of the Fish Commission are estimated to be around 50 million dollars.

Much of the credit for the Commission's record goes to its dedicated, hardworking,

waterways patrolmen. Even though law enforcement, pollution, mine drainage, farm pond projects, channel changes, stream improvements, and drawdowns make large demands on each patrolman's time, he also attends hundreds of sportmen's clubs, civic, church, and school meetings in his area each year; conducts fishing schools and safe boating classes, and provides visual aids to these groups. Yet he is ever ready and available to offer personal assistance, advice, and guidance to fisherman and boaters.

Pollution control and inspection of sources is an important job for the waterways patrolman. Maintaining clean, clear water for fishing and for enjoyable boating is vital to outdoor recreation. Dumping of refuse from all sources can damage boat hulls, props, and engines; and pollution can kill thousands of fish. Fish kills should be reported at once so that an immediate investigation can be made.

Fighting pollution is one job where everyone can help. Proper collection of samples of suspected polluted waters above, at, and below the source usually can be done by any person. This information, turned over to the waterways patrolman, can help pinpoint the source of pollution. And one of the biggest problems at the 42 lakes and 150 access areas, maintained and serviced by the Commission's maintenance crew, is littering by fishermen and boaters. Use of trash containers provided at these sites would be a big help. An enlightened, pollution-conscious public is one of the best deterrents to pollution.

Each year, the Fish Commission propagates and distributes about 30 million fish from its eleven State Hatcheries and the National Hatchery. Included are trout, coho salmon, muskellunge, northern pike, and other species suitable for the various waters stocked.

In Allegheny County, Deer Creek and Pine Creek have now been surveyed and approved for trout stocking; and Bull Creek is being seriously considered. Also, carp and brown bullheads have been stocked in Peters Creek following an extensive survey there.

Pike Run in Washington County has also been approved for trout stocking—the first in that general area. An extensive survey of Pigeon Creek was also made, but a favorable stocking recommendation could not be made due to serious pollution.

Pollution also remains a serious problem on the Youghiogheny River, and no formal stocking program was recommended for the river for that reason.

Fish Commission personnel have also worked with the Water Quality Office in conducting fish surveys in several lock chambers in the three rivers as part of a four-year program to correlate fish population with water quality.

If pollution abatement measures become more effective in the Three Rivers area, the Commission will definitely institute new fish management, including stocking programs. And if pollution can be controlled in the three rivers, there is no question but what they, too, will be stocked. In fact, the Commission believes that these stretches of river would become self-managing with the exception of some of the more exotic species such as the esocids (pike family).

The passage of strong anti-pollution legislation and the effects of long-range pollution abatement programs have brought into use miles of formerly "dead" water for fishing and boating use. And in a period of less than ten years—from 1966 to 1975—the acreage of fishable lake areas in Pennsylvania will all but have doubled, going from 57,000 acres to about 111,000 acres. Many of the impoundments are already complete or under construction; and land is being acquired with construction scheduled in the near future for others.

The Pennsylvania Fish Commission is constantly looking ahead, planning, and building, for a greatly expanded development of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

our fishing and boating areas—so that all Pennsylvanians can enjoy healthy, relaxing, outdoor recreation.

ALLEGHENY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Water protection

In its efforts to safeguard the water supply in Allegheny County the Health Department periodically inspects and samples the water in swimming pools, private homes and milk and food establishments, and investigates complaints about public water supplies. Public health engineers also inspect sewage treatment and disposal facilities throughout the County.

To insure compliance with State and County health standards, each of the County's sewage treatment plants is inspected quarterly. The Department issues abatement orders against violations of Pennsylvania Clean Streams and Sanitary Water Board regulations and seeks compliance through the courts.

Plans for new sewage disposal systems are reviewed for permits by Department engineers. Facilities include sewage treatment plants, sewer and sewer line extensions and septic tank systems.

The Department also reviews plans for water supply and sewage disposal systems on lots slated for land development. The County has a comprehensive 10-year sewerage plan for Allegheny County.

During 1970, public health engineers participated in a U.S. Department of Agriculture survey, which will provide useful information in planning sewerage.

Field staff inspects watering points where river boats, airlines and railroads trains take on potable water supplies.

Solid waste disposal

New rules for solid waste control adopted by Allegheny County Commissioners in September, 1969 imposed rigorous uniform restrictions on trash hauling and disposal facilities.

To upgrade operating procedures and eliminate health hazards, the Health Department stepped up enforcement at disposal sites in the County. Field staff makes inspections, issues abatement orders, conducts administrative hearings with owners, and files criminal complaints in magistrate's court.

Compliance is sought on these main points; adequate soil cover; compliance with State Sanitary Water Board rules covering underground seepage into nearby streams; surface water drainage; control of windborne litter; elimination of rodent and insect harborage.

CITY OF PITTSBURGH

Department of water

While Pittsburgh's Department of Water is deeply concerned with the water quality in all of the rivers and streams of our area, its principal concern is the Allegheny River from which the city of Pittsburgh draws its water supply.

Between the time it is taken from the river and the time it arrives at your water faucet, this water must undergo extensive treatment to make it fit for human consumption. Most of this processing takes place in a group of buildings located on the Allegheny River adjacent to Aspinwall Borough. In this building complex are the Ross Pumping Station (which also houses the Chemical Center), the Clarifier, the new Rapid Sand Filtration Plant, and the underground Filtered Water Reservoir.

The new Rapid Sand Filtration Plant, erected at a cost of over ten million dollars and dedicated on November 25, 1969, is designed to accommodate expanded future water needs. It replaces the old slow sand filter beds which were located directly across Freeport Road from the new plant. Located on the second level of the Filtration building is the focal point of the complex—the Operations Center. This Center contains a lab-

oratory with its service rooms, and instrument room containing automatic controls and recording devices, general and private offices, and assembly and conference rooms for accommodating visitors and officials.

Water preparation

The preparation process starts at the Ross Pumping Station where raw water is pumped from the river at the rate of 80 million gallons a day. As the water passes from the Ross Pumping Station to the Clarifier, chemical solutions are added to it by the Chemical Center which feeds chemical additives automatically into the water at this and various other locations during the preparation process.

The primary function of the Clarifier is to remove the heavier particles from the water. In the rapid mix basin at the Clarifier, the Chemical Center feeds Chlorine, Alum, Lime, Permanganate, Clay, Coagulant Aid and Carbon into the water, in that order. The water next moves to the slow mix flocculator, and then into settling basins. After being collected in weir troughs, the water flows into the Rapid Sand Filtration Plant where additional chlorine solution is added. (This process will be altered in the future with the completion of cleaning and rehabilitation of the detention basins formerly used with the slow sand filters. In the altered process, water from the Clarifier will flow to the detention basins for further detention and settling, then go to the Rapid Sand Filtration Plant.)

The filtration area consists of 18 double filter beds with the design capability of producing 117 million gallons of filtered water a day. Periodic cleansing of the filter beds is accomplished by a back-washing process. The filtered water then flows into the underground Filtered Water Reservoir. It is at this point that a tooth decay preventative, hydrofluosilicic and soda ash acid, are introduced into the water. These additives complete the water preparation process.

Water Distribution

The water is now pumped to high elevated storage facilities so as to create a natural gravity distribution system. The primary distribution system starts with the Aspinwall Pumping Station located adjacent to the Filtration Plant, and the Brilliant Pumping Station across the river. The Aspinwall Pumping Station has a capacity of 86 million gallons a day and pump its water to the Lanpher Reservoir located on Friday Road in Shaler Township at an elevation of 971 feet. The Brilliant Pumping Station has a capacity of 184 million gallons a day and pumps its water to Highland Reservoir No. 1 (elevation 1,062 feet) and Highland Reservoir No. 2 (elevation 972 feet) in Highland Park. Together, these three reservoirs have a total capacity of approximately 400 million gallons. The water stored in these reservoirs feeds into the secondary distribution system and, except for further chlorination, is ready for human consumption.

In the secondary distribution system, seven pumping stations pump water to four reservoirs and six elevated tanks. The seven stations have a total pumping capacity of 100 million gallons a day. The reservoirs will hold 30 million gallons, and the tanks a total of 18 million gallons. These storage facilities feed water into approximately five million feet of pipeline containing pipe ranging from 2 inches to 8 feet in diameter. Also included in this vast distribution system are 7,500 fire hydrants and 30,000 gate valves.

This, then, is the system that takes raw Allegheny River water and turns it into a potable water supply for the city of Pittsburgh, and which also provides the city with water for fire protection.

TRIAD's address is Post Office Box 886, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230 and their telephone number is area code (412) 391-8702.

METROPOLITAN CHALLENGES
FOR 1971

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have attempted to understand the problems confronting urban America find ourselves in agreement on one significant point—there can be no resolution to the problems which beset metropolitan America until we can find the means for dealing with the fragmentation of political institutions which is common to our Nation's metropolitan areas.

The National Service to Regional Councils was initiated by the National League of Cities and National Association of Counties in 1967. It was incorporated in 1968 and since that time has played an increasingly important role in assisting and supporting a growing number of regional councils in every corner of the Nation. The National Service provides advice and guidance to regional councils at the local level and provides a mechanism through which such councils can articulate their views and objectives in regard to national programs and policies.

Earlier this week it was my pleasure to take part in the Fifth Annual Conference of the National Service to Regional Councils at New Orleans. I shared a general session on the subject of "Land Use" with Michael Cafferty, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems in the U.S. Department of Transportation. Mr. Cafferty's comments on "Metropolitan Challenges for 1971" outline efforts within the Department of Transportation to provide the means for strengthening local government and for promoting metropolitan approaches to problem solving. His remarks have real relevance for all of us who are aware of the vital need for institutional innovation as a step toward the resolution of urban problems:

METROPOLITAN CHALLENGES FOR 1971

I am delighted to be here representing Secretary Volpe at the Fifth Annual Conference of your young and growing association of regional councils. I have two messages this morning. First, 1971 will be a year of unprecedented challenges to metropolitan organizations. Second, you have a friend in the Department of Transportation to help you meet these challenges. The challenges I speak of include Federal revenue sharing, responding to the National Environmental Policy Act within the context of the A-95 process, and organizing for effective land-use and urban transportation planning. The friend I speak of is the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems. This office is devoted expressly to strengthening local government and to building a metropolitan approach to problem solving, including those dealing with the environment, land-use and transportation.

In meeting with you this morning, I want to discuss four major recent developments at the Federal level which have grave implications for the metropolitan organizations which this group represents.

First, let me discuss President Nixon's

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Revenue Sharing Plan and Secretary Volpe's recent work in defining the "transportation" part of that plan. As you know, the President's revenue sharing plan is aimed at strengthening State and local government and at moving the focus for decision-making out of Washington to local levels. The President's General Revenue Sharing Plan provides—in 1972, if enacted—a full year allocation of \$5 billion to States and localities, while six broad Special Revenue Sharing plans will provide \$11 billion of shared revenues for: (1) Rural Community Development; (2) Urban Community Development; (3) Education; (4) Manpower Training; (5) Law Enforcement; and (6) Transportation. I would like to comment briefly on the transportation portion of that plan and particularly on how urban areas can benefit from it.

Under Special Revenue Sharing, \$2.6 billion would be available to develop balanced transportation systems serving local urban and rural areas. Special provision for passing Federal funds through the States are yet to be worked out. I suggest that your organization may well be one to lead the support for including generous "pass through" provision. "Pass through" will assure that local governments receive an equitable share of this fund and that they will be provided with the tools it needs to solve its own problem. Federal funding for the Interstate Highway System will be maintained separate from other transportation funds until completion of the system.

You might well ask what this development has to do with the future of regional councils. I suggest to you today that it places upon local elected officials, local government, and regional agencies a new and heavy burden. The burden will be the job of building institutions and of coordinating the planning and decision process, without direct Federal strings and incentives for guaranteeing that this is done. It seems to me that this must be done even if Revenue Sharing is not given immediate Congressional approval.

Secondly, agencies such as yours face a new challenge in regard to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. All of you are somewhat familiar with this landmark legislation I'm sure, but just let me make a few comments on it.

With this legislation, the Congress has, for the first time, attempted to treat government actions and a broad range of environmental values. The policies, plans, regulations and public laws which agencies propose are required to give positive consideration of their impact upon the environment in which they operate. To this end, all agencies of the Federal establishment and their state and local constituent agencies are required to:

(1) "utilize a systematic, interdisciplinary approach which will insure the integrated use of the natural and social sciences and the environmental design arts in planning and in decision making which may have an impact on man's environment."

(2) "identify and develop methods and procedures, in consultation with the Council on Environmental Quality established by this Act, which will insure that presently unquantified environmental amenities and values may be given appropriate consideration in decision making along with economic and technical considerations."

The Council on Environmental Quality has been working with all agencies in an effort to identify and develop those methods and procedures which will make it possible to insure that what we call "unquantified environmental amenities and values" are given equal consideration in design planning equal to that given to cost benefit and technological feasibility. Further, in proposing legislation or in "other major Federal actions" which significantly affect the environment, Federal agencies must prepare and submit to the Council on Environmental Quality statements on environmental impact before they

March 17, 1971

submit legislation to the Congress or before they approve or move forward on Federal programs and projects. This is called "the 102 Statement" and it is designed to factor environmental considerations into the process early enough to make intelligent choice a possibility.

This "102 Statement" must set forth:

(1) the environmental impact of the proposed action;

(2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;

(3) alternatives to the proposed action;

(4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and

(5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

Obviously, this is pervasive legislation. There have already been cases where implementation of the Environmental Policy Act has required painful readjustments in the old ways of doing business.

Until now, project sponsors have circulated their "102 Statements" to local, State and Federal agencies having an interest or jurisdiction over some phase of the project. Effective April 1, 1971, Revised OMB Circular A-95 authorizes and encourages the use of A-95 agencies as the appropriate vehicle for recurring State and local inputs to their statements.

Agencies such as yours will be provided with the opportunity to coordinate the comments on the environmental impact of Federal and Federally funded projects from the viewpoint of State and local concerns.

This is a powerful new tool which has significant long range implications to you and your staff. We in the Department of Transportation view this as a significant step forward in providing local and metropolitan officials with the tools they need to control the destiny of their areas.

Your participation and your consideration of environmental issues will be required at an early stage in the planning of projects which may have—in either the short or the long term—an environmental impact. The Department is proud of the record which it is establishing in this area. We seek your support and your guidance in maintaining that record. We offer you ours as you enter this new arena of action.

The third topic that I want to discuss relates to my second, and reorganizes the fact that environmental issues are really issues of proper land-use planning.

Nationally, there has been considerable interest and activity this year in the area of land-use planning. President Nixon included a Land Use Policy Act as part of his new broad program of environmental legislation.

Three weeks ago, in his annual report on the state of the Nation's environment, President Nixon stated that:

"The use of our land not only affects the natural environment but shapes the pattern of our daily lives. Unfortunately, the use of our land is often thwarted by the inability of the many competing and overlapping local units of government to control land use decisions which have regional significance."

The Administration's Land Use Legislation would establish a National Land Use Policy to encourage the States, in cooperation with local governments, to plan for and regulate development affecting growth and the use of critical land areas. Further, the Bill would encourage State governments to find ways to protect lands of critical environmental concern, to control large-scale development, and to improve the use of lands around key facilities and new communities.

During the last session of the Congress, Senator Jackson, Chairman of the Senate

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, introduced a National Land Use Policy Act which differs slightly in emphasis from the Administration Bill. Senator Jackson would require States to develop State-wide land use plans but would not require actual State control of or regulation of land. Senator Jackson's Bill moved forward but was not passed. Both of these Bills will be considered by Congress during the current session and there seems to be a good possibility that a National Land Use Policy will be enacted this year.

We in the Department of Transportation are enthusiastic in our support of this strong emphasis on land use planning. We have long maintained that there should be a closer integration of land use and transportation. Transportation systems should be used to further and to promote land use decisions made at both the State and metropolitan level. This would facilitate transportation planning and it might eliminate many of the conflicts which have arisen in the past between particular transportation projects and their land use implications.

My fourth and final topic relates to urban transportation planning, a subject with which most of you are involved daily.

Last year, the Executive Office of the President requested the Department of Transportation to evaluate the existing urban transportation planning process, and to make recommendations for improvement, if necessary.

This is an outgrowth of Section 134 of the 1962 Federal Aid Highway Act which required that every urban area of over 50,000 in population have a comprehensive coordinated continuing transportation plan.

In the past studies such as this have focused on the problem from the Federal level and have primarily involved highway transportation interests. Our study, however, is different. It has taken a non-Federal perspective, has involved other Federal agencies, such as HUD and the Office of Management and Budget, and it has crossed modal transportation lines to include all forms of transportation. As part of the study, questionnaires were sent to 40 key mayors across the country, to 25 councils of government, to the 50 State Highway Directors; and to over 233 urban transportation planning agencies; 96 percent responded and provided a remarkable body of opinion on the urban transportation planning process as we know it.

In addition to the questionnaire, I personally visited 10 major metropolitan areas to discuss the study, the evaluation with elected officials, with professional staff and with public-interested groups. We sponsored, along with the American Institute of Planners, six three-day conferences in other major metropolitan areas. Each State Department of Transportation now operating has been brought up-to-date on our efforts. We have discussed the study with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, with the National League of Cities, the National Governors Conference, the National Service to Regional Councils, with groups similar to these, and with professional associations of highway engineers, of planners, of architects, and of public administrators. In short, we have attempted to make our recommendations on the basis of the broadest possible frame of reference.

In addition to the foregoing, our office has sponsored a comprehensive series of research projects expressly aimed at providing further insight into existing urban transportation planning and with a view toward improving that planning process. Our research program—which incidentally was carried out by nationally recognized consultants—was likewise oriented toward State and local officials. It, too, involved countless discussions with governors, mayors, and legislators all over the country.

Our projects were concerned with devel-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

oping an improved urban transportation planning process, which would reflect the impact of the National Environment Policy Act, and with improved citizen and political participation in transportation planning.

All of these sources of data and opinion are reflected in our study of the urban transportation planning process. We have found that urban transportation planning, as required under the 1962 Highway Act, has performed well as the first major Federal effort to stimulate joint State/local planning for land use, transportation and highways. Further, it has functioned—to some degree—at least, in each of the Nation's 233 urbanized areas.

The "3C Process" as it is called—Comprehensive, Coordinated, Continuing—has been the primary stimulus for the development of improved planning techniques and procedures. It has been the means by which data have been acquired for transportation planning decisions. In many instances, it has been effective in strengthening relationships among the individual communities in urbanized areas and between these areas and State governments.

Further, the process has provided a constant and fairly adequate source of Federal funds for planning at the State and local levels. In fact, over 60 percent of all Federal funds spent for transportation and land use planning at these levels comes from the Department of Transportation as part of this process.

At the same time, I think I would be less than frank if I did not say that, by and large, the urban transportation planning process—as we know it—has generated plans that are mere reaffirmations of plans that most highway departments have developed 20 or so years ago, long prior to the initiation of the 1962 Highway Act planning requirement. This suggests to me that the question of need for, and impact of the transportation plan has probably not been as thoroughly re-examined as called for in the 1962 Highway Act.

Few of the transportation plans which resulted from this process contained significant provisions for public transportation; even fewer, for service to planned new airports, for consideration of railroad facilities, for local street improvements, for parking or for the like. This was largely due to the lack of implementation funds and to a concentration on regional transportation needs—as opposed to total transportation needs—but, nevertheless, the problem remains the same.

To extend this thought, the limitation on funding sources has also tended to minimize consideration of innovative transportation solutions particularly as they might relate to new technology and joint development with other urban improvements.

In another area, while the comprehensive transportation planning process did establish elaborate committee structures of elected officials, technicians, and citizens, the conduct of the process itself was largely in response to the interests of the highway technicians. There is no evidence that either elected officials or private citizens have influenced the process significantly. An opportunity was there, but I find little evidence that the plans which came forward reflected anything more than a highway—rather than a transportation—solution.

The urban transportation planning process, to date, has not made significant progress toward comprehending, much less analyzing the physical, social, and environmental impact of transportation plans on urban areas. The results of the urban planning process—as we know it—continue to be influenced largely by traffic considerations.

In this respect, we could all probably agree that little exists in the way of information or planning techniques, pertaining to the environment and its interrelationship with

transportation and other physical facilities. Too little research has been done to determine how transportation and other physical improvements can be assessed objectively in light of their social, environmental and aesthetic impacts.

Then, too, there is the problem of defining the term "environment" and of measuring the trade-off between environmental and economic and technical considerations.

Consider these six additional points:

Although no one knows for sure, we think that about \$200 million has been spent on urban transportation planning since 1958 or so. An expensive process and what have we gotten for our money?

Most urban transportation studies take talented researchers from three to six years to develop recommendations. It behooves us to shorten the process if we can.

There is a semantic problem. Requirements for Federal planning, even the definitions used in transportation planning, differ among Federal agencies. This is another source of confusion and inefficiency.

For too long urban transportation planners have not focused on the analysis of existing plans and programs. They should. The fact that a transit or highway agency has programmed a project for 10 or 15 years need not mean that it should not be re-examined. The opposite may well be true, that all transportation plans should be re-examined critically and on a continuing basis and in light of prevailing knowledge, particularly as community goals and values may change. As a matter of fact, the longer a plan is on the books without being implemented the more I am inclined to suspect its viability.

Let me cite an example. The transportation system—both freeways and transit routes—for a large Eastern metropolitan area was fixed in concept in the 1940's. In spite of the fact there was general agreement that community goals had changed over the years, it took an act of political courage by the Governor of the State to say—as he did, in 1970—that the system didn't satisfy the current needs of the area. He recommended that work toward the system be suspended; it should not have been necessary for him to make such recommendations. The transportation planning process should be designed so as to accommodate and meet changing goals.

Finally, urban transportation planning has never been linked very closely with project planning. By and large, current urban transportation planning has little to do with when or where a particular transportation improvement will be made. It has even less to do with the broader elements of the design of such a project. We must correct this.

In recent years, urban transportation planning has concentrated almost exclusively on problems at the regional level. Such problems certainly need to be addressed but not to the exclusion of local transport problems.

In short, urban transportation planning today is a complex technical process of traffic demand forecasting. It should be a process leading to action, to total transportation and to urban improvement. Some of you may say I've been too critical of the process. If so, it is because I believe in its importance. I also believe that it is absolutely necessary for those who are involved in the process to continually appraise its usefulness and its relevance.

This evaluation of Section 134 study has suggested that the urban transportation planning process is a viable one which improved, could do much not only toward solving our Nation's urban transportation problems, but also toward improving the quality of life in urban areas.

I would say that five major conclusions emerge as the basis for improvement in the "3C" process. These conclusions, roughly in their order of importance, follow:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

First, institutionally we have long maintained that transportation must be planned on a metropolitan basis as one integral part of regional development planning. Even so only marginal progress has been made in providing, within our constitutional system, a mechanism for doing this and for giving all elements of government and society equitable access to this mechanism.

Second, technically, though the urban transportation planning process has evolved into the most sophisticated of all urban planning processes, there are areas where improvement can and should be made.

We must consider local as well as regional transportation needs for all modes.

We must assess environmental, social, and aesthetic factors, as well as economic and traffic factors as they relate to transportation facilities.

We must determine the degree to which planned transportation facilities further other defined goals and objectives.

Third, Federal definitions for urban transportation planning must be modified in both institutional and technical terms to recognize emerging planning frameworks. For several years, urban transportation planning has consisted of two levels of planning—regional system planning and detailed project planning—with most significant decisions made at the project scale. The emergence and success of the "Design Concept Team" has suggested the desirability of a third, a middle planning level. Official recognition of this concept as part of the planning framework could stimulate effective urban transportation planning.

By providing a focus for citizen participation,

For joint development planning,

For an improved response to the Environmental Policy Act, and

For the use of multidisciplinary design talents.

Fourth, an institutional approach, the urban transportation planning process must be tied more closely to transportation program decisionmaking. We must heighten existing efforts to insure that planning leads to action.

Fifth and finally, we must face a problem which emerges from improved Federal planning, capital funding for public transit and airports, and the development of State DOT's. The Federal DOT must develop a focal point within its structure for urban transportation planning to include the technical and financial aspects of such planning.

Where do we go from here? Given the mandates of Federally funded transportation programs, how do we improve urban transportation planning.

Given transportation as an urban function which can disrupt community life as well as shape community form and structure, how can we make it a positive force?

I think our studies have identified three goals. Improvements in urban transportation planning must:

Enhance and strengthen State and local governmental institutions so that they can respond to the expressed needs and desires of all elements of society;

Be conducive to the implementation of a fully coordinated intermodal transportation system; and

Provide transportation the maximum opportunity for serving as the catalyst for better urban development and a higher quality of urban life.

Lofty goals? Yes. Practical objectives? Yes, again. On the basis of these findings, we are now in the final process of preparing our specific recommendations to the Secretary.

The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Environment and Urban Systems believes that progress has been made. We must continue our efforts on urban transportation planning to guarantee metropolitan areas a real capability for making their own choices, to be masters of their own destiny, if you

will. This requires a strong, cooperative effort by Federal, State and local authorities. We welcome your views.

It is important that each of these four areas which I have discussed are designed to lead to change—change in the way we look at our problems and change in the way we seek their resolution. That's not just change, I think that's progress.

ALASKAN PIPELINE LETTER TO SECRETARY MORTON

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

MR. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, below is a letter which I, along with 38 other Members of the House and seven Senators, have sent to Secretary of Interior Rogers Morton. The letter expresses our grave reservations about the adequacy of the draft environmental impact statement on the proposed trans-Alaska pipeline.

The letter follows:

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of the Interior,
Interior Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY MORTON: We would like to express to you our deep concern over the advisability of proceeding with the construction of the Trans-Alaskan pipeline. We are, and must remain, opposed to the granting of any further permits for the construction of the pipeline: (1) Until the very grave ecological problems that constructing the pipeline pose to the Alaskan wilderness have been adequately considered and resolved, and (2) until the rights and welfare of the Alaska Natives have been fully protected.

It was clear from much of the testimony at the Interior Department's pipeline hearings that the draft of the Department's Environmental Impact Statement failed to adequately consider the basic environmental questions involved in the proposed pipeline. Indeed, many statements contained in previous reports and memos of Interior Department officials flatly contradicted the Impact Statement's unsupported conclusion that "The proposed pipeline system would not result in any significant adverse environmental effects that can be related to present or future cultural features of most Alaskans."

Among the more basic environmental questions that the Impact Statement failed to confront was the possibility of an oil spill resulting either from one of the numerous earthquakes common to the area over which the proposed pipeline would go, or from a pipeline break due to the melting and collapse of the permafrost in areas where the pipeline would be built underground. In the words of an Interior Department official:

"With miles between shutoff valves, any rupture would be catastrophic, no matter where it occurred." (Memo, "Proposed Pipeline Stipulations," July 7, 1969, p. 2.)

Unfortunately, neither this statement nor similar ones made by Interior officials was even alluded to in the Impact Statement's conclusion.

The Impact Statement was equally disappointing in its failure to consider the impact the pipeline would have on native Alaskan cultures—both Indian and Eskimo. These natives' very existence depends on maintaining the delicate ecological balance of the land—which could be disastrously affected by an oil spill. It is virtually certain that even under optimum conditions, the construction of the pipeline would significantly alter many natives' way of life. We urge you, at the minimum, to require that the following three

March 17, 1971

stipulations be included in any agreement reached with the pipeline company (Alyeska) to insure that the natives receive both fair treatment and fair compensation:

(1) That Alyeska must agree to specific stipulations guaranteeing the natives indemnification for any economic losses they incur as a result of a pipeline break or as a result of other extraordinary damage caused by the pipeline. At present, the stipulations require the companies to indemnify only the U.S. Government for any damage, and then, only for the cost of "cleaning up." It is indeed difficult to understand why the companies should object to such a stipulation if the pipeline is as safe as they say it is.

(2) That Alyeska be required to enter into an agreement with the natives regarding job recruitment, training, placement, and conditions in relation to the pipeline. In its present form, Draft Stipulation C is inadequate because it is vague and because it requires Alyeska to reach agreement only with the Secretary of the Interior, but not with the natives themselves.

(3) That Alyeska agree to compensate the natives for the effect that the construction both the pipeline and the haul road will have on their lands and on their traditional way of life. So far, the pipeline company has refused to make any agreement with the native villages along the pipeline route to compensate them for the inevitable and permanent damage that will certainly occur to many of the natives' traditional hunting and fishing sites.

As a trustee for these Alaska Natives, we urge you to insure that their interests and rights are fully protected if and when the pipeline is to be built. We were greatly encouraged by the statements concerning the pipeline that you made before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee last week. We applaud your recognition that the environmental problems related to the pipeline have not been adequately dealt with.

We believe the only sensible solution to the pipeline issue is the delay of the pipeline construction until we have the best possible assurance that, first, the damage to the environment will be absolutely minimal and, second, that the rights of the human beings in its path are fully protected. This could take five, ten, twenty, or more years. But the fact that the environmental sciences are now only in their infant state, and are likely to develop significantly in the future, is an additional argument for its postponement.

We would very much appreciate receiving your reactions to the specific points contained in our letter.

Thank you very much for your attention,
With kind regards,

COSIGNERS OF LETTER TO SECRETARY MORTON

Rep. Aspin, Wisconsin, Rep. Abourezk, South Dakota, Rep. Abzug, New York, Rep. Ashley, Ohio, Rep. Badillo, New York, Rep. Brademas, Indiana, Rep. Broomfield, Michigan, Rep. Dellums, California, Rep. Diggs, Michigan, Rep. Drinan, Massachusetts, Rep. Edwards, California, Rep. William Ford, Michigan, Rep. Grasso, Connecticut.

Rep. Halpern, New York, Rep. Hamilton, Indiana, Rep. Harrington, Massachusetts, Rep. Hathaway, Maine, Rep. Howard, New Jersey, Rep. Kastenmeier, Wisconsin, Rep. Long, Maryland, Rep. Matsunaga, Hawaii, Rep. Mikva, Illinois, Rep. Minish, New Jersey, Rep. Mink, Hawaii, Rep. Mitchell, Maryland.

Rep. Mosher, Ohio, Rep. Nedzi, Michigan, Rep. Obey, Wisconsin, Rep. O'Neill, Massachusetts, Rep. Rees, California, Rep. Rooney, Pennsylvania, Rep. Rosenthal, New York, Rep. Roy, Kansas, Rep. Scheuer, New York, Rep. Seiberling, Ohio, Rep. Stokes, Ohio, Rep. Tierman, Rhode Island, Rep. Vanik, Ohio, Rep. Walde, California.

Senator Brooke, Massachusetts, Senator Harris, Oklahoma, Senator Hart, Michigan, Senator Kennedy, Massachusetts, Senator McGovern, South Dakota, Senator Nelson, Wisconsin, Senator Proxmire, Wisconsin.

FALLOUT BENEFITS

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the SST is one of the most advanced high-performance supersonic cruise airplanes, either civil or military, in development in the United States today. Combining this performance with commercial standards of safety, durability, reliability, and economy means that the SST program must perfect thousands of components and details that have never been built before.

I would like to point out that technological fallout benefits begin to accrue immediately with the start of a new, technically challenging program. Experience with the SST's GE-4 engine shows how this process unfolds.

To launch the initial GE-4 design, the latest concepts and technology from General Electric's J-93 military engine, which powered the XB-70 bomber provided a base. But performance and fuel economy required higher turbine inlet temperatures, improved turbine blade cooling, and new, better materials.

Work on improving the SST engine beyond the XB-70 engine then permitted GE to use new turbine technology for their TF-39 engine that powers the Air Force's C-5A. The TF-39 basic design was then adapted to the CF-6 engine for the McDonnell-Douglas DC-10. Using cross-fertilization from all these engines, GE has proceeded on to the development of a new military engine, the F-101 for the B-1 strategic bomber.

The SST engine also provided a new high-temperature rotor disk material named René 95. The improved annular combustor, which is used in the SST engine, is now used in all GE designs. It delivers more performance and durability at lower fabrication costs than previous combustors. The SST engine program has contributed to development of René 63 and 80 high temperature alloys, new improved titanium alloys, and advanced manufacturing processes.

Boeing's SST program has already contributed significantly to technology in general, as well as to aviation technology. A major, broad benefit has been developed in conjunction with the U.S. Air Force of the voluminous Titanium handbook and other standard references for titanium design properties and design allowables. This information forms the basic foundation for titanium design in new projects including military aircraft such as the F-14 and F-15. SST titanium technology development has been utilized in the Boeing 747 program such that a major structural assembly on the 747 airplane was switched from steel to titanium at a significant saving in weight and cost.

A new method has been developed for constructing plastic contour tooling for the outside shape of the SST, both cheaper and lighter. This should have wide usage in a number of industries.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Other SST manufacturing developments include cutters, drills, and coolants which have produced a tenfold improvement in titanium machining rates electromagnetic riveting for more precise, higher-strength joints; cast ceramic heated forming dies; and improved automatic resistance and fusion welding.

There are also notable advancements in high-temperature nonmetallic materials such as glass, titanium sandwich construction, automatic flight control systems, fluids and lubricants, wire insulation, sealants, and insulation. So anyone who insists there is no technological fallout from the SST obviously does not know what the words mean.

THE PLIGHT OF THE LIVESTOCK FEEDERS

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, the livestock feeders of our Nation have found themselves playing scapegoat in recent years to consumer wrath over rising beef prices. The feeders do an excellent job of finishing livestock so that the Nation can enjoy the high quality of beef that it does. Their scapegoat situation is unfair, and I blame it on what I will call deceiving facts.

For example: It is true that the average price of choice steer has gone up 5 percent in the past 10 years. And it is true that the average price of beef for the housewife has risen almost 20 percent in the same amount of time. It is a substantial gain, I will grant you. But let us put the rising beef prices in perspective.

Compare the 20-percent increase in retail beef to the rise in the Consumer Price Index on all items: a whopping 34.4 percent. Or take a look at the increase in 10 years in the average cost of all consumer services: more than 50 percent.

Focus on some of the average hourly earning increases workers in other industries have netted over the past 10 years. Nonagricultural workers have increased their wages nearly 58 percent. Hourly earnings in the retail trade have gone up more than 62 percent, and construction workers are earning more than 76 percent increase.

The beef increase is certainly in line, and probably more than reasonable, in view of the other rising costs—costs which the feeders must bear as well as the consumer in order to provide their service. Expenditures per capita for food alone, for example, have risen more than 45 percent in 10 years.

In view of the overall mounting costs in the last decade, I think the fact that beef is as inexpensive as it is remarkable. The feeders do a very efficient and effective job and have helped make beef one of the best bargains available today.

PRESIDENT SHOWS SURPRISING DEPTH

HON. JOHN T. MYERS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, the President's courageous ability to act decisively, without regard to political expediency, has been aptly described by journalist Holmes Alexander. I submit Mr. Alexander's article for the RECORD as it realistically rates the success of both the Laos and Cambodian maneuvers and dramatically analyzes the consequences of forgoing both:

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, Feb. 22, 1971]

PRESIDENT SHOWS 'SURPRISING' DEPTH

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Richard Nixon is a person of undiscovered depths. None of his biographers—whether dipping the pen in perfume or poison—prepared us for the warleader we now have in the White House. The politician in domestic affairs has become the statesman of foreign affairs. His conduct of the Indochina War, 1970-71, has been superlative, and his countrymen should be cheering him to the echo.

In order to understand his invasion of Laos this year, we must go back to his invasion of Cambodia last year. There were "expert" advisers who reacted in horror last spring when Mr. Nixon first broached the subject of attacking the Communist supply caches in "neutral" Cambodia.

In the first place, they said, it was an election year, 1970, and the GOP had the best mathematical chance since 1946 and 1952 to take over the Senate. Discretion called for the exercise of conventional political wisdom. He was advised: don't rock the boat, keep preaching peace and bring the boys home, stay out of combat situations.

Other persons, identified to me only as "experts," told the President that casualties in Cambodia might well run to 1000 a week, and that he was asking for a "civil explosion." As it turned out, the battle losses were only a fraction of that prediction, and the public alarm, after some campus disturbance, soon subsided.

But Mr. Nixon could not foresee these mild outcomes. What he did perceive with certainty was that by allowing the Communist sanctuaries to remain intact in Cambodia, he would be exposing the reduced American forces of 1971-72 to the mortal danger of overwhelming attacks. The President decided to strike first.

He dispatched U.S. troops who destroyed vast stores of military supplies, and who also liberated the port city of Sihanoukville which received 85 per cent of the weapons, ammunitions and rice from North Vietnam.

This year, in February of 1971, the President turned his attention to Laos. The Ho Chi Minh Trails, entering Laos, now carried all that they had done in the past six years, plus the cargoes that once went by water in Sihanoukville.

It is not well understood, but the Reds have a system of sending supplies first, hiding them in caches, and then sending the combat troops into the area. The President saw that by disrupting or destroying Communist supplies during the dry season that lasts till May, he would not have to contend with the Communist combat troops who were expected to show up in Laos during the winter of 1971-72.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The risks were greater in Laos '71 than in Cambodia '70. A foolish law passed by Congress forced the President to rely on non-American troops to fight for American national interests.

True, the Saigon troops had been greatly improved by the U.S. training programs and weapons. An official figure given in Washington is that last year only two South Vietnamese divisions were rated as "excellent," whereas this year there are eight such "excellent" divisions.

Nevertheless, it must have gone against the Nixon grain of self-reliance to find his foreign policy carried out by Asians instead of Americans. Moreover, he was hearing the ominous code word, "Dienbienphu." It implied that a major victory by the enemy might mean a quick and tragic end of the war for our side.

Had he been looking for excuses, the President could have stayed out of Cambodia and Laos. The first campaign had not gained him a Republican Senate; the second was not likely to insure his own reelection next year. But it was opportunities, not excuses, that he seized upon.

Nobody can foretell that the American people will hail Mr. Nixon for playing the statesman. But somebody in my presence did suggest that the President at least averted a personal misfortune by acting as he did.

In 1938, British Premier Neville Chamberlain chose inaction and attained "peace in our time," only to find that he had World War II on his hands by 1939. Something similar might have happened again if Richard Nixon hadn't been made of sterner stuff than Chamberlain.

MILITARY OWED BETTER RETIREMENT PAY PLAN

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the past 15 years our retired military men and women have sought unsuccessfully from the Congress a fair and workable formula for providing increases in their retirement pay.

Before 1958, that pay was recomputed to keep up with increases in the pay of military personnel on active duty. However, Congress abandoned this plan and substituted one that supposedly was tied to increases in the cost of living.

This program just has not worked out. The cost of living has soared; yet, the retirement pay has not kept pace. The gap between active duty and retirement pay has grown wider and wider.

Like many others on fixed income, our military retirees have been hardest hit by inflation.

Many of our retired military personnel live in my own Eighth Congressional District of Florida, and I am personally and acutely aware of their plight. Many of these men and their families are forced to live a very marginal existence.

For this reason, I have introduced H.R. 1198, to return to the former system and equalize the retirement pay with that of active duty military personnel of equal rank and years of service.

Our retired military people have devoted long, hard years of service to this Nation. Many have fought valiantly and

risked their lives to protect America and preserve its great freedoms.

Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to join in promptly enacting legislation to provide these men and women with a just system of computing increases in their retirement pay. They are entitled to no less.

THAT'S A LOT OF POST TOASTIES

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, held hearings on February 23 through 26 relating to the bill which gives to the President the power to impose selective wage and price controls. This House passed the bill on March 10, and I voted for it. I do think it, however, important, and informative to present to our colleagues the point of view of an industry spokesman who receives an annual salary of \$260,000 plus "fringe benefits," and who testified in support of the bill because, as he states:

A major cause—perhaps the major cause [of inflation]—is to be found in the exorbitant increases in compensation, most of which have ensued from collective bargaining.

I would like to quote from parts of the testimony and of the dialog between myself and C. W. Cook, chairman and chief executive of General Foods Corp.

Mr. COOK. The root causes of a major inflation, of course, are complex and not easy to identify in toto. In the current spiral, however, I share the opinion of many businessmen who are convinced that a major cause—perhaps the major cause—is to be found in the exorbitant increases in compensation, most of which have ensued from collective bargaining and some disastrous strikes in a number of our major industries, particularly construction and transportation.

I can understand why the leaders of organized labor dispute this view. But in the light of the overwhelming evidence supporting it, I fail to see how they can sustain their argument. It is an indisputable fact that increases in wages and benefits far in excess of productivity increases exert enormous inflationary pressure. . . .

I believe, as do others, that freezing all forms of compensations alone—salaries, dividends, and commissions as well as wages and benefits—would be effective without a price freeze. But I am realistic enough to know that such a proposal is not politically feasible, so I would include prices in the temporary pegging. . . .

Mr. KOCH. I wonder if you could tell us what your gross salary, including all increments and benefits paid to you, was in the calendar year 1969 and the calendar year 1970, and the projected salary in 1971.

Mr. COOK. Well, I don't see that that personal information really has a bearing here except let me say it did not go up.

Mr. KOCH. Am I not correct that it is not personal information at all and could be found in the balance sheet, profit and loss statements issued by your company? Isn't your salary—

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir, my salary—

Mr. KOCH. As chairman of General Foods Corporation, a matter of public knowledge?

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir; \$260,000 a year.

March 17, 1971

Mr. KOCH. In 1969 it was \$260,000 a year?

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KOCH. Does that include all benefits, pension benefits?

Mr. COOK. This is what gets very difficult. We have, for example, a thrift investment plan that is available to every member in General Foods in the United States and Canada.

Now, if you participate in that the company makes a contribution to it. We have a pension plan that has very definite benefits, so it is awfully hard to add up all of these things.

Mr. KOCH. If you are not in a position now to give me that figure, would you be able to provide that figure in the testimony when it is presented at the conclusion of the hearing?

Mr. COOK. I am curious. We are talking about not letting inflation run away and I said to you this has not increased. I have said to you I would favor freezing that, including my salary and everybody else's. Now, why is this point germane?

Mr. KOCH. I will get to why I think it may be terribly helpful in a minute. Would you provide that information? You gave us \$260,000 for 1969.

Mr. COOK. That is salary.

Mr. KOCH. But there are other benefits and increments. Would you provide that total information to us at the time that the transcript is given you? Would you include it in the record?

Mr. COOK. You were going to tell me why this is germane.

Mr. KOCH. I will.

Mr. COOK. I don't know. I would like to know here if it is germane.

Mr. KOCH. I will get to that in a moment.

Mr. COOK. Let us hear that.

Mr. KOCH. In 1970, was your income higher than \$260,000?

Mr. COOK. No.

Mr. KOCH. And in 1971, is it projected that it will be any higher?

Mr. COOK. No.

Mr. KOCH. Now I will tell you why I think it is terribly important we know exactly how much the chairman of General Foods Corp. made in those 3 years or will be making.

I happen to believe in selective price, profit, and wage controls, but what is difficult for someone like myself or someone out in the other areas of the economy to accept is your concern. . . .

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir.

Mr. KOCH. About salaries paid to workers in this country when you are receiving a salary in excess of \$260,000 a year, and I ask you whether you might not make a voluntary contribution toward that campaign to reduce prices in this country and to bring inflation under control by suggesting a cut in your salary?

Mr. COOK. I have just figured my income tax and I can assure you it wasn't voluntary, but I think you would be staggered by the percentage of it that went to New York State and the Federal Government.

Salaries like this always sound high. We have lost about three of our very key executives who were making, let us say, at least half as much because other companies come in and offer them more.

It so happens, and I certainly don't intend to pay myself a compliment in this, but it so happens that there are relatively few people who have had the education, who are willing to work 60 and 75 hours a week, which I do, and who will take the responsibility and who will neglect, if you will, a family life and so forth to carry responsibilities of this kind.

They are very scarce.

In response to another Member's question:

Mr. COOK. The idea of paying an unskilled teenager the minimum wages in New York

City, in New York State, has resulted in a very high unemployment rate among them.

And if you just simply try to hire one of them to do some work around your house or whatever, they are not available because I think they priced themselves out of the market. And when the labor leaders propose that this minimum increase be raised still further, I understand now they say: "\$2 is not enough, it needs to be higher than that," without making an exception for the unskilled and let us say the inexperienced, I think these people are going to be left right out in the cold. . . .

Mr. Speaker, I believe that some of the wages in this country and particularly in the construction industry have been inflationary, but I am appalled that Mr. Cook is opposed to paying to adolescents engaged in summer jobs \$2 an hour. This suggestion comes with little grace from Mr. Cook, who, if we accept his assertion that he works 70 hours a week, receives compensation at the rate of over \$74 an hour—and this figure does not include the "fringe benefits" which he has not yet revealed to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate, I am for selected price and wage controls, but I also believe that the working man in this country, particularly in the low and middle ranges of wages and salaries, and surely those earning less than \$2 an hour, ought to have their needs attended to. Those receiving huge salaries such as Mr. Cook might temper their remarks on the need for salary increases for the less fortunate.

Mr. Speaker, \$260,000—that is a lot of Post Toasties.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, today millions of Americans join to honor the Irish and to observe a day set aside in tribute to their patron, St. Patrick. Whether we are Irish by birth, by descent, or in spirit, St. Patrick's Day unites us all in celebration of the Irish character and culture.

It is a fitting occasion, I believe, to call to the attention of this House an injustice which now bars many sons of Erin from joining their forebears in the United States.

Due to a largely unexpected result of the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act immigration to the United States from Ireland has been severely curtailed. Between 1956 and 1965, before the new law was enacted, an average of more than 7,000 Irishmen came to the United States annually. Since 1965, however, Irish immigration has declined to less than 2,000 each year.

Legislation I have introduced would remedy this deplorable situation. H.R. 166 would place a "floor" under immigration from nations, like Ireland, which are the most adversely affected by the new law. This floor would be equal to 75 percent of the average immigration from

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

a country between 1956 and 1965 or 10,000, whichever is less.

Enactment of this measure during the first session of the 92d Congress will insure an especially joyous St. Patrick's Day in 1972.

THE RIGHT LABEL

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, LABEL is an acronym for Law Student's Association for Buyers' Education and Labeling. Its members, five students at George Washington University Law School, have submitted a petition to the Food and Drug Administration calling for a full disclosure of all ingredients in order to predominance on the label of food products.

I have long advocated strengthening our food labeling requirements. I have introduced a Better Labeling Act both in the last session and this session of Congress.

This petition, which I place in the RECORD, is the first project of this new group. I support their efforts and hope that they will continue to work for reforms on behalf of consumers:

THE RIGHT LABEL

SUMMARY

The Petitioner, LABEL, Inc., is a non-profit corporation registered under the laws of the District of Columbia. The goal of the organization is to promote more complete ingredient labeling on all food products. The petitioner respectfully suggests that the purpose of the Standards of Identity provided for by 21 U.S.C. § 341 Definitions and Standards for Foods was to insure the quality and uniformity of food products but not to deny the consumer the knowledge of ingredients and thus the right to make an educated choice. This petition respectfully requests the Food and Drug Administration to issue a rule under section 701(e)(1)(B) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requiring all food manufacturers and/or distributors to label all ingredients which are contained in the food products they put forth for consumption.

PETITIONERS

LABEL is an acronym for Law Students Association for Buyers' Education and Labeling.

The officers and members of LABEL are Louis Kaufman, Arthur Koch, Gary Laden, Joan Levy, and Ellis Saul.

LABEL, Inc., contends that a new Food and Drug Administration regulation is both required and needed to allow the consumer to make a knowledgeable choice with respect to the foods he eats.

The members of LABEL, Inc., are personally affected in this matter by virtue of the fact that they are consumers.

1. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION POLICY

In accordance with Congressional Intent, the Food and Drug Administration has promulgated Standards of Identity "to promote honesty and fair dealing in the interests of consumers."² The Food and Drug Administration maintains that "food products are labeled with required information to guide and protect the consumer."³ Fur-

ther, in 1967, the Food and Drug Administration stated that "labeling requirements should be designed to give the consumer the fullest pertinent information possible in concise terms, completely factual and free from any element of trade puffery."⁴ "Food standards are not a device to be used in the interest of industry to circumvent the consumer's right to choose."⁵ It is clear that the stated policies of the Food and Drug Administration are both to inform and protect the consumer.

However, the American Consumer cannot determine the ingredients of the foods he eats. According to the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health:

"As a result of the maze of present laws and regulations governing food labeling, consumers are presented with confusing or incomplete information about the products they purchase. The label of an unstandardized food, must bear a full statement of ingredients whereas the label of a standardized food need not disclose the mandatory ingredients. Nutritional information may be required on the label of a special dietary food, but not on a general purpose food.

"Consumers have requested and are entitled to more meaningful and useful information than is now provided them about food. Such reforms as required statement of properties, a declaration about the amount of any characterizing ingredient, and simplification of ingredient designation, will help the consumer understand the product more fully and help him to make more intelligent purchasing decisions."⁶

This confusing state of affairs is due to the way in which the Food and Drug Administration has in the past implemented 21 U.S.C. 341 which authorizes the Secretary of H.E.W. to "promulgate regulations fixing and establishing for any food . . . a reasonable definition and standard of identity."

Section 341 of title 21 of the U.S.C. reads as follows:

"DEFINITION AND STANDARDS FOR FOOD

"Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary such action will promote honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers, he shall promulgate regulations (F.D.C. Regs. parts 10, 14-20, 22, 25, 27, 29, 31, 36, 37, 42, 45, 46, 51, 53) fixing and establishing for any food, under its common or usual name so far as practicable, a reasonable definition and standard of identity, a reasonable standard of quality, and/or reasonable standards of fill of container: *Provided*, That no definition and standard of identity and no standard of quality shall be established for fresh or dried fruits, fresh or dried vegetables, or butter, except that definitions and standards of identity may be established for avocados, cantaloupes, citrus fruits, and melons. In prescribing any standard of fill of container, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the natural shrinkage in storage and in transit of fresh natural food and to need for the necessary packing and protective material. In the prescribing of any standard of quality for any canned vegetable, consideration shall be given and due allowance made for the differing characteristics of the several varieties of such fruit or vegetable. In prescribing a definition and standard of identity for any food or class of food in which optional ingredients are permitted, the Secretary shall, for the purpose of promoting honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers, designate the optional ingredients which shall be named on the label. Any definition and standard of identity prescribed by the Secretary for avocados, cantaloupes, citrus fruits, or melons shall relate only to maturity and to the effects of freezing."

For the purposes of this petition, as an aide to understanding the confused state of the present F.D.A. standards, the following is a hypothetical food standard which assumes that Product X is a product for which a

Footnotes at end of article.

March 17, 1971

Standard of Identity has been promulgated under 21 U.S.C. § 341:

Product X; identity; label statement of optional ingredients.

Product X contains ingredients A, B, and C.

Product X must contain at least one of the following: D, E, or F.

OPTIONAL INGREDIENTS.

Product X may contain G, H, I, or J, or any combination thereof. If it contains I and/or J, the names of those ingredients must appear on the label.

With all due respect it is suggested that present FDA regulations have resulted in four vague and misleading categories of ingredient labeling, which we, for the purposes of this petition, will designate as follows: [These definitions will be used throughout this petition.]

(a) *Mandatory Ingredients*: There are ingredients that are listed in the Standard of Identity which must be contained in the product. They do not have to be labeled. (Example: caffeine in cola drinks (21 C.F.R. 31.1) or ingredients A, B, C in the hypothetical standard.)

(b) *Permissible Mandatory*: These are ingredients which are listed by group in the mandatory category within the Standard of Identity, at least one of the ingredients within the group must be in the product. This means that of all those ingredients listed as mandatory in the Standard of Identity only some of them are actually contained within the product. If they are contained within the product under this group, they do not have to be labeled. (Example: the form of egg in mayonnaise (21 C.F.R. 25.1(c)) or ingredients D, E, and F in the hypothetical.)

(c) *Labeled Optionals*: There are ingredients which are listed in the Standards of Identity as "optional ingredients", implying that they do not have to be in the product. Of these ingredients, there are those that must be labeled, by order of the Secretary of HEW, if they are contained in the product. (Example: calcium disodium EDTA in mayonnaise or ingredients I and J in the hypothetical.)

(d) *Unlabeled Optionals*: These are ingredients listed as optional ingredients in the Standard of Identity, which do not have to be labeled if they are included in the product because the Secretary has not so designated (Example: monosodium glutamate in mayonnaise (21 C.F.R. 25.1(a)(4)) or ingredients G and H in the hypothetical.)

The fact that these four categories exist has resulted in inconsistent, incomplete, and misleading food labeling, as illustrated by the following examples:

1. *Many products list no ingredients whatsoever on their labels.*

Hellmann's Mayonnaise (Exhibit A), and Polaner Pure Red Raspberry Preserves (Exhibit B), are nationally distributed food products that do not list any ingredients on their labels. Thus the consumer is unaware of the existence of eggs in mayonnaise or sugar in raspberry preserves.

2. *Some products list only the coloring ingredient, without disclosing any other ingredients.*

Pepsi-Cola (Exhibit C), and Coca-Cola (Exhibit D), two well known soft drinks, tell the consumer that they are caramel colored, but list none of the more than seventy other ingredients. The consumer is unaware of the required presence of caffeine.

3. *Some products label several of their ingredients, but neglect to inform the consumer that this is only a partial disclosure.*

Howard Johnson's Cola (Exhibit E), lists five ingredients on its label. The average consumer could interpret this to be a full disclosure of all the ingredients contained in this product. In fact, some of the major ingredients of this product are not labeled. Thus the consumer is unaware of the presence of caffeine.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

4. *Pet food labeling is qualitatively and quantitatively more informative than the labeling required by the Food and Drug Administration for human foods.*

Exhibit F is illustrative of this more informative labeling. This shows that informative labeling is feasible.

5. *Retailers and Distributors often receive a more informatively labeled product than the consumer.*

The retailer using Coca-Cola syrup will be able to learn that Coke contains sugar, water, phosphoric acid, caffeine, extractive from cocoa leaves (Cocaine removed) and cola nuts, and other flavorings, and that it is caramel colored (Exhibit G).

The retailer using pre-bottled Coca-Cola, and the consumer will be able to learn that Coke contains: "Caramel coloring."

6. *The Consumer has no way of determining the amount or quality of additives in his food.*

"The use of additives in food in the United States rose from 419,000,000 pounds in 1955 to 661,000,000 pounds in 1965—a 58% gain in ten years. It is estimated that the use of additives will soar to . . . 1.03 billion in 1975."¹ Due to the lack of labeling requirements under the Standards of Identity, many of these additives go into the product unlabeled.

II. ARGUMENTS

1. *The purpose of the Standards of Identity is to insure quality and uniformity within standardized foods*

In 1938, Congress enacted Federal Administrative authority to create Standards of Identity for Foods (21 U.S.C. 341). The purpose of these standards was to insure a definite level of quality and uniformity for many foods.

Senator Royal S. Copeland, the sponsor of S. 5, which became the Food and Drug Act of 1938, in a report to the Senate from the Senate Committee on Commerce, commented on the purposes of the act. He stated that the provisions concerning foods not under a Standard of Identity should help "the consumer . . . to obtain reasonable information regarding the composition of the food he buys." He further stated that if a definition and Standard of Identity for a product existed, "a consumer can be assured that the composition is the normal and proper one, and that optional ingredients if used will be labeled."² Moreover, in the reports which accompanied S. 5 to the Seventy-fifth Congress, it was declared, "the purpose of the Standards of Identity was to keep food manufacturers from straying from time honored standards."³ The original intent in the creation of food standards was to insure a standard of quality and uniformity in foods, and that any supplemental deviation from such standards would be made known to the consumer.

According to the Food and Drug Administration, "Food products are labeled with required information to guide and protect the consumer."⁴ This objective is not being fulfilled. Adequate information as to the contents of food products should be on the label so that the consumer in the grocery store can make an informative decision of the product he buys. The FDA food labeling procedures must be modified if this objective is fulfilled.

2. *The Food and Drug Administration regulations governing Standards of Identity are not in accord with the policies and purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act*

The fact that major ingredients, such as caffeine, MSG, milk, and eggs are not listed on labels of standardized products conflicts with the policy and Congressional mandate of promoting honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer.

Caffeine is a mandatory ingredient in cola drinks and as such does not have to be labeled. The consumer in the grocery store has no way of knowing this unless he happens to have a copy of Title 21 of the Code of Federal Regulations in his back pocket. For example, the presence of MSG and coconut oil in mayonnaise are hidden from the consumer.

In addition to promoting honesty and fair dealing, there are health reasons which would require the labeling of caffeine.

Modern medical evidence indicates a possible harmful effect of caffeine. "Dr. Samuel Bellet, Chief of Cardiology of Philadelphia General Hospital, has suggested that 'caffeine may be more important than smoking in setting the stage for heart attacks,'"

Doctors Samuel Bellet, MD, Alfred Kershbaum, MD, and Laurian Roman, MD, writing for the *Archives of Environmental Health* make the following remarks about caffeine:

"These studies show that ingestion of cola drinks containing caffeine (sugar-free cola) alone results in a progressive increase in FFA [Free Fatty Acids]; When the cola contained caffeine plus sugar (regular cola), the FFA usually became lower in the first three hours and then tended to increase by the fourth hour after ingestion. These effects were quite similar to those obtained following the administration of coffee alone and coffee with sugar, respectively. The ingestion of carbonated water had no significant effect on FFA."⁵

What portion of the general consuming public knows that caffeine not only is present in every cola drink, but that every cola drink must contain caffeine? 21 C.F.R. 31.1.

At one time, even the Food and Drug Administration announced that there should be "no tolerance for the amount of caffeine that may be added to cola beverages (TC 144). This TC stated further that "we have consistently discouraged the addition of caffeine in any amounts to soft drinks which may be, and of course often are, consumed by young children. Parents may not always desire them to consume caffeine-containing beverages. Whether or not caffeine is present in a soft drink in an amount which may constitute a deleterious ingredient which may render the article injurious is a question of fact in each case." (Exhibit H).

Other ingredients which have been questioned as to their safety include monosodium glutamate, coconut oil, and cyclamates. Even many basic ingredients which have gone unquestioned for years are now controversial, including sugar, salt, eggs, and milk. Some consumers may need or wish to avoid products containing some or all of these ingredients.

Honesty and fair dealing with respect to labeling would enable people with allergies to determine what products they should avoid. Dr. Theron G. Randolph of Chicago's Human Ecology Research Foundation believes that "mental confusion, agitation, comas, and amnesia can be caused by repeated contact with the wrong food or substance."⁶ Many consumers have adverse reactions to substances in their food, yet find themselves unable to avoid them due to inadequate labeling.

Those with heart diseases or the predisposition towards such diseases must likewise carefully watch what they eat. They must limit themselves as to cholesterol (i.e., eggs, milk, cheese). These items are often unmarked and are often eaten without the knowledge of the consumer. 21 C.F.R. 19.500 et seq., 21 C.F.R. 42.1 et seq., 21 C.F.R. 18.520 et seq.

Honesty and fair dealing would also dictate that those who wish to restrict the intake of certain items for religious dietary reasons be enabled to do so with the help of informative labeling. The Jewish faith has a complicated system of dietary laws that excludes many items and prohibits the eating of certain items (such as milk derivations).

tives) after the eating of others (such as meat derivatives). Although many products are marked with a "K" or an "(u)", religious Jews would not be restricted to these products if they knew what was in the foods they bought. Mormons also have items, such as caffeine, which they, by religious convictions, must not consume.

The existence of the category of unlabelled optional ingredients under the standard for Non-alcoholic beverages illustrates how the honesty and fair dealing standard has been ignored by FDA procedures. Here is but a glimpse of the ingredients which are included under this standard, but which need not be labeled:

One or more of the emulsifying, stabilizing or viscosity-producing agents, brominated vegetable oils, carob bean gum (locust bean gum), glycerol ester of wood rosin, guar gum, gum acaia, gum tragacanth, hydroxylated lecithin, lecithin, methylcellulose, mono- and diglycerides of fat-forming fatty acids, pectin, polyglycerol esters of fatty acids, propylene glycol alginate, sodium alginate, sodium metaphosphate (sodium hexametaphosphate). 21 C.F.R. 31.1(6)(1). (See Exhibit I for complete standard)

It is interesting to note that two of the ingredients (brominated vegetable oils and mono- and diglycerides of fatty forming acids) are currently under FDA scrutiny.¹⁴ Surely no consumer can be expected to know that these ingredients may be present in their soft drink, and there is no way for him to find out if the ingredient is actually present.

The curious category of permissible mandatory ingredients even further undermines the consumer's right to know what is in the food he eats. In many cases, if an ingredient is mandatory under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the ingredient may or may not be present. An example is milk in white bread (21 C.F.R. 17.1(2)). This does not comport with the plain meaning of the English word "mandatory." For example, the Standard promulgated for mayonnaise states that "mayonnaise dressing, is the emulsified semisolid food prepared from edible vegetable oil and one or both of the acidifying ingredients specified in paragraph (b) of this section, and one or more of the egg yolk containing ingredients specified in paragraph (c) of this section" (21 C.F.R. 25). Paragraphs (b) and (c) then list a number of ingredients from which the industry may choose to put in its product as a "mandatory" ingredient:

b) The acidifying ingredients referred to in paragraph (a) of this section are: (2) Lemon juice or lime juice or both or any such juice in frozen canned, concentrated or dried form, or any one or more of these diluted with water.

The mayonnaise industry has discretion in choosing its "mandatory" ingredients. This concept of discretion makes a mockery of the word "mandatory," and leaves the consumer bewildered as to the ingredients of the foods he eats.

Due to the inconsistency between the stated purposes and the subsequent application of Standards of Identity there has evolved an anomaly within the context of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Products outside the Standards of Identity are more informatively labeled than products within the standard.

When a Standard of Identity is promulgated for a product, that product is excused from the more informative labeling requirements of unstandardized foods. Such a provision only makes sense if Standards, as originally intended, are tightly drawn, based on long usages, and easily understood by consumers. In fact, standards have not maintained their original purpose, and are of no substitutional value for informing consumers. In effect, all standardized products are misbranded pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 321(n):

For the purposes of this Act—

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

(n) If an article is alleged to be misbranded because the labeling is misleading, then in determining whether the labeling is misleading there shall be taken into account (among other things) not only representations made or suggested by statement, word, design, device, or any combination thereof, but also the extent to which the labeling fails to reveal facts material in the light of such representations or material with respect to consequences which may result from the use of the article to which the labeling relates under the conditions of use prescribed in the labeling thereof or under such conditions of use as are customary or usual.

In essence, misbranding refers to both material omissions and commissions with respect to ingredient labeling requirements. Both of these routinely occur in present food standards.

The F.D.A. has recognized the fact that Standards of Identity have the potential of becoming a haven for misbranding as defined by 21 U.S.C. § 321(n). Thus the F.D.A. has announced a policy to prevent such inconsistent activities:

"No provision of any regulation prescribing a definition and standard of identity . . . under section 401 of the act shall be construed as in any way effecting the concurrent applicability of the general provisions of the act and the regulations thereunder relating to adulteration and misbranding. (Title 21, Chapter 1, subchapter b, section 101(c).)"

This regulation asserts that the Standards of Identity shall not excuse industry from conforming to standards of informative labeling. However, FDA action again has failed to achieve FDA Policy.

Consumers who spend hard earned money for food in order to maintain their families' health and welfare should be entitled to know the ingredients for which their money is being spent. Various qualities of ingredients are used in different food products. For example, the Standard of Identity for white bread states the following choices:

"Milk, concentrated milk, evaporated milk, sweetened condensed milk, dried milk, skim milk, concentrated skim milk, evaporated skim milk, sweetened condensed partly skimmed milk, sweetened condensed skim milk, nonfat dry milk, or any combination of two or more of these. . . 21 C.F.R. 17.1(2)."

There are marked differences in the value and nutritional benefits of these alternative ingredients. In reality, the only one who gets milked is the consumer. Such secret discrepancies in alternative ingredients flagrantly violate any standards of honesty or fair dealing which the statute may impose.

3. Standards of Identity have produced misleading and inadequate food labeling, contrary to the original intent of the law

The assumption that a Standard of Identity is a substitute for informative food labeling is no longer valid. The absence from labels of the names of all mandatory ingredients and all non-designated optional ingredients can in no way be considered an adequate substitute for informative labeling. It is impossible for any consumer to learn from the FDA information program what goes into a product covered by a Standard of Identity. Even if he should obtain a copy of the standard, he will not know what composes the product.

Optional ingredients under Standards of Identity also contribute to the misleading effect of the standards.

Section 401 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. 341, not only creates authority to promulgate standards for foods, but further authorizes the Secretary to "designate the optional ingredients which shall be named on the label." "Honesty and fair dealing" would dictate that all optional ingredients be labeled in order to avoid consumer confusion. Presently, however, this authority has been interpreted by the FDA to mean that the Secretary may pick and choose which of those optional in-

gredients included in a particular Standard of Identity will be listed on a label. It provides no standard other than *honesty and fair dealing* by which to make the choice. If this discretion has been vested in the Secretary, it has been abused.

The consumer has a right to know what ingredients are in the food products which he buys. Who should make the ultimate choice about the consumption of the ingredients in the foods he eats? By not requiring the labeling of all ingredients, and thus effectively hiding the presence of many of them from the public, the DA has usurped the consumer's right to make that choice.

III. CONCLUSION AND PRAYER

Under the present labyrinth of FDA regulations, the consumer has no way to ascertain the ingredients contained within the product under the Standard of Identity. Instead, the Standard of Identity has become a sanctuary for hidden ingredients and additives.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and supporting FDA policy statements have invested the consumer with a right to know what is contained in the foods that he purchases. Moreover, there is an absolute need due to health, dietary, and religious purposes for there to be a full disclosure of food contents.

In order to correct this situation, the FDA must issue new regulations in accord with the import of 21 U.S.C. 341.

Accordingly, the petitioners pray that the Food and Drug Administration issue a new regulation (under 21 U.S.C. 341) requiring that:

For the purposes of promoting honesty and fair dealing in the interest of the consumer, all food manufacturers and distributors must list on the label, in the order of their predominance, all ingredients which are contained in their product.

The petitioners ask that this proposal be published in the Federal Register, as per 21 C.F.R. sections 2.65 and 2.66.

Respectfully submitted.

LABEL, INC.,
LOUIS KAUFMAN,
ARTHUR KOCH,
GARY LADEN,
JOAN LEVY,
ELLIS SAUL.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, Section 401, 21 U.S.C. 341.

² Food Standards, Facts for Consumers, FDA Publication No. 8, 1964.

³ Additives In Our Food, FDA Publication No. 43, October 1968.

⁴ Food Standards by L. M. Beacham, Reprint from FDA Papers, Sept. 1967.

⁵ Food Standards by L. M. Beacham, Reprint from FDA Papers, Sept. 1967.

⁶ Final Report, White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, at pp. 120-121 (1970).

⁷ Longgood, William, *The Poisons in Your Food*, Pyramid Books, New York, 1960, p. 13.

⁸ S. Rep. No. 361; 74th Cong., 1st Sess. 12 (1935).

⁹ S. Rep. No. 2139; 75th Cong., 3rd Sess. 5 (1938).

¹⁰ Additives In Our Food, FDA Publication No. 43, October, 1968.

¹¹ Turner, James S., *The Chemical Feast*, Grossman Publishers, New York, 1970.

¹² Bellet, Samuel, Kershbaum, Alfred, Roman, Laurian, "Effect of Cola Drinks on Serum Free Fatty Acids", *Archives of Environmental Health*, November 1968, Volume 17.

¹³ Chicago's American, April 12, 1966, Article by David Noble: "Illness of Mind Tied to Allergies."

¹⁴ Petition of F.A.T.S., Inc. & Mr. James S. Turner, Petition to Revise FDA Regulations on Labeling of Food Fat Content and Labeling of Food Containing Vegetable Oils and Fats filed December 2, 1970.

HORTON CITES TASKS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 20 years since the procurement policies of the U.S. Government have been reviewed. During that time, Government buying has risen from \$9 billion to \$55-\$60 billion. As my colleagues in the House know, the nonpartisan Commission on Government Procurement was created by an act of Congress in 1969 to study all aspects of Federal purchases of goods, services, and facilities for defense and nondefense purposes.

The Commission will make recommendations to Congress which, hopefully, will bring some relief to the conflicts, duplications, and confusion in Government buying, which have come about in the years since our procurement policies were last studied.

As one of the 12 members appointed to the Commission on Government Procurement, I am hopeful it will make substantial contributions toward more economical and efficient Government procurement policies. The Commission is already moving in this direction.

In the March 1971 edition of *Government Executive*, an article by the magazine's senior editor, Leon Shloss, explores the organization, goals, and activities of the Commission.

Titled "Government Procurement Under the Microscope," the article outlines the tasks which confront the Commission and the progress which it has already made in its review of procurement procedures.

I know my colleagues in the House will find this well-written article interesting and informative:

AFTER 20 YEARS, REFORM IN THE OFFING—
GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT UNDER THE
MICROSCOPE

(By Leon Shloss)

Bounded on the east by the Peace Corps and on the West by the Atomic Energy Commission—both of which are trying to pass miracles—there reposes a tiny U.S. Government task force which, if it can complete its mission, will have passed the greatest miracle of all.

Housed in the *Matomac Building* (it was supposed to be called the *Atomic Building* but in a typical Government foul-up the sign painters goofed) this little task force is named the "Commission on Government Procurement": Its mission is to untangle, reform and streamline the age-old mess of law, regulations, directives, etc., that direct (or misdirect) Government procedure in buying \$55 billion to \$60 billion worth of things each year ("everything from pencils to nuclear submarines," as President Nixon puts it).

A glimmering understanding of the immensity of the Commission's chore is offered in a 229-page "Preliminary Compilation of Laws Pertaining to Government Procurement." Possibly as amazing as the volume of such laws, etc., is the fact that this recently completed compilation is the first to be made in the history of the United States. Small wonder that the compilation is

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

already on the Government Printing Office best-seller list, at \$1 a copy, as legislators, the military and industry rush to try to find out exactly what they are supposed to be doing.

The need for the new (November 26, 1969) Commission is strikingly revealed in the nine volumes of hearing testimony (2,619 pages) accumulated by the House Committee on Government Operations in the six months prior to Congressional passage of the legislation creating the Commission.

But already the Commission has trouble. The enabling Act sets a deadline of November 26, 1971, for submission of the Commission's final report, with recommendations. Delay in the appointment of the 12 Commission members has resulted in a six-month slippage in the work schedule, so the November 26, 1971, deadline for completion of the job has become completely unrealistic. Further legislation to extend the Commission's life will be necessary and it is believed that an extension to December 31, 1972, will be authorized.

Meanwhile the Commission is getting into real high gear. Eight of its 13 study groups have been activated, staffed with top-drawer talent from industry, the military, Congress and from the educational and scientific communities. The other five study groups are nearly ready to go.

E. Perkins "Perk" McGuire, longtime Washingtonian and universally respected, was chosen to chair the Commission. McGuire, an Assistant Secretary of Defense under Eisenhower, has as vice-chairman the "father" of the legislation which created the unit—Rep. Chet Holifield, a Democrat. Both McGuire and Holifield declare no politics will be played in the Commission operation, and the carefully recruited, highly skilled staff members attest that there "is a singular (for Washington) lack of political activity."

The need for a comprehensive, systematic review of Federal procurement is underscored further by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in terms of the vast increase in procurement spending and the far-reaching changes which have occurred in the last 20 years. OMB says: "No full-scale review of Government procurement policies has been undertaken since 1949. During this period the dollar value of procurement awards for supplies and equipment has increased from \$9 billion to about \$55 billion. We believe current statutes, policies and practices should be examined objectively in the light of greatly increased and changed requirements."

U.S. Comptroller General Elmer Staats, a Procurement Commission member, says: "Federal procurement statutes are chiefly concerned with procurement authority and procedures and do not contain a clear expression of Government procurement policies. Implementing procurement regulations are voluminous, exceedingly complex and at times difficult to apply."

"These procurement regulations have great impact on the rights and obligations of contractors," Staats continues, "and on the high level of spending for Government procurement. For Fiscal Year 1968 the Department of Defense alone awarded contracts totalling about \$43 billion for supplies and services, representing about 80 percent of total Government procurement expenditures.

"It is clear that not only members of Congress receiving complaints from their business constituents, but those who do business for the Government, those who do business with the Government and those in the legal and engineering professions who do business on both sides, all have an interest in this legislation. And certainly the taxpayers, who ultimately must foot the bills for these massive yearly procurements, will be interested in the Commission's recommendations for economy, efficiency and improved manage-

ment in Government procurement and contracting."

Holifield, the initial sponsor of the legislation who fought a five-year, uphill battle for its adoption, sums up its objectives concisely:

"We want to improve Government procurement and contracting procedures and practices. We are interested in economy and efficiency. We want Government to get its money's worth and contractors to be treated fairly."

"We want to examine the accretion of laws, iron out inconsistencies, close gaps in coverage, throw out what is obsolete and recognize what is new and necessary."

"We want to reconcile the regulations within and among agencies which may have needless differences in phrasing or intent, to disseminate useful information more widely, to make the knowledge and experience of some agencies available to all."

So there are the goals, so tersely stated by Holifield.

The ebullient, 61-year-old McGuire, understands the complexity of the problem but is confident substantial progress will be made. As the Study Groups were just beginning to be formed, he said in an interview on May 7, 1970:

"Although many witnesses expressed their endorsement of the Commission proposal in the course of the Congressional hearings, the Commission believes that additional meetings at this time will be helpful in updating prior statements and in making sure that the Commission's attention is directed to important procurement matters of current concern."

"The purpose of these meetings," McGuire continued, "is to (1) invite recommendations for special areas to be reviewed by the Commission; (2) receive studies and other pertinent documents bearing on procurement matters; and (3) provide current orientation to the Commission members in addition to the hearing materials which preceded the legislation creating the Commission."

"The Commission believes that representatives of industry, labor, legal, accounting and other associations may want to submit information."

McGuire's comments helped establish the "open door policy" which maintains. fruitful meetings were held on June 2, 3 and 4, 1970.

McGuire is forthright—and a realist—as he gets on with the job. As this issue was going to press he told *Government Executive*:

"We don't figure to come up with a panacea. The procurement problem is too complex and keeps changing day by day as new situations arise. But we are trying to make this a place where all parties put their cards on the table. We want all parties to be hard-boiled in presenting their ideas. We don't want to wind up with compromises, but with hard decisions—with one or two alternatives, because we realize we can never get unanimity of opinion."

"I think we are making excellent progress to date. We have gotten unbelievable cooperation from Government and industry," he continued. "We will need more time and more money because the legislators, who did such a wonderful job in studying the problem, still could not fully realize the scope of the job."

"I have asked everybody involved whether they thought our effort would be productive, or just a waste of time. Every answer was an ardent 'productive.'

"We feel that we can make a valid contribution to Congressional and public understanding of the problem."

The Commission's policy of gathering all the information it can as a base for further study resulted in a series of public meetings being held by the Commission's Legal Remedies Study Group. The meetings began in

March 17, 1971

Washington on February 17, 1971, and continued on February 24 in Atlanta, Ga. At this writing additional meetings were slated for March 10, 1971, in San Francisco; March 24 in Boston; April 7 in Denver and April 21 in Chicago.

The Legal Remedies Study is intended to identify the various disputes-solving processes that are available to the Government, its prime contractors, subcontractors and prospective contractors; to identify, analyze and explain selected remedial problems generated by these processes, both directly and indirectly, in terms of their effect on the procurement process and to recommend changes that will facilitate an accomplishment of the policy expressed in the organic act of the Commission, i.e., "to promote economy, efficiency and effectiveness in the Federal procurement system in order to encourage fair dealing among the parties concerned with Government contracting."

Under study are some of the thorniest problems confronting Government and industry. Included are:

Regulations. Adequacy of current regulations, the potential for simplification and greater uniformity and the most economical and efficient Government organization and procedures for the development, revision, issuance and distribution of regulations, including the means for public participation. Also the differing approaches to regulations between agencies and the adequacy of the regulation-making process to meet the needs of newly emerging social programs in civil agencies.

Organization and Personnel. Organization and functional relationships affecting the Government procurement process. Job requirements, recruitment, training and career development of personnel in the procurement field.

Contract Audit and Administration. Identify the objectives and methods employed in the performance of the audit and contract administration functions. Review the auditor and administrative contracting officer's (ACO) relationship to a contractor's management prerogatives. Also review the roles of the auditor, the ACO and procuring contracting officer in the performance of such functions as the method and effectiveness of negotiating overhead rates, the application of cost accounting standards and matters concerned with questioned or disallowed contractor costs.

Research and Development. Develop factual data and information concerning the policies, procedures and practices of Federal agencies and departments in the acquisition of Research and Development and make recommendations for improvements. This study will encompass research and development in all areas of science and technology, including the social sciences. It will address such problems as contracts versus research grants, basic research restrictions, technological base, independent research and development, source selection and contract types.

Major Systems Acquisition. Develop factual data and information concerning the policies, procedures and practices of Federal agencies and departments in the acquisition of major systems and make recommendations for improvements. Study will include such systems acquisition problems as the appropriations and budget process, contract type, cost estimating, feasibility studies, extent of competition, program management, risks and benefits, source selection, trade-off decisions and specifications. While the majority of Study Groups scrutinize in detail particular related functions of procurement, this is one of the three studies organized to delve into and evaluate an entire process from the viewpoint of fulfilling a specific Government need.

Commercial Products, Architect & Engineering Services and Construction. Involves

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the largest segment of products and industries of any of the studies. Will develop factual data and information concerning the policies, procedures and practices of Federal agencies and departments in the acquisition of commercial products (including automatic data processing equipment), A&E services and construction. Included are such factors as the role of the General Services Administration, the Defense Supply Agency and other individual departments and agencies in the purchase of commercially available items. In the A&E and construction areas, methods used in awarding contracts and the role of competition in their awards will be reviewed.

Reports and Management Controls. Whether there is an over-reliance on reporting versus other techniques of managing the procurement process whether the report goals are proper for and relevant to the type of procurement activity involved; whether the reports are timely enough to be truly useful for oversight purposes; whether statistical reports on procurement activities communicate effectively such things as the nature of the procurement and competition involved (for example, should procurement statistics reported to Congress on advanced weapons continue to be commingled with more common types of procurement?); whether reports are duplicative of others; whether report requirements are being uniformly imposed on activities where the same purpose is being served; whether requirements for reports permit information systems to be individually tailored to meet management objectives, whether reporting requirements are designed so as to permit management by results.

That's the way things stand today. The searching look taken by *Government Executive* reveals the probability of successful completion of the Commission's mission.

The trouble, when and if it comes, will not be of the Commission's doing. That will be when the final report, with recommendations, reaches Congress and agencies whose wings may be at least partially clipped, begin their campaigns to stall implementing legislation.

THE COMMISSION LINEUP

These are the members of the Commission on Government Procurement which is trying to modernize the archaic procurement concept:

E. Perkins McGuire, Washington, D.C., chairman.

Rep. Chet Hollifield of California, vice chairman.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson of the state of Washington.

Sen. Edward J. Gurney of Florida.

Rep. Frank Horton of New York.

Elmer Staats, Comptroller General of the U.S.

Robert L. Kunzig, Administrator, General Services Administration.

Frank Sanders, Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Paul W. Beamer, Vice President and General Manager, Wyman-Gordon Co., Worcester, Mass.

Peter Dierks Joers, Assistant to the President of Weyerhaeuser Co.

Joseph W. Barr, American Security and Trust Co., Washington, D.C.

Richard E. Horner, E. F. Johnson Co., Waseca, Minn.

THE PROBLEM AREAS

The Commission has broken down its work into 13 areas. A study group comprising seven to nine experts from Government, industry, and the educational/scientific communities will work on each problem. The eight groups already named and staffed (the remaining five will probably be in business before this article appears) are:

Regulations. Chairman, Wayne M. Wallace of Control Data Corp.

Legal Remedies. Chairman, Russell Fairbanks, Dean, Rutgers University Law School.

Organization and Personnel. Chairman, Allen A. Kaufmann, Litton Systems, Inc.

Reports and Management Controls. Chairman, Rear Admiral Edward F. Metzger.

Contract Audit and Administration. Chairman, Robert S. McClure, of Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Co.

Research and Development. Chairman, Dr. William J. Price, Air Force Office of Scientific Research.

Major Systems Acquisition. Chairman, John Russell Clark, of Ling-Temco-Vought Aerospace Corp.

Commercial Products, Architect and Engineering Services, and Construction. Chairman, Robert J. Brown, Atomic Energy Commission. This group's study involves the largest segment of products and industries of any of the Study Groups.

The other five Study Groups will be engaged with Utilization of Resources, Controls Over the Procurement Process, Pre-Contract Planning, Cost and Pricing Information, Negotiation and Subcontracting—plus a Statutory Study Group headed by Comptroller General Elmer Staats.

THE NEW POSTAL SERVICE

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Postal Reorganization Act last year, the Congress removed the U.S. Post Office from its departmental level status in the executive branch and created a new corporation, the U.S. Postal Service, to be run by a board of governors. The aim was to provide service for the public in a more businesslike manner.

An article entitled "The New Postal Service" appeared in the February 18, 1971, issue of the *Public Utilities Fortnightly*. It was written by Elmer Cerin who has served as a consultant and transportation specialist for the Post Office Department.

In this study of the Postal Reorganization Act, Mr. Cerin describes the background of, and the outlook for, the new U.S. Postal Service. I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to this excellent article:

THE NEW POSTAL SERVICE

(By Elmer Cerin)

The nine brave men who have been nominated by the President to constitute the board of governors of the new Postal Service have their work cut out for them. They will be faced with problems that will tax their ingenuity, experience, and ability. In addition, they will be required to spend a great deal of time, especially during the transition period and formative years, in coping with the formidable, numerous, and complex difficulties that beset the Postal Service in an ever-increasing degree.

Although the Postal Reorganization Act (PL 91-375) provides that the governors will be paid, at most, for thirty days of meetings each year and for not more than sixty days of meetings during the first two years, Congress recognized the fact that the actual time the board of governors will, of necessity, be required to spend on postal problems and their hoped-for solution will probably be far in excess of the time paid for. Indeed, the board of governors is specifically advised that, while payment will be

limited to thirty days annually, this should not "be construed to limit the number of days of meetings each year to thirty days."¹

SERVICE AND COSTS

The Postal Service has only two measures to evaluate its performance: service to the public and costs. Over the past ten years, service for all classes of mail has steadily deteriorated so that the total elapsed time from receipt to delivery has increased by at least one day.² Whereas in the fifties and early sixties the objective had been to deliver most of the letter mail on the next day and to develop a regular, dependable service for all other classes of mail, this goal has now been set aside. Despite billions spent, during the past fifteen years, on new postal structures and in the installation of mechanized equipment, and despite improved intercity transportation facilities, the Postal Service has evidently not been able to derive the anticipated cost and service benefits from these heavy capital expenditures.

Not only has service deteriorated but postal costs have risen far in excess of any of the principal price indices. As Postmaster General Winton M. Blount has stated on several occasions, postal productivity, as measured by pieces of mail processed per hour or by pieces of mail delivered per day, has not kept pace with the rise in national productivity.³ Indeed, in the American economy, industrial productivity has increased by some 2.7 per cent per year; postal productivity, on the other hand, has not perceptibly changed in over ten years even with the introduction of letter sorters, facer cancelers, culling and facing conveyors, edger stackers, parcel and sack sorters, and bulk transport conveyor systems. In fact, in many of the larger postal facilities productivity has actually decreased since 1960.⁴

Thus, the board of governors, working through the Postmaster General and the other postal officials, will need to direct their immediate attention to finding the mechanism for increasing postal productivity. Since labor costs account for over 75 per cent of total operating expenses, no marked reduction in unit cost can possibly be achieved without substantial improvement in the productivity of postal employees.

POSTAL DEFICITS

The Postal Service has incurred annual operating deficits in all but a few years of its history.⁵ These deficits have steadily mounted. By fiscal year 1967, the operating deficit had reached the \$1 billion mark and by fiscal year 1970 had increased to an estimated \$1.5 billion. A major portion of this \$1.5 billion deficit had arisen from the substantial pay increase granted federal employees following the postal work stoppage, without a concomitant adjustment in postage rates. For the current fiscal year 1971, the operating deficit will unquestionably be the highest in postal history, ranging between \$2 and \$2.5 billion, depending upon the effective date when the prospective postage rate increases go into effect.

Another measure of the postal financial health, or lack of health, is the postal fund deficit, which represents the excess of obligations incurred over postal revenues. For the ten-year period, 1960-69, the deficit ranged from 14 to 19 per cent of obligated funds.⁶ In fiscal year 1970, this percentage, however, equaled 20 percent, and for the current fiscal year it could well reach 25 per cent or even higher.⁷

Since the Postal Reorganization Act provides for an annual reimbursement to the Postal Service for public service costs of 10 per cent of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1971,⁸ there would still exist a massive deficiency between the revolving fund, consisting of postal revenues and other receipts, and its obligations. Under the for-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mula, Congress would make an annual appropriation to the Postal Service of some \$934 million through 1979 and reduced amounts thereafter. Thus, the Postal Service will no longer be able to petition the Congress for supplemental appropriations but will be required to meet the annual deficiencies from increases in postage rates, borrowings in the open market, and improved operations and management. The board of governors will certainly be struggling with this critical problem from its initial meeting.

CONGRESSIONAL POSITION

That the Congress will be an interested observer of the Postal Service is apparent. Since the Congress will be appropriating substantial sums for at least the next thirteen years, it will need to know what progress the Postal Service can demonstrate in reaching the goals set out in the Postal Reorganization Act.⁹ In addition, Congress will be receiving an annual report of the postal operations and will surely ask many questions and request clarification and explanation on postal operations and programs.¹⁰ But, most important, the Congress has divested itself of significant authority and powers, and will, therefore, expect the Postal Service to operate more efficiently and achieve the service and cost improvements which the proponents of the legislation promised.¹¹ Should the Postal Service, after a reasonable period of independent existence, be unable to carry out its responsibilities in the mail processing functions or fiscal management, the Congress would not hesitate to transfer the Postal Service back to departmental status or to authorize private or quasi-public operation.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

For the first time in the history of the Federal government, the Postal Reorganization Act provides for collective bargaining agreements entered into between the officials of the Postal Service and representatives of the postal labor organizations having exclusive recognition.¹² Following the work stoppage this past spring postal employees were able to obtain an immediate 6 per cent pay increase, and negotiated an additional 8 per cent for withdrawing their opposition to the pending postal reform legislation. This 14.4 per cent increase has added over \$850 million to the total postal salary and wage expenses for the current fiscal year. This was the result of the first negotiations between postal officials and labor representatives that had the tenor of collective bargaining.

The labor organizations have already indicated some of the things needed that they will submit when the collective bargaining sessions get under way. In addition to further wage increases, the Postal Service will be requested to agree to a shorter workweek, thirty-five hours or less; to higher contributions for health and hospital benefits; to retirement at full annuity after twenty-five years of service; and to other fringe benefits. The net effect would be to increase postal costs, unless a commensurate increase in employee productivity accompanies the acceptance of any of these labor proposals.

While collective bargaining agreements are essential to bring labor and management together and to avoid costly and detrimental work stoppages, the economic costs of these agreements must be recognized. Without offsetting gains in productivity, the postal deficit would necessarily become larger and pressure for postage rate increases mount. Thus, collective bargaining sessions must be held with full understanding and appreciation of the effect that each labor proposal and management counterproposal would have on postal operations and costs.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Congress adopted a major policy change in the construction and rehabilitation of postal facilities by authorizing the

Postal Service to borrow money through the issuance and sale of obligations in the aggregate amount of \$10 billion, of which \$2 billion maximum may be obtained in any one fiscal year.¹³ Since these obligations are not obligations of the government of the United States, the payment of the principal and interest is not guaranteed by the government of the United States, unless the Postal Service requests and the Secretary of the Treasury determines that such guaranty would be in the public interest.¹⁴ Evidently, without this guaranty the sale of the obligations would be more difficult and substantially more costly in terms of interest and other charges.¹⁵

Previously, the Post Office Department was required to obtain authorization and to submit funding requests and other supporting information for new postal facilities. Once the Congress authorized the funds, that ended the financial responsibility as far as the Postal Service was concerned, for the appropriations then became an obligation of the government of the United States. But under the new obligational authority of the Postal Service, whether or not there exists a guaranty by the government of the United States, the interest charges become an added postal operating cost. Thus, total postal expenses would be increased, requiring a rise in postal income in order not to enlarge the postal deficit.

SEARCH FOR COST REDUCTIONS

With a postal deficit of \$2 to \$2.5 billion, the board of governors will surely initiate programs to try to reduce the magnitude of this deficit. While comprehensive increases in postage rates, supplemented by the congressional appropriations, would diminish the size of the deficit, there would still exist a considerable portion of the postal expenses not covered by income.

During the initial discussions of the administration's proposals for postal reform in 1969, postal representatives pointed to studies which purported to demonstrate the potential reduction in operating expenses of \$1 billion and that this savings could be accomplished within five years.¹⁶ While this potential cost reduction appears to be overstated, it is nevertheless incontrovertible that improvement in postal productivity at all levels is feasible and, to be effective, must be given top priority.

Other areas where savings should be sought is in the administrative staffs at headquarters and in the 15 regional offices. Postmaster General Blount has repeatedly stated that decentralization of operations is one of his key programs and has shown that he is serious by delegating a number of important responsibilities directly to postmasters.¹⁷ If decentralization is indeed a basic concept of postal organization, then the large staffs in the headquarters and in the regional offices must be adjusted to their true requirements.

During the past ten years, the Postal Service had conducted several surveys of its regional offices to determine whether it would not be more appropriate under existing conditions to reduce the number of such offices from 15 to a smaller number. When first established in the midfifties, there may have been a need for all 15 regional offices. But, once in operation, it became politically infeasible to eliminate any of the offices, even though consolidation would have improved efficiency and reduced administrative complexities. With the new Postal Service the political climate has changed. Moreover, cost reduction must be explored wherever practicable, and the consolidation of the functions and responsibilities of regional offices is a relatively easy task, resulting in manpower savings and in improved operations.

Postmaster General Blount has testified that postal productivity has been almost stagnant for the past decade, during which time the Postal Service had an extensive fa-

city construction program. For each of the major mechanized facilities, the Congress had been presented with an economic feasibility study or cost-benefit analysis to support the requested appropriation. Yet if overall postal productivity has not improved with the construction of new facilities and the installation of mechanized equipment, it must be apparent that the anticipated savings did not materialize. The board of governors would want to know why the expected savings in productivity to offset the capital investment were not realized. A comparison of after-occupancy operating conditions with the initial economic feasibility study would disclose wherein the assumptions were in error and more realistic criteria would become available in the planning for new facilities.

Postal officials will need to explore not only the aforementioned areas of postal operations and planning but many other aspects of the Postal Service if the growing postal deficit is going to be brought under control. Postmaster General Blount has declared that a transition period of five years will be required to reach the break-even point. The Congress, in enacting the Postal Reorganization Act, was more liberal and provided the Postal Service with substantial appropriations for at least thirteen years.¹⁸ It would indeed be a remarkable accomplishment to have the Postal Service operate on a break-even basis and, at the same time, provide the American people with efficient and dependable service. It is within the purview of the board of governors to demonstrate that these goals are achievable.

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

The Postal Reorganization Act also established a five-member Postal Rate Commission which will operate independently of the Postal Service. Heretofore, the Congress held hearings and fixed new postal rates and charges. In addition, the Interstate Commerce Commission had been authorized to hold hearings and approve or reject rates and charges, proposed by the Postmaster General, on fourth-class parcels and catalogues. While the Postal Rate Commission will be functioning in a regulatory capacity, it does not possess the authority to issue final rate, service, and enforcement orders. Its principal responsibility is to submit recommendations and advisory opinions to the Postal Service. Nevertheless, the Postal Rate Commission has great latitude and opportunity for exploring new ideas and concepts, and for recommending much needed changes in postal rates, mail classification, and service.

The board of governors of the Postal Service, upon receiving the recommendations from the Postal Rate Commission, can then adopt any one of the four following alternatives:¹⁹

1. Approve the recommendations and order the new rates and charges into effect.
2. Allow, under protest, the recommendations to take effect but seek judicial review or return the recommendations to the Postal Rate Commission for reconsideration and a further decision.
3. Reject the recommendations and request the Postal Rate Commission to reconsider and submit new recommendations. However, the board of governors, by unanimous written concurrence, may modify the recommendations under certain conditions.
4. Place into effect temporary changes in rates and charges.

In addition to rate-making functions, the Postal Rate Commission has the following additional responsibilities:

1. Issue advisory opinions to the Postal Service on proposed nation-wide changes in postal services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1. Study and submit recommendations for a new mail classification schedule.
2. Receive, study, and issue recommended decisions to the Postal Service on complaints received from the mailing public as to rates and postal services.

How well the Postal Service and the Postal Rate Commission mesh in their respective areas of responsibility will not be known until these organizations have been in operation. The language of the Postal Reorganization Act, however, seeks a high degree of cooperation between the two agencies, and, yet, some of the provisions are vague and ambiguous. For example, rates and charges recommended by the Postal Rate Commission are not automatically geared to postal costs. While rates and charges should be set at levels to provide revenues wherein income and appropriations approximate costs, the Postal Service will need to operate "under honest, efficient, and economical management"²⁰ to merit such level of rates and charges. The question then arises: How efficient and economical is the management of the Postal Service and what adjustment, if any, should the Postal Rate Commission make for inefficient service or low productivity?

A careful reading of the Postal Reorganization Act re-enforces the conclusion that the Postal Service is the major policy-making and operating agency. On the other hand, the Postal Rate Commission, in its advisory capacity, will conduct hearings and studies on postal rates, charges, and service, and will submit recommendations to the Postal Service.²¹ This is a novel regulatory system but it may well be the mechanism to meet administrative requirements of the new Postal Service and our nation.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-101(a) and § 5(g).

² National Service Index, FY 1968-70, Bureau of Finance and Administration, Post Office Department; Service Analysis Studies, Bureau of Operations, Post Office Department.

³ Hearings on Post Office Department Appropriations for FY 1971, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, pp. 33, 34, 687, and 728.

⁴ Work Measurement System Reports, Work Load Reporting System, and periodic reports prepared by large Part 1 post offices and submitted to headquarters, Post Office Department, 1961 to date.

⁵ Annual Report of the Postmaster General, FY 1969, Table 803.

⁶ Annual Report of the Postmaster General, FY 1969, p. 168.

⁷ For FY 1970, comparison of obligations incurred and net postal revenues, National Operating and Financial Report, Accounting Period No. 13, FY 1970, Post Office Department, p. 3.

⁸ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-2401(b).

⁹ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, §§ 2-101(a)-(g).

¹⁰ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-2402.

¹¹ Hearings of Post Office Reorganization before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 91st Congress, 1st Session, Serial No. 91-3, pp. 331-334; Serial No. 91-4(a), p. 1200.

¹² Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-1206.

¹³ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-2005.

¹⁴ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-2006.

¹⁵ Hearings on the Post Office Reorganization before House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, 91st Congress, 1st Session, Serial No. 91-4(a), pp. 1203-1206. Statement by William E. Simon, partner, Salomon

Brothers and Hutzler at Postal Forum IV, reported in *Federal Times*, November 11, 1970, p. 17.

¹⁶ See Footnote 11.

¹⁷ Hearings on Post Office Department Appropriations for FY 1971, 91st Congress, 2nd Session, pp. 54, 55.

¹⁸ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-2401.

¹⁹ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-3625.

²⁰ Postal Reorganization Act, PL 91-375, § 2-3621.

²¹ *Congressional Record*, August 3, 1970, pp. 26953 and 26958, and August 6, 1970, pp. 27605, 27606.

A NEW PLAN FOR POWER DISTRIBUTION

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, in these days when the citizens of our urban areas are increasingly plagued by threats of brownouts or blackouts, some sort of rational planning for our nationwide power distribution systems is fast becoming a necessity.

A House resolution has been introduced by the Honorable RICHARD FULTON of Tennessee which would establish a House Select Committee to conduct a complete investigation of all aspects of the energy resources of the United States. This is a step in the right direction.

Another suggestion which I feel has a great deal of merit was made in a speech by my good friend Ken Holum, former Assistant Secretary for Water and Power in the Department of the Interior. In his address, Mr. Holum suggests that the creation of wholesale public power districts is an idea whose time has come. These districts would provide all utilities, regardless of ownership, with a new, reliable source of bulk energy. Further, they would enable the development of new means of power creation such as mine-mouth generating plants in the coalfields with the energy transmitted outward from these plants, or possibly geothermal steamplants in areas where these would be feasible.

In any case, this would be the creation of a new institutional arrangement to help meet the challenge of providing for the power demands of the American public that will only increase in the years to come. I feel that this concept suggested by Mr. Holum is of such importance that I would call his entire speech to your attention.

It follows:

STATEMENT OF KEN HOLUM BEFORE THE MISSOURI BASIN SYSTEMS GROUP, DENVER, COLORADO, MARCH 10, 1971

During the summer of 1962, I served as Chairman of the United States delegation at an Economic Commission for Europe Power Conference held in Venice, Italy. European and North American nations participate in the E.C.E. This particular conference was convened to discuss problems associated with "peak load coverage."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

March 17, 1971

Our delegation emphasized the value of hydro-power and pumped back storage as sources of generation to meet peak loads. With the Department of Interior's interest in high-voltage transmission during the Kennedy-Johnson years, you will not be surprised to hear that our delegation discussed the potential contribution of a high voltage transmission network towards meeting peak loads in a country with four time zones and a wide variety of climatic conditions.

European countries with substantial hydro-power discussed their use of this resource. Gas turbines and jet engines received substantial attention from other delegates. A few countries from both Eastern and Western Europe discussed their load shedding programs as a peak load covering device.

Although we remembered to mind our manners, you can be sure that no member of the American delegation considered selective load shedding as a proper tool for peak load coverage—in 1962, that is. We were sure that it would never happen here.

I imagine U.S. public officials and power company executives still consider power reductions and load shedding unattractive. Nonetheless, before the decade of the 60's was over, voltage reductions and brown-outs became routine over much of the country every time normal, high summer temperatures increased the demand for air-conditioning. Similarly, fuel and energy shortages threatened much of the country during normal winter cold snaps.

While I'm reminiscing and worrying with you about power shortages and organizational problems in the electric utility industry, let me recall some of the comments I made as Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development in a paper entitled "Looking Ahead 25 Years," delivered to the Annual Meeting of the Northwest Public Power Association in 1964.

"Now that we know the advantages of extra-high voltage, long distance transmission, and recognize its growing importance in the future, I expect the industry, both private and public, to make greater use of this new tool."

"Another power source of growing importance is mine-mouth thermal plants. Here again, extra-high voltage transmission is a key factor. Without it, power could not be carried economically to distant markets, and because some of our most extensive deposits of low-grade coal are in sparsely populated areas, the lack of high voltage transmission capability has inhibited the economic development of important fuel reserves."

"We will see more and more of our power generation located at mine-mouth using large, highly efficient and economic machines."

"Long before the 25 years are over, the nation's electric utilities will be interconnected with a substantial network of high voltage A.C. and D.C. transmission lines."

As you can tell, I find it extremely interesting recalling an international visit of nine years ago and a series of predictions made two years later. Permit me to quote one more paragraph from my remarks at Spokane—

"We can leave the field to the technicians and their bigger machines and longer transmission lines and in 25 years have a national system controlled either by a handful of giant corporations or a single nationalized system. If you don't like either alternative—and I don't—then we must address ourselves to the problem of protecting the integrity of individual systems by making certain that all utilities, regardless of size or ownership, share in the benefits of improving technology."

At this point let me emphasize again my personal preference for a pluralistic electric system with individual communities free to

choose whether they secure their electric service from utilities owned by others or alternatively by utilities that they own themselves. The chances, as I see it, remain the same today as they were in 1964.

However, I suggest that repeated power shortages, together with the stubborn and unreasoning refusal of the private companies to develop new approaches or even to consider new approaches objectively when they have been initiated by others, has moved the country significantly in the direction of a Federalized system since I made the quoted prediction in 1964.

By now, of course, you are all familiar with the views of George Cabot Lodge as expressed in Fortune Magazine of October, 1970. This distinguished New England Republican, now an Associate Professor at Harvard's Graduate School of Business Administration, puts the question this way:

"Would it not make more sense for the New York State Power Authority or a new Northeast Regional Public Power Authority to be charged with the task of power production, leaving to private companies the distribution of power on a decentralized basis to meet local consumer needs?"

George Cabot Lodge is only one of many leaders expressing concern that the vital electric power industry is not organized—and managed in a way that makes it possible for the industry to discharge its public responsibilities. I suggest that many more people would answer Mr. Lodge's question with an affirmative today than would have been the case if the question had been put in 1964.

The power user on the East coast and in the nation's major cities is having his problems with interrupted service and voltage reductions. While this was occurring, the forward looking leaders of the consumer-owned electric utilities in the West have been temporarily frustrated by power company executives who have successfully delayed inter-regional use of Rocky Mountain coal for power generation for a period of two years.

Study 190—conducted by three power marketing agencies of the Department of Interior—and released during the summer of 1968, established the economic and technical feasibility of interconnecting major load centers west of the Mississippi with a high voltage transmission network. Our study of January a year ago, entitled "Coal Resources For Electric Generation", and the system's group study, entitled "Western Intersystem Diversity And Energy Program", confirmed the economic attractiveness of locating large generating stations at mine-mouth on the abundant Rocky Mountain coal fields and delivering that power over a wide area by a transmission network essentially similar to the concepts outlined in Study 190.

Implementing the program identified in the "Coal Resources For Electric Generation" report or one of the schemes identified in the Western Intersystem Diversity And Energy Program" would provide all electric utilities in the West with an alternative source of low-cost bulk power. Equally important, converting the coal to electric power in the states where the coal is found will provide substantial economic growth opportunities in states that urgently need these opportunities.

In our transmittal letter of January, 1970, we said:

"Traditionally, the consumer-owned electric utilities have been the pace-setters for the industry. Development of the inter-regional relationships required to take advantage of the economics suggested by Study 190 and this investigation represents a new and exciting challenge to that leadership."

Unfortunately for their utilities, the states directly involved, and the entire West, top management of the privately-owned utilities in Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota, reconfirmed their inability to examine objec-

tively new concepts and ideas. If George Cabot Lodge decides to examine the philosophy and managerial concepts of Pacific Power and Light, Montana Power and Montana-Dakota Utilities, he will find them at least as religiously opposed to new ideas as Con. Ed.

Robert Partridge, General Manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, discussed the complications caused by the uneasy relationships which exist between the investor-owned and the consumer-owned utilities at the Association's Annual Meeting in Dallas. He said:

"Recognizing that the bitterest of the controversies of the past seem to have revolved around plans for bulk power supply facilities, it would seem that this function should be separated from the distribution function."

"Under this concept, corporations or public bodies would be empowered to finance, build and operate bulk power facilities. Wholesale energy from them would be available to all electric systems—large and small, commercial and cooperative, public and private."

On December 15th of last year, Senator George McGovern delivered the keynote address to the Annual Meeting of the Mid-West Electric Consumers Association. As we listened that day, we knew that we were hearing a workable and urgently needed program enunciated for the electric power and energy industries.

Senator McGovern recalled Leland Olds "Giant Power Concept" and his proposals for establishing separate organizations with responsibility for generation and transmission. "Today", he said, "it is more attractive than ever before."

After emphasizing the urgent need for developing large, efficient generating stations with the output available to all utilities and the need for a national power grid which "we need so badly", the Senator from South Dakota found encouragement in the report to the New England Regional Commission recommending the creation of a single public bulk power supply agency for all of New England. He urged publicly-owned electric utilities to take the leadership in developing and promoting new institutional arrangements in the power field—for the benefit of all consumers.

A few moments ago, I quoted my 1964 concern that the pluralistic electric utility industry would not survive unless we developed techniques which make certain that all utilities share in the benefits of the new technology and the economics of scale. The only thing that has changed since 1964 is the intensification of the nation's conservation consciousness. Electric utilities are going to learn that the public will not permit them to build generating plants and transmission lines until it has been established that regional needs have been considered in the planning process.

Towards this end we have all supported and been involved in power pooling activities. We have either participated in or kept ourselves informed on joint-ownership arrangements in existence or under discussion. We advocate the "one system approach" as utilities plan the facilities needed to provide bulk power supply on a regional basis.

I am certain that the Missouri Basin Systems Group will continue to promote these concepts—and you should.

However, you have found progress towards the one system planning approach agonizingly slow and negotiations related to joint ownership have proven to be extremely complicated and time-consuming.

As Bob Partridge noted in his Annual Meeting report, these activities involve the area where relations between utilities have historically been the most difficult. When you think in terms of regional and inter-regional participation involving many utilities, large

and small, public, private and cooperative, you recognize an urgent need to have available a simpler way to provide the benefits and economics of scale to all utilities.

Fortunately, this can be done without disturbing in any way the ownership patterns that have developed at the distribution level.

Wholesale public power districts, a completely new concept in the bulk power supply field, is another of many new ideas to originate with the consumer owned electric utilities in the Missouri Basin region. Really, it isn't surprising that the region which developed a Missouri Basin Systems Group—and a Basin Electric Power would now pioneer a technique which makes both the "one system approach" and all of the inherent advantages of joint ownership simple and easy for all utilities.

Before the Model T Ford had replaced the horse and buggy, people in the transportation business discovered that it made sense to centralize the manufacture of horse-collars while leaving distribution to specialists in that particular function. Once manufactured, the horse-collars could find their way to the ultimate consumers through a public agency, a cooperative or a private business.

If it makes sense to have shoes manufactured in a centralized shoe factory in Boston, why not have kilowatt hours manufactured in a factory located on the rich coal fields in Montana, Wyoming or the Dakotas.

Why not permit the individual utility or an appropriate grouping of smaller utilities to purchase the kilowatts and kilowatt hours that they need to meet their future requirements from an organization that exists for the sole purpose of meeting this need?

Traditionally, the distributors of consumer goods have made their own deals directly with the manufacturer. Why should the electric business be so different?

Why build slurry pipelines to flush the coal out of Wyoming and Montana when it is clear that the cheapest way to provide bulk power for the West is to build large mine-mouth generating plants on the coal fields and move the electric energy by wire?

Why not establish the necessary ground rules so that all utilities can participate, including the ability of publicly-owned utilities to finance with tax-exempt revenue bonds?

Your answer to all of these questions is contained in legislation designed to authorize the creation of *wholesale public power districts* which was introduced and strongly supported in the Montana, Wyoming and North Dakota Legislatures.

When this legislation is enacted, citizens in the states will be able to organize subdivisions of their state government for the purpose of building generating plants and high voltage transmission lines. As agencies of the state, they will be able to finance the development of their resources with tax-exempt Revenue Bonds. Their communities and their state will secure the economic growth associated with building, operating, supervising and maintaining the kilowatt hour factories. Although traditionally agencies of a state do not pay taxes, substantial "in lieu" payments will help support public institutions and activities.

Wholesale Electric Energy Districts will provide utilities, or groups of utilities, regardless of ownership, with an opportunity to secure their bulk power supply from an organization that exists for the sole purpose of supplying bulk energy at the lowest cost consistent with sound environmental requirements.

George Cabot Lodge suggests a separation of bulk power supply from the distribution function. The Wholesale Electric Energy Districts concept provides utilities with an alternative source of supply, but permits them to make the management decisions to supply their own needs. As introduced in Montana and Wyoming, the legislation spe-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cifically limits the proposed Districts to supplying bulk power to other utilities.

While the legislation will not pass in 1971, more progress has been made than I would have dared to predict six months ago:

(1) The legislation has been drafted, reviewed and perfected;

(2) Strong and determined sponsorship has emerged in each state. This includes both members of the Legislature and citizen support;

(3) The public generally is more knowledgeable of the potential advantages inherent in locally sponsored and financed Wholesale Public Power Districts.

The legislation is on the agenda for future action—in all three states. It will pass in 1973 in all three states if consumer-owned electric utilities provide an appropriate interest and support. I am convinced they will.

Electrical Week—for February 22nd quotes G. W. O'Conner, President of Montana Power Company, "Never had a helluva lot of concern that it would get through." He called it "a ludicrous and unreasonable bill".

It makes sense for Mr. O'Conner not to be concerned about the legislation's passage because the proposal can't possibly hurt Montana Power Company. It may well prove to be the company's salvation in the near future. The proposal is "ludicrous and unreasonable" only if you consider it ludicrous and ridiculous to help the rural electric cooperatives and the consumer-owned utilities and the economic development of Montana and the West.

At this point in time, I don't know whether the first Wholesale Public Power District mine-mouth kilowatt hour factory will be located in Wyoming, Montana or one of the Dakotas. I am certain it will be built and that the people attending this Annual Meeting of the Missouri Basin Systems Group will find great satisfaction in another significant accomplishment.

Senator McGovern challenged you to pioneer the development of new institutional arrangements for the benefit of consumers. You have responded. Wholesale Electric Energy Districts—a new, institutional arrangement applied across the country—could well eliminate selective load shedding and voltage reductions from the peak load coverage plans of American utility management.

HIBERNIAN WOMAN OF YEAR

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Mercedes Scofield has been named Hibernian Woman of the Year on this St. Patrick's Day in honor of her many years of service to Cleveland's Irish community.

Mrs. Scofield is State president of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, and will be honored at the organization's 104th annual banquet tonight.

She is also past president of Division No. 2 of the Ladies Hibernian Auxiliary, past treasurer and vice president of the Ladies AOH Auxiliary, and present Division No. 2 treasurer.

For the past 15 years Mrs. Scofield has been head teller for Lincoln Savings & Loan. She has 2 daughters, Delaine Clare, and Sharon Patricia.

THE RIGHTEOUS HOLLER OF "OUCH" BY THE MIDDLE CLASS

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think many of my colleagues might find much to agree with in this editorial from the Spartanburg Herald of March 15, 1971. It strongly protests the swollen presence of the dole, that shapeless and ever-growing beast which is eating up more and more of the food and funds which hard-working middle-class citizens need for themselves. Some day the beast may, indeed, outgrow our country's ability and willingness to feed it. It is a useless, cumbersome animal. To say that we will put it out to pasture is no answer, for that is where it already is. To say that we will reform it, change its shape, disguise it behind the mask of "welfare," is no solution either, for the welfare dole has lived all its life behind nothing but disguises. To say that we shall slaughter it outright, of course, causes all those welfare humanists to gird for holy battle. So what can we do? It is a problem that is always with us, like the poor. The Herald editorial states the problem very well, but it does not presume to have a solution. However, a real solution is something that we may need to have sooner than we think, or else the hard-working middle-class taxpayers of America may order the beast of taxation brutally slaughtered before we act.

The editorial follows:

STATES HOLLERING ABOUT WELFARE

From a cloud no bigger than a man's hand a few years ago, the cost of welfare programs on both a state and federal level has ballooned into a gigantic dark thing hovering over the nation.

The rise in welfare rolls not only continues to go up, the rate of increase is accelerating.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare reports that in November, the latest month for which full figures are available, there was an unprecedented increase of 282,000 recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

The total was swollen somewhat because it included thousands of families of striking General Motors workers. Even so, November was the fourth straight month that AFDC rolls climbed by more than 200,000.

Two years ago, the number of Americans on AFDC was rising at the rate of one million annually. In 1970 it was two million annually. If the October-November rate were to be maintained, it would leap to 3.4 million annually.

In any event, as of last November, a total of 9.4 million men, women and children were enrolled in AFDC.

The welfare situation has reached the crisis point in a number of states, precisely those which should be the wealthiest and most prosperous.

In Illinois, for example, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie estimates that increasing costs of the state's public aid programs will consume more than four-fifths of the growth in revenues from all state sources in the coming fiscal year.

"The existing system of public welfare is a social and financial disaster," he commented

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

as he presented a \$1.12 billion welfare budget for fiscal 1972, \$261 million higher than that for 1971.

"During the past two years, we have been able to live with this crisis in Illinois," says Ogilvie. "But this runaway growth will catch up with us in 1972."

Gov. Ronald Reagan calls California's welfare system "a \$3 billion moral and administrative disaster." However, his proposed reform plan, which would cut back a variety of free services, makes it tougher to get on welfare and require recipients to work in public work projects, is expected to get nowhere in a legislature controlled by the opposition party.

Welfare is not only a political issue but an emotional one. Human beings are involved. Faced with agonizing choices or bankruptcy, state leaders increasingly look to the federal government, that fount of inexhaustible wealth, to take the welfare albatross from around their necks, or at least to carry more of the burden.

But proposals that the federal government take over responsibility for all public aid, a shift which would be of greatest benefit to the industrial states, have little support among small-state congressmen. And as it is, the accelerating increase in aid to recipients may already have thrown the welfare column of President Nixon's estimated 1972 budget out of kilter by as much as \$1.5 billion.

In the meantime, up and up welfare goes, and where it will stop—or how to stop it—nobody knows.

IN SALUTE OF ST. PATRICK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to salute the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick. Back in my district the cities of New York and Yonkers are alive with the shining hearts of Ireland's sons on their annual dance through the towns. All Americans join with them in their celebration today.

Those of Irish descent have contributed much to the formation of this great country. When their motherland was struck by famine, many crossed the Atlantic to find a new life in the virgin lands of America.

Here at first they were met with skepticism and distrust. Hostility and hardship marked the early path they followed. But they endured and survived. Their hard-working spirit and devotion to God and country soon won them a special place in our history.

During the rapid building of this Nation into a great industrial state, many Irishmen were counted among the leaders in the worlds of business and finance. In fact, their contributions were many in every field of endeavor.

When this Nation went to war, the blood of countless thousands of Irish Americans was spilled to help preserve the freedom and democracy that this country has enjoyed for nearly 200 years.

And today still this Nation welcomes new Irishmen to its shores and counts itself blessed by the gift of St. Patrick's land.

America has brought together many peoples of various races, creeds, and lands of origin. It has been characterized as the melting pot of the world. And on this day in particular it might seem that the Irish flavor is a wee bit stronger.

WILL ENACTMENT OF A UNIVERSAL NATIONAL HEALTH PLAN JEOPARDIZE THE VA HOSPITAL SYSTEM?

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, a number of bills have been introduced in the 92d Congress providing universal health insurance for all of America's citizens. The introduction of these measures is causing considerable concern among our national veterans' organizations because they fear that the VA hospital system might be dismantled and service to veteran patients jeopardized. Evidence of this concern appears in a recent article coauthored by two high national officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and published in a recent issue of their national magazine. I commend this article, which follows, to the attention of my colleagues:

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE: A THREAT TO VA HOSPITAL SYSTEM?

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Health care for Americans is a major issue. Cooper T. Holt, a Past Commander-in-Chief of the V.F.W. and director of the Washington Office, and Norman Jones, director of the V.F.W. National Rehabilitation Service, have carefully studied current bills which propose to solve the problem. This is their analysis, with all its serious implications for the VA Hospital System.)

Supporters of a Universal National Health Care Program are no longer dreaming of success—they are predicting it.

Spurred by compelling and disturbing evidence that the country is failing to deliver medical services to the whole populace, many groups, including influential labor unions, have joined this decade's health crusade.

Their objective is "to create a national health security program which . . . will make health services available to all residents of the United States . . ." as one bill before Congress states.

Hopefully this laudable objective should in some manner be achieved.

Universal health insurance probably will not become the law of the land in the next year or two. Its realization may require three or four years and it's almost a certainty. But the major question to be resolved is what kind of a program and what method of payment.

Several plans are in the legislative hopper. One would simply provide a limited tax credit for private health insurance and health costs. Proponents of universal health insurance do not believe this idea would scratch the surface of the real need.

Another proposal which seems to be favored by the Administration, although top Presidential advisers are still wrestling with the entire problem, would cover only costly illnesses which could wipe out personal and family financial resources.

Another concept would incorporate and utilize private health insurance. Some plans would maintain existing federal programs such as Medicaid and Medicare, but attempt to fill in their gaps. Even if one of these partial remedies is adopted, it presumably will

be only temporary. Unless they are proved to be reasonably adequate, universal health insurance legislation surely would follow.

Of the various proposals for universal health insurance, the bill introduced by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (Mass.) and co-sponsored by several of his Senate colleagues, and one introduced in the House by Rep. Martha Griffiths (Mich.), with numerous co-sponsors, seem to be the vehicles which will be accorded serious consideration.

Each would cover almost every conceivable health treatment or service provided by recognized health practitioners. The Griffiths Bill would require a deduction from benefits of \$2.00 for each professional visit or its equivalent. This presumably would be paid by the individual benefit recipient. The Kennedy Bill, on the other hand, requires no co-payment by the patient.

These two proposals would basically eliminate current federal health programs, such as Medicare, Medicaid and vocational rehabilitation remedial treatment and would blanket all citizens under one broad program. Military hospitals presumably would be maintained because of their special mission. One can foresee, however, the possibility of transfer of servicemen's families and military retirees and their dependents to a universal federal health program.

Various estimates of the cost of universal federal health care are bandied about. A reasonable consensus seems to be that in the first period of full implementation, which probably occur within two years, or less, of enactment, the cost might well be a staggering \$77 billion a year.

Remembering that Medicare's cost, particularly for physicians' fees, has far exceeded original so-called expert estimates, one could well add a sizable figure to the \$77 billion estimate. Of course, advocates of costly legislation usually minimize projected price tags in order to encourage support.

How would it be paid? No one is certain. One proposal would exact a 3% employer's tax and a 1% employee tax on wages and salaries up to \$15,000 a year. One source estimates this scheme as meeting 60% of the total cost, with 40% to be provided by appropriations from general federal revenue.

Neither the Kennedy Bill nor the Griffiths Bill would abolish or otherwise directly alter the VA hospital system. A crystal ball would be needed to predict the actual multiple effects and their extent on the VA hospital system over a period of several years after implementation of a universal federal health care program. These detrimental effects can, however, be predicted:

The dramatically increased demand created by health care activities financed through universal health insurance will make it more difficult for the VA to attract and keep top notch personnel.

Some veterans eligible for VA hospitalization, but who also could come under the federal health program, would utilize the general federal program to obtain necessary treatment in or close to their homes instead of traveling hundreds of miles, in some cases, to the nearest VA hospital. Medicare already has had this effect to some degree among elderly veterans and it is logical to predict the same thing if adequate health care is available to all veterans regardless of age under a broad federal program.

Thousands of currently vacant hospital beds and additional thousands of bed vacancies, created if veterans choose other facilities in electing federal health insurance benefits, might well be used for federal health insurance beneficiaries—the general public. The Griffiths Bill includes permission to enter into an agreement to pay VA hospitals for services to health insurance program beneficiaries.

This is where the Kennedy Bill is more complex. It states that while no VA facility or employee is a "participating provider,"

March 17, 1971

the VA nevertheless may be reimbursed for services furnished to a person eligible for universal health insurance benefits otherwise ineligible for care under any other federal program. Either of these provisions clears the way for admission of thousands of health insurance program beneficiaries to VA hospitals. Some may say it is illegal under present provisions of the law governing VA hospitals. True, so contends the V.F.W. However, the President could by executive order place federal health care beneficiaries in the same category for care in VA hospitals on a reimbursable basis as are Merchant Marine, Bureau of Indian Affairs beneficiaries, federal employees compensation beneficiaries and others. Legal or not, it would be difficult and probably impossible to negate such a Presidential decree.

In any event, it can be foreseen easily that universal health insurance will require all the health care personnel and facilities which can be mustered. It is unlikely that in view of such a demand that 30,000 or more VA hospital beds will be permitted to lie vacant.

What then is the proper V.F.W. position and action?

First, it is essential to preserve intact the VA hospital system and separate entitlement of veterans regardless of other federal health benefit programs.

Second, it is essential to fill all VA hospital beds with veteran patients or obtain legislation which would make certain dependents and survivors of veterans eligible for care in VA facilities. Military retirees and their dependents and survivors could be included. So could dependents of military personnel, particularly those not residing close to Armed Forces hospitals. In this manner it may be possible to utilize all VA hospitals to maximum capacity for the care of veteran patients or veteran-related patients.

The V.F.W. is committed to fight for preservation of the VA hospital system as a separate program for veterans. This it shall do.

INTERNATIONAL DEMOLAY WEEK

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced in the House a bill authorizing the President to proclaim this week—March 14 to 21, 1971—as "International DeMolay Week."

The Order of DeMolay is a character building organization of young men from the ages of 14 to 21 who are seeking to prepare themselves as better leaders and citizens for tomorrow.

The organization was founded in Kansas City, Mo., in March 1919, by the late Frank S. "Dad" Land, and is thus celebrating its 52d anniversary. It currently boasts a membership of nearly 3 million boys, with 2,500 chapters in 11 countries and territories.

Although the order serves as a recruiting ground for the Masonic lodges, membership is not restricted to the sons of Masons. Some Masonic relative or background is expected, however.

DeMolay is founded on and teaches its members the virtues of reverence, comradeship, courtesy, fidelity, filial love, and patriotism. I am hopeful that my colleagues will join me this week in observing the 52d anniversary of DeMolay.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

NO PROTEST ON LAOS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial appearing in the Thursday, February 18, 1971, edition of the Daily Trojan, the campus newspaper at the University of Southern California.

The editorial emphasizes and contrasts the reaction on campuses, particularly the USC campus, during the early days of the Laos campaign as compared to the violence and unrest which accompanied the incursion into Cambodia.

I think the editorial will encourage the President as well as those of us in the Congress who have been supporting his efforts to disengage militarily from Southeast Asia and I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

NO PROTEST ON LAOS

The outcome of the invasion of Laos by South Vietnamese troops is still in doubt. Yet the outcome of this operation will have significant influence on the duration of American involvement in the war.

American students, including USC students, have in the past been vocal and sometimes violent, in expressing their opposition to American moves that to them signal continued American participation and escalation of the Indochina conflict. Yet, unlike the Cambodian invasion last May, which resulted in massive strikes on American campuses, the Laotian invasion has stirred little protest from the students.

At USC, while individuals may express opinions, there has been no unified action of protest. Leaders of last May's strike attempted to rally support for a protest march over the weekend, but failed to generate any significant student response.

While perhaps a majority of students may disagree with this extension of the war, an observer of campus events would have no reason to believe that they did. The last five years have been a time of large protest, and last May saw the largest number of students participating in protest. Why, then, have the campuses been quiet on the Laotian invasion?

The reasons are complex, but there are reasons. President Nixon did not build up the invasion of Laos, as he did with the Cambodian invasion, by going on television before the nation. Rather the preliminaries of the operation were cloaked in a news embargo. The Laotian action was not made to seem as great as the Cambodian invasion, and, thus, protest would not be as great.

No U.S. ground combat troops are involved with the invasion as they were in the Cambodian invasion. U.S. participation does not seem as great. The Laotian invasion is a South Vietnamese action, despite the fact that the operation was planned and approved by President Nixon.

Student leaders, particularly those at USC, have lost the support of the mass of students, and they realize it. Too many students recognize that their goals at the universities are not mass protests against the war. Students, also, seem to believe that President Nixon's plans of Vietnamizing the war are leading to decreased American troop participation. Few students buy the theory of American aggression and imperialism espoused by campus militants.

The Laotian invasion is vital to Nixon's plans for American withdrawal. If the South

Vietnamese can keep the Ho Chi Minh trails blocked and keep supplies from reaching the enemy troops in Cambodia and South Vietnam, the American withdrawal timetable can be met and the forces of Cambodia and South Vietnam can be built up to a level capable of withstanding future enemy offensives.

But if the invasion fails, the war could continue much as it has. North Vietnam could choose to step up support for guerrillas in Thailand or step up its own military effort in central Laos. Or the North could strike directly against the forces of the South in Laos. Any of those actions might necessitate even further American involvement and indicate a failure of Nixon's famous plan to win the war.

The war must end. Nixon's policies, if the South Vietnamese succeed in Laos, seem to be decreasing American involvement in the war. Nixon's policies seem to be the best means of ending the war, aside from a negotiated political settlement, which seems an impossibility, judging from the peace talks. Unilateral withdrawal would be a disaster, as great a disaster as trying to win the war militarily. American students realize these things, and are no longer protesting.

A TRIP TO IRELAND

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1971

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that seems to be an eternal certainty is the beauty that is Ireland. Her lakes and fields, her mountains and rivers, and her people have thrilled men through the ages. Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., has recorded his impressions of a journey through Ireland in the Sunday, March 14, issue of the National Catholic Register. While Father Lyons writes of some interesting spots in Ireland, he unfortunately neglects two of the country's more beautiful counties: Leitrim and Sligo. I do not mean to sound prejudiced, but even before I first saw them I knew they were the best spots in the Emerald Isle; my mother and father, who were born in these counties told me so.

Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted me, I include the article written by Father Lyons:

A TRIP TO IRELAND

(By Father Daniel Lyons)

March 17, the Feast of St. Patrick, is an appropriate time to plan a trip to Ireland. Take it from one who studied there for four years: it is the friendliest country in the world. There is no language barrier, and asking for directions is like a letter of introduction. The weather is refreshing, the people are delightful, and every nook and corner is as pretty as a park. In other countries you tour; in Ireland you visit.

Start at Shannon and drive to Killarney in the kingdom of Kerry, where they never answer your question but ask you another. Kerry, where the mountains laugh, weep, and weave their spells. Kerry, where they had so much land they "put it in hapes."

Killarney, said Austin, "has all the world over no superior." Queen Victoria called it "fairyland." Wrote Wordsworth: "In point of scenery this is the finest portion of the British Isles." Lord Macaulay added: "The

gem of Killarney, not a reflex of heaven, but a bit of heaven itself."

Be sure to drive around the Ring of Kerry, through Kenmare. Lunch at Waterville. Visit Cahirciveen, the former home of Daniel O'Connell, who won emancipation for the Catholics. See Dingle Bay and Castlemaine. You will see why E. V. Morton referred to "the enchanted hills of Kerry, as the evening turns them purple."

Killarney is the ideal place for strolling, golfing, boating, sightseeing or just plain resting. Muckross Abbey (1348 A.D.) is there. So is Ross Castle, where Tennyson wrote "The splendor falls on castle walls. . . ." Wrote Macaulay: "The myrtle in Kerry loves the soil. The turf is of a livelier hue than elsewhere. The hills glow with a richer purple. . . . I never in my life saw anything more beautiful."

Drive on to Cork City via Glengariff, Bantry Bay, Skibbereen, Bandon and Kinsale. The sights are as pretty as they are inter-

esting. "You can set God in every turn of the road in west Cork," say the people. So you can, for He is "nearer than the door."

The city of Cork was founded in the 8th century by St. Finbarr. All extroverts, Corkonians are sly of wit but their hearts are warm. When I asked a farmer in Macroom how come there were no Jesuits in Cork, he replied: "We attribute that to the power of prayer."

Drive to Cobh, then north to kiss the Blarney Stone. Cliodhna, queen of the fairies, gave it to Cormac: "Kiss it," she said, "and you'll never want for words." No one who kissed it ever has. Drive on to Youghal, where Sir Walter Raleigh was mayor in 1588. Visit the famous Cistercian Abbey at Mount Melleray. Then on to Waterford and the cut-glass factory.

Visit Tipperary and Wexford, birthplace of Commodore Barry, father of the American Navy. Be sure to see Glendalough, with its seven monastic ruins, where thousands of

Irish youths were trained as missionaries to the Continent.

Don't forget Dublin, which Morton described as "an aristocrat among cities, with an easy manner and a fine air of unstudied elegance." Added Lynn Doyle: "Dublin is easy to live in. If there is a pleasanter place in the world post me a ticket." Visit Galway Bay and watch the sun sinking in the west, filling the sky with brilliant gold.

Drive on to County Mayo, which furnished America's first Cardinal, a mayor of New York, and the father of the Argentine Navy. See the Belleek factory and press on to Donegal, where the air is so salubrious that no one ever dies, they say, "except the doctors, and they die of poverty."

They are good people in Ireland, and none have been stancher to the one true Faith. Nor has any country in this century supplied more missionaries to the waiting world. There is not a mean man among them. But be careful; they'll steal your heart away!

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 18, 1971

The House met at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Wait on the Lord: be of good courage and He shall strengthen thine heart: wait, I say, on the Lord.—Psalms 27:14.

Our Father God, we come to Thee, troubled about the tensions of these times, fearful about the future, and with a deep concern about our Nation and our world. As we endeavor to do our work and play our part during these days of destiny, we bow at the altar of prayer seeking the guidance of Thy wise spirit.

"God of the strong, God of the weak,
Lord of all lands and our own land,
Light of all souls: from Thee we seek
Light from Thy light, strength from
Thy hand."

Thus empowered and sustained may we enter upon the labors of this day with souls restored and spirits renewed.

Bless our Nation with Thy favor and by Thy grace enable us to lead our people in the paths of righteousness for Thy name's sake. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman let the Chair announce the approval of the Journal?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I insist on my point of order at this point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri insists on his point of order, and, of course, there is no quorum present in the Chamber.

Mr. BOOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Alexander	Buchanan	Diggs
Anderson	Clark	Dorn
Tenn.	Clay	Dowdy
Ashley	Conable	Edwards, La.
Badiollo	Crane	Fraser
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Gallagher
Blagg	Dent	Goldwater
Blatnik	Devine	Gray

Green, Oreg.	Landgrebe	Rostenkowski
Green, Pa.	McCulloch	Rousselot
Halpern	Macdonald,	Scheuer
Hansen, Idaho	Mass.	Skubitz
Hawkins	Madden	Steiger, Wis.
Heckler, Mass.	Mink	Stuckey
Hogan	Rhodes	Wilson, Bob
Jones, N.C.	Roberts	Wright
Kyl	Rosenthal	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it. So the Journal was approved.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

(Mr. HALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it has often been said by those far wiser than I, that a politician's word is his greatest asset. I am sure this applies equally to elected public officials. I full well understand the apologies that were issued for "the leadership" here yesterday, referring to the promise last Thursday of no legislative business; in fact, the statement was that on Monday and on Tuesday those could be absent for other business, who would not attend the pro forma meetings.

I hold here in my hand those commitments. To involve the leadership, in addition to breaking the word, indicates some question of the quality of leadership and the planning program that we must expect hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of

prolonging the proceedings here today when we have come in early for the purposes of considering an alleged international emergency. However, I do want to serve notice on all concerned that if we are going to have violations of the public trust, indeed, of legislative program hereafter by any act of chicanery which involves renegation of the rules adopted by the last Congress and the law of the land, to say nothing of the given word—there will be objection per se, if not obstruction per se.

ROLLCALL VOTES ON TUESDAY LAST

(Mr. BOOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD) and myself, discussed this matter. The gentleman from Missouri is correct. He did ask me specifically whether or not there would be any business on Tuesday and I replied categorically that there would not be business.

I said on yesterday, and I repeat today, that my office as late as 11:45 on Tuesday was telling people there would be no votes.

I went to the late Whitney Young's funeral. There I saw the minority leader. He asked me at 9 o'clock in the morning on Tuesday whether there would be a vote and I told him "No." We both missed the votes.

It was a matter over which I had no control. I again say what I said yesterday, I did not think the matter was of any special urgency to require a vote on Tuesday. I am sorry it happened and I apologize to the membership that it happened.

THE SST AND MASS TRANSIT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today the